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(**The meeting was called to order at 9:32 A.M.**)  

D.P.O. HORSLEY:  
It is now 9:30. Mr. Clerk, would you please call the roll.  

MR. LAUBE:  
Good morning, Legislator Horsley.  

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Here.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Here.

LEG. BROWNING:  
Here.

LEG. MURATORE:  
Here.

LEG. HAHN:  
(Not Present).

LEG. ANKER:  
Here.

LEG. CALARCO:  
Present.

LEG. MONTANO:  
Here.

LEG. CILMI:  
Here.

LEG. BARRAGA:  
Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Here.

LEG. NOWICK:  
Here.

LEG. GREGORY:  
Here.

LEG. STERN:  
(Not Present).
LEG. D’AMARO:
Here.

LEG. SPENCER:
Here.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Here.

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

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay, we have a quorum.

May I please ask Legislator Thomas Muratore to lead us in the salute to the flag. Oh, there you are, Tom.

Salutation

The Invocation will be given by Pastor Scott Kraniak from the Centereach Bible Church, guest, of course, of Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:
Good morning, everyone. It’s with great pleasure that I introduce Pastor Scott Kraniak. Scott is the Senior Pastor of the Centereach Bible Church in Centereach since 2005. Prior to becoming pastor, he attended North Carolina Bible College. He has a Bachelor’s Degree in Theology, he has a Masters in Christian Counseling. Pastor Scott is a mental health counselor specializing in suicide prevention, depression, teen-cunning issues and family mediation.

Scott is very involved in the community. He has served as a Brookhaven Youth Board member, Suffolk County Ministries Association, and what’s unique about him, he’s the track Chaplain at Riverhead Raceway. And in his own words, Scott says, "I like fast cars"; so that’s a little different than we’ve gotten here with some pastors.

Scott is married to Julie and has three sons; Jacob, Aaron and Luke. He is currently in contract with a publisher for a second book about depression and anxiety due for release in Spring of 2014. So without further ado, I invite Scott Kraniak to perform our invocation. Scott?

PASTOR KRANIAK:
Thank you, Tom. It’s a great honor to be here. I want to thank Tom for asking me to come here and speak to you this morning to do this invocation. And again, the honor it is to speak to you wonderful people, men and women here, and to allow me to be able to pray and speak about God in a public forum; that says a lot and I’m grateful that we can still do that.

With all you have to do here, it is of grave importance that we do things that are pleasing to our God. Making and establishing laws to better serve our land and our people is a great responsibility. I once heard it said that without great power comes great responsibility, and if ever our land needs God’s discretion in the use of that power, it is certainly now.

Now before I open up in prayer, I would like to share one short scripture from the Bible. But before I do, Tom reminded me that we lost someone, our PO here, Bill Lindsay, so please remember him and his family in your prayers. But the one short scripture that I’d like to read to you, I chose it for
a very specific reason. Number one, because it gives us great insight to how we are to lead our people and our land, and it's filled with great truth for people of leadership. But I also chose this scripture because it's very unique in that besides being accepted by Christianity, because it's from the Old Testament, besides being accepted by Judaism, it's also accepted by Islam as the Book of Proverbs is one book in the Old Testament that is accepted by all three religions. And the scripture is Proverbs, the Book of the Wisdom of King Solomon, Proverbs 29:18 and it says this: "Where there is no vision, the people perish, but he that keepeth the law, happy is he. A land without law and people who keep the law and obey it is a lawless society where only chaos will reign." May you all catch God's vision for Suffolk County and may the people of Suffolk County follow that vision.

Let us bow our heads in a word of prayer. Lord God, maker of Heaven and Earth, Dear Father, may you bestow upon these great men and women in leadership the wisdom, the character and the discretion to do what needs to be done; to do what needs to be done in a way that would be pleasing to you. And with that wisdom acted upon, may this great County be blessed by you. In Jesus' name we pray, amen.

"Amen" Said in Unison

LEG. MURATORE:
Thank you, Scott.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Nice job, Scott. Thank you.

Thank you very much, Pastor. And very nice job. May we please continue to stand for a moment of silence and let us remember all those men and women who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our country. And may I offer Legislator Krupski to continue on with our moment of silence.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Riverhead Police Detective Robert Boden died yesterday, he was 54-years old. The lifelong Riverhead resident was a 32-year veteran of the Riverhead Police Department. Detective Boden, the son of a Riverhead Police Detective, started out on the force November 16th, 1981, the same day as Riverhead Police Chief David Hegermiller. They were hired on the same day in April, 1981, and attended the Police Academy together and came up through the ranks together. He will be missed by his family and his community.

Moment of Silence Observed

All right. Good morning, everybody, and welcome to the General Meeting of October 8th in our glorious County Center in Riverhead. On -- are we all set, we're ready?

On September 11th, we lost a true public servant, the late Presiding Officer William Lindsay, who possessed an unstoppable determination to serve the people of Suffolk. Even in the midst of battling cancer, Bill was the strongest serving -- the longest serving Presiding Officer in the history of the Legislature. He possessed an ability to use common sense during his interactions with his fellow Legislators and constituents. It is now necessary that we fill the vacancy of the Presiding Officer for the term ending December 31st, 2013. We will now have an election for the position of Presiding Officer. Nominations to fill the vacancy of Presiding Officer for a term ending December 31st will now be accepted, and I would recognize Legislator Gregory for purposes of nomination

LEG. GREGORY:
Thank you, Deputy Presiding Officer Horsley. I would like to address our colleagues for the purpose of submitting the name Wayne Horsley for Presiding Officer.
As we mourn the loss of our great leader, Bill Lindsay, who Wayne so aptly described as a commonsense person, a great leader, someone that we all tremendously respected, Bill would understand that we have to move forward, that we have business to conduct, and that Wayne Horsley is that person, the caretaker, if you will, to carry us through this transition. I know Bill was very grateful for Wayne's leadership during Bill's toughest fight of his life, he has said that to me many times in conversation. I think that at this point, Wayne, who has not left yet --

(*Laughter*)

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

LEG. GREGORY:
The longest good-bye. We have to give him something to do -- no, I'm only kidding.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
(Laughter).

LEG. GREGORY:
That it's appropriate that you have shown tremendous leadership during this difficult time in the Legislature, I think it's only appropriate that you help the Legislature carry this body through this transition through the end of the year. I submit your name for nomination for Presiding Officer.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Legislator Gregory. And thank you for your kind remarks.

LEG. ANKER:
I'd like --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Is there a second?

LEG. ANKER:
I'd like to second that.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I recognize Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:
And also, I just want to comment, too, is that, again, it's very difficult to keep everybody on the same page, and I think Legislator Horsley has been able to do that, especially during the very hard times that we had to deal with when, you know, Bill wasn't here by our sides. So I wanted to, again, thank you for, you know, your commitment to leadership and, you know, we look forward to continue on -- continuing the goal of Suffolk County, and that is just to make it better and for all of us to work together. It's unusual, again, what we're dealing with on the Federal level, but we're -- you know, it's just not working, but what we're doing here in Suffolk, it is working and with your leadership, it will continue to work. Thank you.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, I'd like to share the second. Bill was an extraordinary man, an extraordinary leader. Nobody is going to fill his shoes. There is no other Bill Lindsay. But there was one person that Bill Lindsay
personally picked to be his Deputy and that was Wayne Horsley. He had great confidence in Wayne and we all supported that decision to have Wayne serve as his Deputy. We knew Bill was not of strong health and the possibility would come where Wayne would have to step up, and he did. He's led this body for quite a long time now, so I think it's only fitting. And I know, Wayne, that you're leaving the Legislature at the end of the year, but I think you are the right person for this time and I think it's certainly what Bill would want to see.

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much, Legislator Schneiderman. That was very nice.

There are -- are there any other nominations for the position of Presiding Officer?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Mr. Deputy Presiding Officer, I have no nomination, but I have a question on this, and I'm going to ask Counsel to weigh in.

The role of PO is an important role, but as there's been allusion to already, we are late in the year and Presiding Officer is a position that is selected to lead us and to do the ministerial work of the body for the full calendar year. So I've had some question, I've tried to take a look at it. As we know, there is a succession plan in place as we sit right now. If the Presiding Officer, for whatever reason, is not available, and Bill has passed, we have a DPO, then we go to a Majority Leader and then we go to a Minority Leader. Not that I'm looking to lead this body in that capacity, but I want to ask Counsel; George, procedurally, why are we doing this now?

**MR. NOLAN:**
Well, there's a vacancy in the office and pursuant to our rules, we are supposed to fill that vacancy within 60 days of the vacancy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Well, I -- now I guess I'm going to ask you a little bit more. So is it -- do we find that out of our code, or is that our own internal rule? Are we bound? We literally only have -- we're on October 8th, we have about, what, 60, 70 days, about 70 days left of this year; is that correct? Is it the Charter, George? What speaks to that specifically?

**MR. NOLAN:**
It's our rules.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Cite the rule. Yeah, could you cite the rule?

**MR. NOLAN:**
Just for a little background, a couple of years ago we -- it actually is not addressed in the Charter or the Administrative Code when we have a vacancy in the middle of the year. We did pass a law a couple of years ago to put in the Charter and the Code a succession; it was passed but unfortunately was vetoed by the County Executive and the override failed by one vote. I think it is something we should put in our Charter Administrative Code, but right now it's just under our rules. But I'm looking for the rule at the request of Legislator Montano, so if you give me a second and let me just find the rule.

(Brief Pause)

Okay, it's Rule 3.
LEG. KENNEDY:
Look, can you give us a little bit; what does it say specifically, George?

MR. NOLAN:
I'm getting there, Legislator Kennedy. It's actually D; "In the event of a vacancy in the Office of
Presiding Officer, such vacancy shall be filled at a regular meeting of the County Legislature within
60 days after such vacancy or resignation shall occur. The person so elected shall serve in that
capacity for the unexpired term of his or her predecessor." So if we elect somebody today, they will
serve till the end of the year at which time we'll elect a new Presiding Officer.

LEG. KENNEDY:
And what about the role of DPO? As our body sits right now, does Legislator Horsley have all of the
powers and the authorities that the PO had that we selected at the beginning of the year?

MR. NOLAN:
The rules really -- the rules state that the Deputy, in the absence of the Presiding Officer, presides at
the meetings. But there are other things that a Presiding Officer does and the rule does not really
address that. It does not say the DPO can then sign contracts or do other things, hiring, personnel
decisions. So I think it behooves us, this body to elect a Presiding Officer and invest that person
with the full powers that a Presiding Officer has.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay?

LEG. MONTANO:
Well, hold on.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I'm going to yield to Legislator Montano for a second.

LEG. MONTANO:
No, I just want to -- if you would suffer an interruption. What rule are you referring to now about
the PO, so I can just take a look at it.

MR. NOLAN:
In terms of the vacancy?

LEG. MONTANO:
Yes, in terms of the vacancy. Not filling the vacancy, that's rule D, 3-D. But you said that the
Deputy PO has -- or performs the functions of the PO under the rules; what rule?

MR. NOLAN:
I said that the Deputy will preside at a meeting.

LEG. MONTANO:
What rule is that?

MR. NOLAN:
B. And the --

LEG. MONTANO:
B? Okay, that's all I'm asking.
D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay?

LEG. MONTANO:
Not yet, let me read it.

(Brief Pause)

LEG. KENNEDY:
When is our last meeting?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
We have the budget meeting and three more after that.

LEG. MONTANO:
It says, "Exercise all the powers, duties and functions at a meeting." Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Look, for continuity and continuance, I guess, we should have a Presiding Officer named. I have no particular objection to Legislator Horsley. My questions run to specifically as to why we're taking this action this late in the year. If you count where we will be in session to do business, we're probably less than 60 between where we are right now and where we will be with our last meeting. Nevertheless, if there's some ambiguity or there's silence in the rules, then my suggestion -- well, I'll do it. I'll propose a rule change, then, coming into the beginning of next year. Because quite frankly, we should not have the ambiguity. We do have a very clear succession chain right now. I'd offer the capacity that really all the powers that Presiding Officer Lindsay had are vested in you right now, quite frankly. Whether you're DPO or PO, I think you're the one that's charged with the ability to go ahead and act on our behalf.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. I didn't -- I'm not sure I agree with that, but that's okay. What we'll do is that you can change those rules when it comes in January, and I think that would be the appropriate time for that.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you. Do you want to weigh in? (Laughter).

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
No, I don't.

(*Laughter*)

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I might be here, John. You never know.

(*Laughter*)

Are there any other nominations for the position of Presiding Officer?

LEG. NOWICK:
Can I ask a question?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes, you may.
LEG. NOWICK:
Just a question, because now I'm wondering. So if future Presiding Officer Horsley decides to leave earlier, then the next person in succession would be the Majority Leader; is that how it works?

MR. NOLAN:
In terms of chairing a meeting, that would be the case, yeah.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay?

LEG. NOWICK:
Okay. I was just curious.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yeah, but any of us could chair a meeting.

LEG. NOWICK:
Well, but --

MR. NOLAN:
But the rules do have a list of who presides at a meeting if somebody -- the PO or the DPO, and it just keeps going down till we finally reach you.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. KENNEDY:
No, no.

LEG. MONTANO:
I have a question.

LEG. KENNEDY:
That would be a meeting, George.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. MONTANO:
George, I have a question.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
The great fear.

LEG. KENNEDY:
(Laughter).

LEG. MONTANO:
Mr. Horsley? I have a question.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes, Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah. So upon your elevation to the Presiding Officer, that creates a vacancy in the Deputy Presiding Officer. So now we have 60 days to fill that?
MR. NOLAN:
Pursuant to the rules, that's correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
Why don't we fill that -- so the minute that you become the PO --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Then the count starts.

LEG. MONTANO:
-- we can elect -- we can elect someone today, actually; can we not?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
You could.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. Thank you.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Let me ask this question again; are there any other nominations for the position of Presiding Officer? Are there any other nominations for the position of Presiding Officer? Are there any other nominations for the position of Presiding Officer? Hearing none, we will -- we will vote. May I ask the Clerk to do a roll call vote?

MR. LAUBE:
Yes, sir.

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

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Oh, Spencer; sorry.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I jumped on that one.

MR. LAUBE:
No, that's my fault. D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.
LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMANN:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMANN:
Congratulations.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

Applause

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Swearing in the newly elected officer will be our County Clerk, Judith Pascale.
MS. PASCALE:
Congratulations.

(**Oath of Office Administered to
Legislator Wayne Horsley, Presiding Officer**)  

P.O. HORSLEY:
Tom, you still get the clock.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay (laughter).

P.O. HORSLEY:
First of all, I want to note that -- thank Legislator Krupski for providing us the pumpkins today. 

Applause

LEG. CILMI:
Were those pumpkins stolen?

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
And I want all to note, now, that I have the Great Pumpkin.

(*Laughter*)

And please, keep that under your -- in mind always.

To my colleagues, I want to thank you for my -- for your support, not just today but for all the days that I've served in this body. It is a privilege to serve as your Presiding Officer. I am honored to assume the leadership role at the Legislature and plan to continue Bill Lindsay's call-to-arms. This isn't my term as Presiding Officer, this is Bill's, and I can't think of a better legacy to leave for Bill than to lead by his example.

While I've often called Bill the lion of the Legislature, we rarely heard him roar unless it was absolutely necessary. He was steadfast and empathetic, which are the marks of a true great leader. Let us listen rather than roar, let us all come together for the betterment of the great people of Suffolk County. And again, I want to thank you for your support. And I also want to make a comment that I would like to thank Governor Cuomo, Governor Cuomo's staff, Commissioner of Parks Rose Harvey for their gracious and patience for the longest good-bye. Thank you. And thank you to them.

Applause

All right, let's move along, let's get to work.

Proclamations

We have several proclamations today. **Legislator Schneiderman** will present a proclamation to **Charlie Schneider, a Boy Scout from Hampton Bays Troop 483**. During this year's National Scout Jamboree, Charlie saved the life of a fellow scout who began choking on a cupcake.
LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
That's what I was going to say.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Well, it's certainly worth saying again.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Great.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I have the Great Pumpkin, Jay, just keep that in mind.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Fellow Legislators, one of the best parts of our job is to recognize people from our community, to bring them here, to proudly present them and congratulate them or thank them for their service. It's nice to do that with a young individual. This is Charlie, Charlie Schneider. Hi, Charlie. Charlie is a Boy Scout working on his Eagle Scout, which I suspect, based on all these merit badges, he's going to make it. You know, you never know when you're going to be called into action, and Charlie discovered this at a jamboree, a scouting event, I think it was down in West Virginia?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
Bechtel Summit, West Virginia.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Bechtel Summit, West Virginia. And a fellow scout was choking on, I guess it was a cupcake, and luckily -- now, was this one of your merit badges, like life-saving or the Heimlich maneuver?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
We do have first aid.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
First aid; a first aid merit badge. Did you get the badge after the rescue?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
No, before.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh, good, so you had good training. So anyway, he saw the fellow scout choking, he quickly jumped into action, performed the Heimlich maneuver. The cupcake, I guess, shot out? (Laughter). How does that happen?

MR. SCHNEIDER:
It just kind of came out.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay, and obviously saved the other scout's life. So to Charlie, we owe him certainly a debt of gratitude. He's really an exemplary young man, and if we could all give him a nice round of applause.

Applause
I'll say a few more things. You know, besides working on his Eagle Scout, Charlie is aspiring to be a paramedic. He comes from a family of dedicated first responders. His father Allen is a 31-year member of the Hampton Bays Fire Department, his sister Julie volunteers with the local ambulance. I know some of his family members and friends are here. You want to just -- Mom?

**MS. SCHNEIDER:**
Yes.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes, hi. Well, thank you, you've done well.

**MS. SCHNEIDER:**
Thank you very much.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Do you want to -- are you brave enough to say a word or two?

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**
Sure.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Come on up. And I have -- I'm going to be presenting Charlie with a proclamation on behalf of myself as the Legislator for the 2nd District as well as the whole County. I'm sure you all share with me in giving this proclamation to Charlie. So Charlie, come on, say a word.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**
What would you like me to say?

(*Laughter*)

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Do you want to say anything about the incident or of being a scout, what you've learned?

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**
I've learned a lot from Boy Scouts. A lot of the stuff that they taught me is going to be used later in my life. These badges aren't just patches to me, they're life skills and each thing has a meaning to me. So hopefully in life everything that I've earned today or recently in my past will be used further in my life, and hopefully I'll continue on and help other people get to the point I'm at.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Good job.

Applause

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Good. Congratulations.

Legislator Krupski will present a proclamation to Lance Prager, an EMT who save a gentleman’s life while off-duty.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
An off-duty Suffolk County Police Officer revived an elderly man who had suffered cardiac arrest, had no pulse and wasn't breathing in Mt. Sinai. Suffolk County Police said Lance Prager, an off-duty Emergency Service Section Officer, had just left a training session when he saw the man suffer
cardiac arrest. The man started breathing on his own and was taken by Port Jeff Volunteer Ambulance.

You know, we just want to thank Officer Prager for his quick action, his ability to do what he was trained to do. It's really important to, obviously, this man and his family and we all appreciate that kind of service to the community. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Legislator. And congratulations, Officer Prager.

Legislator Anker will present a proclamation to Tony Galatro, owner of Saddle Rock Ranch, and we'll let her tell you about it.

LEG. ANKER:
I'll tell you a little bit about Saddle Rock Ranch. It was probably, let's see, almost 20 -- well, 17 years ago. I lived close to Saddle Rock Ranch in Coram and I took my daughter, she was five, and it was the first time she had actually been on a horse, and since that time we've been part of the equestrian family. It's a wonderful place to be.

Saddle Rock Ranch in 2004 was acquired by FREE, and that is Family Residence and Essential Enterprises, and their basic goal is to help those in need with -- that have issues with emotional and physical handicaps. They have wonderful therapeutic, recreational programs. And especially there's a new program that you have for veterans, and I would like Tony just to say a few words about that program. Because we have so many vets coming back from the war, and it's amazing what animals can do as far as, you know, with the therapy programs that you have. So could you tell us a little bit about your programs?

MR. GALATRO:
Well, thank you. It's a pleasure to be here. Veterans are our goal, it's been our goal. And again, Saddle Rock Ranch is a service of family residences and essential enterprises, the largest human services agency on Long Island. We strive to honor our heroes of all ages by offering therapeutic and recreational horseback riding to their families as well as the heroes themselves. So we're striving ever more to offer this complimentary service to as many veterans as we possibly can.

Again, Saddle Rock is a beautiful place, I invite you all to come down and take a look. We're fifteen and a half acres of hope and happiness. It's just a wonderful place that we offer over 350 therapeutic lessons on a monthly basis. So we thank you very much for this honor.

Applause

LEG. ANKER:
And again, thank you very much, Tony, you're amazing. I appreciate it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Congratulations, and thank you.

Legislator Calarco will present proclamations to sponsors of the Play-For-Peace Soccer Tournament.

LEG. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. And it's a pleasure to be able to present some proclamations to some really deserving individuals and organizations and businesses. And if all the sponsors who are here for the Play-For-Peace Soccer Tournament, please come up. I know Bridge Hampton Bank was
here, BiasHELP, Long Island Wins; the Suffolk County PBA, I saw Lou Tuttone in the back of the room; if you guys could all come up.

I know some of you have heard me talk about this soccer tournament I hold every -- we host every summer. Five years ago we had a horrific hate crime happen in the Patchogue-Medford area which involved -- while it happened in Patchogue Village, it involved individuals from across our community. And we were looking to try to find ways to start to build -- to bridge the divide that was existing there to try to bring people together and one of the things that we thought of doing was a soccer tournament, some sort of sports, something that people all share in common and a way to get people to interact. It took a lot of hard work, we were in our fifth year this year of the soccer tournament. And unfortunately soccer tournaments aren't cheap, they cost a lot of money to put together, and we also wanted to make sure that we raised enough funds to actually provide some money to the Patchogue-Medford Library which runs a whole host of culturational programs, whether it's citizenship programs, ESL classes for adults, all sorts of different programs, it is really the hub of our community.

So every -- for the last two years, and this year including, we were able to raise $1,000 to help the library meet that mission, that goal, in addition to actually funding the program. And today we have with us a few of our sponsors: Bridgehampton National Bank, which joined us a couple of years ago, is one of our corporate sponsors, they give us quite a substantial amount of funding as well as the Suffolk County PBA, Gershow Recycling, who was one of the first to jump on board, TriTech Real Estate and Riverwalk Community Development; all of them have made very substantial donations. But some of our other sponsors, Long Island Wins has been there at all of our meetings, helping to organize it, BiasHELP has been with us for many years helping us to organize the event, and we get a really good cross -- a diversity of people to participate. We had over ten teams this year, it was a very successful tournament. We added something new this year, at the end of the tournament we hosted a dinner for all of the players to get them to stick around and interact a little bit more with each other. And we had a number of local restaurants that donated the food, so we were able to do that. So I couldn't read you all of the sponsors, but we had over 19 of them and it was a really fantastic tournament this year.

And I also must thank those people who have been on our board, our committee, to host this every year. The Patchogue-Medford Youth Soccer League, which without their expertise in how to run a tournament as well as their fields, we'd never be able to pull this off; the Church of the Nazarine, Pastor Bonfiglio who was here a few months back giving our opening invocation, he's there with his volunteers every year; Long Island wins, BiasHELP; the Patchogue-Medford Congress of Teachers, among a number of other organizations. So we want to thank them all for helping us. And if any of them would like to add a couple of words, please, feel free. No? Okay.

MR. NOLAN:
Yeah, hi, I'm Howard Nolan with Bridgehampton National Bank. This event hits close to home because I live in the Patchogue-Medford community and both my children grew up playing soccer and also playing in the Patchogue-Medford Sports program. I coach there as well. So it's certainly something that, at the bank, we try to do is support our local communities and we thought this is something we should be doing for Patchogue. So thank you, Rob.

LEG. CALARCO:
Thank you very much, Howard. So I have some certificates for everyone. Howard? Thank you, everyone.

Applause
P.O. HORSLEY: Congratulations and job well done. I understand that Legislator Spencer has a proclamation for the Legionnaire of the Year, Dennis Madden.

LEG. SPENCER: Good morning. I would like to ask if Dennis Madden would join me with his fellow post members, if they would come up.

This is a real privilege for me to be able to recognize Dennis. Dennis is currently the 1st Vice-Commander of the Greenlawn American Legion and has served as Membership Chairman since 2005. Never missing an opportunity to recruit new members, the Post membership has grown by 250% and continues to exceed the Department of New York's membership goals since Dennis has been Chairman.

In addition, he's organized many activities and programs which have made Greenlawn Post 1244 one of the most active posts in the country. This year, in recognition of his sincere belief and the mission of the American Legion, and for his hard work and dedication, the Greenlawn Post, the Suffolk County American Legion, the 10th District of the Department of New York, have chosen Dennis to be their 2013 Legionnaire of the Year. It is my distinct privilege to recognize Dennis and to present him with this proclamation for this fantastic honor.

Thank you.

Applause

MR. MADDEN: Thank you, everyone, for this great honor. It's a pleasure to be here this morning. I can't thank my comrades and colleagues enough for coming out to support me today. And it has been said that there is no greater sign of respect, from one veteran to another, than the hand salute, and with that...

Mr. Madden Gave a Hand Salute to his Fellow Comrades

Thank you. Thank you, all.

Applause

P.O. HORSLEY: Doc, one second. Before you take your final picture, Legislator Krupski wants to just add an additional comment.

LEG. KRUPSKI: I would just like to thank -- I was talking to Bob Nevel here this morning and he's very active in the Southold group. I just want to thank you guys for the work you do in the community. You're really a part of the community and everyone appreciates it.

P.O. HORSLEY: Thank you.

(Photograph Taken)

Congratulations. Job well done.

Applause
LEG. SPENCER: Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY: You're welcome, Doc. And Bill, you're doing a good job over there. I'm watching you, from Babylon.

All right, congratulations again.

All right, we have -- this is a Volunteer Recognition Program for Firefighters and EMS personnel. Resolution No. 339-2001 established a Volunteer Recognition Program for the firefighters and EMS personnel whereby each Legislature -- Legislator has the opportunity to formerly nominate one person in his or her district for their outstanding service to the community as a firefighter or EMS worker. At today's General Meeting, I will read into the record the names and a brief district's designated volunteer. Any presentations of proclamations will be done in each individual Legislator's district. But if any recipients are in the audience, please stand when your name is announced to be recognized, and thank you for that. I will now read the list of our honorees for both firefighters and EMS personnel.

First of all, from Legislator Krupski's district, Leon Jasinski. Leon Jasinski, are you here? Okay, Leon Jasinski is a 57-year member of the Riverhead Fire Department. He is a multi-talented member who is always willing to do whatever he can in any given situation. He recently reorganized and leads the Riverhead Fire Department's band which played in several parades this year. Leon was honored as the Riverhead Fire Department's 2012 Firefighter of the Year this past May.

Legislator Schneiderman's district, Lieutenant Matthew Shimkus. Lieutenant Matthew Shimkus, who joined the Southampton Fire Department in 2007, is currently a member of the rescue squad, the water rescue team and the rapid intervention team. He selflessly entered a burning building in an attempt to save the life of an elderly victim who had -- who had become overcome with smoke. Together, with another responder, they carried the victim through heavy smoke and flames. Sadly, the victim later passed. Congratulations.

Legislator Browning, Mastic Beach Fire Department & Ambulance Company. During Superstorm Sandy, the village of Mastic Beach took extensive damage due to flooding and wind damage. Throughout the duration of the storm, volunteers of the Mastic Beach Fire Department & Ambulance Co. Braved the elements to help people evacuate to safe locations. Some of the firefighters and EMTs had to battle through flooded roads, electrical fires and other issues to help get residents to a safe location.

Legislator Muratore's District. Legislator Muratore would like to honor eight individuals from the Ronkonkoma Fire Department who saved the life of a 1-year old girl in cardiac arrest: 1st Assistant Chief John Santoli, Firefighter Doug Michels, Firefighter Vincent Diaz Jr., EMT Tony Carlo, Firefighter Thomas McGrath, Firefighter Thomas Weinhofer, EMT Stepeh Etts, and Paramedic Sam Miller. Congratulations to all.

Legislator Hahn's District, Arthur Bryant. Arthur was a member of the Setauket Fire Department for 75 years and served the residents of East Setauket, Poquott, Old Field and Setauket with valor and bravery. On September 10th, Arthur passed away at the age of 93. Arthur devoted his life to defending and serving his neighbors. On behalf of the grateful community, Legislator Hahn nominates him as the 5th Legislative District's Firefighter of the year. Congratulations.

Legislator Anker's District, Robert Pobjacky. During Winter Storm Nemo, the Mount Sinai Fire Department received a call to assist the Port Jefferson Ambulance Corps in helping stranded vehicles. When Robert and his rescue crew arrived to the scene of the call, they met a man and a
woman who were stranded in their car. The man was disabled due to a pending surgery and was not able to walk back to his home. Robert and his crew acted quickly and wrapped the man comfortably and pulled him on a sled through the snow back to his home. Congratulations, Robert.

Legislator Calarco’s District, and also Legislator Montano’s District honor Chief George Clancy. Honorary Chief George Clancy joined the Central Islip Fire Department as a member of the Engine Co. No. 1 in 1953. In 2003, he was presented with the title of Honorary Chief when he was honored for his 50 years of community service. Honorary Chief George Clancy has served on numerous committees during his time volunteering for the Central Islip Fire Department. After volunteering for 60 years, he continues to be an active member of Engine Co. No. 1. Legislator Montano is honored to name him the 2013 Volunteer Recognition Month Award from the 9th Legislative District.

Legislator Barraga, Trevor Ruiz. While traveling on his personal -- congratulations to the Chief Clancy.

Legislator Barraga’s honoree is Trevor Ruiz. While traveling on his personal motorcycle on May 12th, 2013, probationary firefighter Trevor Ruiz of the Bay Shore Fire Department stopped to investigate what looked to be a car accident, and soon realized that the male driver was in cardiac arrest and began chest compression on him. Shortly after he began to assist a Suffolk County Police Officer with the deployment and use of a defibrillator, before EMS units from Bay Shore/Bright Waters Ambulance arrived on the scene. Unfortunately, despite all the efforts, the male driver did not survive, but because of Mr. Ruiz’ actions that day, he gave that man and his family a fighting chance to survive. Congratulations to Trevor Ruiz.

Legislator Kennedy nominates John Martin. John Martin is the 3rd Assistant of the Nesconset Fire Department.

Legislator Horsley, that's me. I would like to acknowledge all Volunteer Firefighters -- The Great Pumpkin -- the volunteer firefighters and EMS personnel across the County, and especially those in my home district which includes Department of Babylon, West Babylon and Lindenhurst. It has been an honor and a privilege to have been associated with these distinguished men and women who are dedicated to their community and provide our residents with vital services 24/7. It is an unpaid commitment, which is priceless. Also, our fire department members went above and beyond to assist our residents during and after Superstorm Sandy, many times leaving their families behind to come to the aid of their neighbors. I am eternally grateful to each and every member of our volunteer fire districts in Suffolk County. I thank you for your service. You are an inspiration to all of us and, of course, be safe and I will always be thankful for your volunteer efforts in my community as well.

Legislator Stern picks Eytan Pick. Eytan was born in Israel and in 1969, while serving in the Israeli Army, he was wounded in battle. A medic who came to his aid was killed as a result. Instilling a deep sense of gratitude and desire to serve, in 2002 Eytan and his family moved to Dix Hills. In 2009, at the age of 60, Eytan joined the Dix Hills Fire Department and earned his New York State Certification as an EMT Critical Care. He also served as a basic life support instructor for the American Heart Association. Eytan was recently the recipient of the Dix Hills Fire Department's Prestigious Alan Cornfield Rescue Person of the Year Award. Eytan's passion for helping others help ensure that Dix Hills residents receive the finest professional emergency care available. Thank you very much to Eytan Pick.

Legislator D’Amaro’s pick is Kevin Heissenbuttel. Legislator D’Amaro is proud to honor Kevin Heissenbuttel of Deer Park as a Legislator’s Legislative District No. 17’s Volunteer Firefighter of the Year. A member of the Deer Park Fire Department since November of 2001, he holds the rank of Lieutenant and is one of the line officers. Lieutenant Heissenbuttel was considered the department’s
go-to man; where there's a job, task, community event or anything at all, he is one to go get the job done. Married with a child and second on his way, he maintains a full-time job and somehow still finds time to be one of Deer Park's most active members. He is affectionately known as Lieutenant Christmas, preparing the firehouse for the holiday, decorating and making his annual Christmas Eve Santa visit to both members and children and adopted needy families. He is well deserving of being recognized for efforts in serving the fire department and his community. Congratulations to Kevin.

Legislator Spencer, Fred Steenson, Sr., and John McKenna. Legislator Spencer would like to honor Firefighter John (Fred) Steenson, Sr., a 50-year volunteer with Huntington Manor Fire Department, and Firefighter/EMT John McKenna, a 41-year member of the Greenlawn Fire Department.

And that concludes our honorees for both the Firefighters of the Year as well as EMT personnel. Please, everybody, shhh. Congratulations to all. Give them all a hand. Nice job.

Applause

I do not have any more proclamations; is that correct? Very good.

All right, we're going to be moving over to the public portion. And as is our tradition and custom, we -- because of their schedules, we -- and because of their standing in the community, we ask that those elected officials be moved to the front, and the first speaker to speak in the public portion is the Supervisor of Riverhead, Sean Walter.

And Sean, I see you've got some sewer monies; all good.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:
We hope so. And congratulations, Legislator Horsley, for your nomination and election to Presiding Officer.

I have with me Michael Reichel, my Sewer Superintendent. I also want to congrat -- thank Legislator Krupski. Sadly, we lost Detective Boden yesterday in a sudden loss and it's going to be a great loss to the Police Department.

I'm here to talk about the sewers and I just want to sort of quote proverbs, okay. See, I'm not used to having the track Chaplain not do a smoke show after -- because if you've come to the Riverhead Racetrack, after he gives his invocation, he does a smoke show with his -- I think he's got like a '68 Comet (laughter). One of the things he said was proverbs without vision, the people will perish. Legislator Horsley, your vision and that of Legislator Krupski's and the County Executive is inspiring. You see, we can't have economic development in the Town of Riverhead, nor anywhere else in Suffolk County, without a sewer system. And I want to thank you and congratulate you for having that vision, and I'm addressing the entire Legislative body.

Riverhead is doing our part. We're doing our part to bring jobs to the town; we're doing our part to increase the tax space, the sales tax space; we're doing our part to bring workforce housing to the town, or whatever you want to call it because I know sometimes some of these things don't have the right connotations, but housing for the next generation of people. But Riverhead's a small town and we cannot do it on our own. And having this $8 million grant to upgrade the sewer district is quite humbling, frankly. It's a $22 million upgrade; without that grant, it would have been a 544% tax increase to the ratepayers of the district. You have made a huge -- or you are about to, if you pass 1806, a huge dent in that.
And in repaying you, our sales tax -- because as you know, we have things like a new Wal-Mart, a new Costco, a new Dick’s Sporting Goods, several new sports that will be the direct beneficiaries of this upgrade. Our sales tax revenue, I am sure, is going to repay you tenfold over the years.

So I thank you very much for your wisdom. I thank the County Executive for putting this forward. And if you have technical sewer questions, Michael Reichel is here to answer them; otherwise, I’m done. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY: Thank you very much. Michael, did you want to say something, you’re good? Go ahead.

MR. REICHEL: I just want to say thank you to the Suffolk County Legislators for considering our application. It's a great show of support to the Town of Riverhead and to all the East End towns to help improve the water quality and Peconic Estuary. It's important to the East End for our tourism, for our fishing industry and everyone who just lives there. Thank you very much.

LEG. KENNEDY: Wayne?

P.O. HORSLEY: Thank you very much. Yes?

LEG. KENNEDY: Can I ask him one quick question?

P.O. HORSLEY: Sure, go ahead.

LEG. KENNEDY: All right, thank you. Supervisor, first of all, thank you for being there. I sat on the committee, as a matter of fact, that started the whole process and recall hearing, I guess, about this application in Riverhead. But just remind me again, you are improving the functions at the plant and, in addition, expanding the size of the district?

SUPERVISOR WALTER: We're expanding the plant slightly, and it's the volume that the plant can handle and we're increasing the nitrogen removal capabilities. We have tertiary treatment sequencing batch reactors -- let's see if I remember all of this. We are now putting a membrane filtration system into the SBR’s?

MR. REICHEL: Yes.

SUPERVISOR WALTER: And that is going to reduce the nitrogen that's discharged into the Peconic Bay by 70%?

MR. REICHEL: Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY: Effluent content will be down to, what, five, four?
MR. REICHEL:
Four.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Four. Four milligrams?

SUPERVISOR WALTER:
Right.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay, good.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:
Thank you.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:
You know your sewers as well. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I think I just started a new precedent; boy, when things break down right away. Legislator Krupski, did you have a quick question? And then we're going to move on, because this is not -- we don't have questions during public portion. But go ahead.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I just -- it's -- because -- ha ha, you got me there, Wayne. Thank you. Because Riverhead was ready and they had their permits in place and it's a good project environmentally, that's why the County was able to select Riverhead. So Riverhead deserves a lot of credit here for being organized.

SUPERVISOR WALTER:
Thank you. We'll leave before there's any more questions. Thank you very much, everybody.

Applause

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Supervisor. And just one comment, is that you can't -- Rahn Emanuel says, the Mayor of Chicago, you can't have a 21st century economy with 19th Century infrastructure, so sewers are a good thing. You get my editorial no matter what.

Okay. The next elected official that would like to address the Legislature is Southampton Councilwoman Bridget Fleming.

COUNCILWOMAN FLEMING:
Good morning, Presiding Officer Horsley. Congratulations.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN FLEMING:
Thank you for your leadership, and I wish you all the best in your role.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

COUNCILWOMAN FLEMING:
Good morning, members of the Legislature. Thank you for allowing me to speak. I want to first thank you in connection with the Dark Skies Amendment that was signed into law last month. I know that that was brought forward by Legislator Schneiderman, in part because of a request by the Southampton Town Dark Skies Committee, so I want to just thank you for being responsive to the needs and concerns of the Town of Southampton.

I also want to thank you for your support for our continued efforts towards the revitalization of Riverside Downtown, and that's in connection with Resolution 1802 which is contribution to trail funding.

But I'm here particularly on Resolution 1810 in Public Works which proposes a new section to your Annual Vector Control Plan with regard to tick-borne diseases. Lyme's Disease and other tick-borne diseases are debilitating diseases that have a very real, very serious impact on the families of -- and the community members on the East End of Long Island. It is an increasing concern for us with regard to the health and safety of our community and it's a -- it would be a focus that is very welcome.

Should you find that you should pass this bill, and I do hope that you will, I know that we in the Town of Southampton and others on the East End of Long Island will be looking and watching with great interest as you tackle this very, very serious problem for the people of the Town of Southampton. So thank you very much for your time. And again, Legislator Horsley, I wish you all the best.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Councilwoman.

Applause

All right, another elected official that would like to address the Legislature is Jeffrey Sander, the Mayor of Newhaven -- North haven, I'm sorry.

MAYOR SANDER:
That was close.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
I knew that. You know these west-enders.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Connecticut has a Lyme's Disease problem, too.

MAYOR SANDER:
Anyone that's been to Northhaven would not mistake it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Would never do that, you're absolutely right.
MAYOR SANDER:
Anyway, I'm pleased to be here this morning to address you, and I also am here in support of the resolution to address the issue of tick-borne illnesses. We live in a beautiful place on the eastern end of Long Island, but many of our residents are hesitant to walk our trails or use our beaches or even have barbecues in their backyard for fear of getting tick-borne illnesses. It has really become an epidemic. And like most towns and villages on the East End, we are trying to address it with a comprehensive plan of education, four-poster programs which kill ticks on deer and culling of the heard. But if you read a lot of the details and a lot of the experts, this is not an easy problem to fix. You can find experts that allow you on all sides of the solutions. So what we need, I think, on the County is a systematic method to look at what things work and what doesn't. And I certainly urge you to support this legislation. There's not nearly enough being done at the State level or at the Federal level, and I applaud the County for taking this first step to try to introduce this legislation. I applaud Legislators Schneiderman and Krupski for introducing it, and I certainly strongly urge you to pass it, and I thank you for your time.

Applause

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

All right, I have one more -- I'm going to move, and I'm sure she won't object to this, the -- she wanted to be in the pile. I have Town of Southampton Supervisor Anna Throne-Holst is here; Anna, would you like to speak? Welcome.

SUPERVISOR THRONE-HOLST:
Thank you. Thank you for having me. Good morning, everyone.

If I may, first of all, I would like to join all of you in fond remembrance of Mr. Lindsay. For those of us who have had the pleasure of working with him, he was a one-of-a-kind and he will be fondly remembered and missed, and I would like to just send my thoughts to his family at this time.

And then move on to recognizing you, the new pres -- I mean the new Presiding Officer, Mr. Horsley, and I look forward to working with you as well, and I'm sure you will do a wonderful job.

I'd like to speak on three things this morning, if I may. First is the walkway that is being proposed for funding along the Riverside/Flanders trail there. And I want to thank Jay Schneiderman for the work that he has done as part of the Economic Development Task Force that I founded there and the work that we have been doing, and Jay has been an integral part of that work. And again, looking at it as a partnership from a regional perspective and economic development perspective for a region that needs it very badly.

And moving right on to more work introduced by Jay, the bill on the Vector Control Plan for addressing tick-borne disease. I think we all recognize the crisis that it is today and this is -- has been recognized by Southampton Hospital that is now also starting a program to address this and, again, working regionally on these issues is absolutely critical at this point. So thank you, Jay, for that, and I would appreciate everyone's support on it, with the understanding of what a critical issue it is.

And then on to bill 1565 that deals with the proposal to establish a commission for aquifer protection. I don't think there's anyone on the East End of Long Island and beyond that doesn't recognize that water quality and the protection of our waterways going forward is an absolute crisis issue at this point. Numerous efforts are going into this. The regional approach, the combined approaches and approaching the issue from every which way is critical here. So I speak in very, very strong support of that effort. It's a well thought-out plan, it's sound. It speaks to tangible
deliveries with time lines, it's based on science and it is sensitive to cost.

And I want to just finish by saying I think what's important with both of these bills that I just spoke to is that they recognize two very important things, which I think is the name of the game for all of us in government today. One is addressing the issue of cost and being sensitive to that and being as practical, proactive and a joint purpose there. But also, as importantly, recognizing the cost of not addressing these issues. When we're talking about public health and the issue that that is on a Federal level today and a national level is understanding the cost of not addressing what are the crisis in our public health. And again, with water quality and the protection of our aquifer and other waterways, the cost of not dealing with these issues today.

So I applaud you for addressing them, addressing them on a -- from a regional perspective and being sensitive to cost but also the cost of not addressing them, and I look forward, again, to working with all of you on these issues. Thank you very much.

Applause

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Madam Supervisor.

All right, we're going to move to the public portion again for the public, which we have limited to three minutes per speaker, and we do have a clock on the speaking. So the first -- the first speaker that would like to address us is Dr. Jeffrey Reynolds.

DR. REYNOLDS:
Good morning. I'm Dr. Jeffrey Reynolds, I have the privilege of being Executive Director of the Long Island Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence.

It seems like every time I'm before you I'm either bringing bad news about the region's Opiate crisis and how it's getting worse, or begging for LICADD's dollars back. Today I've got a little bit of both. I'll tell that you since I came here last year to have a very similar conversation, there have been 150 more overdose fatalities in Suffolk County. You know that the arrests have gone up, you know that you can't find enough room in the Suffolk County jail to put folks, you know that families lives who have been torn up continue to grow day by day by day. And yet here I am asking you to restore $35,000 in the budget. The problem, of course, by the way, has gotten a little bit worse with the advent of the I-STOP legislation which we all supported. And so when you see pharmacy break-ins and robberies and burglaries and potential violence, know that without intervention that gets progressively worse. Desperate addicts do desperate things.

We came to the County three years ago, after working without County funding for 55 years, and I came before you and said, "The problem has gotten so bad we're serving seven times as many people and they're out the door of our waiting rooms, can you please help." And you all responded, and for the first time funded LICADD for $35,000, funds for very specific things. It funds pretreatment groups for young people who have begun the use of alcohol, marijuana and Opiates, before it gets to the point where they're shooting up a pharmacy. We told you we'd serve a hundred people through the end of last month, we had served 386. We told you we'd do family education groups for families with a loved one who was struggling and teach them how to deal with the disease and how not to enable things as they get worse. We told you we'd serve 200 families, through the end of last month we served 280. It funds crisis interventions for young people, that is young people who have decided to make some changes, young people who have had a near fatal overdose but have been revived, or folks that have suicidal ideation, we told you we'd serve 100, kids through the end of last month we served 131. So in each and every category we've done almost three times as much as we promised the County we would do.
When we figured out -- and Kara Hahn is aware of this -- that the folks who are revived by the Suffolk County Police Department weren't necessarily getting treatment after getting revived with Narcan, we offered at no cost to the County to call those folks after they were discharged from the hospital and offer them access to treatment; again, at no cost to the County.

When the Sheriff said, "We've got a great cohort of kids where less than 16% are coming back into the jail, is there any way your staff could come and do support groups for them to give them the tools they need to be successful on the outside," again, our answer was, "Absolutely. Tell us where and when and we'll be there."

(Beeper Sounded)

And so right now as we speak, I've got a clinician who is wrapping up that group.

County Executive -- and I'll wrap up because I know my time has run. The County Executive, once again, opted not to make dealing with this crisis a priority in his proposed budget. This is the single biggest health concern facing Suffolk County right now. I hope you folk will understand the importance of these services and ensure that we're able to continue them going forward. I thank you for your time.

Applause

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Jeffrey.

All right, the next speaker is Doctor -- I'm sorry, Joe Gergela, and on deck is Paul Granger.

MR. GERGELA:
Congratulations on your election this morning.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Joe.

MR. GERGELA:
And to all of the Legislators, because I wish that the guys in Washington could learn a little bit about knowing how to go across the aisle to cooperate and do the people’s business, so I congratulate all of you.

I just want to comment on two different resolutions. The first one of interest to the Farm Bureau is IR 1700 which is slight amendments to Chapter 8 which governs the County Farmland Preservation Program. We've been working cooperatively with Sarah Lansdale and Auggy in her office, a number of Legislators, including our Al Krupski and Jay Schneiderman and several others, over two-and-a-half years. So we're trying to make the case that it's not only protecting farmland that's important, but also the economic well-being. Without farmers, then our farmland will be nothing more than open space. Some people may desire that, but us in agriculture want to keep it as a legacy and a long-term industry.

The bill does a couple of things. We modified it to allow a little bit more economic development activity on preserved farmland; as an example, a little expansion of retail for farm stands. And the other part is for on-farm processing, which we have not been able to do. And it's fairly limited. We did not overreach, it took a lot of work and a lot of compromise over the last two years to get it here today, so we would ask for your support.
The other resolution, I just want to mention, and I appreciate Jay Schneiderman's efforts on the tick-borne illness problem which is epidemic out here on the East End. I personally have been very involved with deer management issues, not very popular in some circles. However, it's a very real problem and it's not only the deer but other rodents and animals that carry ticks. And as a -- I'm on the Peconic Bay Board of Directors here in Riverhead and we've seen the numbers rise of people that have different illnesses as a result of ticks, so I think it's a step in the right direction on that problem.

From the deer management side, that's not where it's not so popular, we get millions of dollars a year in damage to crops. We've resorted to deer fencing. That, too, is not popular, because people say, Oh, we've got all this beautiful land and you're making it like Stalag 17. Well, we don't have a choice, we have to try to protect the investment, and at the same time what we really need is to better manage the herd. So that is something under way and we're working together at various levels of government in that regard.

So I just wanted to say thank you to you all and good luck today. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much, Joe. We appreciate it.

*Applause*

Paul Granger, and on deck is George Proios.

**MR. GRANGER:**
Good morning. My name is Paul Granger and I represent the Long Island Water Conference. We're a professional organization representing all the water suppliers in Nassau and Suffolk Counties, and I appreciate the opportunity for the Legislature providing us with an opportunity to advocate for the passage of the Long Island Commission on Aquifer Protection, known as LICAP.

LICAP has the full support of the Long Island Water Conference and the Nassau/Suffolk Water Commissioner's Association. As a partner at H20 Water Engineering, head of the Water Conferences's Legislative Committee, and as a former Water District Superintendent, I believe that I am uniquely qualified to comment on the effectiveness of the proposed legislation.

LICAP represents the first real step to a bi-County cooperation for aquifer protection and management, considered our industry's answer to the Regional Planning Board. Moreover, it provides for a State-of-the-Aquifer report, which is very important to us. The legislation will bring local experts and stakeholders together so that a coordinated approach can be employed to address groundwater issues and concerns facing both Suffolk and Nassau Counties. There's no wall that separates our water, we all drink from the same well.

It is our opinion that a by-County commission is an effective approach to address our local water concerns. While we believe that the water supplies across Long Island have effectively managed our vital drinking water resource, it is very important to note that at this time it's time to implement an important proactive approach at a local level that will use science and expert local knowledge to address current and future water supply concerns.

In closing, I'd like to thank Legislators spencer, Horsley, Hahn, Anker -- and Anker for introducing this progressive legislation. And in advance, I thank the Legislature for their anticipated support of LICAP. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much, Paul. George? And on deck is Brad Bender.
MR. PROIOS:
I would like to add my congratulations to Wayne as well. Working with you in the past, I've found you also to be of the same temperament as Bill and I'm glad you're going to continue in his footsteps.

Those of you who know me know I've been around water issues for almost 40 years, most relevant to this topic is the fact I was a Public Health Sanitarian assigned to the Water Unit in the County Health Department where for a while I tested water supplies, public and private, from one end of the County to another, and then for a decade I was the Executive Director of the New York State Legislative Commission on water resource needs for Long Island, the longest named commission in State history. And every year we produced a bible this thick of recommendations about what to do to protect Long Island Sole Source Aquifer. We ended up passing 45 pieces of legislation, a majority of them still not being enforced by DEC or other levels of government.

Issues I brought to Sweeney's attention at a public hearing. I just want to read a statement, if I can get it done quickly;

"Groundwater protection has finally become somewhat of a household term having suffered for many years from the same identity crisis that Spiro Agnew found himself in. After all, it is difficult to convince the average citizen that he must protect the resource that's, for the most part, invisible, lying hundreds of feet below our feet. Nevertheless, having played the catch-up game, water protection is now in vogue. In fact, the size of the bandwagon necessary to hold all those individuals who do not profess to be experts in the field is about the size of Noah's Ark. And there are as many ideas and statements being made regarding the quantity and quality of our water supply as there were animals on the Ark. And with all the prophecies and interpretations being made, the average citizen must indeed find it confusing to understand the present condition of our water supply," and I would probably add to this confusion. But the point I'm going to make is that the reason so many statements appear to be contradictory is that the questions have not been properly asked.

Is our water supply contaminated? The answer is yes and no. And while this may sound like a politician's answer to a volatile issue, the fact is that there is some truth to both answers. The more proper and specific questions that should have been asked are, Is all of Long Island's groundwater contaminated? No. Are some portions of the aquifer contaminated? Yes. Are public water supply wells contaminated? Sure. Are the people serviced by these wells, therefore drinking unsafe water? No. All public wells that do not meet drinking water standards must either be treated to meet standards or not used. Are private wells contaminated? Some are, especially in the eastern section of Long Island near farming areas. Are we running out of drinking water? The answer to that question is somewhat similar to the question which asks is the sun burning out? Yes, but not for quite a long time.

The following narrative may help put this in some type of perspective;
"It is estimated that there are of trillions of gallons of fresh water in our system, some put it at 60 trillion. Water companies in Nassau and Suffolk since 1980 have been pulling out approximately 450 million gallons per day or approximately 180 billion gallons per year. Divide this into the total number and you can see that even if it did not rain in one group for a century, there would still be water available for a long time. Why worry then? Because streams and lakes would dry up, wetlands would disappear, the drop in the water table require new wells to be dug deeper and deeper and on a significant cost. Shoreline areas that have wells which are finally reaching bedrock will find salt water entering their systems which will have to have water piped to them from other areas of the Island, also at tremendous cost, not to mention the impact contamination will have on our ability to use the water that's left."

For these and other reasons, it should be clear that protection and preservation of the resource is the more economical and aesthetically pleasing approach.
P.O. HORSLEY:
George, you’re going to have to start wrapping it up.

MR. PROIOS:
Okay. So the question of what is safe and what could be done to protect it. Long Island has 875 governmental entities in its two Counties, 13 townships, two cities, 93 incorporated villages, and 765 special districts. We also have over three million residents, we have one aquifer whose inadequate protection is the sandy soil above it and was only a source of replenishment as rainfall. It’s a regional resource that does not recognize municipal boundaries. Unfortunately, our only --

P.O. HORSLEY:
George, please.

MR. PROIOS:
Last sentence.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay.

MR. PROIOS:
Only hope for protecting it lies in a multitude of laws enacted over a number of years by a host of governmental entities with little enforcement. In all truth, Long Island’s groundwater no longer suffers from neglect but rather from excess shared responsibility with no accountability.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

MR. PROIOS:
Thank you.

Applause

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. The next speaker is Brad Bender, and on deck is Maryann Garvin.

MR. BENDER:
Good morning, Legislators, Officer Horsley. Congratulations. My name's Brad Bender and I am the -- an Executive Board Member of the Flanders/Riverside/Northampton Community Association. I'm also a member of the Riverside Economic Development Committee that Anna Throne-Holst spoke of, that also Jay Schneiderman is part of. I must also tell you that I am a candidate for Southampton Town Board.

I'm here to speak to Resolution 1802, the Downtown Revitalization Program. This is a great project and sets in motion the start of a larger revitalization vision. The Maritime Trail will allow the public to enjoy the Peconic River in its natural state. Water fowl and song birds are abundant in this area and this passage recreation use is a win for the community and also a win for the County.

I'd also like to speak to Resolution 1810. Vector Control, this is the -- around the Lyme's Disease or the tick-borne disease. Vector Control has a history of protecting us from mosquito-borne disease, but currently tick-borne disease is a greater risk to public health. Residing here on the East End, I have personally been afflicted by Lyme’s Disease as well as my chocolate lab Chelsea, numerous friends and family. Now would be the time to protect public health and move forward with this legislation to protect all the people of Suffolk County. Thank you very much for your time.
Applause

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Bender. Marianne Garvin, and on deck is Liz McMillan.

MS. GARVIN:
Good afternoon. I am Marianne Garvin, President and CEO of the Community Development Corporation of Long Island, a regional not-for-profit. I want to commend Suffolk County for its commitment to affordable housing and to thank the County Executive and the Legislature for years of support to public/private partnerships that leverage scarce dollars to meet multiple public objectives, increasing the supply of much needed housing, improving the environment and stimulating economic development.

I seek your support for Resolution 1804. I have been working for nearly two years to transform the 18-acre site that contains the vacant and blighted United Artist Theatre in Coram, located at 3700 Route 112, into a new mixed-use development with 176 units of workforce housing and approximately 13,300 square feet of commercial space.

Together with my development partner, Conifer Realty, we seek the support of the Suffolk County and the Affordable Housing Opportunities Program to build Wind-Coram Commons. The vacant and blighted existing theatre structure will be demolished and replaced with a combination of mid-rise apartment buildings and town homes over flats which will produce a mix of one, two and three-bedroom residential units. Approximately 7300 square feet of retail space will be built on the town’s center Main Street on the first floor of the three-story residential buildings. A 6,000 square foot commercial building will be constructed at Route 112 and serve as a gateway to the community. A leasing office, fitness center and community space will be housed in a clubhouse located across the Main Street from the commercial building. The clubhouse commercial building and the mixed-use residential buildings will frame a pedestrian-friendly plaza.

Anticipated average residential monthly rents are 1,121 for one-bedrooms, 1,334 for two-bedrooms and 1,549 for the three-bedroom units. As a comparison, at the adjacent Avalong Charles Pond Apartments, one-bedrooms start at 1,515 and two-bedrooms at 1,815. All 176 apartments are restricted to families earning no more than 90% of the area median income. There will be 60 one-bedroom units, 92 two-bedroom units and 24 three-bedroom units. Preliminary site plan approval was granted by the Town of Brookhaven in September, 2012, and final site plan approval is expected by the end of this month.

The project has been accepted into the Town’s Blight-to-Light Initiative which incentivizes redevelopment of blighted and vacant sites within the Town of Brookhaven. New York State DEC has approved a Wetlands Mitigation Plan and the Town of Brookhaven has issued a wetlands permit, both of which are critical to the successful redevelopment of the site. There is tremendous support for Wincoram Commons through the community. The Coram Civic Association has assisted in the development of the project which is based upon the Coram Middle Country Land Use plan for the site --

(Beeper Sounded)

-- which was itself the result of -- is that my --

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.
MS. GARVIN:
I guess I'm done. I'm asking for your support for this important project and for the funding that will help us pay for the infrastructure improvements. Thank you very much.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Marianne. I see it is now 11 o'clock, and I will make a motion to extend the Public Portion.

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. Public Portion has been extended.

MR. LAUBE:
Fourteen.

P.O. HORSLEY:

MS. MEYER:
My name is Ilissa Meyer, she's deferred to me.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:
Liz McMillan is ceding to Ms. Meyer.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay.

MR. NOLAN:
It's not the normal procedure.

P.O. HORSLEY:
It's not the normal procedure. Counsel is --

MS. MEYER:
There is a card already.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Go ahead. Okay. We're going to have to -- hang on. This is a special thing for you. I'm sorry. Your name again is.

MS. MEYER:
Ilissa Meyer.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Ilissa. Okay, Ilissa, you're on.
MS. MEYER:
Hi. I'm a resident of East Hampton Town, and for almost two years, I've been speaking to the East Hampton Town Board in hopes they begin to do something for the residents will all tick-borne diseases.

Our community is under siege from four different tick species, the black legged ixodes scapularis, American dog tick, brown dog tick, lone star tick. These four main species carry 19 different diseases, some deadly, including Lyme's, Anaplasmosis, Ehrlichia, Powassan, Encephalitis and Rocky Mountain spotted fever. The four main species of ticks need three separate host to go through a life cycle. The black legged tick is not born with the Borrelia burgdorferi, the pathogen that causes Lyme disease. They acquire it from their first host, the white footed mouse. These mice are running around your homes. They're in your sheds, they're under your porches. Seventy different types of birds then move these ticks around everywhere.

I've sat down with your experts at Suffolk County Vector Control, Dr. Scott Campbell, lovely, lovely man, contacted three high-ranking officials at the CDC in both Atlanta and Fort Collins, Colorado to educate myself and our clients on tick-borne diseases. Since my husband is a veterinarian, Board Certified in large animal internal medicine, I'm fortunate enough to have these wonderful contacts around the country and abroad. Some of the newest and most complete research is being currently conducted at the Cary Institute in Millbrook, New York. This is a state-of-the-art scientific research center where they have been investigating Lyme disease for the past 20 years. Dr. Richard Ostfeld, who I have also spoken with on several occasions, is the man who literally wrote the book on Lyme disease, the book.

In addition, I've also spoken to the DEC, which does not have one single person in charge of tick-borne disease, yet they seem to be dictating to you, the County and the Towns, what you are and are not allowed to do for tick-borne disease.

Biggest misconception about tick-borne disease is people believe that by reducing deer, you're going to reduce ticks. According to the CDC, East Hampton has 1,000 cases, are now 10,000. That doesn't include the tourists that we get every year. I want you to remember one thing today. A tick does not care where you live, what religion you are, what you do for a living, if you're male or female, old or young, and most especially a tick does not care what political party you belong to. Everyone in East Hampton knows someone currently battling Lyme disease. Do you? Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Ilissa. All right. Carrie Gallagher and Janalyn Travis Messer is on deck.

MS. GALLAGHER:
Good morning. Carrie Meek-Gallagher from the Suffolk County Water Authority, now Chief Sustainability Officer there, although it feels -- being back here feels like I never left. And I am here --

P.O. HORSLEY:
I understand that feeling.

(*Laughter*)

MS. GALLAGHER:
You haven't left yet. I'm here this morning to speak in support of I.R. 1565, the Long Island Commission for Aquifer Protection.
And despite himself, I think George may have made the best case yet for why the Commission is needed, because one of the tasks of the Commission is actually to assess the current regulatory regime, the management regime, and the regulations that exist to protect our groundwater, and see where there might need to be modifications.

The goal of the Commission is to monitor and report on the state of our aquifer, and it would if this Legislature approves it and the Nassau County Legislature approves it, it would fill a vital role that is missing right now in the protection of our aquifer. It would embrace an Island-wide approach, something that has not happened for protecting our water resources, our groundwater resources. As George said and as Paul mentioned, there's no divide. Route 110 does not divide the aquifer, so everything that's happening, we're all drinking from the same well. And two, for too long it's been managed parochially.

So we feel it is imperative to act now to address the pending water quality issues, not just pending, the water quality issues that we know exist, as well as emerging issues of concern. Should any other body be formed, we would welcome that as an addition to the dialogue. We know that the water quality issues facing the region extend beyond groundwater. There are also important issues to address with our coastal water bodies, but as water providers. And we think that if we look at the aquifer and start managing groundwater resources better, that that will have a very positive impact on the quality of our surface waters as well. And it's something that we know now.

The Long Island Clean Watership -- Long Island Clean Water Partnership is working to raise awareness around the Island about the current contaminants. We know that it's our greatest asset, our aquifer is our greatest asset. And while some people may feel that starting a body that doesn't have regulatory powers doesn't go far enough, we can't wait until such a body is formed with those regulatory powers. Again, we know the levels of contaminants are increasing, we know there are new contaminants out there. We need to have all the involved agencies sitting around the table in one place trying to coordinate the regulatory regime, the management structure, and start making changes now, and not waiting any longer to try to make those changes.
So I would ask you to let LICAP be the catalyst to start that conversation to get a process moving.

And just one of the other questions I know has come up is there are several water providers bodies that would be permanent members.

(*Timer Sounded*)

Let me finish with one final thought. No one has a greater stake in preventing pollution to the aquifer or ensuring proper management of our aquifer than the water providers do, because we are required by law to remediate any contaminants before we send it out into the distribution system to serve our customers. Preventing pollution is much less expensive than remediation and everyone will benefit from that.

Thank you, and I'll be around later for questions.

(*Applause*)

**P.O. HORSLLEY:**
Thank you very much, Carrie. We appreciate you being here today. Janalyn Travis-Messer, and on deck is Barrie Silver.

**MS. TRAVIS-MESSER:**
Good morning. Many of you have seen me here speaking to you before over eight-years-plus, and I am the President of the Shelter Island Deer and Tick Management Foundation. It was started as a not-for-profit after the original Tick Task Force that I presided over as the League of Women Voters
of Suffolk -- Shelter Island's President, and the League of Women Voters Suffolk County President. And we brought in the League's study guide and protocol to develop a plan that we presented to the Shelter Island Town Board a year-and-a-half later.

Shelter Island Town Board did implement many of the items that the Executive Summary presented, including creating a Deer and Tick Committee that handled management of the deer, in addition to implementing the four-poster program; that finally we were given permission to implement from the DEC and the State with -- totally unfunded.

The foundation was formed to help try and raise the one-and-a-half million dollar funding that it required over a three-year time frame. We raised almost a million dollars in private funding, and the Town picked up a lot of it. Suffolk County gave 155,000 and the State gave 100 over that three-year time frame, that's it. Everything else was raised privately. That's how important trying to remedy this tick-borne epidemic that we have on the East End, quite frankly, in most of Suffolk County, and a lot of the western people don't realize that. And we raised those funds to put the four-poster program in place. Tick eradication was reduced by 98% at the end of the three-year study with 60 units out. In the three years since then, the Deer Tick Committee had recommended 30 units to go out every year, or 60 units every other year. The Town could not afford that, and we weren't getting funding from anywhere else, including the Department of Health. The tick population has now increased by 200%. The four-poster program works.

I really hope that you support 1810. I really hope that with that plan of action that the Department of Health puts in place will be the four-poster program that was developed by two scientists working for the EPA, and has proven itself in multiple communities around the United States.

This is a program that's very dear to my heart. My husband died from a tick bite. Nobody else needs to die. There have been multiple incidences of miscarriage. There have been multiple incidences of children not to being able to receive Doxycycline under a certain age, and, yet, they still have to give it -- be given it and their teeth were affected. There's so many things.

And all of the measures that have come before you today are really so interrelated. Your trail preservation that you want to improve. Well, guess what, no one's going to walk those trails if they know they're going to get a tick bite and come down with a tick-borne illness. You want to revitalize your downtown communities. Well, guess what, no one's going to come down to the East End to the downtown communities if we don't have the watershed protected by no spraying, and by people not getting bitten by a tick. They are so interrelated, they are all important, and it starts with health. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Ms. Travis-Messer.

(*Applause*)

All right. Barrie Silver, and on deck is Josephine Devincenzi.

MS. SILVER:
Hi. I represent no one, except maybe the victims of ticks. I've had Lyme disease enumerable times. I spend half of every summer on Doxycycline, which is not a pleasant medication to take. I dress like a mummy to go out and pull two weeds. The quality of life is so impacted by these evil little bugs. And I just want to say that the cost of funding or allocating funds, or moving funds, or whatever it is, to begin to fight this on a more global level is not nearly as much as the cost of not doing it, because until last Sunday, I was a resident of New York City, which has a lot of problems, ticks not being one of them, and I know enumerable people who will not come to the East End of Long Island. They won't buy houses, they won't visit, they won't bring their children, and it really
affects the tourist industry out here. We have a problem. We have a possibility of solution, which is very unusual, and I think it would be a shame to ignore this opportunity. Thank you.

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

(*Applause*)

**MS. DEVINCENZI:**
Good morning. I'm Josephine Devincenzi and I live in North Haven. I'm here to talk about Legislator Schneiderman's Resolution 1810, to direct the Division of Vector Control to develop and maintain plans to reduce tick-borne diseases.

Having had Lyme disease four times and Babesia, I could tell you that on a personal level, I have suffered, and so many, virtually every one of my friends and neighbors. We desperately need a comprehensive plan to address this issue. And I'm so pleased that Jay's proposal includes the key elements of what this plan needs to include, which are culling the deer herd. I don't think we need to decimate the deer herd and -- but I do know that there are no natural predators to deer, and it's either the car or the hunter. If it's done in a controlled way, we need to cull the herd. We need to destroy tick habitat, leaf litter, picking up leaves in all of our communities, not just some. We need to control rodents and deal with effectively addressing the rodent population's tick problem through some form of Permethrin tubes, which they did on Fire Island very successfully. We know, we have Shelter Island as a model, they did it. We need to do it on a regional level. This is a critical issue that also needs to include education, and I'm not just talking about individuals, I'm talking about doctors who still tell people they are getting chigger bites when they're really lone star ticks.

Your own -- well, one of the people working on your Suffolk County plan is an Entomologist, Dan Gilrain. He has said, after 20 years of flagging insects on Long Island, there are no chiggers on Long Island. People are being bitten by lone star ticks, and even doctors are calling them chiggers. So the education has to go beyond the schools where most of our new cases are children under 14 years of age. We need to get our adults. We need to get visitors who leave here and may be sick and not realize it. We need to get our medical personnel addressing this issue and not sharing misinformation.

I urge you, as you talk to your Vector Control people, please realize, as you've talked about water quality this morning, we do not need more broad spectrum spraying. That's destroying our bays and our water quality. We need to do targeted scientifically-based approaches, which are the four-poster program that can target this material on the necks of deer that carry thousands of ticks, 500 on an ear, a thousand on their neck. That pesticide gets put on their neck and brought back to the source of the problem.

Please, support this legislation. Act today, we cannot wait. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much, Ms. Devincenzi. Marlene Germans, I believe, or Bermans. I'm not sure. I can't read your writing. And Ms. Rena Rosenfeld.

**MS. BERMAN:**
Good morning. My name is Marlene Berman.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Berman.
MS. BERMAN:
I'm here to speak on 1810 as well. Much of what I'm thinking has been said. I just want to reiterate a few important things.

Thank you to Jay Schneiderman for initiating this process. Tick-borne diseases are a public health epidemic. The plan that's developed really needs to be informed, comprehensive and regional. There need to be ways of collecting and sharing data so that we can continue to monitor and adjust the plan to make it as effective as it can be.

Education, as Josephine mentioned, critical. As a retired educator, I think education needs to begin in kindergarten, as far as the schools are concerned, and that a real respect for developing personal habits to protect you from tick-borne disease have to be inculcated. Adequate funding, of course, that's always an issue, but taken in perspective, it's not as expensive as we might think.

I would appreciate and ask for your total support for 1810. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Ms. Berman.

(*Applause*)

Rena Rosenfeld, and Ilissa Meyer on deck.

MS. ROSENFELD:
Hi. My name is Rena Rosenfeld and I'm a resident of Sag Harbor. The beat out on the East End cull, cull, shoot, shoot, Bambi gets a bad rap. It's not about Bambi, it's not about the deer, it's about epidemic, epidemic.

And I want to thank the Mayor of North Haven and I want to thank Mr. Schneiderman for using that word. Folks, it's an epidemic. That's the beat, that's the beat of the drum.

For over 30 years we've had the same blood test for Lyme's disease, tick-borne; very inaccurate. Same antibiotic regimen, doctors and hospitals doing complete misdiagnosis. A lot of education is needed there. It's not about the bull's eye, it's not about the rash. Where is the vaccine?

The bottom line, death and illness, severe food allergies, heart problems, nerve damage, brain damage, severe joint swelling, and the most important, misdiagnosis. The Federal, State, and County governments need to know that we have that beat, the epidemic.

I am very honored to support Mr. Schneiderman's bill, and thank you very much.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Ms. Rosenfeld. I understand Ms. Meyer spoke earlier. Dale Moyer, and on deck is George Aridas.

MR. MOYER:
Good morning. I'm Dale Moyer. I'm Program Director for Cornell Cooperative Extension, and I'm also a member of the Suffolk County Farmland Committee. I'm here to speak in support of the I.R. 1700, Local Law amending Chapter 8 of the Suffolk County Code.

First, I'd like to commend the staff of the Economic Development and Planning for their work over the past year-and-a-half in developing the amendments to Chapter 8. These amendments will strengthen Chapter 8 in several ways. First of all, it will make the process more efficient by
increasing the review of applications annually, instead of -- biannually instead of annually. Excuse me. It will also -- the delegation of review of routine practices and issuance of permits to the staff of the Economic Development, instead of going to the committee, so it will expedite that process.

The amendments will also support economic development, increasing the structure of space in farm stands, also by permitting year-round use of the farm stands. Also limiting a certain amount of on-farm processing to be done on that preserved land, and also allowing specified agritourism will help in developing economic development.

And lastly, the amendment will also help in preventing the preserved land from being abandoned and used for other purposes. Overall, the amendments to Chapter 8 will support Suffolk County agriculture and help in the continuation of preserving farmland. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much. George Aridas, and on deck is Greg Noone, Gregory Noone.

MR. ARIDAS:
Good morning. My name is George Aridas. I am with the Albanese Development Corporation. And don't worry about it, Legislator Horsley.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Sorry.

MR. ARIDAS:
No, it's -- I'm used to it. I am here -- Albanese Development Corporation is the master developer for Wyandanch Rising. I am here to ask your support for I.R. 1803, which is a request for Suffolk County infrastructure monies to support the development of workforce housing.

You've heard a great deal about Wyandanch Rising over the years, and I am here as the developer to tell you that it is happening. What we come before you today is for the second building in Wyandanch Village. The first building is rising. It is -- we're working on the second floor slab at this point, and you're welcome to drive by there. This building will complete the two mixed-use, mixed-income development that are part of Wyandanch Village, with a commercial building to follow to close in the park.

The two buildings represent 70 million dollars of investment, 60 million dollars of construction work, construction projects, construction jobs. And the funding is a key component to securing the overall capital structure to arrange the bonds and the private loans that come in, as well as the private investment.

I did want to address an issue that was raised at the committee hearing. The building is being -- Building B that is before you is being developed upon land that was Long Island Railroad property and parking lots. The parking will be replaced with a structure, which will bring more capital improvement to the area. There were no taxes being generated by the parcel on which the building will be developed. The building will contain 86 units of housing and 18,000 square feet of retail. The housing will be -- 72% will be within the workforce guidelines, the limited income, limited rent, and the balance will be market rate.
So we are developing a full community at Wyandanch, one that will, while it has a tax abatement, still be contributing net increases to both the real estate taxes and certainly the sales taxes from the retail, which is gained -- aimed at the commuter services and the community needs. I thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you, George, appreciate it. Greg, and on deck is Kerry Thomas.

**MR. NOONE:**
Beannachtai a chairde. Dia daoibh agus maidin mhaith, which means, greetings, my friends. Hello and good morning.

Founded in 1989, and incorporated into a nonprofit charity in 1991, the mission of Thursday's Child is to develop, to coordinate and to provide services to people living with and affected by HIV/AIDS on Long Island.

Several years ago I came before this body pleading on behalf of those who have no voice, on behalf of the sick, on behalf of the poor. I come to you again today to plead and ask that you fund the AIDS Services Access Program at Thursday's Child of Long Island. We assist, we advocate, we offer care and compassion to hundreds of families across this great County, who rely on us not only for things. People rely upon our agency because we are trustworthy, because we uphold and value each person's dignity. We respect not only our clients' medical privacy, we respect each person's inherent value as a human being.

People living with HIV and AIDS are to us more than their diagnoses, they are more than clients, they are more than charts, they are our neighbors in need. The AIDS crisis may no longer be on the front page of the papers, and, obviously, as soon as -- before I get up, Channel 12 leaves the room, yet 3,000 Suffolk County residents are living with HIV and AIDS. Over 100 are testing positive for HIV each year. Emergency rooms and funeral homes may no longer be filled with AIDS patients, but we continue to suffer heavy, burdensome losses.

The simple truth is this: There are several large, multi-component organizations that have excellent and worthy HIV programs, but our entire reason for existence is to serve solely this population. Thursday's Child remains only focused upon serving people with HIV and AIDS.

I represent a unique place. Our services are not performed by any other agency. We have served for over two decades as the one place where all persons with HIV and AIDS are welcome without reservation, without affiliation. We do not and have never charged for services. We are the unbiased source for HIV/AIDS information and referrals. The only requirement to be a part of Thursday's Child is to have an HIV or an AIDS diagnosis. And now, with our HIV-positive Early Intervention Service, we can help you find out your HIV status. If you are negative, we can offer advice on staying that way. If you test positive, we can help you navigate this life-changing and often bewildering event.

I ask that you allow us to continue to do what we do best. Maimonides said to "anticipate charity by preventing poverty." I ask that you extend your charity and understand that our aim is to prevent poverty. Our goals are to keep people from becoming sick or disabled, and for those who are already sick and disabled, allow us the dignity of serving.

Thank you for all of your years of public service. On behalf of the Board, and the staff, and clients of Thursday's Child, allow me to recognize and thank the late Presiding Officer, Bill Lindsay, as well as retiring member of this body, Ms. Lynne Nowick. And congratulations, Mr. Presiding Officer Horsley. I beg of all of you to restore and increase the HIV/AIDS services funding to Thursday's Child.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Boy, perfect. Thank you very much, Greg. Appreciate your comment, too.

Kerry Thomas, and on deck is Neal Lewis.

MR. THOMAS:
Good morning. My name is Kerry Thomas and I'm from Thursday's Child. I'm here to plead that the Legislature restores funding to Thursday's Child in support of its mission to develop, to coordinate, and to provide services for people living with HIV and AIDS here on Long Island.

Managing HIV disease is challenging and different from other chronic health conditions. In 2013, there are still people who do not respond well to treatment. The side effects of the daily medications can be severe, and alarmingly some strains of the virus are resistant to treatment. Many are silent in their struggles with this disease because of the social stigma associated with it. Although it has become hidden, the epidemic remains a serious issue affecting thousands of Long Islanders. Many people have difficulty accessing their lifesaving HIV care. As a supportive service agency, Thursday's Child helps many of our Suffolk County residents living with HIV gain or maintain access to medical care. Providing supportive assistance to people living with HIV or AIDS is the right thing to do. It is a moral imperative for our most vulnerable to help them. Additionally, there are public health implications which all of us are stakeholders in the funding of HIV/AIDS resources. In some communities, the rate of HIV transmission is increasing due to the prevalence of those living with the disease. The seriousness of AIDS has fallen under the radar, and many have become complacent.

When Thursday's Child does community outreach, we raise awareness. We are in at-risk communities providing this health literacy on a regular bases with the goal to link those who are HIV positive, but unaware, into care, as well as assist those who are at risk of infection stay disease-free. Risk reduction counseling and linkage to care are key to stemming the tide of the epidemic. In fact, half of all new infections originate from the one in five HIV positive individuals who are unaware of their status. This is why knowing your HIV status means everything. In fact, for those who are in treatment, the likelihood that they will pass the virus along to someone else is reduced by 96%.

The fight against AIDS has come so far, but it is not over. It is not the time to pull out the resources. We hope that the next generation will be an AIDS-free generation, and I believe that is something that we can achieve. In fact, there's a mathematical projection by the best researchers in the field who have said that for every 100 persons identified and made aware of their status, at least eight new infections are avoided.

We are so proud that the Early Intervention Service Program at Thursday's Child has identified 12 HIV-positive individuals this year and linked them to care. We've reached hundreds more to provide them risk reduction counseling so that they can stay disease-free and take care of themselves.

Our other program called the AIDS Services Access Program provides emergency assistance and benefits counseling to hundreds of HIV-positive Suffolk County residents to help them stay in treatment. Suffolk County cannot afford to cut this supportive service funding. Please help us maintain this small resource we have to fight HIV and AIDS on Long Island. Thank you for your time.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Kerry. Neal Lewis, and on deck is Adrienne Esposito.

MR. LEWIS:
My name is Neal Lewis. I'm the Executive Director of the Sustainability Institute at Molloy College. I had planned to speak today without knowing that someone who I've worked closely with over the
years, Legislator Wayne Horsley, would be taking on this new role. So my sincerest congratulations and --

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thanks, Neal.

MR. LEWIS:
And deepest condolences.

(*Laughter*)

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, carbon monoxide poisoning is the leading cause of unintended poisoning deaths in the United States. Now, I should point out that CO is produced whenever any fuel, such as gas, oil, kerosene, wood or charcoal is burned. If appliances that burn fuel are maintained and used properly, the amount of CO produced is not usually hazardous. However, if appliances are not working properly or are used incorrectly, dangerous levels of CO can be emitted.

Carbon monoxide is often referred to as a silent killer, because it can't be seen, it can't be smelled. But at high levels, it can kill a person in minutes. At moderate and low levels, there are also a number of illnesses that can result. Many of these symptoms seem similar to the flu or food poisoning or other illnesses, and, therefore, they may not be recognized as CO poisoning as the cause. People who are especially vulnerable include pregnant women, infants, the elderly and people with anemia or with a history of heart or respiratory diseases.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that non-fire-related CO poisonings are responsible for approximately 15,000 emergency department visits annually and nearly 500 deaths in the United States. These dangers are, however, completely preventable. And the measures to enhance awareness and promote carbon monoxide safety are measures which also have the benefit of promoting energy efficiency in the home. So our campaign to promote carbon monoxide safety awareness include some basic information about proper detectors and how to put them in your home and maintain them, but also to explain that a carbon monoxide detector will not go off for a low-level exposure that could be slowly poisoning your family over a long period of time.

Some of the advice, we'll also talk about things we learned during storm responses, such as not bringing generators too close or even inside a home, never cooking inside a home with a barbecue, and things of that nature. But the other area that you haven't seen as much information about that would be emphasized by this campaign is the things that should be done on a regular basis, such as an annual inspection and tune-up of your heating system in the beginning of the heating season, and an audit of your home, an energy audit of your home done by a certified professional.

And it's on that last point that I did hand out an additional flier. Of course, we worked with Suffolk County a few years ago to establish standards for home energy audits, and there is money from the State government to make home energy audits free or low cost. So this is a perfect time to be emphasizing the availability of those audits and to tie that into this broader educational campaign.

Thank you very much for considering joining with us in promoting this safety awareness campaign.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Neal.

MR. LEWIS:
Thank you.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Good job. Adrienne, and on deck is Kristin Motylinski.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Good afternoon, Members of the -- or good morning, I guess it still is. Congratulations on your Presiding Officership, Legislator Horsley. Apparently, you'll have the longest good-bye and the shortest term as Presiding Officer as well to put on your record.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All true.

(*Laughter*)

MS. ESPOSITO:
Okay. Two things. One is that Citizens Campaign for the Environment is strongly in support of Resolution -- I believe it's 1806, which is the bill allocating funds from the Quarter Cent Sales Tax Program to the four different sewage treatment infrastructure programs.

As Legislator -- Legislator John Kennedy will tell you, and also Legislator Spencer, I attended every meeting for the last two years of that committee, and we feel that the committee and the County Executive's Office got it exactly right. These four infrastructure programs represent the spirit and the intent that the public voted for in the Quarter Cent Sales Tax Program in the first place. They voted for clean water for both groundwater and beaches and bays. And so these four programs, Riverhead, for instance, that upgrade will protect the Peconic Estuary, the Wyandanch program, will protect the groundwater in that area, the Patchogue infrastructure, will protect the Patchogue Bay, part of the South Shore Estuary Preserve, and, of course, to us the highest priority is the Northport Sewage Treatment Plant, which will help protect the Northport Huntington Harbor complex, which is plagued by red tide. For those of you who don't know, that is a lethal algal bloom when it builds up in shellfish that can cause paralysis or death.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Exactly.

MS. ESPOSITO:
So we think solving those problems in those estuaries and also in groundwater represents geographical parity, but also is, as I said earlier, is with the intent of the Quarter Cent Sales Tax Program in the first place. So we give strong support to that legislation.

The other last comment I just want to make is for the LICAP legislation. And Citizens Campaign for the Environment supports the need and also the role of a State of the Aquifer Report. But I do want to caution this Legislature, is that we don't need to wait for a couple of years for one more report, we have work to do now. We know that our aquifer needs to be protected. We know we have 117 pesticides that are found in the aquifer system. We know we have 240 toxic waste sites lying on top of it. We know that we have nitrogen from our own sewage infrastructure leaching into that groundwater, raising the nitrogen levels to be between 50 and 200%, depending on what layer of aquifer. We know that in Suffolk County 40% of the test results show trace amounts of pharmaceutical drugs. We know that 330 wells have MTBE, a possible and known carcinogen, as classified by the EPA. We have known problems already. So all I want to say is we don't want to wait for one more report to base any decisions that we need to make today on.

So, please, work aggressively to protect the aquifer. We agree with the State of the Aquifer Report, and congratulate you, but we have things we need to do now. Thank you so much.
P.O. HORSLEY:

MR. HALSEY:
All right. I'm John Halsey, President of the Peconic Land Trust. And, first of all, I want to just -- well, I just acknowledge the loss that we're all experiencing with Bill Lindsay. And I want to congratulate you as well, Presiding Officer Horsley, for your new role.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thanks, John.

MR. HALSEY:
I really am here to talk about a couple of bills. One is the I.R. 1700, and this relates, of course, to the revisions to Chapter 8. And, of course, that is what controls the whole purchase of Development Rights Program here in Suffolk County, which, of course, is landmark legislation from the 1970s, all designed to protect a critical mass of farmland so that agriculture can remain a very viable and important component of our economy. And, of course, that has impacts on our tourism as well, especially out east.

So the health and the improvement of the PDR Program, Purchase of Development Rights is very important, and that's why we're here in support of the changes to Chapter 8. That will do a number of things. It will keep farming going on protected farmland. At least we want to assure that working farms remain here on the East End, and also Western Suffolk to the extent that the farms are still with us. And so I urge your support of 1700, I.R. 1700.

I also want to take the opportunity to voice our support for 1810. I think it's really clear that we have a huge issue with ticks and tick-borne diseases, and really hope that you will move forward to enhance your efforts to control, you know, this huge problem. So thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, John. Minerva Perez, and Sharon Frost on deck.

MS. PEREZ:
Hello. My name is Minerva Perez, and I am the Director of The Retreat’s domestic violence shelter for women and children. For over 25 years the retreat has been a community-based not-for-profit agency that provides domestic violence services and support for victims.

You have met with and heard from Jeffrey Friedman, our Executive Director, from Karen Ross, our Director of Nonresidential Services. You are aware of the devastating trends that Suffolk County is experiencing regarding the need for our services. We have been encouraged by your messages of support, given the tough choices that you're faced with, and we know it's a difficult year. The same economic crisis that impacts Suffolk County's budget is fueling tensions and causing an unprecedented spike in family violence.

Over the past three years, The Retreat has experienced a 96% increase in calls to our 24-hour hotline, that's 96% increase. That means more counseling, more legal advocacy needed, more shelter needed. It's a public safety concern.

We recently had a woman in our shelter with her young son, and for seven years she endured the most horrific physical, sexual and emotional violence imaginable. These are nine pages, single spaced, of real life horror that she detailed in order to change her identity. She was thrown across a bedroom, stomped on until her ribs broke. "To this day, if I’m hugged too hard, it still hurts. Again, I was convinced that it was my fault." A year later, he beat her until he thought she must be dead,
so he stopped. She told me how eerie it was that even though she couldn't speak, or open her eyes, or move, that her sense of hearing had been heightened, and she listened to him walk from the bathroom, where he beat her, into the bedroom to lay down to rest, as if after a very -- a major exertion on his part.

At The Retreat we need to stand for these women because they cannot do it alone. If I were to have brought this woman before you on the first day that she was in the shelter, she would have quietly deferred and said, "Please, please, don't worry about me. You take that money and you spend it where you need to, because I'm not worth it." But I know she's worth it, her son knows she's worth it, and I believe each and every one of you knows that she's worth it. But this isn't about empathy or sympathy, it's about action. We need you to actively stand with us in this most challenging of times. Stand with us fully so that The Retreat might continue to provide safety, and shelter, and support for victims of domestic abuse, and also to end the cycle of family violence.

I thank you for your past support and your attention. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Ms. Perez.

(*Applause*).

All right. Sharon Frost, and on deck is Ronald Cassaro, it looks like.

MS. FROST:
Hi. My name is Sharon Frost. I work for the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District. Congratulations on your election.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Sharon.

MS. FROST:
Some of you may have noticed, we had a little table set up in the breakfast room there this morning, mainly because we wanted to just give you an idea of what we can do, and what we can do for your constituents. So I'm just going to give you a couple of things that we do so you have an idea, but this is just a very short list among a very long list.

We assist residents and municipalities in both private and public property with drainage issues, drainage plans, erosion control and water quality issues. We also design and install rain gardens. Maybe some of you have been to the Cornell building in the back parking lot, that cute little rain garden in the middle, that was one of our projects. And, as you know, rain gardens actually suck up the pollutants before they're mainlined into the aquifer through storm drains.

Also, we coordinate many educational programs, including the Long Island Envirothon. It is -- the Long Island Envirothon is an environmental education competition for high school kids in Nassau and Suffolk County. This year, as -- it's going to be held in Suffolk County, in District 17. I would hope to invite Legislator D'Amaro to speak there, if he's available. It's going to be in April -- on April 30th, which is a Wednesday morning. Anyway, we also work on invasive species eradication and education, and native species education.

And, finally -- not finally of things that we do, but the final thing that I wanted to mention is that we also help farmers with compliance issues with Suffolk County Health Department through cautionary programs and public awareness and site inspections. We've brought in over 100 and -- $680,000 for fuel tank replacement, just that's just one of the things that we've done.
Anyway, thank you for your attention, and have a good day.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you, Sharon. Ronald Cassaro. Ronald? I hope I'm saying that right. It looks like Cassaro, right?

MR. NOLAN:
Yup.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yup. Okay. We'll put Ronald off for a second or two and try it again.
Nanci Dallaire, and on deck is Jennifer Appel.

MS. DALLAIRE:
Thank you. I've come here today to voice some concerns and to question some of the actions of my elected officials.

How do you pass a Charter Law to create a unified County Department of Financial Management and Audit when the State Appeals Court has blocked a November referendum on the merger of the County Comptroller and the Treasurer's Office? I hear once again a decision unanimously ruling that Suffolk officials violated County rules. So what will be done, change those rules, or will the ruling be ignored? The County Executive decides to waste time and tax dollars to appeal the Court's ruling, rather than streamlining and improving government efficiency. Lawsuits are not efficient. And who will we hold accountable for wasting money on plans that will never materialize?

Today the County will decide to sell the H. Lee Dennison Building, and will it remain the H. Lee Dennison Building, or will that be another legacy lost to our County? It's been said that this deal patches up the hole for 2013, yet I recently read that the State Comptroller lists Suffolk among a dozen municipalities statewide that are under significant fiscal stress. What are we to believe? What else must we sacrifice? What's left? We're running out of those one-shot revenue resources, and, in the long-term, Suffolk County will face serious fiscal challenges. We cannot continue to force our youth off Long Island. We cannot keep pushing our debt on to future residents and strip the citizens of vital services.

I hear the County will direct the Sheriff to issue a Request for Proposals for an independent study of the County's alternatives to incarceration programs? Why was this not evaluated in 2006? Why was it not implemented in 2008, or again in 2010? One day that Taj Mahal will sit as empty as John J. Foley. These are the wasteful actions that I will continue to call for an investigation.

I'm convinced that we, the public, are informed too late. By the time we're aware of these proposals and have a chance -- the opportunity to address these plans, they're already being invested in and acted upon. I'm convinced that we must stop allowing outside interests to influence this County's decisions. If we allow Albany to tell us what we need here on Long Island, that's a decision we will regret.

And one last quote that I've heard recently, sadly, is "After all is said and done, more is said than done."

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Ms. Dallaire. Jennifer Appel, and on deck is Kelly Smith.

MS. APPEL:
Good afternoon. My name is Jennifer Appel and I am General Counsel and Program Advisor to the Long Island Housing Partnership. The Long Island Housing Partnership is a not-for-profit that has
been providing affordable housing to Long Islanders for the past 25 years. Long Island Housing Partnership is here today for I.R. 1803, which would authorize the additional infrastructure funds needed for Building B for the Wyandanch Rising project. LIHP has been involved in this project over the past several years, providing technical assistance both to the Town of Babylon and to the developer of the Albanese Organization.

LIHP believes that the Wyandanch Rising project is the first of its kind in the region, and does represent a true model of both private and public partnership. We believe that it has the capability, not just to transform several blocks in a neighborhood, but to actually transform an entire community that up until now has been isolated from the prosperity of Long Island.

Rental apartments are critical to Long Island. According to the Long Island Index, only 17% of all housing stock on Long Island is multifamily, compared to 38% in other areas of the region. There is clearly a demand for affordable rentals for both young people and families alike, and there's also a strong need to revitalize the economic conditions of Wyandanch.

The Housing Partnership supports this development and looks forward to it bringing the much needed affordable rental housing and economic stability to the area. LIHP was privileged this summer to being present at the groundbreaking for the first building in this project, and we urge the Legislator -- Legislature to fund the balance of the project for the infrastructure so that Building B can start construction. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Ms. Appel. Kelly Smith.

MS. SMITH:
Hello. I'm here to speak about 1810. I have chronic Lyme disease. I had the best doctor in East Hampton, and for 10 years, every time I went in to my physical exam, the Doctor came in waving my Lyme test, "No, you don't have Lyme, you don't have Lyme because your test came back negative." The ELISA test, which is the first part of the two-tier testing, is useless. It should be gone and not used at all. It causes more harm than it does good. Okay? After -- finally, after 10 years, I called him up, because I saw -- I went to a Lyme talk and saw all my symptoms, the brain fog. I'm a writer, I couldn't write. I would go to the library, try to write a sentence down and sob because I could not function, besides the fact that my body was racked with arthritis, and no one could figure out why. Okay?

My doctor should have put two and two together and diagnosed me with Lyme. He didn't. I finally called him up. He gave me the Western blot; it came back positive. He put me on an IV, Rocephin, after the -- you know, the orals didn't work. He was ready to pull the line. I went to a specialist in the city. There are no Lyme literate doctors on Long Island. This is a sin. More people have -- you have no idea how bad this disease is. Okay? They call it the non-HIV/AIDS. It bases much like AIDS. In fact, it behaves a lot like syphilis, because it's a spirochete. It hides in your cells, it is -- you know, it becomes immune. And not only that, it opens you up to so many other diseases. As Jay said in his -- you know, his bill, there's all kinds of co-infections, but it also opens you up because your immune system is so low.

In East Hampton High School, they had a cancer cluster at the end of the 1990s. The State did a study and they said there was no red flags, but there was a synergy going on. Well, guess what part of the synergy was? It was Lyme disease. It causes -- most people with chronic Lyme have Epstein Barr virus, they have all kinds of viruses and parasites you don't even want to know about. Okay? I mean, we are talking -- this is a serious disease, it's no joke. All right? These kids, they got cancer because the Lyme was in their system, the immune system goes down, and when the pesticides -- the high school is across the street from a tree farm. The pesticides are blowing in
your face. Bingo. That creates, you know, a mess of things. So that's why spraying is not good.

Education: Doctors need to be educated. We need to get a better testing system. The CDC said that now, you know, the numbers are tenfold. That's bullshit, it's more like 25-fold. This is only the tip of the iceberg. You need to do something. Mow the sides of the lawn -- you know, the roads, clear the trails, education, research, money for research. Thank you.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you, Ms. Smith, and be well. All right. These are past Public Portion speakers that weren't here when I called them. Kristin Motylinski or Ronald Cassaro, either of you here? If not, that is all the cards that I have. Would anyone else like to speak? Would anyone else like to speak?

I'll take a motion to -- motion by Legislator Stern to close the Public Hearing, I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? The Public Portion has been closed.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Eleven. (Not Present: Legislators Krupski, Hahn, Montano, Kennedy, Stern, D’Amaro/Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Would all Legislators please come to the horseshoe. We're about ready to start with the agenda.

All right. First of all, I'll take a motion to approve the **Consent Calendar**. Motion by Legislator Calarco, second by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. We approved the Consent Calendar.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you. Let's move to Page 7, **Resolutions Tabled to October 8th, 2013:**

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Could I make a motion to take 1810 out of order, Mr. Presiding Officer? Quite a number of people spoke on it. That's the --

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
That's the Lyme disease?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes, exactly.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
What page is that, Jay? Jay, the page on that is?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
We're looking, we're looking.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Oh, okay.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Twelve.
LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
It's in Public Works.

LEG. ANKER:
Twelve, Page 12.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Page 12.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I have a motion to -- what's the number on that, Jay?

MR. NOLAN:
1810.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I have a --

LEG. KRUPSXI:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Page 12. I have a motion to take out of order 1810.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Right. It's the last one under Public Works; and second by Legislator Krupski. All those favor? Opposed? So moved, we're taking it out of order.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District Number 8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I then would like to make a motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:
And on 1810, Mr. Schneiderman makes a motion to approve.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Krupski. We have a motion and a second to approve.

LEG. KENNEDY:
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion. Who said that?
LEG. KENNEDY:
That was myself.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay, John.

LEG. KENNEDY:
To the sponsor.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Sure.

LEG. KENNEDY:
There is no doubt in my mind that Lyme's disease is a difficult thing to deal with, that there is an increase in the proliferation of it; that despite all of the experts and scientists, unfortunately, we are still seeing misdiagnosis of it. Two of my family members, as a matter of fact, have suffered with it, both my father and my uncle. But I remain unconvinced at this point, or I'd ask you, convince me how our Health Department, who I believe is the one tasked to do something with this, is going to do anything. Time after time after time they have dropped the ball, and we heard it this morning, Jay. They can't even deal with the heroin epidemic. They can't deal with most anything that we task them to do. So I think that your intent is good, and I think the application, quite frankly, stinks. So tell me -- tell me how I'm wrong.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Good, I'd love to. All right. So the bill doesn't actually task the Health Department, it tasks the Division of Vector Control, which is under Public Works, and why you see this in the Public Works section of our agenda. Public Works has been dealing with West Nile Virus quite successfully for years. They do many things. They do spraying, they do ditch maintenance, etcetera. The first thing I thought of was to look at the County Charter, thinking that I would, you know, try to expand the role of Vector Control to deal with tick-borne illnesses as well. When I looked at the County Charter, it was already there. It was formed to deal with both mosquito and tick-borne illnesses. So they are also required every year to submit a plan in terms of how they're going to deal with those illnesses. But that plan has never contained a section specific to tick-borne illnesses. So what this bill does, basically, and this would apply to the next plan, which we'll see in October of next year, a plan. What the plan will look like, I don't know. They will develop the plan and then they will implement the plan. The plan will have to be reviewed and approved by this body.

And, you know, the towns are struggling, towns and villages are struggling to deal with what in essence is a public health emergency.

LEG. KENNEDY:
No doubt.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
You know, they're trying to cull herds of deer. They don't know what to do. This is really -- you need a Health Commissioner, you need a Health Department to be in the position to deal with the epidemiology and the many public health aspects of this.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So, through the Chair, then, then tell me, because I don't see Dominick here. I guess he must have come to Public Works, but, again, Dominick is very good at what he does with mosquito control and some of those things. But I don't recall -- he's my constituent. In 10 years he's never once ever spoken to me about Lyme's disease or tick control or what it does. So if we're relying on him to come forward, aren't we setting ourself up again for something -- I'm not trying --
LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Well, that's exactly why this bill was written, to bring Vector Control on to this. When Vector Control was formed, the primary disease vector in Suffolk County was mosquitoes; today it's ticks. So we need to adapt, we need to adapt Vector Control to this growing epidemic, and that's what this does. It says, "You must develop a plan to deal with this." And, you know, I hope they work with the Department of Health, I hope they work with Stony Brook, I hope they work with the State Department of Health.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Well, I hope so, too, Jay. But tell me, what did they say in committee? What specifically did they say as to how they're going to do it?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Dominick was not there. The Administration, I've been told, is supporting this measure and they're here today. Whether they'll speak or not, I don't know. Dominick has not said anything. Gil Anderson was there; he did not speak in opposition of this. I think -- is Mr. -- Commissioner Anderson here? He may not be here as well, but here's Mr. Vaughn.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah. Tom, just hang on one second on that, okay, because I have a list.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yup.

LEG. KENNEDY:
You know, I have to come back to this. I'll yield to my colleagues, but I really -- I don't disagree with the desire to bring something more effective than what we have collectively right now, which, in my opinion, is woefully inadequate, if anything. You know, we have a world renowned Lyme's researcher in Stony Brook who, quite frankly, does a good job on the diagnosis side, but I doubt there's very little involvement at all on the field prevention or eradication side. But I'm just mystified as to how a guy who goes out and ditches and trenches is going to actually go ahead and, you know, give us something scientifically valid on how we're going to implement. We can't even implement, you know, basic communicable disease stuff. We are, you know, in free-fall and worse. So I don't know how we get this one picked up. Add it to a list that we're not meeting. That's all.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Thank you.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'll let others speak.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Go ahead, please. Yeah, I've got a list here. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the -- actually, on the motion, and also to answer Legislator Kennedy, you know, I went to talk to Vector Control a couple of months ago and they talked about not just the traditional ditching, but also the marsh restoration they're doing to control mosquitoes and mosquito breeding, instead of just relying on spraying. And, you know, on their Board there in Vector Control, there's a tick. And I said, "So what are we doing about the ticks," because, you know, living on the East End, I know there's an epidemic on the -- you know, with the tick problem, and, you know, right now, not much as far as the County's concerned.
Well -- and a lot of people spoke today. We've had deer management meetings in Southold for years now; we had one two weeks ago. We had over 300 people there and the consensus is the same thing. You know, when I was growing up, you never saw a deer and there was very little tick-borne illness. You had the dog tick, you could get Rocky Mountain spotted fever, that was it. Now, with the deer, you know, they are an integral part of the tick's life cycle.

Somebody said, well, if you put the four-poster out, you can control the ticks on the deer. There's a big weakness there. First of all, we did the math. In Southold alone, it would cost four million dollars to put the four-poster system out there. All right? It's very expensive.

Second of all, you're putting pesticide on the deer, which is a source of food. So now you're putting -- because we have a program where people who don't eat the deer, but they're culling the heard, they put the deer in a cooler and the Town DPW takes it up to a food pantry every week, or they're also available for, you know, any Town resident for free. So you don't want to put pesticide in the -- you know, into your food system. The deer, they said, well, no, mice spread a lot of the ticks. Well, yeah. If you ever hit a mouse with your car, you know how dangerous that is, you know.

(*Laughter*)

So the deer represent -- the deer are also devegetating all the natural vegetation in the woods. The invasive species are coming in. When you have a big storm, the trees blow over. Invasive species come in because there's no new native saplings to take their place to replace them.

All right. So that you have -- you don't want to start feeding the deer with the four-poster system, that's just the wrong thing to do, because then you're encouraging more rodents. Now you have mice and rats attracted to the feed stations because now you have free food, right, and concentrated areas of free food. So then you're -- then you're going to have to poison the mice and the rats near the four posters. It kind of perpetuates that.

The Supervisor in Southold, Scott Russel, reached out to Fred Thiele and to Ken LaValle and they got a bill in Albany to allow for more local control of deer management on the East End, in the five East End Towns, and this is -- we know what we need to do, we need to control the deer population. We could never possibly eradicate the deer, but we know we need to control it. The local people know they could do that, but State Law prohibits hunting within 500 feet of a habitable building. State Law prevents baiting, and State Law prevents trapping. And if we could change those things, you'd have better -- much better deer control. You'd have less car accidents. People are actually dying on the highways because of deer. The L.I.E. was closed the other day because a truck overturned because of a deer. You'd have less, you know, spread of the tick-borne illnesses, and you'd have a healthier environment, you'd have less runoff into our surface waters, and you'd have cleaner surface waters.

So you've got these -- you know, you've got all these -- I would like to link the County's vector control. The vector here is the deer, that's what's vectoring the tick from the natural habitat into people. So if you -- I would like the County to come out with a report to help us push the State to allow for more control, because the State is being very unresponsive.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Mr. Presiding Officer, just suffer one quick comment and then I'll yield.

Legislator Krupski, I don't disagree with anything that you've said, and I'll give you something that actually speaks to the issue, not just on the East End. My colleagues here from Islip, as a matter of fact, have a very robust herd down in Heckscher Park. Yesterday State DOT was doing road kill collection on Vets Highway and there was a 120-pound buck on a flatbed, as a matter of fact, in the
next lane from me. Blydenburgh Park is filled with them, and, as a matter of fact, they're out most evenings around seven or eight o'clock at night eyeballing the Fourth Precinct, somewhat ironic. So, towards that end, as to a wild population that has no predators, that's out of control and is impacting us, that happens to be a mechanism for the disease-filled insect, I couldn't agree more. And it's not just unique to you, we have it on the West End as well and it's something that we have to address.

I'll go back to my original comment to the sponsor. For the life of me, I don't understand how we're going to get a department to embrace something at this point regarding another written requirement when they can barely function at the level they've been tasked at now. So, conceptually, I support it. I have issues with the bill as structured, because I don't see it as something that's actually going to produce anything for us. But I join you, if there was a way that we put something in there for some specific resources, whether or not we were going to fund somebody to produce the study, because I just think it's mindless to contemplate that our existing staff -- they can barely dig out the ditches we have now. How the hell are they going to -- how the heck are they going to give us something that actually is meaningful to address yet another issue? That's all.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator Krupski, are you done?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Indicated thumbs up).

P.O. HORSLEY:
We're good. Okay. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:
I would like to applaud Legislator Schneiderman for taking on this public health concern. And, quite frankly, I feel like it's about time that we, as a County, began to address this issue in a comprehensive way. So thank you, Jay, for putting this forward. I think our Vector Control needs to be on this and in a very, you know, organized, planned-out, strategic fight against what we are facing, both on the East End and the West End. So thank you.

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

LEG. ANKER:
And, again, this is something that we know we need. There's no -- there's no doubt in our mind that the entire Long Island, mainly the East End, but in my area especially, I have 5200 acres of open space just at the RCA property alone. So we have a lot of hikers, a lot of folks out there. And, you know, it's the kids. You know, the moms and dads are afraid to let their kids outside. You know, that's not where Long Island needs to be, so we need to do something to prevent this.

I just wanted to put -- you know, mention my concerns as far as in working forward with this study, that if we could try to figure out a way to use less chemicals, less -- let's don't contaminate the environment as we're trying to save the environment. That's a concern. And I know -- I think it had been mentioned that it's not even so much the deer, it's mice, it's rats, it's the smaller, you know, animals, wildlife that seems to be moving this Lyme's disease along with the ticks.

If we could look at that and really try to come up and think out of the box. Again, we've got Brookhaven National Lab. I know they worked on the four-poster study. We've got Stony Brook, we've got Cold Spring Harbor. You know, they're inventing nuclear fission and quantum physics, and we just have to figure out how we can stop the growth of the Lyme's disease. And, you know, it just seems there's something we're not seeing right now. We need to look at this, look out of the
box, figure this out and, you know, move forward. But I think this is a great idea. I support this study, and I look forward to the results.

P.O. HORSLER:
Okay. Thank you very much, Legislator Anker. Legislator Barraga, Tom.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I'll be supporting Mr. Schneiderman's bill. The main reason I'll support it is that at least it gives focus on this Lyme problem as of today. The problem you have is that, you know, there's a lot of discussion, and then once we pass the bill, it sort of fades off again until someone brings it up six months or 12 months down the line. I don't know if Vector Control is going to be any different than any Health Department at the County level or the State level.

This has to be at least the sixth bill I have voted on in my political career dealing with this issue. I can remember having public hearings, not in Suffolk County, but in Westchester County, because years ago the one county that had more Lyme disease than any other county was not Suffolk, it was Westchester County. And I can remember going up there, it was a subcommittee of the State Assembly dealing with this particular issue, listening to people testify. And I'll never forget a young mother coming up with her three or four-year-old child and the child had gotten Lyme disease and it wasn't diagnosed for about a year-and-a-half, and that child was suffering not only physical damage, but brain damage as well. After she testified, people were almost crying, but the next speaker was up there defending Bambi. They didn't want any action taken whatsoever against the deer, none whatsoever, and yet the deer was the main carrier of the tick. And that was like 15 years ago and things really haven't changed.

You were sitting here with me maybe four or five years ago when the people from Shelter Island came in with the tick problem then. And I can remember one lady coming up with that sticker with all the ticks on it, and how the infestation of that tick-borne disease was so paramount in Shelter Island, and that really hasn't changed, no matter what is being done.

So I'll support your bill. And I hope Vector Control can come up with some sort of a plan, but I am just not optimistic. I don't think it's going to be any different than in past years, because you have a diagnosis problem and you have a prevention problem. And it seems that, you know, no one really wants to deal effectively with the deer. The politically correct word is "cull", cull them out. Well, maybe you should just kill them off. It's Bambi versus baby.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Well, on that note, Mr. Vaughn? Baby versus Bambi.

(*Laughter*)

What have you got to say about that to the Administration? Go ahead, Tom, I'm sorry.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:
He's speechless.

MR. VAUGHN:
Today is going to be a good day. Look, the Administration does support -- support the piece of legislation that Legislator Schneiderman has put forward. There's concerns about follow-up, there's concerns about follow-through, and I would say that one of the pieces -- one of the things that this piece of legislation does is that it ensures that those things will happen. The legislation requires that we come back with a plan in a year, that it be included in a plan that is put forward next October. I
could not tell you today. It would be incredibly disingenuous of me to tell you what the plan is today, but I know that Commissioner Anderson is here, and I know that he is confident that their Department will be able to handle this or -- and help develop a plan.

We agree with part of the concern that Legislator Kennedy brought up about funding, which is why we are going to be looking to work with both the Federal and State Governments, or the Federal Government, if they ever get back to work, but -- and the State Government to see if there are funding sources available. Dr. Tomarken believes that there may be, if not immediately, but in the near future, that there may be a -- there may be some source of revenue available.

But we agree with Legislator Schneiderman, that this is -- that this is a matter that needs to be addressed by our Vector Control, and we will work to address it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Vaughn. Commissioner, did you want to -- any comment on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. I think Tom eloquently put our view into this as well. Certainly, this is a long-term discussion. I think the first step -- and I realize that there have been other discussions between the Tick Task Force and other previous attempts. You know, I know that my Vector staff are -- they have supported DEC efforts in the past over on Shelter Island, and will put together a plan that we'll bring before the -- you know, before the Legislature that we feel will best support this based on, obviously, funding from not only County, but other sources, as well as probably -- it's not just going to be an effort that's local to Suffolk County. This is now a nationwide effort, and, you know, that may be brought into the aspect as well.

P.O. HORSLEY:
When you put out the Vector Control annual statement, now, is that a collaboration between your Department and Health, is that -- you guys work together on this? How does that happen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. Generally, the plan that comes out is a compilation, mostly put together by Superintendent Ninivaggi, but as well as, you know, with input from Health Department staff. So, again, with this, I think you would -- it would be a joint departmental effort, and, you know, this is no easy fix. It's going to be --

P.O. HORSLEY:
No, I could see that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. It's going to take some time and probably quite a bit of money.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. So is this something that should be addressed in this year's budget? I mean, is that something that we should be talking about, because as we're putting this together?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I would say not at this point, because there's still -- you know, again, Senator Schumer, I believe, has recently talked about raising this issue. There's a lot of things that still are out there. I wouldn't even know what number to throw in there.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And, at this point, I would just say, you know, let's -- let us move forward with the planning. We can identify how much funds are needed, we'll bring them back. You guys may tell us we're out of our minds, you guys may say this is great. You know, we'll see at that point.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Very good.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
If I could just add on that, because the plan --

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah, please, Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
We already have the Vector Control Plan for 2014, which I'm sure we'll, you know, be reviewing and approving soon.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yup.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
So this really affects the plan for 2015, so there'll be a whole other budget cycle when we're preparing the budget next year this time of year. Once we have the plan, we can then be putting it together. If there are costs involved with it, which I suspect there will be, it will have to go into the 2015 budget. Hopefully, some of those costs will either be offset locally, by towns or residents, some may be offset by Federal or State sources.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much. Are there any further questions? We're all good?

LEG. MONTANO:
I have one question.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah, sure, Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah, just a brief question to the sponsor, Jay. Do you have any idea of what they're going to come up with? I mean, this is not a new problem. So I'm looking at the bill. It's very general, it just says they're going to come up with a plan, but -- or that they should include a plan. But do you have any preconceived idea of what this plan would look like or how we solve this problem, or is this just something that's shooting in the dark?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I could tell you in my own opinion what components, you know, should be considered.

LEG. MONTANO:
Well, can you put those on the record, then?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Sure. I mean, I think, first of all, you know, the County maintains a lot of parklands and there's primary trails in those parklands that, to me, are not being maintained to the standards that they need to be so that people feel comfortable using those trails. So maybe setting some trail widths in
some of those main trails, certainly public education, certainly working with doctors' offices in terms of sharing the best resources for diagnosis and treatment. Possibly controlled burnings, which in certain areas they used to do that through the Nature Conservancy. It's actually good for the environment and it tends to wipe out the tick populations for at least a decade. Mowing along the sides of roads, looking really at where people are contacting. And then you have to deal with the amount of deer. Either you're getting insecticides on the deer or culling the herds, reducing the deer population, but also the rodent population. The main vector for Lyme's disease is actually the white footed mice. And so I think we need to, you know, either use some of those tubes, that I think Damminix may have been the product name, but they have basically the same -- I think it's called Permethrin, is the insecticide, and they go in there and they get the little cotton that they use for nesting purposes; that has the insecticide on it.

So there's multiple approaches. The four-poster system that Shelter Island talked about, where the -- where the ticks come to feeding stations, there is like corn kernels in there, and the fur on their neck brushes against rollers that have that insecticide in it. That's been effective, but it's costly. So there are multiple approaches here.

I'm not developing the plan, and I was specifically generic in the bill, so that the Department of -- Division of Vector Control could put together a plan for us to review, and that's what the bill does.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. Thanks. And I gather, though, that this issue has been dealt with in other jurisdictions, because I heard Legislator Barraga say that Westchester was a prime example of an out-of-control tick population.

You've made your -- what you put on the record here, you've made that known to Vector Control, have you not?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I have not specifically told Vector Control how to develop a plan.

LEG. MONTANO:
No, but, I mean --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Told them to develop a plan.

LEG. MONTANO:
-- you discussed these issues with Vector Control, I would assume; am I correct?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I haven't met with Dominick Ninivaggi about this particular issue, only with Mr. Anderson through the Public Works Committee. And, you know, there may be a lot of other things out there that could be components to a plan. They may not put any of those things I mentioned into a plan, I don't know. I am concerned, as many others, about the aerial spraying of pesticides. I don't know that that is the best approach here because of all the nontarget organisms that would be impacted by that. You know, direct application of insecticide to deer and to mice makes sense, but the broad spraying I don't think does, but I'm going to leave it to the professionals to develop the best plan. A plan that involves spraying would obviously have to be approved by the DEC as well, so they could then look at those ecological impacts.

LEG. MONTANO:
So this bill just deals with "Go out and develop a plan and then come back," and then at that point, the discussion as to how much this plan is going to cost to implement will be had; is that your idea?
LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Well, yeah. Long before now, the Legislature passed a law requiring Vector Control to develop a yearly plan, and they do that. They do that, but all that’s in there is mosquito control. This says that that yearly plan must contain a section on tick-borne illnesses as well.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay. Thanks.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Everybody good? All right. We have a motion to approve. I don't think there are any other motions; am I correct on that, Mr. Clerk?

MR. LAUBE:
You’re correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:
There you go. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved. Congratulations, Jay.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Abstain.

P.O. HORSLEY:
And Legislator Kennedy abstains.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen. (Not Present: Legislator Hahn/Vacancy: District 8)

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Tim, cosponsor.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We’re going back. We just got a few minutes before our lunch break. Why don’t we see if we can knock off a couple of these tabled resolutions that were dated October 8th.

1119 - Authorizing appraisal of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Terryville Greenbelt properties (Town of Brookhaven) (Hahn).
Legislator Hahn? Sorry to be jumping on you.

LEG. HAHN:
Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion is to table. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

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

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8).
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P.O. HORSLEY:
This is Page 7, resolutions tabled. Okay? We just did 1119. We're moving to 1307.

1307 - A Charter Law adopting and incorporating a 2% Property Tax Cap into the County budget process (Cilmi).

LEG. CILMI:
Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion to table by Legislator Cilmi, seconded by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been tabled.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
1347 - Directing the Department of Public Works to conduct a traffic study on a portion of County Road 86 (Spencer). Legislator Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:
Still working with the Commissioner, so still table. Motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Motion is to table, second by Legislator D'Amaro. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8).

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

BUDGET & FINANCE

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. We got five minutes. Introductory Resolutions for October 8th, Page 8, Budget and Finance. Everybody ready? We're good. Okay.

1706 - Extending existing one percent sales and compensating use tax for the period beginning December 1, 2013 and ending November 30, 2015, pursuant to authority of Section 1210 of Article 29 of the Tax Law of the State of New York (County Executive).

LEG. GREGORY:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by -- I'm sorry, who said that?

LEG. GREGORY:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Gregory. Second on the motion, motion to approve? Anybody?
LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion to approve by Legislator Muratore. We have a motion to approve and seconded. Any further motions? We're all good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. 1749 - Amending the 2013 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a liability case against the County (County Executive).

LEG. GREGORY:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Gregory.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator D’Amaro.

LEG. MONTANO:
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah. Could we get an explanation of what kind of case this is? Is the County Attorney’s Office available?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes, they are. Ms. Bizzarro?

MS. BIZZARRO:
Thank you, and good afternoon.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Good afternoon.

MS. BIZZARRO:
And congratulations.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, thanks, Lynne.
**MS. BIZZARRO:**
This resolution would approve the appropriation and the bonding for a general liability matter against the County. Ways and Means Committee basically approved the settlement on July 24th to -- of this year for $285,000. And if you’d like any details, I’d be happy to go into a County Exec -- into executive session and speak to you about the details.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Why do we need to go into executive session on the general aspects of the case? What kind of case is it? It’s not a secret, is it?

**MS. BIZZARRO:**
It's not a secret, but until the approval, until I receive the approval from the general Legislative body, there’s an issue that the case could, unfortunately, land back on the trial calendar, and that’s not where I want to be after speaking about it in open session. So, until you bless this resolution and the bonding resolution that’s, you know, the companion bonding resolution, I’m concerned about any discussion I have about the case, so --

**LEG. MONTANO:**
But you can’t -- you’re telling -- you’re telling us that you can't discuss what kind of case this is, whether it's an automobile case, whether it's a police brutality case?

**MS. BIZZARRO:**
This one, yeah, I can give you -- I can give you some general, yeah.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Well, go ahead.

**MS. BIZZARRO:**
This is an excessive force case, yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Oh, so it's a Police --

**MS. BIZZARRO:**
Correct.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
It’s a Police Department case?

**MS. BIZZARRO:**
Uh-huh.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Go ahead. Can you say anything more? What precinct? Can you say what precinct?

**MS. BIZZARRO:**
You know, I don’t know the precinct. I’m sorry. I can give you the date of the incident, was March 29th, 2010, and it had to do with an individual who was located in a vehicle and several police officers that were tending to him in that vehicle.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Tending to him?
MS. BIZZARRO:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
What does that mean?

MS. BIZZARRO:
They came from -- there was a call that was made at the building in which he worked, and the police officers came in response to that 911 call.

LEG. MONTANO:
All right. I just want to get this straight. 911 was called, they went to a location?

MS. BIZZARRO:
Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
And there was, I guess, a resulting arrest?

MS. BIZZARRO:
No, there was not.

LEG. MONTANO:
There was no arrest made?

MS. BIZZARRO:
There was no arrest made. Ultimately, the individual was brought to the hospital.

LEG. MONTANO:
So the individual that was brought to the hospital is the individual that’s suing?

MS. BIZZARRO:
Correct, right.

LEG. MONTANO:
And we’re settling an excessive force case, but there was no arrest made of that individual?

MS. BIZZARRO:
There was no ultimate arrest, correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Did you want to go into executive session with this?

MS. BIZZARRO:
I'd be happy to explain to you the details.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator?

LEG. NOWICK:
Can I ask about --

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes. Legislator Montano, are you done?
LEG. MONTANO:
I'll pass for now.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:
No. I just wanted to mention that this, more than likely, was one of the cases that was decided in executive session, and rather than going into detail about what the case was, I think that was done with Ways and Means, as you used to do that, remember, years ago when you were on -- when you were chairing Ways and Means?

LEG. MONTANO:
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:
So I believe that that's already been decided and it was a matter of speaking to the attorneys in executive session and saying yes or no. And now I think the question is more we went to the court, we agreed, and now we have to say we have to bond it, because I don't think we have a choice.

LEG. MONTANO:
Oh, so you've reached -- you've reached a settlement. This is to approve the settlement?

LEG. NOWICK:
I believe. Lynne, am I right about that?

MS. BIZZARRO:
Correct, yes, absolutely. And the case was on the trial. We were in the middle of a trial.

LEG. MONTANO:
You were, all right. So you had picked the jury or something?

MS. BIZZARRO:
Yes, the jury had already been picked, correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay?

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah.

P.O. HORSLEY:
We're good. All right. Do we have a motion on this?

MR. LAUBE:
You have a motion and a second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
To approve, right?
MR. LAUBE:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We have a motion and a second to approve. All those favor? Opposed? So moved.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I'm in.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. On the pending bond resolution, same motion, same second. Roll call vote.

MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen on the last one. (Not Present: Legislators Anker and Gregory/Vacancy: District 8). Let me just catch up.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Roll call vote, Mr. Clerk.

MR. LAUBE:
Yeah, I'm just catching up.

P.O. HORSLEY:
No. Thank you. I'm sorry.

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

LEG. GREGORY:
(Not Present)

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
What was that?
MR. LAUBE:
Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
(Not Present)

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMANN:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Did you call me?

MR. LAUBE:
I'm sorry, Horsley.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
There we go. Sixteen. (Not Present: Legislator Anker/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I think that brings us up to the 12:30 hour. We are in recess for lunch.

(The Meeting Was Recessed at 12:30 p.m.)

(*The following testimony was taken & transcribed by Alison Mahoney - Court Reporter*)
General Meeting - 10/08/13

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

P.O. HORSLEY: 
Okay. Are we all set, Mr. Clerk? Call the roll.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI: 
Here.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: 
Here.

LEG. BROWNING: 
(Not Present).

LEG. MURATORE: 
Here.

LEG. HAHN: 
Present.

LEG. ANKER: 
Here.

LEG. CALARCO: 
Present.

LEG. MONTANO: 
Here.

LEG. CILMI: 
Here.

LEG. BARRAGA: 
Here.

LEG. KENNEDY: 
(Not Present).

LEG. NOWICK: 
Here.

LEG. GREGORY: 
Yeah, here.

LEG. STERN: 
Here.

LEG. D’AMARO: 
Here.

LEG. SPENCER: 
Here.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Here.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Browning & Kennedy - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. Welcome back to the public meeting of today, the 8th. And first up on the agenda is we're going to be going to the Public Hearings, that would be page three of the agenda. Everybody good, page three of the agenda?

First up on the agenda for Public Hearings is the 2014 Operating Budget, which I have a number of cards. And the first person that I'm calling up to discuss the Operating Budget is Robert Barsky, and on deck is David Warren.

MR. BARSKY:
Okay. Hello. My name is Robert Barsky, I'm here today as a Smithtown resident and as a volunteer crisis counselor of Response of Suffolk County. When I learned that Response was in danger of losing more funding, I decided it was time for me to speak up. This is the first time I've spoken to such an august body, and I beg your indulgence.

I have lived in Nissequoque since 1999 when I came to work for Broadridge Financial Services, a Long Island-based employer in Edgewood, as their Chief Technology Officer. I worked there until my retirement in 2011. Upon retirement, I started looking for a way to use my time and energy for the benefit of others. I volunteered for the Coalition Against Child Abuse and Neglect and the Hospice Care Network. While I still volunteer for them from time to time, I now devote the majority of my time to Response, because in spite of all the beneficial work those other agencies do, Response touches many more lives in many more ways, and today I'd like to give you a personal perspective.

Unlike agencies that specialize in one particular issue, Response provides counseling to any person in any type of crisis at any time of the day or night, 365 days a year, and they do it for absolutely no cost to the people that call them. I have personally spoken with people as young as 12 and as old as 84. I've spoken with people who are homeless, abused, suicidal, about to cut themselves so badly that they will have to be hospitalized. I've spoken to mothers who are at their wit's end because their 9-year old child is threatening to kill themself and they have no idea about what to do or where to get any help. I've spoken to the hopeless and the helpless. I've spoken to the desperately lonely who do not have any loved ones, people whose only contact with the outside world is a counselor at Response. People whose families have not spoken with them in 10, 15 or 20 years; we know it has been that long because that is how long they’ve been calling Response seeking some validation that their lives matter, that someone somewhere cares about them enough to talk to them for a few minutes. I've spoken to people who have called Response back after their personal crisis to say thank you; thank you for listening to me when no one else would and I had nowhere else to turn. Thank you for saving my life. Thank you for helping me put down the gun, the knife, the bottle of pills. Thank you, because if I hadn't -- if I couldn't speak to someone at that particular moment, I would have hung myself. Those are the human and moral benefits of Response's work, the kinds of things that we as a country believe in and fight for.

But there are also financial advantages for our County. The cost to the County of treating people who self-harm, who can’t get out of bed to go to work, who can’t attend to their children’s needs, who make repeated visits to psychiatric facilities and who kill themselves or orders of magnitude greater than the cost of supporting Response’s work. If Response cannot do what they have done so well for the last 40 years, there will be even more suffering in our County. You won't hear about it because it will be amongst the voiceless and the isolated and the lonely and the dispairing who will
have nowhere to go for the help and simple human contact that we take for granted.

I ask you, as a citizen, as a volunteer and as a fellow human being, to is help Response continue to do what they do so very well by continuing their funding. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Barsky. We appreciate your comments.

LEG. CILMI:
Can I ask a question?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes. Mr. Barsky? We have a quick question from one of the Legislators. Mr. Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:
Sir, thank you for being here and for your testimony and for the good work that you do for Response.

MR. BARSKY:
You're welcome.

LEG. CILMI:
To your knowledge, are there any other organizations in Suffolk County that serve the needs of those who may be inclined to take their own lives or to harm themselves?

MR. BARSKY:
Not to my knowledge. I believe that Response is the only one in Suffolk County that does this kind of work.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Are you aware of another program that is run by Family Service League, I believe? It was a program, I believe Joe's Project, that our Presiding Officer was a champion of, and they, as I understand it, come into the home after there’s been a suicide and sort of try and pick up the pieces.

MR. BARSKY:
Right.

LEG. CILMI:
I believe that program has -- I believe, has been defunded as well, as have many other programs in the budget. This year, in 2013, we are budgeted to spend something like a hundred million dollars or so on contract agencies in Suffolk County, and the proposed budget includes, I think, $67 million of funding, so it's $33 million, 33%, roughly. Certainly the County's facing tremendous financial challenges, and figuring out how to fund some of these very important programs is daunting because we recognize the good work that many of these contract agencies do. Can you talk a little bit more specifically about what Response does, what you do for Response, the value of the dollar that we spend with that agency?

MR. BARSKY:
Sure. So basically what I do as a crisis counselor is I wait on the -- either I make calls out in certain cases when we follow up on something, but most of the time we accept calls when somebody calls in in crisis. And when they call in, you really don’t have any idea why they’re calling and then you need to talk to them, you need to engage them, you need to get them to trust you and then you need to hear their story. Once they do feel comfortable and they feel they can trust you and that
you'll listen without pre-judging them or without telling them what they need to do and just want to listen to them, then they start to tell their story and then you can figure out how you can help them help themselves to get through the crisis. So it's really all about helping the people help themselves and think through what they need to do in this particular crisis by helping lower their anxiety or helping them -- in the cases, sad to say, when they are thinking of killing themselves, to help them plan for their safety by taking -- asking them to put their pills away, to put the gun away, to call somebody in to help them. So whatever you need to do to get them to be safe. And then in the really extreme cases, we'll contact 911 when we need to and have them go out to the home and pick them up if we really believe that suicide is imminent.

LEG. CILMI:
How long have you been with Response?

MR. BARSKY:
Two years now.

LEG. CILMI:
Two years. It must be a very emotional work, it must be very emotional work that you do. It must be very challenging for you emotionally.

MR. BARSKY:
It is and --

LEG. CILMI:
You must have some rewarding stories, though, I'm sure.

MR. BARSKY:
I'll tell you the most rewarding, and I mean this sincerely, is when somebody at the end of a call just says, "Thank you. Thank you for listening." And sometimes you don't even have to say anything to them on the call, all you need to do is listen to them and allow them to know that they're being validated, that their story is being heard and that they really -- another human being out there is paying attention to them and they'll thank you profusely for just listening and being there when they needed to speak with somebody. That's the most rewarding, I think, in my opinion.

LEG. CILMI:
Well, from my point of view having had the unfortunate experience of being very close personal friends with a Mom who lost her son to suicide a couple of years ago, I know how that impacts a family, and so I can't thank you enough for the work that you do. And hopefully we'll find a way to continue supporting your program.

MR. BARSKY:
Thank you very much.

LEG. CILMI:
Sure.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Mr. Chair?

LEG. D'AMARO:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSELY:
Hang on one sec. Legislator D'Amaro.
LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes, thank you. I wanted to ask you a question. I'm looking at this testimony here about the young girl crying, she couldn't help herself, was cutting herself with a razor at the time of the call. How do individuals, and especially children, know to call Response.

MR. BARSKY:
Well, we do a lot of community education, that's a big part of what Response does. And so a lot of the kids when they call, and they -- kids tend maybe not to call as much, they use our -- what we call our Here-to-Help line which is a computer chat line, so -- because they're more familiar with texting and the internet. So I think a lot of them hear about what we do from school or from friends that have heard somebody at school, in my experience.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, this says, "Last week I picked up the phone and heard a young girl crying. She was, at that time, cutting herself with a razor."

MR. BARSKY:
That's not my testimony.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Oh, that's not yours?

MR. BARSKY:
No, no.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay, that's --

MR. BARSKY:
I think we have a few other people.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. My other questions was -- oh, I see, you're Mr. Barsky, right?

MR. BARSKY:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. You have four County contracts; correct?

MR. BARSKY:
I'd have to defer to the finance folks, I don't know.

LEG. D'AMARO:
You don't know?

MR. BARSKY:
No, I'm a volunteer, I just do volunteer work.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

MR. BARSKY:
I just work the phones.
LEG. D’AMARO:
Okay, so I'll wait for the next speaker then.

MR. BARSKY:
Okay.

LEG. D’AMARO:
But thank you for the spending the time, we appreciate it.

MR. BARSKY:
You're very welcome. Thank you for your attention, I appreciate it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Excuse me, Mr. Barsky. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Mr. Barsky? Over here.

MR. BARSKY:
Oh, sorry.

LEG. KENNEDY:
How are you, sir? Thank you, and thank you for coming out to speak with us and thank you for sharing your experiences as a volunteer. Tell me a little bit about what kind of training you received. I see that you were a prominent executive with an Island financial firm.

MR. BARSKY:
Uh-huh.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So unless maybe you had some human service experience in your background, how did you as an individual become -- what kind of instruction did you get so that it would assist you in order to be somebody on the phone, working with somebody in crisis?

MR. BARSKY:
That’s an excellent question, because it is -- it is something that requires a great level of skill. And what Response does is they have a phenomenal training program; in fact, we just got finished with the last training program for perspective volunteers this weekend. So twice a year they have training classes and we bring people in for two two-day -- two weekends of two days each, back-to-back, so a total of four days, where people come in to talk about various aspects of what Response does, various mental illnesses, they talk a great deal about suicide. And then the rest of the time is taken up -- I’d say at least half a day each day of the four days -- with doing role plays where the skills of active listening are taught to the trainees, to the perspective volunteers, which is what we employ on the phones, and that’s that way of listening to somebody without judging, without trying to tell them what to do, but just to get them to understand that there’s a caring person on the other end.

We go through two days of intensive role plays and we have the trainees either be the caller or be the volunteer, and then what we do is we assess how in touch are they with the methodology, how empathic are they, are they getting emotional about the call and will they be able to take a real call without breaking down if that call is personal to them, and just how are they going to do with that. So after that training is done, we then select about probably -- depending on how many we can take, but probably like two-thirds of the people we’ll take and we’ll reject at least a third. Then the training starts in the office for ten weeks, you know, probably 12 weeks of training where a trained volunteer or a seasoned volunteer will sit with that person once a week for the four hours of the shift...
and go over it, then they'll do the calls, they'll have the perspective volunteer do the calls, the new volunteer do the calls at that point and they'll sit there and coach them, they'll take them in a separate, private room after each call and pick apart the call and say, "Here's what I think you did correct, here's what I think you can do better, here's what this person" -- and we want to make sure that they're now understanding exactly how to talk to a real person on the other end rather than in the role play.

In addition to that, there's ten weeks of training classes once a week, a two-hour class, on different topics and aspects. So, for example, one aspect -- one topic would be how do you make a 911 call when you think the person is imminently suicidal, and it goes through all the instructions and we have the books and we -- so those kinds of things are done. And then there's constant follow-up for at least a year, what we call shadowing and such and then supervision and heavy critiques. Plus, after each call, at least in the beginning, that looks like it might have been a difficult call in terms of emotion or in terms of what the seriousness of the crisis is, one of the staff members will usually take the person in a room and just try to debrief them and also to care for their emotions and say to them, "How are you feeling after this call? What can we do for you?" How -- you know, and then they'll kind of make sure that that call --

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. So it's a fair statement to say that there's a pretty significant amount of initial training and then ongoing training that occurs via volunteers.

MR. BARSKY:
I would say that's correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Typically how many volunteers do you have out for however you measure time? If it's like a shift or a day or -- a couple of people hail on the phone, one person and a supervisor; what does it typically involve?

MR. BARSKY:
It varies. And there's usually, I'd say, at least two people on the hotline, we try to have at least two people on the hotline and one person on what we call the support line, which is the line that we use where we call out to people that have been -- we've been speaking to for say 20 years or so, people that are isolated, home-bound, disabled, mentally ill that really have nobody else to talk to, people about the families that I mentioned. And we'll have one person at least per shift, we try to have, to call those people out. So two to three people a shift is what we try for.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay.

MR. BARSKY:
And then we have the help line, we have the Here-to-Help line at night, that's four hours every night, from 7 to 11, where we have one or two people on the chat lines with usually children that call, and I would say 90% are kids 12 to 16 that come on the chat lines every night. And we have a Spanish hotline that one person mans for people that don't speak English.

LEG. KENNEDY:
How many hours a week is your typical volunteer? I mean, do you have to give a minimum commitment?

MR. BARSKY:
Four hours.
LEG. KENNEDY:
Five hours? Ten hours?

MR. BARSKY:
We ask for four hours a week for six months to a year.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. So suffice it to say, then, out of anybody who makes a commitment here, we're talking about at least a hundred hours commitment, I guess, following whatever the training is. That's after?

MR. BARSKY:
I'd say -- yeah, that's four hours a week. Almost 200 hours, probably, a hundred to 200 hours probably, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Yeah, we could never pay for that, that's for sure. All right, thank you, sir. I appreciate it.

MR. BARSKY:
Thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Legislator. And thank you very much, Mr. Barsky. David Warren, and on deck is Meryl Cassidy.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you. My name is David Warren, I'm a 35-year resident of Stony Brook and I'm speaking in support of the funding that the County provides to Response of Suffolk County, Inc., an organization that provides suicide prevention services to all of Suffolk County.

I've been on the Board of Directors of Response now for almost ten years and I'm speaking to ask you to restore the $47,000 funding to Response that's been zeroed out in the proposed budget. You have heard and will hear more about the critically important functions that Response performs in Suffolk County in the areas of suicide prevention. I speak as one who's been touched by suicide of someone close; my best friend in grade school and high school took his own life just a few years ago. I am not unique, the tragedy of suicide is more common than many of us like to think.

Today I want to speak as a member of the finance committee of Response about the continued health of this organization and the importance of this funding to that end. A few years ago Response had a total annual budget of about $500,000; this year it's a little over 400,000. That drop of almost 20% was do mainly, as we know, from government budget cuts that followed the economic crisis of the great recession. The total cut in government funding to Response was greater than that 20%, and some of the difference was made up by increased funding through private grants and public fund-raising events that we have organized. If the proposed funding line is indeed zeroed out this year, we will face approximately another 12% total budget cut next year. That will result in a total budget cut over the last several years of about one-third; that's a huge total and poses an existential threat to the organization.

We have responded to the cuts thus far by reducing staff and by increasing our fund-raising and grant proposal writing activities. This puts a greater burden on our now-reduced staff to meet the needs of our vulnerable clients, needs which have grown over the same time period as the funding cuts we've faced, and for the same reason. But not only is the client workload greater, our staff now must commit more effort to new duties of fund-raising and grant writing. This is not our area of expertise or, frankly, our primary interest. At some point the burdens of the job and the outlook for the organization will not sustain the commitment of our people, the people who do the life-saving
work of Response, one of whom you just heard from. They may decide that they can make better contributions elsewhere. We are not at that point yet, I hope, but I do fear that cuts of the kind suggested are pushing us further in that direction.

I know that times are hard and that there are many claims on your limited budget, but we at Response, and many others before us, have worked very hard to build an organization over the past 40 years which has effectively served the most vulnerable in Suffolk County and we will do our very best, whatever the circumstances, to continue that service. We hope that you will consider our situation, restore our funding and help us to continue to serve our community. Thank you.

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

LEG. CILMI:
Question.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Mr. Warren? Excuse me, we have a question. Legislator Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:
Mr. Warren, thank you for being here. Could you talk a little bit more about the finances of the organization? What sort of administrative staff do you employ and --

MR. WARREN:
We have -- our Director, Meryl Cassidy, will be speaking next, and she can speak better to some of these things.

LEG. CILMI:
Terrific. Thank you. I'll ask her.

MR. WARREN:
Is that all right?

LEG. CILMI:
Yep.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Warren. Okay, Meryl Cassidy, and on deck is Martin Woodle.

MS. CASSIDY:
Hi, everybody. You have my written testimony and I don't want to read that, I'd like you to read it when you have an opportunity because it has a lot of facts. But what I want to talk to you about is what it means to be in a crisis.

A crisis is a turning point, right? We've heard that a crisis can be a time of danger or a time of opportunity. The opportunity is that you can learn and grow and evolve and adapt, and in fact you have to adapt to survive; the danger is that it can lead to really unhealthy or harmful outcomes. Response really faces a crisis if our YDDP funding is eliminated. We were bracing ourselves for cuts. We understand there needs to be cuts, we're totally prepared for cuts, more cuts, that's really been the story for the past several years, so we're prepared for that. But when we saw that that contract was entirely eliminated, that's why we rallied to come here today.
Over the past few years, as we have suffered funding losses, we have adapted, I think very well. We've increased fund-raising efforts, as David said. We've -- I spend a lot of time writing grants and I've gotten grants from a variety of sources, so I think we're very good at adapting. This cut, however, poses the risk of really destabilizing our funding base to the point of danger. So the first, I think, ironic thing is that, you know, Suffolk County's only 24-hour crisis center is in crisis. So where do we go? We come to you.

The second irony is that we provide backup coverage to almost every other agency. If you call the Youth Bureau, you know, you'll get their answering machine after hours, it will say, "If you're in crisis, call Response," right? If you call Joe's Project after hours, Legislator Cilmi, it'll say, "If you're in active crisis, call Response." Right? So we're backup. We provide backup after-hours coverage to many, many youth and mental health agencies throughout the County; at the last count it was something like 30 agencies that I tried to call and find out if we were on their answering machines, and many, many more private therapists as well. So the question is -- and we don't charge for this. So the question is who will back us up, right? That's why we're here, that's why we come to you, we need you to back us up. We need you to restore this contract to the extent that you're able in the 2'14 budget.

We promise, though, to keep up our end of the bargain. We promise that we will continue to do our excellent work and to do our excellent collaborative work with right now we have a collaboration with our area's CPEP at Stony Brook Hospital. So we promise to hold up our end of the bargain, we're really looking for you to help us and back us up.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. Thank you very much, Ms. Cassidy. Legislator Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:
Meryl, it's good to see you again. Thanks for being here.

MS. CASSIDY:
Good to see you, too.

LEG. CILMI:
Talk, first of all, to the question I asked the speaker prior to you, talk to us a little bit about the administrative costs associated with running your agency.

MS. CASSIDY:
So we have about 60 volunteers and so that's -- before I get to the administrative costs, that's about 15,000 hours that would cost about over $300,000 if you had to pay for that. We have a very small staff, we have three full-time staff; there's me, there's my assistant and there is a training coordinator who is responsible for all of the good training that you heard about. We have a couple of part-time people, we have a couple -- we have about ten per diem people who do the overnight shifts, we pay them a stipend.

So when you talk about administrative costs, that's a difficult thing. We went through an audit recently and since there's only three full-time people, on any given day, you know, the three of us are doing lots of administrative tasks, but they're all to keep the agency going. So if we're doing vouchering for the County or we're doing payroll or we're cleaning the toilet -- I'm not even kidding you -- you know, is that administrative costs? But we're also directly supervising people on the lines or writing grants or -- you know, all three of us wear so many different hats that it's --

LEG. CILMI:
Well, I don't think you'll find anybody here that would suggest that three full-time paid staff members among a volunteer force of 60, is excessive. I think, you know, that qualifies for a
shoe-string administrative budget for sure.

**MS. CASSIDY:**
Yeah, I think for sure.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Talk to us a little bit about the face of the suicide victim. I understand that one of the most telling statistics I heard was that roughly 20% of suicide victims are veterans.

**MS. CASSIDY:**
Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

**LEG. CILMI:**
I think the numbers are like 50,000 in the past several years have killed -- veterans have killed themselves. So talk to us about that and how the agency specifically addresses that specific need and what some of the other faces of suicide victims are.

**MS. CASSIDY:**
Sure. There are so many at-risk groups, but just to speak to veterans. You know, there's been more losses to suicide than combat deaths, that's a statistic we've all heard. We're part of the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline which is a network of 160 or so crisis centers throughout the country -- that's the 1-800-273-TALK number that you see on the New Jersey Turnpike -- we got a very small stipend of $1200 from the Lifeline. And what that means when a call -- and when you call the lifeline, if you're a veteran you get -- you can press -- I forget which number it is, and we're a part of that network as well, so we have specialized training in that and how to handle that caller.

However, there are many veterans who might not call the lifeline and might not even identify initially as a veteran. So part of our training is in teasing that out and letting them know the resources in the County, there are specialized resources for veterans who are at risk and linking them with those resources. So we might not even ask somebody "Are you a veteran". We might say Have you ever served, or Are you a family of someone who has served. Did you know that, you know, there's this program or that program. So that's one population. But as you know, and you came to our event at the Youth Bureau, youth are another hugely at-risk population, but also over time it's older, white males who have lost a job, are at very high-risk of suicide. So it really -- I mean, the second-leading cause of death among college students, emerging adults who are having trouble finding employment; many, many different at-risk groups.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Lastly, if you could just share with my colleagues the title of that You Tube video that we watched at your event, if you remember it off the top of your head. And I would highly suggest --

**MS. CASSIDY:**
The one with the young girl?

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yeah, the poet. I would highly suggest, if you have three minutes at some point during the remainder of the day, that you go to You Tube and check this video out. Meryl will tell you the title.

**MS. CASSIDY:**
It's three minutes and nine seconds and you type in "eulogy for a young poet", and be prepared to be blown away. You know, be prepared to have somebody around you because you'll be -- well, I was shaking after I watched it. Right? I mean, it's extremely powerful. It's a 15-year old girl and she's just reciting her poem about how she was affected by the loss of a fellow student who she didn't even know, that's the refrain of the poem, "I didn't know you, but I heard you were a poet";
that's the refrain of the poem. So it just kind of speaks to how the whole community is really shaken when somebody -- when we lose somebody that way and how very much we want to prevent those future tragedies.

LEG. CILMI:  
Meryl, thanks for your good work.

MS. CASSIDY:  
You're welcome.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Okay. Thank you very --

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Question.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Excuse me, Cheryl -- Meryl. Legislator D'Amaro?

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Ms. Cassidy, hi. How are you?

MS. CASSIDY:  
Good.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Thanks for coming down today. I had a couple of quick questions. Response is crisis intervention and suicide prevention 24/7.

MS. CASSIDY:  
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Now, are you the only agency providing any services of that nature, or is it the only agency providing those services 24/7.

MS. CASSIDY:  
I think we're unique in that we're the only one providing a 24/7.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Okay.

MS. CASSIDY:  
And in the way we do; it's free, there's no waiting list.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Right.

MS. CASSIDY:  
No stigma, it can be anonymous.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Right. And it's a great thing that you're doing, it's wonderful that it's available 24/7, but I think there are some other methods of getting crisis intervention, but not 24/7.
MS. CASSIDY:
Yes. I mean, some of the barriers would be, you know, that you have to get there and you have to pay and all of that. You don't have to pay to pick up the phone at three o'clock in the morning.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, I understand. Now, what's the -- what's Response's -- Response of Suffolk County's total budget?

MS. CASSIDY:
You mean if this cut goes into effect or just at this moment in time today?

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, for this year, sure.

MS. CASSIDY:
About $400,000.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Four hundred thousand?

MS. CASSIDY:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And can you give me a breakdown of what percentage of that funding comes through the other avenues that were mentioned such as grant writing, fund-raising and then, of course, County assistance or any other level of government assistance.

MS. CASSIDY:
Sure. So there's three County contracts through Suffolk County Youth Bureau that total about 150,000.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Rob, do you have that information?

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:
Meryl, here.

MS. CASSIDY:
I'm going to give you rough numbers.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, we also have it with our Budget Review Office, so just give me a moment.

MS. CASSIDY:
Okay. And then there's one contract through Suffolk County Mental -- Office of Mental Hygiene.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yeah, let me just get the total from our budget office.

MS. CASSIDY:
Okay.
MR. LIPP:
Okay. So adopted for 2013, according to the budget, is 244,000 and change.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Two forty-four?

MR. LIPP:
Yes, over the course of four different contracts.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So your total funding from Suffolk County for this year is 244,000.

MS. CASSIDY:
Okay. That's --

LEG. D'AMARO:
And Dr. Lipp, what's the reduction --

MS. CASSIDY:
That's a little lower than I even thought (laughter).

LEG. D'AMARO:
What's the reduction in the recommended budget?

MR. LIPP:
The reduction would be almost 96,000 from the 2013 number.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay, so 244 would bring you down to one --

MR. LIPP:
Forty-eight.

LEG. D'AMARO:
One forty-eight would be the funding that's recommended for next year. So that would be a $96,000 reduction of County participation.

(*Ms. Cassidy & Mr. Lipp had a brief side discussion*)

MS. CASSIDY:
I'm not seeing the mental health contract. That's on a different -- that's about 112,000.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Ms. Cassidy, you're going to have to go to the mic. Over here.

MS. CASSIDY:
Sorry, I'm so sorry.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Didn't mean to scare you there.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. But what we can see here is -- so between fund-raising and grants, is it about equal for the balance or is it more from fund-raising or from grants?
MS. CASSIDY:
It's a little bit more from grants. It's about 65 to $70,000 in grants, and then there is this
fund-raising.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay, so that's about -- well, if it's 244 from the County plus the -- there's a contract you didn't see
there.

MS. CASSIDY:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So 344, 370, so about 30 or 40,000 in fund-raising; does that sound about right?

MS. CASSIDY:
Yes, that sounds about right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. Now, you're here today specifically with respect to the Youth Development & Delinquency
Prevention contract?

MS. CASSIDY:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
All right, and that was funded by the County to the extent of 47,000 for this year.

MS. CASSIDY:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
How much does it cost to run that particular contract or program, above what the County provides?

MS. CASSIDY:
We need every penny of it. That contract is used to support the hotline and the on-line services, so
it's basically help support my salary and my assistant -- the three full-time people, so it helps
support those three -- do you know what I mean?

LEG. D'AMARO:
I do. So the 47,000 is not particularly earmarked for that program, it just goes into the budget and
helps fund your entire budget --

MS. CASSIDY:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
-- in effect.

MS. CASSIDY:
Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:
As long as you're spending up to 47,000 on that contract, of course.
MS. CASSIDY:
That's right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. What was the reduction that that particular contract experienced for last year?

MS. CASSIDY:
There was -- Seth from Kara's office helped me figure that out. There was a reduction and then it was restored with the Omnibus.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. So --

MS. CASSIDY:
So it stayed the same.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So it stayed the same?

MS. CASSIDY:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So you went through this last year as well.

MS. CASSIDY:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Where that contract was reduced or zeroed out and then it was restored at the end of the budget process?

MS. CASSIDY:
No, no, no. That happened -- that happened -- there was another contract that was -- that we lost almost $50,000 on through the Youth Bureau last year.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

MS. CASSIDY:
That particular contract we were just expecting the usual cut.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. But what you're asking for today is a restoration of the 47,000 for that Youth Development & Delinquency Prevention Program?

MS. CASSIDY:
That would be the best case scenario. The Youth Bureau requested 42,224, so they put it in with a cut. We would be, you know, prepared for that as well.

LEG. D'AMARO:
To go to 42.
MS. CASSIDY: Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO: Which was proposed by the Bureau.

MS. CASSIDY: Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO: Uh-huh. And what services do you provide through that particular contract?

MS. CASSIDY: We provide the 24-hour crisis hotline and the on-line crisis counseling program.

LEG. D'AMARO: Okay. All right, thank you for answering my questions.

MS. CASSIDY: You're welcome.

P.O. HORSLEY: All right, thank you very much, Legislator. And thank you very much, Ms. Cassidy. Martin Woodle, and on deck is Beth Sperben? Or Sperber, I'm not sure.

MS. SPERBER: Sperber.

MR. WOODLE: I'm Martin Woodle.

P.O. HORSLEY: Welcome, Martin.

MR. WOODLE: Thank you. Just for the record, I am a resident of the 1st Legislative District, so Legislator Krupski, I'm one of yours.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. KRUPSKI: Welcome.

MR. WOODLE: Okay. My name is Martin Woodle and I've been a Long Island resident for 35 years. For 33 of those years I have volunteered at Response, Suffolk County's only agency, as you know, providing suicide services 24-hours a day, seven days a week and, more importantly, 365 days a year. We're in at Christmas, we're here on New Year’s, we're here on Yom Kippur, we're here all the time. And I've been a hotline counselor, I've been a trainer for volunteers, I've actually chaired the Board of Directors for about eight years, and now I'm just a member of the board.

For our 2004 budget planning, as you've heard, we're kind of -- we're planning our budget and we were kind of given some guidance of what we could expect, 5% cuts across the board. And we were really kind of dumbfounded, I was blind-sided by the Suffolk County Youth Bureau which is this
YDDP funding being cut to zero, because this is really stunning. How are we going to -- how are we going to deal with this shortfall? The YDDP I believe stands for Youth Development & Delinquency Prevention, and it was being zeroed out.

So I’m asking you to restore this cut, as Meryl has said, and let me tell you why. We get about 20,000 calls a year, on the average, and about 30% of those calls are dealing with youth. And the reason that I’m focusing on youth is the cut comes from the Youth Agency. This is money that was earmarked to just help the people that are going to be cut out. About 30% or 6,000 of our hotline calls every year deal with youth or are from youth or are youth related; parents, friends of youths and other people calling about troubles with young people. And ironically, as I say, the cut is just the population that we’re supposed to be serving.

Even more seriously, we found that something like 10% of our calls are related to suicide or suicides in progress. So if we take 10% of 6,000, there’s something like 600 calls coming in from youth on the average that deal with suicide, either suicidal thoughts, a friend who they think is committing suicide, a parent who’s worried about their child or a neighbor’s child or a friend of their children. And the cuts essentially are going to eviscerate our funding for the services that we provide for this.

As Meryl has said, we have an on-line -- after school on-line counseling called Here-to-Help and it’s every afternoon during the week and we find, as we’ve said, that young people, again, are much more familiar with this means of communication.

(Beeper Sounded)

Just quickly, we also have a Community Education Program which will be affected by this because we’ll have to take funds out of it, which basically we go out to schools and talk to young students and teachers and help them -- and teach them how to identify people at risk for suicide and how to get them help. And finally, we need the support for the general hotline which is really the heart of Response.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Mr. Woodle, you're going to have to start wrapping it up, please.

MR. WOODLE:
I'm going to wrap it up right now. The death of anyone by suicide is a tragedy, but the death of a young person by suicide because of a lack of funding for these programs is, in my view, a crime. So please restore the cut, $47,000 cut for Response's funding. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

MR. WOODLE:
Any questions?

P.O. HORSLEY:
We're good. Thank you.

MR. WOODLE:
Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Beth Sperber, and on deck is Craig Brennan.
MS. SPERBER:
I think I'm a little bit shorter than Marty, so he took up my time, which is great. Hi, everyone. My name is Beth Sperber and I'm really grateful for being -- having the opportunity to speak to you today. I'm both a board member and a volunteer telephone counselor since 1993 at Response of Suffolk County. I appreciate you taking the time to listen to my concerns.

I'm going to veer from what I said like Meryl did. Someone asked about a veteran the other day and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. We speak to veterans, we speak to their wives, we speak to their children, or really their -- and it is -- we get so many different calls from the family members, people who are suffering with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder and who are on the brink of suicide. Yesterday I got a call on the lifeline from a veteran whose son was 34-years old, had -- was going through a divorce, had mental illness, was locked in his childhood bedroom and he was on Facebook with a noose around his neck, and the father reached out because he didn't know what to do. We spoke to the son from Response, the suicide crisis hotline that you've all listened about. We spoke to him -- I spoke to him for about an hour. We also have an information and referral system that we deal with, and a lot on Mondays people seem to always rally for that. He didn't -- he needed meds and he had no money. He had nowhere to turn, and that's when he was calling Response.

Response's 24-hour hotline saves lives, the lives of your constituents, your friends, your neighbors, and possibly even your family members. If our budget is not restored, it will mean the elimination of these vital services and help the children so desperately need and no longer will be available to them. These kids have no other way to receive help. There is no duplication of services that respond 24-hours a day, 365 days a year. The social workers from the schools are calling us. No other agency provides a hotline, a community education program, an on-line help line to listen to kids who are suffering and in crisis. These kids are in pain, they're calling us in tears. They're calling us numb, cutting themselves, because they just want to feel pain. No one else is speaking in the schools on the warning signs of suicide, are educating them. No one else will be there to save the lives of teens 24-hours a day, 365 days a year.

I can continue with stories about the girls with the razors or the children -- that child that is running away because her father is abusing her and she has nowhere to go. We provide a runaway service, we provide shelter, we can get them that information.

(Beeper Sounded)

If our budget is not restored, we will not be there to help these kids. Please don't let these kids down and please --

P.O. HORSLEY:
Ms. Sperber --

MS. SPERBER:
-- don't let them die. That's it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Well, we've got a question for you. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:
Thank you. Thank you for all that you -- everyone who has spoken here. You can't -- you can't fathom how devastatingly difficult it is when your child is in crisis and it's so important that we have these services available to the parent, to the children, young adults, teen-agers who are going through this, individuals, like you said, veterans. And so I just thank you for what you're doing.
MS. SPERBER:
Thanks, Kara.

LEG. HAHN:
And I think you have made -- you all have made such a passionate plea here. I think it's crystal clear to my colleagues how important these services are and this funding is. So thank you.

MS. SPERBER:
I just also -- because funding is being reduced everywhere, there's a lack of jobs, people are turning to drugs, to alcohol, to abuse, to all of those things which is filtering down to the children, and that's why they need our help, so someone is there to listen to them. Thanks.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Hold on a second. Hold on. Wayne?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes, thank you. Ms. Sperber, hi. How are you? First I want to say thank you for all your volunteerism and what you're doing. You're actually saving lives and it's wonderful and I thank you for that.

MS. SPERBER:
It's been a long time.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And for a long time, too. It's really terrific; it's inspirational, in fact. The -- I was looking at your written testimony and it did catch my eye earlier about this poor girl that had called crying and was cutting herself with a razor and couldn't stop, and thank God you were there on the other end of that line. But what I wanted to ask you is just how does a person, a young girl, I would assume a teen-ager, know to call that hotline?

MS. SPERBER:
Okay. We have --

LEG. D'AMARO:
In that moment of crisis.

MS. SPERBER:
There is a cry. You know, instead of killing yourself, the piece that hopefully they call is that piece that there is an ounce of hope.

LEG. D'AMARO:
But how would she have the number to call?

MS. SPERBER:
Oh, community ed. We are in all the schools in Suffolk County. We are in all those classrooms. If you look in the phone book or in the classrooms or also through the university and -- we are -- community ed is spread -- our statistics are over --

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:
They're on the bracelets that go out to all the kids, the number is on it.
MS. SPERBER:
Yeah. We have people all over.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. Sir, you need to sit down. Thank you.

MS. SPERBER:
Thank you.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So that's the community education program that also would take a hit if the funding wasn't restored; is that correct?

MS. SPERBER:
Yes. And we go into libraries, we go into firemen and --

LEG. D'AMARO:
The point I'm making is that the effect of this particular cut is not limited just to the contract or program that's being cut.

MS. SPERBER:
Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
It would also effect your ability to do outreach to kids --

MS. SPERBER:
Without a doubt.

LEG. D'AMARO:
-- to teens that might need that number and need to know where to go in a moment of crisis.

MS. SPERBER:
Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So it has a broader impact to that particular cut.

MS. SPERBER:
As the training and all of that effects the community, the on-line services, the support services, all of that, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MS. SPERBER:
They all interconnect with each other.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. Thank you very much.

MS. SPERBER:
Thank you.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Ms. Sperber, one more. Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Mrs. Sperber, let me ask you a question. Let me just follow-up a little bit on Mr. D'Amaro's questioning.

MS. SPERBER:
Sure.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Using the example in your letter of the girl who was cutting herself.

MS. SPERBER:
Uh-huh.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Now, based on what I'm reading, whoever spoke to her spoke to her for about an hour; at some point she indicated she would speak to her mother?

MS. SPERBER:
Uh-huh.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Now, what's the follow-up on a situation like that where, you know, it could be suicidal? How do you know she's really speaking to her mother? Do you follow-up later on? Do you have phone numbers?

MS. SPERBER:
It depends if it's a suicide -- you know, what we're thinking, but we do have a follow-up. We contract with someone, this child we contracted with that she wasn't going to harm herself, she would get help and speak to her mother. And yes, we can -- if she says we can, then we can call her back and we will follow up.

LEG. BARRAGA:
You try to call back, in this case, the victim.

MS. SPERBER:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
The young girl.

MS. SPERBER:
Uh-huh.

LEG. BARRAGA:
All right. But you're not reaching out to the mother or --

MS. SPERBER:
Unless she says it's okay and then we can speak to the mother.

LEG. BARRAGA:
All right. In most cases --
**MS. SPERBER:**
But we don't -- we will not go to that place unless the child says it's okay. Now, if it's imminent
danger and we know that the person is cutting themselves and they are in their vein and, you know,
ready to go to the hospital, yes, we will --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
You have situations -- let's take this example that you've enunciated.

**MS. SPERBER:**
Well, there are different kinds of -- okay.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Let's say she doesn't want to give you her phone number and you just -- you find yourself in a
position then where you just really cannot follow-up.

**MS. SPERBER:**
Yes, we can -- if we feel there's imminent danger, we can trace the call and help the person we need
to.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
All right. So --

**MS. SPERBER:**
Yes, at this point in 20 years, my -- a hundred percent, you know, I can't say, but I'm pretty
intuitive to know if its imminent danger. That is part of what we're learning also.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
You're taking the lead from the victim in this particular case in terms of who you can call as a
follow-up. In most cases, I take it she would want to be phoned by you --

**MS. SPERBER:**
Yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
-- as opposed to telling you to phone her mother or her father for other --

**MS. SPERBER:**
It depends. You know, maybe -- there are people who are reaching out for help, and if she can't --
if she doesn't -- if she needs us to talk to her mother with her, we can do that also. In other words,
sometimes you say, you know, if --

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
In other words, they can't speak to their mother or father, but they'll use you as an intermediary.

**MS. SPERBER:**
Exactly.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
All right.

**MS. SPERBER:**
If someone -- if we tell children in school, If you have a friend that's suicidal or, you know, in deep
depression and they don't want to go to a therapist or go speak to a social worker, their parent by --
by themself, we'll say You can go with that person. And that's the same sort of --
LEG. BARRAGA:
Mr. D’Amaro also asked you about how would this young person know enough to call and you said, well, you’re in all the schools and all the classrooms. Do volunteers go into the classrooms and actually speak to the students or is it just post --

MS. SPERBER:
Yes. I was a community educator, I am not now, but I used to speak in Montauk, I’ve spoken in East Hampton, I’ve spoken in Huntington.

LEG. BARRAGA:
So you wait for an invitation from the school district, I take it, to go into a school?

MS. SPERBER:
Usually we go in through the Health Department and we speak in the health classes. And yes, the schools invite us to go in and we speak there.

LEG. BARRAGA:
All right, thank you.

MS. SPERBER:
Okay. Any other questions?

P.O. HORSLEY:
I think we got it. Thank you, Ms. Sperber. Craig Brennan, and on deck is Harriet Adams.

MR. BRENNAN:
Good afternoon. My name’s Craig Brennan, I’m the Client Programs Coordinator at the Long Island Association for AIDS Care. And one aspect of my position is to oversee the Suffolk County Education Service Manager, and that individual is responsible for providing HIV testing and education to 18 to 24-year old college-age students throughout the County. She’s also responsible for providing linkages, services and outreach to target population areas where there is a high incidence of infection. She distributes public health information, literature, as well as providing prevention education, risk education and condom distribution.

The 13 to 24-year old is the fastest age group with new HIV infections. The increased prevalence of HIV among this population reflects various risk factors and various prevention, including sexual risk factors, substance abuse and lack of awareness, poverty and out of youth -- out-of-school youth, and the coming-of-age of HIV+ children. In the United States, between the ages of 13 to 25 are contracting HIV at the rate of every two -- of every -- at two every hour, sorry. At least half of all HIV infections in the U.S. are among people under 25 years old.

The LIAAC Education Service Manager also provides BASICS and BASICS is the Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students. It’s a harm-reduction curriculum that makes college students aware of the dangers of binge drinking and connection between binge-drinking and HIV risk. Five hundred college-age students have either tested for HIV or learned harm reduction techniques because of this program since September, 2012. LIAAC has received funding for over -- funding for more than two decades. We’re being cut $154,000; without this funding, this program ceases to exist.

This also affects our AIDS hotline, and 5,000 Suffolk County residents contacted the hotline in 2012 for the following reasons; HIV information and education, referrals to various internal programs such as HIV, HCV and STD testing, as well as case management, education, nutrition services and financial assistance. We also provide referrals to external resources like housing, medical and mental health and transportation and entitlements, as well as crisis intervention. So without funding
from Suffolk County, the service delivery through the hotline would be severely impacted and it would even -- it could even result in the collapse of the hotline.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Brennan. Oh, Mr. Brennan? We've got a quick question.

MR. BRENnan:
Yes?

LEG. BARRAGA:
Mr. Brennan, you're from the Long Island AIDS Coalition?

MR. BRENnan:
Long Island Association for AIDS Care.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Now, this morning we had the group from Thursday's Child.

MR. BRENnan:
Uh-huh.

LEG. BARRAGA:
What is the interrelationship, or is there any, between your organization and theirs? Because you both seem to be treating AIDS patients.

MR. BRENnan:
Yes. We work closely with Thursday's Child. We provide referrals to them. There's a lot of times when our clients could be in crisis. They might need money for rent, money for co-payments for their insurances and we'll contact Thursday's Child and a lot of times they can help us out with that, so we work closely with them.

LEG. BARRAGA:
But you operate separate, not-for-profit groups.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN:
That's correct.

LEG. BARRAGA:
All right. Thank you.

MR. BRENnan:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Brennan. Harriet Adams, and on deck is Laurette Mulry.

MS. ADAMS:
Good afternoon. My name is Harriet Gordeen Adams, I'm Chief Officer for Care Coordination at Long Island Association for AIDS Care known as LIAAC. LIAAC has been privileged to serve the residents of Suffolk County since 1986 and been the recipient of this funding for over 20 years. This funding is essential for the support of our agency's hotline. Suffolk County callers access all programs and services through our toll-free telephone number funded by the Suffolk County budget. The hotline assists residents of Suffolk County who are in crisis. Callers are connected to medical services, provides referrals for testing and other resources throughout our communities. The hotline is staffed
by agency staff who are extensively trained in HIV and other sexually transmitted infections, suicide prevention and crisis counseling. New York State Department of Health has designated LIAAC as a community service provider on Long Island. We are proud to serve the residents and partner agencies in Suffolk County.

The health care landscape in Suffolk County will change without the hotline. There will be a disruption in service from the acute setting in the hospital and the community. Currently, our hotline is called by emergency room hospital staff when a patient is newly diagnosed with HIV. The patient is connected with our experienced staff who provides emotional support and assistance with appointments, obtaining medication, transportation and other entitlements. Although medical advances are allowing infected -- those infected with HIV to live longer and have better quality of life, HIV is still a health care issue. Individuals continue to be unaware of their HIV status. As Mr. Brennan stated, most newly infected individuals are between the ages of 13 through 24. Where will these persons call when they want to be tested and have questions about their window period? This hotline number is published and distributed all over Suffolk County. Testing people early and linking those found to be positive to care and treatment is critical, not only for individual health outcomes, but also preventing new infections. Who? Where will our young adults, our college students, our community members call for assistance when they may have engaged in risky behaviors? Recently an agency called our hotline when a blood donor learned that they were HIV+. It was through our reputation in the County and established agency collaborations that referrals and linkages to medical care were provided. It was seamless. Without this funding, the hotline will not be staffed. Please reinstate this budget.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Legislator Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:
Hi, Ms. Adams. How are you? Thank you for being here. Thanks for the work that your organization does. What's the -- what's your overall budget?

MS. ADAMS:
This particular budget is 154 that we were --

LEG. CILMI:
No, the agency's overall budget; I'm sorry.

MS. ADAMS:
I'm not privy -- I don't know the entire -- I'm just privileged to this particular part -- privileged to this particular number.

LEG. CILMI:
What's your title again with the agency?

MS. ADAMS:
Chief Officer for Care Coordination.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So your experience with the agency is more in the service delivery end, not in the financial end.

MS. ADAMS:
That's correct, sir.
LEG. CILMI:
Is there anybody here from your organization who can speak to those types of questions?

MS. ADAMS:
Not today, but I would be happy to get that information to you if you have pointed questions.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Yeah, I'd be curious to know what your overall budget is.

MS. ADAMS:
Okay.

LEG. CILMI:
What portion of your budget is administrative costs and how much are the administrative costs, what sort of volunteer activities you take advantage of.

MS. ADAMS:
Yes, I'll be happy to get that to you.

LEG. CILMI:
All right. Thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right, thank you very much. Laurette Mulry, and on deck is Ronald Maher.

MS. MULRY:
Honorable Legislators, good afternoon. My name is Laurette Mulry, I'm very pleased and honored to be here today on behalf of the Legal Aid Society of Suffolk County. I've met with many of you individually and I thank you all for that. I thought it would be a good idea to come today to present to the entire Legislative body, as you sit in General Session, to give you a brief synopsis of Legal Aid's budgetary needs and concerns, especially as you are now embroiled in the debate over the 2014 Operating Budget for the County.

As you all well know, Legal Aid provides a very valuable function of government, in fact, and a mandated service for the County, that of course is indigent legal defense. And in this 50th anniversary year of the United States Supreme Court landmark decision in Gideon v. Wainwright, I think it's important to note and to acknowledge the work that the Legal Aid Society does as integral to our justice system and, indeed, it allows for those that need counsel to be provided with effective assistance of Counsel, despite their inability to afford counsel.

Legal Aid upholds that ideal and we help the County to meet that ideal and to provide that for the citizens of this County. Every year we come before this esteemed body to ask for pay and benefit parody for our employees. There is an underlying theory to that request and that is, of course, that in order for justice to be metered out swiftly and fairly, there must be equal advocacy on both sides of a case. With that, I'd like to discuss with you some of the numbers that Legal Aid is seeking for our budgetary request. I did bring a budget memo and, in fact, a letter was sent to each and every one of you last week, so you will have this and much more.

Essentially, what we requested was this: We requested a cost of living increase for our employees and salaries. We were also looking for an increase in our medical plan, number one, to assure that we can meet our net projected premium increase next year in NYSHIP, which is the New York State Health Insurance Program. We were also looking for an increase to be able to accommodate the ability to decrease the contribution of our individual employees. Each employee now pays 20% towards their premiums, towards their medical premiums; we'd like to bring that down to 10%.
that, of course, is to bring it in line and make an even playing field as between the Legal Aid attorney and our brother in the DA's Office and the County Attorney's Office.

Finally, we asked for an increase in our positions, of course, to handle an increasing caseload. Last year alone we handled over 31,000 cases. The County Executive did recommend for us the additions in the positions, however, we are asking that you look again now at what we're asking for for our medical insurance as well as for our salaries in order for us to maintain an even playing field and to afford our employees those benefits. Thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY: Thank you, Ms. Mulry.

LEG. CILMI: I have a question.

P.O. HORSLEY: Yes, excuse me. We have one question from Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI: Hi, Laurette. How are you today?

MS. MULRY: I'm good. How are you?

LEG. CILMI: Great, thank you. So you said that the County Executive -- the County Executive's budget proposal does include additional positions to -- for your agency and the funding required to fund those positions?

MS. MULRY: Yes, Legislator.

LEG. CILMI: Okay. The number of positions that he included, is that commensurate with the number you requested or less than or more than?

MS. MULRY: Indeed, it is exactly what we requested; we had asked for two attorney positions and one clerical staff worker. Again, we are looking at a growing trend in the caseload numbers. Since 2008, our caseload has gone up by 14%. It's the unfortunate consequence of a poor economy; of course when the economy goes down, crime goes up. So of course we're laboring to be able to handle those cases. In the District Court Division, our attorneys handle anywhere from 600 to a thousand cases annually, so well above what ABA standards provide. So we are trying to maintain the workload that we have, but try to help those attorneys that are there now. So those positions will help us, however you're asking us to expand the workforce without giving us the means to be able to operate and manage that workforce, and that's why we come here today to ask you to look again at what our medical is costing us and also in our salaries.

LEG. CILMI: Do you find that -- you know, one of the things that we're going to be asked to deal with today is in our Medical Examiner's Office, for example, we've come to the conclusion that the salary that we are -- that we've paid our Medical Examiner in the past is not sufficient in order to attract a qualified Medical Examiner for the future. Do you find that that's the case with the salaries at Legal Aid? Are you finding it difficult to hire attorneys at the salary levels that you're able to pay?
MS. MULRY:
Yes, and thank you for that question. Our starting salary is about $2500 less than what the DA and the County Attorneys are offering. We have been very, very lucky and fortunate that we are able to attract the best and brightest out of the law schools, not only in this area but across the country, and that is really because we provide very valuable training. The attorneys that come to us know that they're going to have a wonderful experience and get trial-ready very quickly, so they want to do that. The problem really is in maintaining that quality workforce. We do not have a step and grade system like the County exempts have. We do not have the ability to give an increase of 2 to 4% or any flexibility that the DA now has, so it really ties our hands. And we've seen a great turnover in our workforce and that becomes problematic. So we'd like to be able, again, to maintain that even playing field with being able to offer a little bit higher in terms of the salaries.

LEG. CILMI:
And last question; if you could just draw the distinction again for me between what you do and how you do it, and 18-B and the services provided by 18-B.

MS. MULRY:
Sure, sure. The mandated service of indigent legal defense really comes from the United States Constitution, the Sixth Amendment and the New York State Constitution, and it's passed through to the Counties, actually, through Article 18-B of the County Law. As such, there is a plan. The plan in this County is that Legal Aid is the primary provider of indigent defense with an 18-B assigned counsel defender plan as the backup. So if we can't take a case because of a conflict, because of multiple defendants, because it's a homicide case which we don't cover, then 18-B steps in to take on that case.

Legal Aid handling a case, our cost per case is approximately $300, from arraignment through final disposition. That's because our attorneys are salaried employees, they're there, they're in every part, they're ready to take on assignments readily from the Judges in those parts. Whereas 18-B, they are private attorneys, it's a voucher system and I think you all are well aware that on average their cost per case is approximately a thousand dollars per case. Again, not in any way disparaging what my colleagues do in 18-B, they do a fabulous job, it's just a matter of the fact that we are salaried employees as opposed to the voucher system.

LEG. CILMI:
So is it fair to say, then, that if we -- if we look at the entirety of the cost of indigent defense in Suffolk County, if we had more Legal Aid attorneys, we would be able to reduce our overall cost of indigent defense; would you agree with that?

MS. MULRY:
I absolutely would agree with that. And in fact, the Chief Justice in New York State, Johnathan Lippman, has made it imperative to the counties in this state that they engage in some action to reduce caseload numbers. In fact, New York City now has a law where the attorneys in New York City Legal Aid cannot have any more than 300 misdemeanor cases annually and 150 felonies. So you see we're well above that. So yes, absolutely, the positions are very, very helpful in order to reduce our caseload and to reduce the cost of 18-B for the County.

LEG. CILMI:
If I could, through the Chair. Robert, what is our total budget for indigent defense, Legal Aid and 18-B combined?

MR. LIPP:
I'll look it up. I'll get back to you, I'll look it up.
LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Laurette, you don't happen to know the answer to that question, do you?

MS. MULRY:
I'm sorry, I do not.

LEG. CILMI:
If we were to provide Legal Aid with more attorneys to absorb more of the client burden and thereby reduce our overall cost, would Legal Aid -- I mean, I suppose if we provide you with more attorneys that you would be able to handle the caseload, commensurate with the additional attorneys provided. Would the Courts be able to assign you with those additional cases? Because I know that that's part of this equation as well, the Courts have to be able to find you all to assign the cases to you.

MS. MULRY:
Yes. And, you know, really that's part of the equation, the fact that the Legal Aid attorneys are assigned in most every part makes us available to take those cases and the Judges like us to be there to readily accept assignment to move their calendars along, and they have thanked us for that. But again, that task is becoming more and more challenging because there are more and more parts now. I think you're well aware of the speciality parts that, again, another mandate of Judge Lippman, we have the Drug Court, the Mental Health Court, the Veterans Court, very important courts that are really diversionary courts, treatment courts. There's a new one that's starting up on October 29th, it's the Human Trafficking Court. Again, we have to have the personnel there to staff these parts. So we're really stretching the personnel very thin right now, but we are able to do it and we have been able to do it and we will continue to do so.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. Robert, did you get that answer yet?

MR. NOLAN:
My bad.

LEG. CILMI:
Your bad; what does that mean? *(Laughter).*

MR. LIPP:
No, no. He means his bad, he distracted me. I'll have to research it now, I didn't have an opportunity yet.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Laurette, what's your -- while Robert is looking that up, what is your budget for Legal Aid?

MS. MULRY:
Our budget? I don't know the exact number. Oh, my gosh, I --

LEG. CILMI:
Well, Robert will find that while he's looking for the other numbers.

MS. MULRY:
I'm sorry.

LEG. CILMI:
I mean we're all -- you know, we're going through the budget process now, as you know, and we're struggling with ways to save money.
MS. MULRY:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
We just heard from a couple of different agencies that funding has been cut to provide valuable services to the residents of Suffolk County, and the financial challenges have resulted in our contract agency budget being cut 33%, $33 million, if not more, in next year's budget. So, I mean, that's significant, and we recognize those challenges, so we wouldn't -- we wouldn't necessarily criticize the proposed budget in that respect, we have to try and deal with those challenges. So Robert, you've got some -- I'm stretching here (*laughter*).

MR. LIPP:
Okay. So we're talking about 2014 recommended, I suppose?

LEG. CILMI:
Sure.

MR. LIPP:
Okay. So the total for Legal Aid and 18-B is 17.1 million, of which 4.2 million is budgeted for 18-B.

LEG. CILMI:
18-B. Okay, so it's $17 million and four million is budgeted for 18-B?

MR. LIPP:
Yes. There are some other things also, some grants, other items like that; Legal Aid for indigents, which is their main appropriation, happens to be 11.3 million.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Is there any other part of that equation, or is it just Legal Aid and 18-B?

MR. LIPP:
So there are special services contracts, one, two, three, four, five, six, including the 18-B. There's a targeted crime initiative which is like 750,000, defender-based advocacy program which is a little over 100,000, a sex offender program which is budgeted at 53,000; so a lot of small items, and a grant also on top of that. So the two main appropriations are 18-B's main -- I'm sorry, Legal Aid's main appropriation of 11.3 and the 18-B piece of 4.2.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. All right, so I'm going to have to look at those numbers a little bit and see what we can do there, if anything, in the budget. Thank you, Robert. And thank you, Laurette, for your testimony.

MS. MULRY:
Thank you.

MR. LIPP:
I'll forward that information that I just spoke about right now.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
We have more, Laurette. Legislator Browning?
LEG. BROWNING:
No, it's okay. Laurette, you mentioned the special courts and the last one that you mentioned, I was going to ask you about that, but you said it.

MS. MULRY:
Okay, great. Thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:
One more; Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
In past years when Mr. Mitchell has addressed us, because he's always been down here just about every year with reference to budgetary considerations.

MS. MULRY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Let me ask you, I think one of the things he kept on stressing is the fact that you do not get step increases, you do not get a cost of living adjustment, so the challenge is, as he often explained it, keeping attorneys.

MS. MULRY:
Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I mean, I would think that it's relatively easy, less challenging when you get someone right out of law school who has passed the bar who needs a job; whatever the salary is, they're happy just to have a position.

MS. MULRY:
Absolutely.

LEG. BARRAGA:
But as the years go by, that's where the problem really arises because they're not moving ahead financially, and I think it's a real challenge for your particular group. Have you ever made an effort in the past to try to work out something with any administration, whether this one or the previous administration in terms of step increases or cost of living adjustments based on a regional cost index, which would help you retain existing attorneys?

MS. MULRY:
Oh, we have asked for that. Unfortunately, we are a private organization, we're non-profit, so we're not able to get into that system. But we have argued that many times, that we don't have that automatic structure that allows us then to afford those raises, you know, just routinely; we have to come here, like I am today, to ask for that.

It is a tremendous challenge for us. In fact, we had an attorney that just left just two weeks ago who was fabulous, who our clients loved, who was in the speciality courts, in fact, and unfortunately she came to me and said, "I love this job. I would do this job for the rest of my life, but I cannot afford it." So that is the problem that we're running into, it's really maintaining that workforce. And it becomes very difficult when we have to send our attorneys out to the County Court, because usually they start in District Court and they learn their craft there and then they go out to the County Court, but we need those experienced attorneys out in County Court because those are the heavy duty --
LEG. BARRAGA:
Keeping that in mind, would you have been better off, instead of asking and receiving 195,000 for two attorneys and one clerical, would you have been better off to make a request for 195,000 to give some sort of moderate increase in salary for some of these attorneys that you're losing?

MS. MULRY:
Well, we did make the increase in --

LEG. BARRAGA:
Oh, you asked for both, you only got one.

MS. MULRY:
We asked for both.

LEG. BARRAGA:
And you didn't get your medical either. But, I mean --
MS. MULRY:
Yes, I know.

LEG. BARRAGA:
-- just taking a look at what you just said, even though you may need two additional attorneys and clerical, and you're going to get them from 195, maybe it might have been a different approach, not necessarily the right one, to request say 200,000 just to give the existing attorneys, the ones with some experience and time under their belts, some additional money. Because right now you're not going to get anything.

MS. MULRY:
I agree. And if I could prioritize, I would make definitely, you know, the salaries and the medical more important than the positions, even though I do think the positions are --

LEG. BARRAGA:
Well, I mean, you still have time. Can you ask or make a request to make the switch, move the 195,000, instead of getting the additional positions, let it be used for salary increases for your people?

MS. MULRY:
I will absolutely discuss that with Mr. Mitchell and see what he thinks.

LEG. BARRAGA:
All right, thank you.

MS. MULRY:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. Thank you very much, Legislator Barraga. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Hi.

MS. MULRY:
Hi.
LEG. D'AMARO:  
So your request this year is for an increase in two positions; is that what we're talking about?

MS. MULRY:  
It was actually attorney positions and one clerical support staff person.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Because I know in the last few years that we've been working on our budgets, we've been working along with Legal Aid and we did give some increases last year, if I recall, didn't we?

MS. MULRY:  
Yes, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
We did.

MS. MULRY:  
The medical insurance.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
We covered medical insurance.

MS. MULRY:  
The premium increase, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
The premium increase, yeah. I just want to go back to a point that you were making before about keeping staff attorneys. You had mentioned that a particular individual came to you and said, you know, "I have to leave. I love my job, but I have to leave because I have to make more money".

MS. MULRY:  
Uh-huh.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
Legal Aid can't compete with the private sector.

MS. MULRY:  
No.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
So that's going to be the norm, I would think.

MS. MULRY:  
It is, but --

LEG. D'AMARO:  
I mean, if we're trying to give raises to compete with the private sector, we'd have to double the cost of this program.

MS. MULRY:  
Yes. But I would like to point out that I do believe, and you can correct me if I'm wrong here, that the DA was given some flexibility in either withholding or giving more in terms of raises to be able to reward those who are doing a better job. So, you know, we don't have that ability at all. We would like to be able to do that for those attorneys who are doing above and beyond, we would like to be
able to support them.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
But wouldn't that come at the expense of the other attorney that's getting a raise?

**MS. MULRY:**
Well, we've always tried to be very equal, but that's because we don't have any flexibility really there.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
That's a different issue.

**MS. MULRY:**
Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
My point is that when we look at the budget for Legal Aid and, you know, certainly you do a great job and it's cost effective rather than going through 18-B and we only go to 18-B when we really have to. In fact, I think in past budgets we've taken some of the 18-B funding and put it over back to Legal Aid, if I'm not mistaken. So we've been working along with Legal Aid over the last several years.

**MS. MULRY:**
We appreciate that, thank you.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Yeah. No, just the point I want to make, however, is that -- and maybe you need some flexibility on how you give out your raises and all that, and I understand that. But we cannot compete with the private sector --

**MS. MULRY:**
Oh, absolutely not.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
-- for attorneys' salaries.

**MS. MULRY:**
No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Nor can the DA.

**MS. MULRY:**
And there are other reasons that people work in the public sector and come to Legal Aid. It's not -- you know, obviously -- and whenever we have an interview, the first thing we say -- because we say, "Can you afford to work here," and the common response is, "This is my dream job. I don't need the money." Eventually, as they get older and they get married and have to buy a house, then all of a sudden it's very difficult, as you could understand.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Yeah. And on a professional level, going to Legal Aid also helps especially a younger attorney, a less experienced attorney, giving an attorney an opportunity to take on a caseload and get some great experience, also. So there are advantages to that job.
MS. MULRY: Yes, there are.

LEG. D'AMARO: Right. So, but your budget request is not to try and compete with the private sector.

MS. MULRY: No, but we would like to bring it up a little bit more in line with what our brother in the DA's Office and the County Attorney's Office have.

LEG. D'AMARO: Okay, thank you.

MS. MULRY: You're welcome.

P.O. HORSLEY: All righty, I think that is the last question there for you, Laurette.

MS. MULRY: Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY: Thank you very much. Ronald Mayer; if Ronald hasn't forgotten (laughter).

MR. MAHER: Yeah. Hi. My name is Ronald Maher.

P.O. HORSLEY: Maher, I'm sorry.

MR. MAHER: I'm a lifelong Suffolk County resident, I'm 21 years a homeowner in Mastic. I'm also an honorably discharged Marine Corps Veteran, and I'm a former Suffolk County employee with an unblemished disciplinary record at the time of my resignation. Also, my father was President of the Suffolk County Superior Officer Association, Suffolk County Police Department, retired, he just passed away September 8th. My mother was a crossing guard for over 20 years, so I come from a family of government employees here in Suffolk County. I'm very familiar with the workings of what's going on right now with County Executive Bellone. He's trying to sell the Dennison Building for $67 million to fill the budget deficit, all right? It's a one-shot, crap deal. With a sweet lease-back agreement, it's going to create more reoccurring debt for Suffolk County and for my children and my five grandchildren. After this sweet lease-back agreement, who knows? And who knows this bond company and how did Bellone get together with Cuomo and do all of this and we only find out about it a week ago in Newsday, a little small article? You know, it's just incidentally, you know, Cuomo signed off.

Listen, there's so many other ways that we could do things. Right now the Obama Health Plan is in effect. Where is our self-insured administrator looking into how could this benefit us? We're self-insured here in Suffolk County, we pay for all of our employees, AME, the Police Department, everybody's health insurance. You can get health insurance for a hundred bucks under the new plan. What is it costing us, $2,000 each employee? You know, and I think there are other things we could sell, all right? Why don't we take a bond? I read something a couple of years ago that our bond rating, actually part of our bond rating was the fact that we own Suffolk County's beautiful, most largest office building. All right? I blew the whistle on the Dennison Building. Halpin was
trying to sell it for $25 million to Metropolitan Life. I went public, it was on Channel 12 News and Newsday, asbestos called risk. We renovated the building, remediated it, and now we have a beautiful building and now you want to use it one time to bail out -- you know, why? Politics. But that's a real building that we have housed with all of our top executives and all of our finest offices. You know, what are we going to sell next, the ME building and lease it back? You know, why don't we talk to Trump about buying Indian Island? You know, get rid of some parks, call Campgrounds of America. I mean, let's go to Obama Health Plan because I think that is going to be -- we could probably save, you know, $100 million. Or how about the alternative; let's just take a bond. You take a bond for $100 million. How much is this sweet lease-back agreement, $5 million a year? It will probably cost less than $5 million a year interest on a bond for a hundred million, which would put is into the red, right? And maybe restore the 33% that Legislator Climi (sic) said; he said 33 million, he said 67 million. These are real numbers, the Dennison Building 67 million? There's your problem solved, right? Are you part of the whole band over there with Bellone who did this? Are you Democrat or Republican, Mr. Climi (sic).

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
No. Mr. Cilmi, you don't have to answer that.

**MR. MAHER:**
Okay. Well --

**LEG. CILMI:**
You know what? You can find me on-line.

**MR. MAHER:**
Oh, yeah, okay. All right, well, I appreciate the time to speak here, and I think I have a lot -- all different kinds of plans and things that have been done to us in the past as a County employee. I went through a furlough program, we saved millions of dollars doing that, everybody got their money when they retire from service.

*(Beepers Sounded)*

It hurts our employees, but it keeps employees still working and it will help to keep our budget from reoccurring more and more debt. Don't sell the Dennison Building, please. It's a VA Veterans Memorial, it's Suffolk County's most beautiful building and it's very, very important to keep that -- to keep our bond rating, because we have a nice piece of real estate at least to hang our hat on. Thank you very much.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Thank you very much. One more, I have D. Ray Ward.

**MR. WARD:**
Good afternoon, Members of the Legislature. My name is D. Ray Ward, I'm the Chief Program Officer for Long Island Association for AIDS Care. I stand before you requesting that LIADD's funding, and other agencies that we collaborate with, be restored.

For nearly 25 years, LIAAC's hotline has been a lifeline for Suffolk County residents who access various health education service programs, rapid testing for HIV, ACV and STIs, case management and care coordination services. In addition, fast track to substance abuse treatment, nutrition and food programs and suicide prevention training, and referrals to medical and mental health treatment.
For many years, the Suffolk County Community has depended on LIAAC's hotline to be a reliable source of help. As the only designated New York State hotline on Long Island, it would be devastating to thousands of Suffolk County residents, including colleges, universities and other service providers who depend on the hotline to provide them with linkage to health education, health screening testing programs, case management and medical care referrals. In order for the disenfranchised communities to have better health outcomes, health disparities and barriers to access treatment and care must be reduced and eventually eliminated.

The Center for Disease Control, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration and the New York State Department of Health AIDS Institute all agree that reducing health disparities and disenfranchised communities, increasing health education and screening, testing, linkage to care and treatment, adherence improved individual health outcomes and is cost effective.

LIAAC Hotline is a lifeline for the Suffolk County community, and by restoring LIAAC to the Suffolk County budget, thousands of people who annually access the hotline will continue to get the help that they need.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much.

MR. WARD:
Thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. That concludes my cards. Would anyone else like to be heard on the Operating Budget? Would anyone else like to be heard on the Operating Budget? Seeing none, I'll make a motion to close. This was our second meeting on it. And seconded by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, the 2014 Public Hearing on the Operational Budget has been closed. All right.

MR. LAUBE:
Eleven.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. I.R. 1570 --

MR. LAUBE:
Twelve. (Not Present: Legislators Schneiderman, Montano, Kennedy, Nowick and Spencer/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
-- a Charter Law to improve the County's budget approval and amendment process to increase transparency and accountability ("Taxpayer Awareness Act") (Cilmi). Legislator Cilmi?

MR. NOLAN:
You should see whether there's any speakers.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, I'm sorry. Yes, let me, just before you do that. Would anyone like to be heard on this? I do not have any cards. Would anyone else like to be heard on this, on 1570? Seeing none, Legislator
Cilmi?

LEG. CILMI:
Motion to recess.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion's to recess; I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been recessed.

MR. LAUBE:
Twelve. (Not Present: Legislators Schneiderman, Montano, Kennedy, Nowick and Spencer/Vacancy: District 8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
We're good? Okay. **I.R. 1591 - A Charter Law to Institute a Departmental Omnibus Budget Amendment Process (Cilmi.)**

I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard on 1591? Would anyone like to be heard on 1591? Seeing none, Legislator Cilmi, what would you like to do?

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you for pronouncing my name correctly. Motion to recess, please.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. I wouldn't even go there. Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been recessed.

MR. LAUBE:
Fourteen. (Vote Amended to 13 yes, 4 not present/Not Present: Legislators Schneiderman, Montano, Kennedy and Spencer/Vacancy: District 8.)

P.O. HORSLEY:
**I.R. 1666 - Proposal to form Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 - Smithtown Galleria (Co. Exec.).** I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard on the Smithtown Galleria? Anyone like to be heard? Seeing none, Legislator, is this yours, John.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Go figure. Motion to recess.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion's to recess. Seconded by?

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Fourteen. (Vote Amended to 13 yes, 4 not present/Not Present: Legislators Schneiderman, Montano, Kennedy and Spencer/Vacancy: District 8.)
P.O. HORSLEY:
I.R. 1678 - A Local Law to provide assessment and tax relief to property owners impacted by Superstorm Sandy (Browning). Would anyone like to be heard on 1678? Would anyone like to be heard on 1678? Seeing none, Legislator Browning, what would you like to do?

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion to recess.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion's to recess.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Seconded by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been recessed.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen. (Vote Amended to 14 yes, 3 not present/Not Present: Legislators Montano, Kennedy and Spencer/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
I.R. 1690 - 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 (Co. Exec.).

I do not have any cards. Would anyone like to be heard on 1690? Would anyone like to be heard on 1690? Seeing none, Mr. Vaughn, where -- oh, there. What would you like to do with this, Mr. Vaughn?

MR. VAUGHN:
Would you mind recessing this, please?

P.O. HORSLEY:
I wouldn't mind that at all.

LEG. STERN:
Motion to recess.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion to recess by Legislator Stern.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

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

I.R. 1698 - A Local Law to strengthen Suffolk County's E-911 System (Schneiderman).

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen -- sixteen. (Vote amended to 15 yes/Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacancy: District 8)
P.O. HORSLEY:
I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard on 1698? Would anyone like to be heard on 1698? Seeing none, Mr. Schneiderman, what would you like to do?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion to close.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion's to close. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

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

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. I.R. 1700, A Local Law amending Chapter 8 of the Suffolk County Code (County Executive). I do have cards on this matter. The first one is Robert J. Andrews, Jr., and on deck is Sarah Gordon.

MR. ANDREWS:
Good afternoon. My name is Robert J. Andrews. We operate a farm stand and 70-acre farm in Wading River, Long Island. I am here to comment about the Chapter 8 changes, and I think I sent everybody an e-mail in the future (sic) and I hope that you all received it, and I think it's going to get handed out again just to make sure I didn't miss anybody.

I went over these rules that are coming out. A lot of the amendments are better, but there is a few things that I'd like to go over briefly and quickly that show me concern. We have a display area. There is absolutely no language for this display area in front. From my past experience, it becomes an extension of a sales area from products from all over the place, from different growers or whatever. It is not what's grown on-premises.

My other concern is that a farm stand is a farm stand, it shouldn't be designed with heat and to be kept running all winter long. Where is this product going to come from? And the temptation is just too much to bring it in from elsewhere other than local product. I think if a farmer has a product in the winter to sell and he puts it out for sale on a weekend or during the week, whenever he does it, I don't think anyone has a problem with that. But to actually make a heated store, you're bringing commercialism to preserve farmland; absolutely not, I don't agree with it.

Another one that I am -- that I found problems with is that a farm stand is awarded on a particular piece of preserved property. That farm stand has to be farmed by that farm stand operator. He can bring product from other parcels he farms, but that farm itself has to be farmed. Whether it's in a rotation process or whatever, it has to be managed and farmed by that farmer operating that farm stand. Otherwise you're going to end up with a bunch of stores on preserved farmland with one, two, three acres of farming going on, and the rest of the 40, 50, 100 laying dead. I experienced it, it's happening across the street from me now.

Okay. Now, my next concern for preserved farmland is this: We sold development rights to Suffolk County. We were recommended by Suffolk County officials and our legal system that leave parcels out for your retail, and also for your greenhouse operations. It was no surprise, everybody knows
And another problem was, that made me aware, was the thousand square footage expansion of a farm stand. I’m not against this, But, at this particular time, we are a business. We are a farm, but we are a business. It’s not just a day in the sun on the farm. We take our COs, our permits and everything very seriously. We are a business. So when someone comes across the street, I expect the same level of government. I expect this. And for someone to come and slap up a farm stand that's illegal, oversized, overnight, and operate this against me, this is not competition. Some people say this is my competition; this is not competition. I would have loved to do business. Those three years I waited for all of my Suffolk County health approvals, I would have loved it. I would have had a lot more money in my pocket.

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

MR. ANDREWS:  
Okay. I disagree with anything going on, any leniencies. I don’t -- leniencies towards farmers is not a problem, but when this activity is going on, I can’t see how anything can be enforced by anybody. I don't see it.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Okay.

MR. ANDREWS:  
Thank you very much.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you very much. All right. Sara Gordon, and on deck is Kimberly Quarty. Sara? Did we lose you?

MS. QUARTY:  
She had to leave.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
We wore her out, huh? Yeah, I believe. I understand. Sara? I mean, Kimberly.

MS. QUARTY:  
No, I'm Quarty.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Right.

MS. QUARTY:  
With Peconic Land Trust. I’m here on behalf of Peconic Land Trust to lend our support to the proposed revisions to Chapter 8, and to thank you for considering these -- to adopt these revisions that we believe are essential to the sustainability of the farmers and their farming operations.

The existing program is a valuable tool, as it preserves the farmland and it helps the farmers hold onto their farms, but there are holes in it. And in some cases it either doesn't speak to some issues, or it restricts farmers from practices that are essential to their economic viability. We ask that you support some of these revisions that do allow the agritourism, to allow the processing for value-added products and modifications to farm stand regulations.
Another thing that we support, perhaps most importantly, is the Section B of 8.14, which prohibits the abandonment of agricultural use. This states that, beginning in January of 2014, no owner shall leave agricultural land uncultivated and not engage in agricultural production for more than two consecutive years. This is becoming a huge problem in Suffolk County, especially out east and on the South Fork, where we have developers and realtors that actually bundle these preserved lands with spec houses, and they're selling them as a bundle. This not only takes the land out of production and makes the land unaccessible to farmers, but it also makes it unaffordable to farmers, as it raises the comps. And some of the preserved farmland on the South Fork especially is now valued at 100,000 an acre. This is unattainable to farmers, and we were really working to help with overlay easements and other tools that were working with them. But we really need this legislation to help ensure the viability of food production in Suffolk County.

Thank you for your consideration.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Ms. Quarty. The last card I have is Herb Strobel. No, I have several cards left. I'm sorry. Herb Strobel. And on deck is Melanie Cirillo.

MR. STROBEL:
So good afternoon. My name is Herb Strobel. I'm a member of a farm family in Center Moriches, where we've been farming for nearly a hundred years.

About 10 years ago, we sold farmland development rights to Suffolk County, as well as Brookhaven Town. I'm also a member of the Town's Open Space and Farmland Committee, as well as a Board Member for Peconic Land Trust and Cornell Cooperative Extension.

I'm here today to express my general support for I.R. 1700, which, as you've already heard and as you already know, would update the County's Farmland Preservation Program, or the governance thereof.

As you've heard many times in the past, the Farmland Protection Program has been in place for 40 years, and really has been a pioneering program that's been emulated by many municipalities and states across the country. But in that time, in the last 40 years, since the early 1970s, agriculture, particularly here on Long Island, has undergone a revolution in many ways. No longer do we have large scale commodity crop production going on by most farmers. A lot of farmers nowadays are producing a variety of different crops. A lot of retail is going on. That's including nursery, grapes, and certainly a wider assortment of vegetables than perhaps was the case in the past. And, as I said, many farmers nowadays, in terms of their marketing, are utilizing more direct marketing via farm stands, activities such as selected parts of agritourism, as well as on-farm processing of value-added products in terms of generating additional income, and a very competitive and economically challenging environment, as is Long Island.

But the original preservation program didn't necessarily anticipate such types of activities at the time -- at that time, back in the early '70s. And it's certainly time that Chapter 8 needs to be revised in ways that promote the economic viability of the lands that are currently within, and hopefully will continue to be within, the Farmland Preservation Program.

The proposed changes to Chapter 8 are certainly the result of a lot of input from both within and from outside the farming community. Most of the proposed changes are certainly common sense, from my perspective, while maintaining the core integrity of the program, while also recognizing the changes -- the changing nature of agriculture and the need to maintain the economic sustainability of Long Island's farms.

So I would appreciate your very careful consideration of the proposed changes. Thank you.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Mr. Strobel. Last one is -- card I have is Melanie Cirillo.

MS. CIRILLO:
Hello. Melanie Cirillo with the Peconic Land Trust, and on behalf of Peconic Land Trust, we generally support the revisions to Chapter 8, for example, the reallocation of committee members to more accurately reflect the current fabric of farmers in Suffolk County. The diversity will broaden the Farmland Committee level of expertise, and directly benefit both new properties that come before the PDR, and those that are already protected as PDR lands change hands, and the farm operation develops in a more specialized field. The Farmland Committee panel can be more informed and effective.

The review of applications for acquisition of development rights is better from a practical standpoint, because September is a very busy harvest month for farmers, on the heels of a busy growing season. So allowing landowners to submit an application for consideration during their slower season will prove to be better received by the farming community. And, in general, we do support the revisions to the farm stand code change. So thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much. That is the last card that I have for 1700. Would anyone like to be heard on 1700? Would anyone like to be heard on 1700? Seeing none, Mr. --

LEG. HAHN:
Motion to close.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion to close by Legislator Hahn, seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.


MR. LAUBE:
Fifteen (I.R. 1700)(Not Present: Legislators Montano and Kennedy/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
I do not have any cards. Would anyone like to be heard on 1716? Would anyone like to be heard on 1716? Seeing none, Mr. Cilmi what would you like to do with it?

LEG. CILMI:
Motion to close please.

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

LEG. D’AMARO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator D’Amaro. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

MR. LAUBE:
Fourteen. (Not Present: Legislators Anker, Montano and Kennedy/Vacancy: District 8)
P.O. HORSLEY:
I.R. 1718 - A Local Law to authorize conveyance of real property previously taken for delinquent taxes (Browning).

I do not have any cards. Would anyone like to be heard on 1718? Would anyone like to be heard on 1718? Seeing none, Legislator Browning, what would you like to do with this?

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion to close.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion's to close. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Hahn, was that?

LEG. CALARCO:
Calarco.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Calarco. I'm sorry. You forget, I'm the Great Pumpkin. I.R. --

MR. NOLAN:
You didn't call the vote.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, yes. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

MR. LAUBE:
Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Anker, Montano, Kennedy and Spencer/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
I.R. 1792 - A Charter Law amending Article II of the Suffolk County Charter to clarify the requirements of a Revenue Impact Statement (Co. Exec.).

I do not have any cards on this. Would anyone like to be heard? Would anyone like to be heard? Seeing none, this is for the County Exec's. Anybody would like to make a motion on this?

LEG. D'AMARO:
Motion to close.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion to close by Legislator D'Amaro, second by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been closed.

MR. LAUBE:
Thirteen. (Not Present: Legislators Anker, Montano, Kennedy and Spencer/Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. I'd also like to set the date for the following Public Hearings, November 19th, 2012, 2:30, at the Rose Caracappa Auditorium in Hauppauge:
I.R. 1877 - A Local Law to strengthen the Animal Abuse Offenders Registry (D’Amaro).

I’ll take a second on that. Legislator D’Amaro would like to make a second.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**

What?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second to close -- second to set the date.

**LEG. D’AMARO:**

Yeah, yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Okay, seconds the date to have the Public Hearing. All those favor? Opposed? So moved. I.R. 1877 has been --

**MR. LAUBE:**

Fourteen. (Not Present: Legislator Montano, Kennedy and Spencer/Vacancy: District 8)

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

All right. I also -- all right. I have one more **Public Hearing**, which I didn't know, that has to be set, it is a CN. **I.R. 1882-13 - A Local Law to lift salary cap for Commissioner of Health Services and Chief Medical Examiner (County Executive).**

**MR. NOLAN:**

It has been advertised.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

And it has been advertised?

**MR. NOLAN:**

It has been posted, so see if there's anyone who would like to speak.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Would anyone like to speak on 1882-13? Would anyone like to be heard on 1882-13? Seeing none, I'll make a motion to close.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. CILMI:**

On the motion. On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**

On the motion. Yes, Legislator --

**LEG. CILMI:**

I just have a question --
P.O. HORSLEY:
Sure.

LEG. CILMI:
-- for Counsel, I suppose, or maybe for the County Executive's Office. Where was this -- where and when was this advertised?

MR. VAUGHN:
Mr. Legislator, we left that in the very capable hands of your County Clerk -- I mean, of your -- the Clerk of the Legislature to advertise it today.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you. Tim?

MR. LAUBE:
We post it on the doors of the Legislature, of the auditorium.

LEG. CILMI:
And is that standard operating procedure when we have a Public Hearing necessary on a CN?

MR. LAUBE:
I'm familiar with letting it age an hour.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.

MR. NOLAN:
You only have to let it age an hour. That is the requirement, is to -- is a posting. When a bill comes in via Certificate of Necessity, it's in the Charter that it is posted, and that is the hearing that the -- the notice that's required under the Charter in this situation.

LEG. CILMI:
So, if somebody wanted to speak about this issue, they'd have to be walking through the building, happen to notice the sign posted on the door, and decide that they just want to walk in and speak to it?

MR. NOLAN:
Unless they found out some other way, yeah.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. What's the -- what's the function of our closing this today versus the impact of us recessing it today?

MR. NOLAN:
It means we can vote today on this bill. If we left the Public Hearing open, then we would not be able to vote on the Certificate of Necessity.

LEG. CILMI:
Well, I mean --

P.O. HORSLEY:
Would you like to have Mr. Vaughn answer that? Maybe --
LEG. CILMI: Yeah. And let me just preface my question with, you know, I recognize that we're trying to fill the position of Medical Examiner as quickly as possible here, but this proposed Local Law is extending some salary relief, I guess, not only to the Medical Examiner's Office, but also to the President of the Community College, as well as to -- which I know we've already done, as well as to the Commissioner of our Health Department, again, which we've already done. But I'm not sure that, you know, the extent to which that relief is presented. In other words, right now, the law says that those -- our employees can't make more than the County Executive, correct, Tom?

MR. VAUGHN: That is my understanding of the law as it is currently written.

LEG. CILMI: Does the resolution that we're proposing to vote on today set any parameters as to what the maximum salary can be, then, or does it leave it completely open-ended.

MR. VAUGHN: It does leave it open-ended, but I would say that when we bring back someone as a nominee, it's in that -- it is in that piece of legislation at that point in time.

LEG. CILMI: Okay. So we would have to -- you would have to propose a bill, then, to confirm any of those three positions, and the Legislature would have to approve that.

MR. VAUGHN: I can confirm that we would have to bring back one on both the Medical Examiner and the Health Commissioner, sir. I'm not completely positive who does the bill nominating the President of the College, in all --

LEG. CILMI: Okay.

MR. VAUGHN: In all sincerity.

LEG. CILMI: Right, right, right. Well, I mean, since we've already discussed and approved, and I -- quite frankly, I don't recall what the parameters of those previous approvals were. But since we've already approved the President of the Community College and the Commissioner of the Health Department, I'm most concerned with the Medical Examiners position at this point in time, again, recognizing that we need to -- we need to get somebody in that position, and we're currently without a medical examiner and Deputy Medical Examiner; but also recognizing that, or at least I understand that notice was given 30 days prior to the departure of our Medical Examiner, and now we're faced with a Certificate of Necessity and the realization that we can't hire somebody at the current salary levels. I'm just a little concerned that we have a Public Hearing process, but that process would require somebody to happen to wander through the building and happen to see something posted on a door.

MR. VAUGHN: Well, sir, to address that issue, Dr. Toulon did state quite clearly during the Public Safety debate at -- on Thursday we would be bringing this forward. So I understand what you're saying about -- oh, good afternoon, Doctor. I understand your concerns about the advertisement, but it was brought up that we were going to be bringing this bill forward today, and that was on Thursday. So, yes, I do realize that it is not the standard advertising procedure, but it wasn't like it was a surprise to anybody this morning.
LEG. CILMI:
No, I certainly -- well, it wasn't a surprise to us. It wasn't a surprise to me, and, quite, frankly, you know, I think I agree with the resolution. It's just that I'm concerned about the lack of public knowledge of what's supposed to be a Public Hearing process. So I'm not quite sure how to deal with that. We have a motion to close and a second, correct?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes, that's correct.

LEG. CILMI:
What would happen if we were to recess this, Tom? I mean, can we -- can we continue to look for a Medical Examiner if this was recessed? How long do you expect the whole process to take?

MR. VAUGHN:
I know the last time, sir, the process took seven months to find a new Medical Examiner when we began the last time. Now, at the very -- I think that the first step, and I think it's a very important step, is to get this Public Hearing closed. If, at the end of the day, this Legislature chooses not to adopt the resolution, at least the Public Hearing is closed. By not closing the Public Hearing today, you're essentially delaying this, not one cycle, but two cycles at the very least.

LEG. CILMI:
Well, we're not -- pardon me for interrupting, Tom, but we're not stopping the Administration from interviewing potential candidates, are we?

MR. VAUGHN:
I would say that you are not stopping us from interviewing potential candidates, but it would be impacting the -- our ability to interview them in good faith. I mean, how do we make -- without direction from the Legislature that we are going to be able to offer a salary range that may or may not be higher than what we are -- than what we're currently offering, how do we do that without -- with a Local Law that's still open? How do I -- how do I interview potential candidates say, "Well, we think that the Legislator may or may not approve waiving this law"?

LEG. CILMI:
Well, you do it all the time. I mean, you negotiated a contract with Parents for Megan's Law, for example, prior to us approving that contract. So you could very easily interview candidates and say, "We fully expect the Legislature to authorize a salary level above what we're currently" -- "what we paid our previous Medical Examiner," and we're just going through -- I mean, you've hired folks without our approval on waivers of County residency, so --

MR. VAUGHN:
I would say that in each case we followed the rules that were already established. So when -- with the waiver, we followed the rules. It did not state that we had to get the approval prior to. In the case of today's advertisement, we followed the rules that were in place. I mean, we'll play by whatever set of rules you want to play by, but could we just know what the rules of the game are going to be?

LEG. CILMI:
Well, you know what the rules are going to be.

MR. VAUGHN:
Right. And the rules of the game state that we're allowed --
LEG. CILMI:
Rules are all fine, and we do appreciate when those rules are followed, for that matter, except in this case, the rule may not be in the best interest of the taxpayers, and certainly not in the spirit of the law as far as public hearings go. I mean, as I said, I'm inclined to support the resolution, but if we have to wait a cycle to properly advertise a Public Hearing, so that if someone wants to come to the Legislature and ask questions or speak about it, they can do that. That's all I have.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. Thank you very much, Legislator. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. The question I have is the change seems to be going from the exemption for the President of the Suffolk County Community College to two positions; is that true?

MR. VAUGHN:
Yes, sir. It includes the Medical Examiner and the Health Commissioner.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And why does it include both positions?

MR. VAUGHN:
My understanding is that it's two -- is that it includes the Medical Examiner to address a current need, and the Health Commissioner to address a potential future need, should Dr. Tomarken retire at some point in time.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Should Dr. Tomarken retire at some point. What is his salary currently, and why would you need to -- why would you need an exemption there for that salary?

MR. VAUGHN:
Legislator, I actually don't know what Dr. Tomarken's salary is at this moment in time. I honestly have no idea what Dr. -- I will know by the time we debate this bill, but I don't know what Dr. Tomarken's salary is at this moment in time.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
But why -- if we don't know it, why do we need to have no cap on it?

MR. VAUGHN:
I think that we are concerned that with the Health Commissioner, we would run into the same problem that we're running into with finding a Medical Examiner, and that is that it's very difficult to find a person who is a doctor, as you do need to be in the case of a Health Commissioner, for the salary that we're offering.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. I just wanted clarification on the actual salary.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thanks.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. Legislator Kennedy, then D'Amaro.
LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you. Tom.

MR. VAUGHN:
Yes, sir.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Can we go back to -- first of all, you're right, Dr. Toulon did mention at Public Safety about where we were at. As a matter of fact, we had some of -- a dialogue, and I spoke to him for a brief period of time after the meeting, and maybe he said it on the record, I can't recall, but you've already spoken with or had some interview with three or four potential appointees?

MR. VAUGHN:
We've currently interviewed one individual and that person -- and Dr. Toulon, correct me if I'm wrong, stated that they would not accept it based on the current salary point.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. I can't see behind you. Is Errol here? Good. Errol, why don't you come up to the podium? Please, through the Chair.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Good. Thank you. Good afternoon, Dr. Toulon. How are you today?

DR. TOULON:
Good afternoon, sir.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So are you kind of the point person on this for the interviewing, then, that's going on for the M.E., or you just happen to have some knowledge based on what the Administration is doing?

DR. TOULON:
No, I am one of the point people with Civil Service.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. So, then, do you have additional appointments set up to interview other potential candidates for this position?

DR. TOULON:
Yes. Within a week-and-a-half we'll be interviewing a second candidate. These are local candidates. After that, we'll be interviewing -- we would be forced to interview candidates from other states.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Now I know that we had spoken a little bit, and I guess you've done some due diligence, as you always do. What's the general salary range for M.E.'s, let's say Downstate here, you know, Westchester, Orange, Rockland, City of New York, Nassau; what are we looking at?

DR. TOULON:
The City of New York is $356,000.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Oh, that's interesting. Okay.
DR. TOULON:
Nassau County is $181,000. Westchester County, which only has a population of $961,000 -- 961,000 people, the salary is $172,295.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. And what's the salary right now that we have for what Dr. Milewski's position was?

DR. TOULON:
$172,295.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. So assuming that this resolution, the CN, was to go through, what do you anticipate that it would float up to? What would be the offer that the Administration's prepared to put on the table?

DR. TOULON:
Based on the qualifications, we're looking for a range of between 200,000 and 250,000, that's what we're asking for.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Oofa. Oofa. Wow. Well, that's a big range, though, that's a big range. Maybe we widen the pool, though, you know? Maybe we widen the pool.

You know, I think there's an element of concern with what Legislator Cilmi has brought up about the move. Let's go at it this way: Today, who's doing the M.E.'s function?

DR. TOULON:
The Administrator function of the Medical Examiner's Office is being performed by me. The Doctors are doing the autopsy services. The Lab Directors are doing their forensic services.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. So, clearly, that's a temporary arrangement, but we're fulfilling all our obligations and responsibilities as a County under the M.E.'s Office. We're dispatching people for the investigations, we're performing the autopsies, the meat wagons are going out, all that, right?

DR. TOULON:
Yes, sir.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Based on your estimate, as a skilled manager, how soon -- how long can we go with this? Based on what Legislator Cilmi has raised, and I think it's a valid concern about whether or not there was adequate notice? Are we going to break down and become nonfunctional in a month from now, or can we suffer one cycle?

DR. TOULON:
As Tom mentioned, our most difficult challenge, because our first candidate, his first question after we finished our questioning of him, was a -- what was the salary.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay.

DR. TOULON:
When we mentioned the salary, he referred to 2004 National Institute of Justice report that stated -- recommended that medical examiners be paid $200,000. And he said the current going rate for a medical examiner was $250,000.
LEG. KENNEDY:  
Okay.

DR. TOULON:  
And that's what he told us.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Okay. But then you did point out that we have neighboring counties that are a little bit less than that. Look, I mean, obviously, this is a situation where we're attempting to strike the right compensation package for somebody in order to attract the best and brightest talent. Our M.E. is still the head of our Forensics Lab as well, I believe, correct?

DR. TOULON:  
That's correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Okay. And, clearly, nobody wants to wind up in the debacle that Nassau had. So part of the range of interviewing is how well they are -- how good they are, what skill set they have, I guess, with that forensic side, as well as management and the autopsy function and all that, right?

DR. TOULON:  
Yes, sir.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
I got to think on this a little bit. All right. Thank you very much, Errol, I appreciate it. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Okay. Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
No.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
He's good.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
I just wanted to say we should close the Public Hearing.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Okay. Mr. D'Amaro wants to relay that we should close the Public Hearing and debate the bill later. Legislator Cilmi? Yeah, just -- why don't we move this along? We're starting to drag on a little here.

LEG. CILMI:  
So I didn't really want to talk about the actual salary itself, because I think that's part of the -- when you come to us with a potential candidate, at that point we can talk about that. But I suppose -- I mean, if you're going to go out, and you've been interviewing -- you've already interviewed somebody. That person, Dr. Toulon, you said declined the position because of the salary?

DR. TOULON:  
No, he did not decline the position.

LEG. CILMI:  
Okay. So that's still a viable candidate, potentially?
DR. TOULON:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
And we have somebody else coming in.

DR. TOULON:
That's correct.

LEG. CILMI:
Now what do they know at this point about the salary for the job?

DR. TOULON:
I think the one thing we all have to recognize is the fact this is a small, close-knit networking community and they all know each other, they all communicate. You know, if you've mentioned to anyone about a different name from a different jurisdiction in a different state, they seem to know something about them from various conferences that they attend. So they do know what jurisdictions are -- you know, compensation packages are.

LEG. CILMI:
But -- okay. So when the first candidate came in to interview, they must have asked the question, you know, "What are you paying," right?

DR. TOULON:
That's correct.

LEG. CILMI:
And what was our answer to them at that point?

DR. TOULON:
One of the committee members answered what the current salary was, what the stipend was, and the fact that we were coming before the Legislature to see if we can make the salary commensurate of other jurisdictions.

LEG. CILMI:
And, at that point, did the candidate express any unwillingness to wait until the Legislature, you know, approved or disapproved of that resolution, that impending resolution?

DR. TOULON:
He did not indicate anything to that effect.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Let me ask one more, one more question. So when were we made aware that the Medical Examiner was leaving our employ, Dr. Milewski was leaving our employ?

DR. TOULON:
Dr. Milewski submitted her resignation on August 26th, and, of course, that was around the Labor Day weekend.

LEG. CILMI:
Right.
DR. TOULON:
So it took us some time to put the ad together, I should say Civil Service put the ad together, so we can start posting for her position.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. And when did we realize that the salary that we were paying Dr. Milewski was not going to be enough to attract a qualified Medical Examiner?

DR. TOULON:
The exact date I could not give you. We did realize it, I would say, within three weeks later. I started calling various academic institutions and hospitals to ascertain from their Chiefs of -- Chief of Pathology, or the Pathology Department if it was an academic institution, if they knew of anyone in their network or alumni who would be interested in a position with the County.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So three weeks hence, so you're talking about some time in September. We're at the beginning of October, so, you know, the benefit of the doubt there. I understand, everyone's busy. What about other -- what about other municipalities and what they're paying their Medical Examiners. What does Nassau County, for example, pay their Medical Examiner?

P.O. HORSLEY:
He just answered that.

LEG. CILMI:
Did he say? I'm sorry, I wasn't -- I didn't hear.

DR. TOULON:
Nassau County is $181,352. Westchester County is 172,000.

LEG. CILMI:
And what does our County Executive make?

DR. TOULON:
I do not know, sir.

P.O. HORSLEY:
He's taking 5% less, right?

(____Laughter____)

LEG. CILMI:
I'm just curious. All right. Regardless, go ahead Robert.

MR. LIPP:
Okay. So the County Executive is pulling down 187,000. That being said, that's considerably less than what he's entitled to.

LEG. CILMI:
Well, that's fine. So we're all very thankful.

(*____Laughter____*)

So the Nassau County Medical Examiner, you said, Doctor, is one-eighty something?
DR. TOULON: $181,352.

LEG. CILMI: One-eight-one. And Westchester, you said, was?

DR. TOULON: One-seventy-two-two-nine-five.

LEG. CILMI: Do either of them get stipends like our Medical Examiner does?

DR. TOULON: That wasn't provided to me by Civil Service. And one of the things I think you have to remember is that we have the Chief of Pathology on the Search Committee with us, and so there's no guarantee that any candidate will be awarded a stipend. They have to meet the academic and faculty requirements of Stony Brook University. If they don't meet those requirements, they would just be receiving the salary that the County provides.

LEG. CILMI: Okay. And can you -- I had asked Tom a question earlier and Tom couldn't answer, maybe you can. When we find a Medical Examiner, will you have to come to us for confirmation of that person, and do we approve the -- do we approve the salary level at that point?

DR. TOULON: I have no knowledge of that process, sir.

LEG. CILMI: And maybe I misunderstood your answer, Tom, when we were talking about that earlier.

MR. VAUGHN: The process that I said I was unfamiliar with, sir, was the approval of the President of the Suffolk County Community College.

LEG. CILMI: Oh, I see. Okay. But we -- so we would have to authorize the Medical Examiner at whatever salary was discussed?

MR. VAUGHN: That is my understanding of the process.

LEG. CILMI: Okay. So, now, when you -- I'm sorry to belabor this, but -- so when you've decided on a candidate, and you're going to bring that candidate to us for confirmation, you've already sort of decided on a salary, right?

MR. VAUGHN: Yes. Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Okay. So you've decided on that salary absent Legislative approval, not only for the confirmation of that candidate, but for the salary of that candidate, right?
MR. VAUGHN:
Still subject to Legislative approval.

LEG. CILMI:
Of course. So that's my point with respect to this resolution. And, again, I'm fairly certain that I agree with -- that I'll be supportive of the resolution itself. I just think that the process needs to be advertised. So I'm going to make a motion to recess because of those reasons, and, you know, this way -- this way the public has an opportunity, if they want to, to come in and weigh in on the bill, that's all.

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

LEG. NOWICK:
What happened to me?

P.O. HORSLEY:
I'm sorry, Lou, I didn't know there were --

LEG. NOWICK:
Take the pumpkin away from him.

LEG. KENNEDY:
He, buddy, come on, she voted for you.

   (Laughter)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Nowick first, then D'Amaro.

LEG. NOWICK:
A quick question.

P.O. HORSLEY:
He was in earlier, but then he backed out.

LEG. NOWICK:
All right.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I got confused with the eloquence.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I didn't back out, I passed.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Passed.

LEG. NOWICK:
Who is doing the autopsies now?

DR. TOULON:
The Deputy Medical Examiners. They are the ones who always do the autopsies.
LEG. NOWICK:
They oversee the autopsies. The new Medical Examiner that we're talking about hiring, what does that position do?

DR. TOULON:
That is the Chief Medical Examiner, and they would oversee the entire office.

LEG. NOWICK:
Do they actually perform autopsies or just oversee the office?

DR. TOULON:
That's up to their discretion whether they want to perform autopsies or not. I have been informed by the staff that in the past, Deputy Chief Medical Examiners have engaged in autopsies, but I have never heard of any Chief Medical Examiner actually performing. They are qualified to do that, of course.

LEG. NOWICK:
How are we doing in the Medical Examiner's Office as far as getting the autopsies done at a reasonable -- in a reasonable amount of time?

DR. TOULON:
The staff there are able to complete all of their work in a timely manner. I meet with them twice --

LEG. NOWICK:
What is a timely manner?

DR. TOULON:
Timely manner is the course that it takes to perform an autopsy. There's no particular time that you can say an autopsy can be completed. So they're very comfortable with meeting their time constraints with investigations that might be ongoing with the Police Department and the DA's Office. So none of them have expressed to me any problems with the office right now.

LEG. NOWICK:
So there's not a particular backlog as far as reporting and doing autopsies, it's going along rather smoothly?

DR. TOULON:
Yes, ma'am.

LEG. NOWICK:
Okay. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Legislator D'Amaro, then Hahn.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Thank you. I'm a little concerned. Legislator Cilmi, you made a motion to, I think, recess the Public Hearing based on the fact that there might be insufficient notice. So I just wanted to ask, through the Chair to Counsel. I just want to know if this notice had been posted in accordance with the rules and procedures that we've adopted and as we've done numerous times in the past? I want to make sure that if we're going to close the Public Hearing, that there was sufficient notice given according to our rules.
MR. NOLAN:
Yes, we have complied, and we’ve done this in the past. You know, it’s for emergency situations, and if the Legislature determines that is the case, then, you know, they could close the Public Hearing and you could move on to the merits.

LEG. D’AMARO:
I mean, whether or not --

MR. NOLAN:
But it’s up to the Legislature to decide that.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Thank you. Whether or not there’s sufficient notice could be a subjective determination, but I want to at least ensure that we’re in compliance with our rules, as we’ve done for the last -- well, at least seven-and-a-half years that I’ve been here.

MR. NOLAN:
Right. This has happened on repeated occasions.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Okay. Thank you. And the other thing is, I just want to ask you gentlemen, since we’re going to the merits of the bill anyway, just very quickly, you’re in negotiations to hire a new Medical Examiner. Would you be -- do you think it’s appropriate or would you be comfortable to negotiate or offer a salary or even discuss a salary that’s not authorized by current law?

MR. VAUGHN:
No. I think that would be pretty irresponsible.

LEG. D’AMARO:
Okay. And that’s why you’re asking for this authority?

MR. VAUGHN:
Yes, sir.

LEG. D’AMARO:
All right. Thank you.

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

LEG. HAHN:
Yeah. I just want clarification from our Counsel. It was a little confusing before. We were talking about what the Legislature would or would not -- what would or would not come back to us for a vote. It would be the appointment, but not the salary itself.

MR. NOLAN:
When we confirm somebody, we don’t set the salary at that point. I think that the salary might be set forth in -- somewhere in the budget. But when it comes time to actually confirm somebody, we won’t be setting the salary in that resolution.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay? All right. That being the case, we have a -- did we get a second on the motion to recess? Is that --
LEG. CILMI:
No.

MS. ORTIZ:
You did not.

MR. LAUBE:
No, you didn't.

P.O. HORSLEY:
No. Did anybody want that? Okay we don't have a second to recess. We have a motion to close. We all good? All those favor to close? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. CILMI:
Opposed to close. Opposed to close.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Sixteen. It is closed. All right. I think I'm ready for the meat wagon.

LEG. KENNEDY:
There you go, fire it up.

(Laughter)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah. We have -- I have requests for several I.R.'s to be taken out of order because of folks that are in the audience, that they'd like to let them go home, and we'll understand that and sympathetic towards that.

The first one, I believe, is Legislator Gregory's; is that 1805? Why don't you let us know.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I wanted to call I.R. 1805 on Page 8, in the Economic Development and Energy Committees, out of order. We have several people here from the Town of Babylon who would like to -- I know they're here. I don't see them.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I think we're going to need a second. I'll make a second on the motion to take it out of order. All right? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it is now taken out of order.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
1805 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Jumpstart Suffolk (CP 6424) (County Executive). Legislator Gregory, do you want to make a motion or --

LEG. GREGORY:
Motion to --
P.O. HORSLEY:  
You want to make -- there's a motion to approve, I think.

LEG. GREGORY:  
Make a motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Okay. I'll second the motion to approve. On the motion, everybody good?

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Hold on, Mr. Chair.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
All right.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
We'll make it real fast. I know the gentleman from Albanese, I see in the back row, has been here, he spoke at committee. I believe the project has been moving along pretty well. Legislator Gregory and I had spoken about it. We have local hiring that's going on, and basically all the construction at this point is being done through collaboration with the trades; is that correct?

AUDIENCE MEMBER:  
Yes.

LEG. GREGORY:  
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
I see the gentlemen in the back. Yes? Good. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
You're going to have to -- did you want that on the record, Mr. Kennedy, or --

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Absolutely.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Then he should come up.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
No, he doesn't have to come up. Legislator Gregory basically affirmed to it. That's fine. And I see a nod from the audience. There you go.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
All right. Thank you very much for your nod, George. Okay. We have a motion to -- oh, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:  
Just very, very quickly. I opposed this in committee for a variety of reasons. Subsequent to our committee meeting, I had a lengthy conversation with Deputy County Executive for Economic Development, Joanne Minieri, who was very helpful in addressing some of my concerns. So I will be voting in the affirmative.
P.O. HORSLEY:
A change of heart is always good.

LEG. CILMI:
Change of mind.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Change of mind, yes.

LEG. CILMI:
My heart never changed.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. All right. We have a second. We have a motion and a second to approve. Anyone else? All good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. 1805 has been passed.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen.

LEG. HAHN:
I'm here.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. We also have a pending bond resolution. Same motion, same second. Roll call vote. Mr. Clerk, you're good?

MR. LAUBE:
Yes.

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

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.
LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Vacancy: District 8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
It's good?

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay, thank you. All right. Legislator Gregory, you had a second one you want to take out of order?

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes, on Page 9, if --

P.O. HORSLEY:

LEG. GREGORY:
I.R. 1803.
P.O. HORSLEY:
1803, three up from the bottom in Government Ops. Okay. I'll make the second to take it out of order. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it is now out of order.

1803 (Authorizing funding of infrastructure improvements and oversight of real property under the Suffolk County Affordable Housing Opportunities Program (Wyandanch Rising Building B)(County Executive). Legislator Gregory, what do you want to do with this?

LEG. GREGORY:
Make a motion to approve, please.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes a motion to approve.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen on the last one. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
I'll make -- I'll make the second on that motion. On the motion, everybody good? Okay. You guys paying attention? 1803, with motion to approve. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Now, Legislator Calarco, I understand you have one. We're good? DuWayne, we're good.

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:
Sure. I'd like to make a motion to take I.R. 1804 (Authorizing funding of infrastructure improvements and oversight of real property under the Suffolk County Affordable Housing Opportunities Program (Wincoram Commons), it's the next one on the agenda under, out of the order. This is the Wincoram project, and there's representatives here on it.

LEG. MURATORE:
Second.

LEG. ANKER:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)
P.O. HORSLEY: It's been approved.

LEG. SPENCER: Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. HORSLEY: No, that was --

LEG. CALARCO: Taken out of order.

MR. LAUBE: Taken out of order.

P.O. HORSLEY: That was just taken out of order?

LEG. CALARCO: Taken out of order.

P.O. HORSLEY: Oh, I'm sorry. My apologies. Okay. It's been approved that we took it out of order. Now, Legislator Calarco, do you want to make a motion?

LEG. CALARCO: No, Tom is going to make it.

P.O. HORSLEY: Okay. Legislator Muratore wants to make the motion. Motion to approve, second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE: Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

LEG. SPENCER: Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. HORSLEY: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: I apologize. I need a couple of resolutions taken out of order. The reason I'd like to take 1565 out of order, we've had a representative from Suffolk County Water Authority here all day.

P.O. HORSLEY: Okay. Where is it.

LEG. SPENCER: It's 1565, top of Page 9, and that's establishing the Long Island Commission.

P.O. HORSLEY: Got it. Everyone got it? 1565 (Establishing the Long Island Commission on aquifer protection. (Spencer), which is on Page 9, right up by -- it's right on the top under Environment.
Okay. We have a motion. We need a second to take it out of order.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it is taken out of order.

**MR. LAUBE:**
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8).

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
I'd like to make a motion to approve.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**
Second.

**LEG. HAHN:**
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Okay. I think I heard D'Amaro first. Okay. He passes it to Legislator Hahn. Okay. The motion by Spencer, seconded by Legislator Hahn to approve.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
On the motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
On the motion. Who did it come from? Krupski. Legislator Krupski, on the motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
This is on 1565?

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
That's correct.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Okay. And I think that my colleague across the horseshoe there, I think he's on -- you know, he's on the right track, and I think he's interested in doing the right thing, and I give him a lot of credit. My concern was that we needed a -- if we're going to do this, and we heard a lot of testimony this morning about the different layers of different aquifer protection commissions that have gone in the past, and I think if you want to have something that is going to address water quality on all of Long Island, you need to have more of a balanced approach.

And I do have a commitment from Legislator Spencer to amend this next month to add additional factions to this Commission to give it a more balanced approach, instead of having -- it's sort of a one-sided enrollment in the Commission, so I do appreciate that. And, you know, based on that, I would support it.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
So you're supporting the legislation is what you're saying.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
*(Nodded yes).*
P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Very good. We have a motion to approve and it's seconded. Anyone else on the motion? Everyone good? All those in favor?

LEG. KENNEDY:

P.O. HORSLEY:
Where is it coming from? Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Right here. Hold on.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
To Dr. Spencer. Legislator Krupski said he'll support it predicated on the fact you're going to amend, but you're still looking to pass the bill and then you're bringing it back to us again?

LEG. SPENCER:
We're looking to pass the bill. This is the Bi-County Commission, and Nassau has the mirror bill in their chamber. This was co-introduced by me, and Legislator Horsley, Anker and Kara Hahn where, what we're looking to do, and you saw the series recently. This is --

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes, yes, yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
-- front and center, but -- and then there's State action that's also taking place, but a lot of the other actions that we're looking at do require revenue, they're a lot bigger and bulkier. Adrienne Esposito testified this morning that this is a critical issue, we want to move it forward.

What Al was referring to is the makeup of the Commission being water providers, Suffolk County being the largest, and they take -- having for the position. Now there's a -- in the legislation, for there to be a member of both the majority, the Legislatures from both Nassau and Suffolk, and from the Executive's from both Nassau and Suffolk, and from also both of the Health Departments, which would be six members. And Al wanted to have -- and I apologize. He wanted to have someone on there that would represent a scientific organization, having a tenth member. And I've spoken with some of our friends in the environmental community in Suffolk County who is accepting of this. But what we have to do -- the reason the bill will need to be amended is because it has to mirror what Nassau does. So someone has to go first, and we're in a better position to advance this. We tend to get things done better in Suffolk County. And so, because of that, and I know it's on the record --

P.O. HORSLEY:
It's like a slogan.

LEG. SPENCER:
So that's why we'll have to make some changes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
So then I need to ask Counsel here. I spoke with Jeff Szabo yesterday, and conceptually I support regional planning. I mean, it's a uniform aquifer, but I'm vehemently opposed to punching the aquifer, to punching the Lloyd. Nassau, apparently, has done it multiple times. We, here in Suffolk,
I believe, have never done it, or might have done it just one time.

So towards Counsel, then, talk to me about this bill, to what extent this commission is empowered.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
To punch holes in the aquifer.

**MR. NOLAN:**
I mean, if you had to describe their powers, it's really to do some studies and make some recommendations.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
That's it.

**MR. NOLAN:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
I think that would be a DEC opportunity, I don't think that would be --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
I'm trying to remember. Didn't we -- Legislator Cooper had that bill in where he was attempting to drill it up in Northport.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
Could I respond?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
And a blend.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yeah, sure.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Yeah.

**LEG. SPENCER:**
This goes a step further. In the first two years -- there are studies. This is going to pick up where those studies have left off. But besides making a study, in the third year, it's going to come up with a Comprehensive Resource Management Plan.

And what the plan also does is that as the State gets their act together, it will flow right into the action that will, I guess, have more teeth where -- whether it's Sweeney's bill that's working its way through the process, but this keeps it front and center. So it goes a step further than just taking a report. It actually forms a management plan. But what's more important is that it gets all of these water providers on the same page, where they're following the same set of rules, because, right now, there's so many different authorities out there and this would put everyone in one place. And so, at this point, it's kind of like putting a group of specialists together and saying, "This is what we all agree to," and the teeth will follow, but this gives us the best option. And we would be taking leadership, leading by example, to the State, as well as Nassau County.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
Would the plan come back before us for adoption, or are we empowering them and they're going to go off?
LEG. SPENCER: No, they would not be empowered to -- I mean, they -- beyond the powers that we have already, they may come to an agreement in terms of how they engage or how they handle certain things, but this would not be giving them any additional power.

LEG. KENNEDY: And the modification request Legislator Krupski is asking for is for the, I guess, scientist -- a specialist in water?

LEG. KRUPSKI: Through the Chair. It would be the addition of Cornell and the Suffolk County Soil and Water, both Nassau and Suffolk County, to be part of that Commission. Don't forget, this is -- you're not looking at it to say, "Well, we're going to look at the water," and, "Oh, there's a plume of," you make up the chemical in this location.

LEG. KENNEDY: Sure.

LEG. KRUPSKI: This is -- if this goes further and says, *Well, these are the land use recommendations that we think should be in place by local municipalities*, that's -- you know, that could be -- that could have serious implications.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: And, also, "Oh, these are going to be the water restrictions," and where and when and how. I think you really need a balanced approach and it should come from more than the people who sell the water, it should come from a wider range of people looking at the issue, quantity and quality-wise.

LEG. SPENCER: I agree with Legislator -- I'm sorry, through the Chair. I apologize for speaking out of turn.

I agree with Legislator Krupski. I do think that we have that built in because the Legislative appointments, it's very clearly spelled out, that they have to be scientists. And so we kind of came to a compromise where we would put an additional individual on the Board, but the Health Department -- but our Legislative appointments do -- they can't just be anyone. There are very specific qualifications that relate to water, that they would need to be experts in the field as our appointments to this body.

So there is some balance there, but he would like a little more balance, and so that's why I'm -- you know, this is important, and I'm asking for your support.

LEG. KENNEDY: Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY: Okay? Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA: Legislator Spencer phoned me the other day because I had voted against this in committee and he assured me of a couple of things.
I've always had reservations about these task force and commissions and committees, because usually they're formed, and the only thing you hear from them within a certain frame of time is how they come back to you and they want an extension of time. In fact, I made a reference when he and I were speaking to 1722, which is really there to do just that, intervention for children with special needs. It was the task force that's formed and it had a six-month lifespan. I guess the report was due December 31st of 2013, now they want an additional year. And he assures me that that would not be the case, this particular commission will do its work and do its work on time.

And the other thing we discussed is that I said I would hate to see elected officials, when questions are posed with reference to aquifer protection, coming out with the scenario, "Well, you know, we have a task force or a commission and they're going to do a report." I think Adrienne Esposito hit it on the nail's head this morning when she mentioned that, you know, we have challenges associated with the aquifer. Regardless of what the Commission is doing in terms of work, those challenges, if they can be met now, should be met now. And Legislator Spencer, I believe, was in agreement on both of those issues.

LEG. SPENCER:
Those were good conversations, and you have my commitment to what we discussed.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Thank you very much. Legislator Krupski, you wanted it back to you. You're good?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Indicated thumbs up.)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I think that's all I had on my list. Everybody good? We have a motion to approve and seconded, correct?

MR. LAUBE:
That's correct.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

LEG. SPENCER:
Thank you, everyone, we really appreciate it. Congratulations, Suffolk County Water Authority and all my colleagues on that.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Congratulations, Doc, that was good. That was a long time coming.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All righty. That's all I have as far as those that want to be moved up. Mr. Zwirn, so enjoy staying with us?

MR. ZWIRN:
What a way to put it. Always enjoy.
P.O. HORSLEY: Should we take you out of order?

MR. ZWIRN: It would be nice.

P.O. HORSLEY: It would be nice. All right. Where is it?

MR. ZWIRN: Page 12.


MR. NOLAN: 1757 and 58.

MR. ZWIRN: 1757 and 58, Public Works.

P.O. HORSLEY: All right. 1757 and 1758. It's on page 12, halfway down Public Works and Transportation. Everyone got it?

LEG. HAHN: Motion to take it out of order.

P.O. HORSLEY: Motion to take it out of order by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. ANKER: Second.

P.O. HORSLEY: I'm sorry, I missed the second on that. Legislator Anker. Okay. We have a motion and second to take it out of order. All in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE: Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY: 1757 (Amending Resolution No.147-1999 in connection with the renovation to the Physical Plant Building/Warehouse (CP 2165)(County Executive) is now taken out of order. How say ye? Who wants to take this one on.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY: Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. MURATORE: (Raised hand).
P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Muratore seconds the motion. Everyone's good on the motion? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
You're halfway there, Ben. **1758 (Amending Resolution No. 909-2002 in connection with the renovation to the Physical Plant Building/Warehouse (CP 2165)(County Executive).** Do I have a motion to take it out of order? 1758, motion by Legislator Hahn, second by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it is now taken out of order.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the -- who wants to make a motion on this?

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Muratore wants to make a motion to approve, second by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

MR. NOLAN:
Do the bond.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, same motion, same second on the corresponding bond act.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Bond resolution. Roll call vote on the -- on that.

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

LEG. STERN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
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. BROWNING:  
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

MR. ZWIRN:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Presiding Officer. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
You're welcome. Drive safe.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Wayne, maybe we should do 1802 and let Caroline go home, too. I think that's what she's here for.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Make a motion on it.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
I'll make a motion to take 1802 out of order. That's the Downtown Revitalization Program grants.
LEG. BROWNING:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. 1802 (Allocating and appropriating funds (Phase XI) in connection with the Downtown Revitalization Program (CP 6412)(County Executive).

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Page 8 under Economic Development.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. It's under Economic Development, Page 8. And we have a second on the motion, Legislator Calarco makes, to take it out of order. It is -- all those in favor? Opposed? So moved. It is --

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
It's now out of order. 1802. I need a motion on the I.R.

LEG. BROWNING:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
By -- Legislator Browning makes the motion to approve.

LEG. ANKER:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We also have a corresponding bond resolution. Same motion, same second. Roll call vote.

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

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
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. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Very good. Motion's been approved. Okay. The same page, let's go up to where we left off right before lunch, which is Budget and Finance. I believe we're at 1754; everyone agree? All right.

**BUDGET & FINANCE**

First one **1754 - Amending the 2013 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a Medical Malpractice Case against the County (County Executive).**

LEG. GREGORY:
(Raised hand).
P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Gregory.

LEG. D'AMARO:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
We have the same motion, same second on 1754A, the corresponding bond resolution. Roll call vote.

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

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
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.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you. 1790 - Authorizing the County Comptroller and County Treasurer to close certain Capital Projects and transfer funds (County Executive). Make a motion, Legislator Gregory; I'll second the motion. On the motion, everybody's good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you. 1796 - Amending the 2013 Operating Budget to providing funds for the Brentwood Historical Society (Montano).

LEG. MONTANO:  
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Legislator Montano makes the second. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. BARRAGA:  
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Legislator Barraga makes the second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:  
1807 - Amending the 2013 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with bonding for a settlement for a liability case against the County (County Executive).

LEG. GREGORY:  
Motion.
LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Gregory, seconded by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MONTANO:
Just on the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion. Do we have a --

LEG. MONTANO:
I gather the second one is medical malpractice. What's the liability case here?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Lynne, do you want to?

MS. BIZZARRO:
Thank you. This is a bus case.

LEG. MONTANO:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Bus case it is. It is -- we have a motion and second to approve. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Same motion, same second on the corresponding bond issue, 1807A. Roll call vote.

MR. LAUBE:
I've just got to check on the motion and second on the last bill. Gregory and?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Gregory and Muratore, was it?

MR. NOLAN:
Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I think so, yup. Okay. We have a roll call vote.

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

LEG. GREGORY:
Yes.
LEG. MURATORE: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO: Yes.

LEG. STERN: 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. BROWNING: Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI: Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY: Yes.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Thank you very much. 1703. We're into Economic Development and Energy. I think we only have one left. Approving the change of a project -- of project for Downtown
Revitalization Grant, CP 6412, to the Rocky Point Civic Association and amending the contract with the Town of Brookhaven to reflect same (Anker).  Legislator Anker?

LEG. ANKER:  
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:  

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen.  (Vacancy:  District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Very good.  All right.  We're moving down to Education and Information Technology.  Everybody with me?

EDUCATION AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

1784 - Authorizing execution of an Intermunicipal Agreement pursuant to Chapter 103 with the Town of Islip (County Executive).

LEG. ANKER:  
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Motion by Legislator Anker.  Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. CILMI:  
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Second by Legislator Cilmi.  I have a motion and a second.  Everyone good?  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen.  (Vacancy:  District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:  
All right.  Page 9.  We've already done 1565.

1705 - Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the Speonk Mobile Home Park, Inc. Property - Manorville Pine Barrens County Park addition - Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No. 0200-511.00-06.00-064.001) (County Executive).

LEG. CALARCO:  
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. MURATORE:  
(Raised hand).
P.O. HORSLEY:

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you. **1762 - Amending Resolution No. 606-2013, authorizing appraisal for the acquisition of Development Rights under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Gus Wade Farm property - Town of Babylon (County Executive).** Mr. Gregory?

LEG. GREGORY:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes the motion; I'll -- Mr. D'Amaro seconds the motion. On the motion, everybody good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Very nice. 1788, to appoint -- I'll take a cosponsor on that, if that's possible.

MR. LAUBE:
I got it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thanks. **1788 - To appoint member of the Suffolk County Planning Commission, Nicholas J. Planamento (County Executive).**

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Krupski makes the motion; seconded by?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'll second it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen.

P.O. HORSLEY:
**1791 - Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the William and Antoinette Smith property - Swan River County Park addition - Town of Brookhaven - (SCTM No. 0200-981.10-03.00-005.000) (County Executive).**
LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion's by Legislator Calarco, second by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, PERSONNEL, HOUSING & CONSUMER PROTECTION

Government Operations: 1510 - Adopting a Local Law to safeguard employees displaced by privatization (Browning). Legislator Browning, what do you want to do with this.

LEG. BROWNING:
I think some of you are going to be happy when I say, "Motion to table."

P.O. HORSLEY:
I think somebody's going to be happy.

LEG. GREGORY:
Give her a big pumpkin.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
Seconded by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. KENNEDY:
The Great Pumpkin.

LEG. GREGORY:
Take mine, please.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Privatization. Tabled, it's been tabled. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been tabled.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen -- Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
1653 - Approving the reappointment of Thomas G. Gallagher as a member of the Suffolk County Commercial, Industrial, Residential Septic Tank/Sewer Drain Treatment --

LEG. CILMI:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
-- Bacteria Additives and Maintenance Board (County Executive). Legislator Cilmi makes the motion, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.
MR. NOLAN:
You got that?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes, I did, I got Cilmi and Barraga.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
1654 - Approving the appointment of Steven Macchio as a member of the Suffolk County Commercial, Industrial, Residential Septic Tank/Sewer Drain Treatment, Bacteria Additives and Maintenance Board (County Executive). I'll make the motion, seconded by Legislator Gregory. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
1723 - A resolution to change the membership of the Suffolk County Pet Store Rating Board (Spencer). Legislator Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion's to approve. Is there a second on the motion?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Schneiderman is on board with the pet store change. Okay. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. 1793 - Amending the hourly rate for a title in the Suffolk County Temporary Classification and Salary Plan (Labor Technician) (County Executive). Anybody on this one?

LEG. GREGORY:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Gregory makes the motion.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.
MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen. (Vacancy: District 8)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. We're down to -- I think we got everyone -- everything done now to 18 -- through 1804, which --

MR. NOLAN:
We did that.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I know, through.

MR. NOLAN:
Okay.

HEALTH

P.O. HORSLEY:
Now to Health. 1599 - Establishing a new fee policy for County Health Centers (Calarco).

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes the motion to approve; seconded by Legislator Hahn. Is there any other motions?

LEG. CILMI:
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion.

LEG. GREGORY:
I make a motion to table.

P.O. HORSLEY:
We have a motion to table.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator D'Amaro. Okay. We have a motion to table and motion to approve. Legislator Cilmi, on the motion.

LEG. CILMI:
Could you -- Mr. -- through the Chair, I hear Mr. Calarco explaining this to one of our colleagues. If you could do it on the record, that would be great.
LEG. CALARCO:
I'd be happy to, sure. So what this does is, currently, in 2010, the middle of 2010 actually, the County changed their policy for patients at the health centers to be able to access the sliding scale fee schedule for their copayments, in that you were required to have had applied to Medicaid and been denied Medicaid coverage before you would be permitted into the sliding scale fee schedule for your payment at the health center. And what we have seen as a direct result is a drop in patient visits at all of our health centers. In fact, from 2010 to ’12, we've seen between a 30 and 40% drop, depending on the center you’re talking about, and I think a large number of this is directly related to this change of policy.

As we all know, there is quite a time frame in terms of just applying for Medicaid and getting that denial letter, so there is a delay in service there, not to mention there are a number of individuals who are simply not capable of getting that denial letter for one reason or another, because if you are not able to submit all the paperwork for DSS to actually make a determination on your ability to actually access it, then you can't get the denial letter on the income issue.

So what may happen is -- and I confronted this when I was in Aging. I'd have seniors who were definitely eligible for Medicaid on an income basis, but, you know, they didn't have their birth certificate anymore. Maybe it was an older lady that didn't have her wedding license anymore, even though her husband's been deceased for a while. And so there was quite a process to undergo to get those documents so that person can qualify. And that is the impetus of this bill, is to eliminate that requirement for the Medicaid denial letter before you can access the care and have the sliding scale as your fee schedule.

It does still direct the Health Department to make Medicaid applications available. It also directs the Health Department, in doing their negotiations with Medicaid HMO providers, to give them access to our health centers, so their advocates can come in and sign people up for the health care -- the Medicaid HMO plans. They have advocates who do that, because the more people they bring in, the better their rates are. Unfortunately, when we sold the Suffolk Health Plan a few years ago, we gave exclusivity to them. That has now expired. We have the ability to negotiate with other providers, other HMOs to bring them into the health centers. It would bring in more revenue through Medicaid. And that was the intention of the resolution. Certainly, if somebody is qualified for Medicaid, we'd prefer them to be signed up into Medicaid, because then we're getting a much better reimbursement. We're getting paid for our services, as opposed to having to cover that cost. But that is the intention of the resolution.

LEG. CILMI:
So that's quite a mouthful. Is there a fiscal impact to this, then?

MR. LIPP:
We thought that there may actually be a reduction in revenues, and the reason is, even though it's true, that when the new fee schedule came into effect a couple of years ago, there was a reduction in demand, which you would expect. The problem is, more recently, there was a reduction in staffing. So we're at a point where the number of providers cannot provide additional services or visits, so that all it’s going to do is affect the waiting line or the queue in terms of greater demand, and it's not likely to lead with the current list of providers to additional revenue, because they won't be able to get the --

LEG. CALARCO:
I would just want to add to that, and I know that they made that point at committee. I came up with the -- one of the reasons I submitted the bill is because when I go to my health centers, which is the South Brookhaven Health Center network, which is operated by Brookhaven Hospital currently, they had told me quite explicitly that their doctors -- they were one of our more efficient facilities, their doctors were very busy. And that once we put this plan into place, their doctors
became very -- less busy. So they felt that their efficiencies were being hampered because of their inability to bring in the patients they were capable of serving.

So while what Mr. Lipp is saying may certainly be true of some of our health centers, I think some of the other ones, it may not be true.

LEG. CILMI:
So -- but Budget Review has issued a fiscal impact statement that predicts a negative fiscal impact to this -- for this resolution, then?

MR. LIPP:
We didn't put a dollar amount on it. We said it could. It's hard to say. We're just basically looking at -- observing the behavior in the market. And, you know, from an economics point of view, the supply is basically fixed because of the low staffing levels.

LEG. CILMI:
So you believe there will be a negative fiscal impact, but, for whatever reason, you didn't place a number on it, you couldn't predict a number?

MR. LIPP:
Correct.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. I mean, what could it potentially be?

MR. LIPP:
Well, it wouldn't be an opportunity cost.

LEG. CILMI:
Yeah. What could it potentially be?

MR. LIPP:
It's hard to say. I couldn't venture how we would exactly calculate that. I mean, in theory, we could figure out a number, but it probably wouldn't be large, but I couldn't really say.

LEG. CILMI:
Through the Chair to the County Executive's Office. How do you guys feel about this resolution? And given our -- given our direction in terms of what we're doing with our health centers, how does that impact this resolution?

MR. VAUGHN:
Thank you very much, Legislator Cilmi. So we believe that this -- we believe that everybody, or the Administration shares the intent of Legislator Calarco, which is to reduce the cost of our health care facilities, but we disagree in the method of getting there. We think that the best way to provide an enhanced service at a reduced rate is to continue moving through to the FQHC model, which is what we've put into the budget, and that's why we would support a tabling of this resolution.

I think we all have the same goal, which is providing -- which is making sure that residents who need it get the health services, but we have a different direction on how to get there.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Do you share Budget Review's concern about fiscal impact?
MR. VAUGHN:
We do share Budget Review’s concern about fiscal impact, which is why we would also say that we are in the middle of the budget process right now, and that this is something that should be, if it’s the desire of this body to move without waiting for the FQHC process, to be finalized with the other health clinics, to look at this and bring this up during the budget process.

LEG. CILMI:
How quickly will -- could the impact of this resolution become moot because of what we're doing with our health centers?

MR. VAUGHN:
I don't think I have an answer to that, Legislator, because the resolution would have to come on line, and then we’d still have the health centers to continue moving through. So how -- I think that's an answer of how quickly are all of the -- all of the centers going to transition over to FQH -- to the FQHC model, and I don't have an exact timeframe of when --

LEG. CILMI:
Right.

MR. VAUGHN:
We do expect that to happen. It's in the budget, so we do expect that to happen within the next year.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So -- and to the sponsor, this would be -- this would cover all of our health centers, correct?

LEG. CALARCO:
Correct, this would cover all of the health centers that we currently operate. So the three that have been shifted towards FQHC status this doesn't cover, but those who are in FQHC status are permitted to apply the standard that we have now. They must allow anybody who qualifies for the sliding scale to use the sliding scale. They can't require you to go for -- apply for Medicaid as we are doing now.

So, listen, I don't necessarily say that this might not have some sort of a fiscal impact. Certainly, if you displace a Medicaid patient with a sliding scale patient, we're bringing in less revenue. I just see that we've had a dramatic decrease in the number of patients coming to our health centers. I think that defeats the purpose of why we have health centers. I don't disagree with the Administration, that we need to move towards an FQHC status, and I think my bill just looks to try to correct the problem immediately, that's an easily correctable issue. If it's the will of my colleagues to put this off until we get to the FQHC status, that's your prerogative.

LEG. CILMI:
Is it possible that there will be a positive fiscal impact from this? There's no possibility that there'll be a positive fiscal impact, Robert?

MR. LIPP:
Unless the staffing levels are increased, but even there, it's hard to imagine, only because then you would have an increase in cost. It is possible, if staffing is improved, or, as Legislator Calarco says, some of the, I guess, centers would be more motivated to be more efficient, but --

LEG. CILMI:
But it's more likely there'll be a negative fiscal impact?
MR. LIPP:
For the reason, stated, that it looks like there's a fixed ability in terms of full capacities apply.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah. Actually, my main question was answered by Mr. Vaughn, but I will ask this of the sponsor.

As you've seen -- do you know, or has anyone looked at, as we've seen a decrease in the intake at the health centers, have we done a correlation to see whether or not there's been an increase at the emergency room centers?

LEG. CALARCO:
I could tell you that Brookhaven has seen more people coming through their emergency room. I can only speak for the Brookhaven operated facilities, because those are the ones that I interact with. They have seen an increase, and they have seen the decrease in patients at the health centers, and it's -- in their words, there are people who would otherwise qualify and there are certainly people who are citizens.

LEG. MONTANO:
So is it fair to say that the increase -- and I'm not putting words in anyone's mouth, but is it fair to say that the increase in the emergency room intake is a result of the decrease in the health care center service, or we don't know?

LEG. CALARCO:
Listen, there's a lot of correlations I guess you could draw. I don't know what impacts are being had out there in terms of people being laid off and losing health care services, but it's certainly a -- I would think it has some level of impact. I couldn't tell you the impact completely, and I'm sure there's a lot of other factors that go into something like that.

LEG. MONTANO:
So we haven't looked at that issue, whether or not there's a direct -- I mean, just because you have an increase in the emergency room doesn't mean that it's resulting from the implementation of the policy to charge people a sliding fee and exclude those that don't qualify immediately.

LEG. CALARCO:
All I know is that they've seen an increase in their emergency room visits. We've seen a decrease of almost 30% in the Patchogue Health Center, but whether there's a correlation or not I can't say has been statistically proven.

LEG. MONTANO:
I would look at that. Thank you.

(*The following testimony was taken by Alison Mahoney - Court Reporter & was transcribed by Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Thank you very much, Legislator Montano. Anyone else? Everyone good? Okay, we have a motion to table and we have a motion to approve; the tabling motion goes first. I guess we might
as well do a roll call on it. Roll call on the table.

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

**LEG. GREGORY:**
Yes to table.

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

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

**LEG. STERN:**
Yes.

**LEG. NOWICK:**
Yes, yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**
No.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**
Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**
Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
No.

**LEG. CALARCO:**
No.

**LEG. ANKER:**
Yes.

**LEG. HAHN:**
No.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
No.

**LEG. BROWNING:**
No.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**
Yes.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**
Yes.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**
Yes. Legislator Spencer is here as well.
LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay, the tabling motion passes and it has been tabled.

Okay, **1607-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to improve uniform drinking water distribution system standards in Suffolk County. (Horsley)** I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator -- you're both pointing at each other.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Muratore; second by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. CALARCO:
Cosponsor.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

**1722-13 - Amend Resolution No. 824-2012, task force to optimize early intervention for children with special needs. (Spencer)** Legislator Spencer?

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion to approve.

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

LEG. SPENCER:
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion?
LEG. SPENCER:
Just with regards to Doc -- I'm sorry, Legislator Barraga's remarks earlier. This task force does have recommendations that have come out. And the extension is there's been a change in terms of the State guidelines in terms of how they disburse funds through the Early Intervention Program, and that's the reason for the extension. But there is a -- an interim report that we will share as far as the budget process that may help us. So that's why we're extending this. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. Anyone else? We're all good? Okay, we have a motion to approve. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1733-13 - Approving the reappointment of Kathleen Riddle as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, and Alcohol and Substance Abuse Planning and Advisory Board. (County Executive) Motion by Legislator Browning. Seconded by?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Raised hand).

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

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1734-13 - Approving the reappointment of John Haley as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, and Alcohol and Substance Abuse Planning and Advisory Board. (County Executive) Same motion, same second all right? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1735-13 - Approving the appointment of Roy Probeyahn as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, and Alcohol and Substance Abuse Planning and Advisory Board. (County Executive) Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1736-13 - Approving the reappointment of Barbara Townsend as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health -- and I've been told I don't have to read it all, which is great, by Counsel. Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.
MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
1737-13 - Approving the appointment of Barbara Carey-Shaw as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, etcetera. Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1739-13 - Approving the reappointment of Doris Wagner as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, etcetera. Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1740-13 - Approving the appointment of Christine Epifania as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, etcetera, Board. (County Executive) Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1741-13 - Approving the reappointment of Elaine Economopoulos as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health, etcetera, Board. (County Executive) Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1742-13 - Approving the appointment of Elba Garcia-Marmo as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health Board, etcetera. Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1743-13 - Approving the appointment of Gregson Pigott as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health Board, etcetera. Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1744-13 - Approving the reappointment of Kathleen Herz as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health Board, etcetera. Same motion, same second. All those in

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
1747-13 - Approving the reappointment of Norma Downey as a member of the Suffolk County Community Mental Health Board, etcetera.  Same motion, same second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Cosponsor on 1747, please.

**Parks & Recreation:**

1710-13 - Approving a license agreement for Kenneth Dickinson to reside at the Isaac Mills House, St. James. (County Executive)  Legislator --

**LEG. NOWICK:**  
Motion.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Right, that's what I was going to ask.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Second.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
And seconded by Legislator Kennedy.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
1711-13 - Approving a license agreement for Michelle Hein to reside at Charles R. Dominy County Park, West Sayville. (County Executive)  Anybody want to take Bill's?  Legislator Barraga takes the motion, second by Legislator Stern.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
1712-13 - Approving a license agreement for George Bean to reside at the Robinson Duck Farm, Brookhaven. (County Executive)  Legislator Schneiderman, is that yours?  Is that yours, Legislator Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**  
It's mine.

**P.O. HORSLEY:**  
Browning makes the motion, second by Legislator Schneiderman.  All those in favor?  Opposed?
So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1721-13 - Accepting donation of an All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) from Rose-Breslin Associates, LLC for the Suffolk County Park Police. (Browning)  Legislator Browning?

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes the motion.  Seconded by?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Raised hand).

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Barraga because he said it.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1724-13 - Approving the donation of certain items to the Suffolk County Historical Society. (Pres. Off.)

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
I'm sorry, who said that?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Raised hand).

MR. NOLAN:
Al.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1726-13 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program, accepting a Community Enhancement Facilities Assistance Program (CEFAP) Grant in the amount of $125,000 from the Dormitory Authority of the State of New York, and appropriating funds in connection with improvements and lighting of County Parks – Construction of
Canoe/Kayak Launch sites in Suffolk County Parks (CP 7079). (County Executive)

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Nowick, second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Same motion, same second on the corresponding Bond Resolution 1726A (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $125,000 bonds to finance the cost of improvements and lighting to County parks - construction of canoe/kayak launch sites in Suffolk County Parks (CP 7079.426), roll call vote.

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

LEG. NOWICK:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
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.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

1755-13 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with improvements and lighting at County Parks. (CP 7079)(County Executive) Legislator Nowick?

LEG. NOWICK:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes the motion. Seconded by -- I'll make the second. 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 1755A (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $300,000 bonds to finance the cost of improvements and lighting at County parks (CP 7079.111 and .312), roll call vote.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
That's yours, Lynne. You made the motion.

LEG. NOWICK:
(Inaudible).

MR. LAUBE:
Yes?
P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
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.
MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you.

Public Safety:  

1448-13 - Approving the appointment of Nicholas Luparella III as a member of the Suffolk County Fire, Rescue and Emergency Services Commission. (County Executive)

LEG. HAHN:  
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Motion by Legislator Hahn, seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you.

1727-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with renovations and alterations to probation buildings (CP 3063). (County Executive)

LEG. HAHN:  
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Motion by Legislator Hahn, second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Same motion, same second on the corresponding Bond Resolution (1727A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $25,000 in bonds to finance the cost of renovations and alterations to Probation buildings (CP 3063.310)), roll call vote.

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

LEG. HAHN:  
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. MURATORE:  
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:  
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Yes.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you.

1750-13 - Appropriating funds for the Office of the Medical Examiner Consolidated Laboratory (CP 1109). (County Executive) Legislator Browning, you want to do that one?

LEG. BROWNING:  
(Laughter) Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Just got to like saying that. Okay. Is there a second on the motion?
LEG. HAHN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Hahn. 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 (1750A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $100,000 in bonds to finance the cost of building renovations, upgrades and improvements to the Office of the Medical Examiner Consolidated Laboratory (CP 1109.316)), roll call vote.

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

LEG. BROWNING:
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. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Yes.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you.

1751-13 - Requesting legislative approval of a contract award for Temporary Lab Support Services for the Office of the Medical Examiner. (County Executive)

LEG. STERN:  
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Motion by Legislator Stern.  Seconded by?

LEG. CALARCO:  
Second.

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

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

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you.

1794-13 - Accepting and appropriating grant funds in the amount of $180,564 from the United States Department of Transportation for a Dedicated Commercial Motor Vehicle Safety Enforcement Project with 80% support. (County Executive)

LEG. STERN:  
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator Calarco.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

MR. LAUBE:  
Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).
P.O. HORSLEY:
Public Works & Transportation:

All right. We're over at Public Works, **1717 - Amending Resolution No. 40-2012, establishing a Blue Ribbon Panel to examine restructuring all County-owned sewer districts into one consolidated district. (Horsley)** This is just -- this is the old Barraga, we're going to need more extension for time. I'll make the motion.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Seconded by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. They are working, Tom, by the way.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
**1730-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of CR 59, Long Lane, Town of East Hampton (CP 5561). (County Executive)**

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Schneiderman. Second by?

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
I'll make the second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Same motion, same second on the corresponding Bond Resolution **(1730A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $2,000,000 in bonds to finance the cost of reconstruction of CR 59, Long Lane, Town of East Hampton (CP 5561.310)),** roll call vote.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
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.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

1731-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with Suffolk County Highway Rehabilitation Project (CP 5576). (County Executive)
LEG. SPENCER:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Spencer. Seconded by --

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
-- Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1731A on the corresponding Bond Resolution, (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $4,000,000 in bonds to finance the cost of Suffolk County highway rehabilitation (CP 5576.310), Same motion, same second. Roll call vote.

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

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
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. BROWNING:  
Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Yes.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you.

1748-13 - Authorizing an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Board of Trustees of the Freeholders and Commonality of the Town of Southampton, and accepting funds associated with overtime costs for dredging of County waters within the Town of Southampton. (County Executive) Legislator Schneiderman makes the motion. Seconded by -- I like dredging, I'll second the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you.

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)

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Motion to table based on the fact the public hearing is still open.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
That's right. He makes a motion, Legislator Nowick seconds the motion. All those in favor to table? All opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Thank you.
1756-13 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of SCSD No. 11 - Selden with Wincoram Commons, LLC (BR-1647). (County Executive)

LEG. MURATORE: Motion.

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

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

P.O. HORSLEY: All right. Skip down the next 1757, 58, 58A to 1759-13 - Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with strengthening and improving County roads (CP 5014). (County Executive) Anybody?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY: Motion -- I'm sorry. Legislator Schneiderman makes the motion, seconded by Legislator Spencer. 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 (1759A - Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $1,100,000 in bonds to finance the cost of strengthening and improving of County roads (CP 5014.354)), roll call vote.

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

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:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

1806-13 - Amending the 2013 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 404 Assessment Stabilization Reserve and appropriating funds in connection with the Sewer Infrastructure Program. (County Executive)

LEG. SPENCER:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Spencer. I'll --

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. CALARCO:
Cosponsor.

P.O. HORSLEY:
So moved. Cosponsor.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMANN:
Cosponsor.

LEG. SPENCER:
Cosponsor, please.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Me, too.

P.O. HORSLEY:
We got the “me too” in there?

MS. ORTIZ:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. All right, we’re good.

1810 we’ve already done.

LEG. SPENCER:
Mr. Presiding Officer? We still have our Commissioner of Health back there and he’s waiting for one thing, and you can -- you can say if we can take this out of order or not, but he is here with 1885 --

P.O. HORSLEY:
What’s that?

LEG. SPENCER:
-- with regards to the HEAL Grant and he kindly requests if we could consider taking it out of order.

MR. NOLAN:
It’s a CN?

LEG. SPENCER:
It is, so I don’t know if we can take -- take the CN or not.

P.O. HORSLEY:
It’s just slowing me down, though.

LEG. SPENCER:
I don’t want to slow you down, but --
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P.O. HORSLEY:
No, but make the motion.

LEG. SPENCER:
-- with the Commissioner making a request as kindly as he did, at least I figured I would bring it up.

P.O. HORSLEY:
And he's a kindly man. Okay, we're making a motion to take the CN 1885 out of order.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Seconded by Legislator Stern. All those in favor to take 1885 out of order? Opposed? So moved. It has been taken out of order.

1885-13 - (Amending Resolution No. 1204-2010 in connection with Construction and Renovation for the Mental Health Integration Project (CP 4043)(County Executive).
Legislator Spencer, you want to make a motion on it?

LEG. SPENCER:
I'll make a motion to approve.

MR. LAUBE:
That was 17 (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion? You guys caught up with me yet? George, you've got it, I don't even know what it is.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay, I got a second by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Or we just accept the money; what is it?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay, I've got a motion and a second.

MR. NOLAN:
It's State aid.

P.O. HORSLEY:
It sounds like we're taking the money.

LEG. MONTANO:
Where does the money come from?

P.O. HORSLEY:
As far as what George is saying, I don't have it in front of me.
LEG. GREGORY:
It's renovation of a health center.

P.O. HORSLEY:
He's reading it. Okay. Maybe the good doctor, who is -- what'd you call him before; patient?

LEG. SPENCER:
Patient -- patiently waiting.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Patiently waiting; well, whatever. Dr. Tomarken, would you explain this to us? You caught us off-guard.

COMMISSIONER TOMARKEN:
Thank you. This is a HEAL 18 grant for approximately $246,000. It was initially going to be used at the Shirley Health Center to renovate to put in a primary care physicians office and group room, but because of the uncertainty of the Shirley facility, not the health center itself but the building, it was decided that it would be better spent putting it in the Farmingville Mental Health Center. So all we're doing is taking the exact same project, which the State has approved, and moving it from the Shirley Health Center to the Farmingville Health Center, and we have a letter of support from Brookhaven Hospital regarding that as well. So that's all it is.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. You're okay with that, Kate, we're good?

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah, I've been in conversation and I'm okay what that. It's something that Brookhaven needs to get done.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. So we have a motion and a second on -- on the issue; 1885, is that the number?

MR. NOLAN:
Yep.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay, we have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

COMMISSIONER TOMARKEN:
Thank you.

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

LEG. SCHNEIDERMANN:
Mr. Presiding Officer, can we also do 1873, it's a CN, out of order so that Commissioner Anderson can go back to his family?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We have a motion to take 1873 out of order.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Krupski.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
It's a CN, It's on Wincoram.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
It's, I think, the last one that Commissioner Anderson is here for, so.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. I have a motion and a second to take it out of order. All those in favor? Opposed?
So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
(1873-13 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of SCSD No. 11 - Selden with Island Green Associates (BR-1634) and Wincoram Commons, LLC (BR-1647) to upgrade Pump Station No. 3.) (County Executive) Everyone have it?

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion to approve.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion to approve by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second by Legislator Calarco. Are we good, everybody? You know where we are? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

LEG. MURATORE:
Thanks.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
It's good.

MR. NOLAN:
It was the bonds.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Ah, that's what Legislator Calarco was talking about. Got it.

Okay. Because I'm moving so fast we're making errors, and so I just wanted to note that on 1885 we also have a bond. Okay? 1885 was the HEAL grant issue (1885A - Amending Bond
Resolution of the County Of Suffolk, New York, adopted on December 28, 2010, authorizing the issuance of $798,434 bonds to finance the cost of Construction and Renovations for the Mental Health Integration Project (Cp 4043.110, .310 And .510)).

Okay, same motion, same second as the original resolution. Mr. Clerk, you're with us so far?

MR. LAUBE:
Got it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We have a motion to -- don't we have to take this one out of order, too?

MR. NOLAN:
No, it's okay.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Because it's with the -- okay. It is out of order and we have a motion to approve and seconded. This is the Bond Resolution; same motion, same second. Roll call vote.

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

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
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. 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:
Good, all right.

Back to *Ways and Means*, page 12, all the way down at the bottom. 1693. We're all good? We're good, okay.

1693-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to accelerate legislative consideration of resolutions to accept and appropriate grant funds. *(County Executive)*

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

1694-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Charter Law to implement performance measurement to increase accountability and enhance service delivery by contract agencies. *(Gregory)* Legislator Gregory?

LEG. GREGORY:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes a motion to approve. Is there a second on the motion?
LEG. ANKER:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. 1702, page 13, **1702-13 - Authorizing the reconveyance of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 215, New York State County Law to Ray and Pamela Bortzfield.** *(Deputy Pres. Off.)* Oh, this is Bill Lindsay’s bill that I took, that I sponsored. I'll make the motion to approve.

LEG. ANKER:
Second.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Seconded by Legislator Anker.

LEG. GREGORY:
(Laughter).

P.O. HORSLEY:
All those opposed -- all those for? Opposed? So moved. He's laughing at me, I know.

LEG. GREGORY:
The Big pumpkin is getting tired.

(*Laughter*)

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
(Laughter) The Great Pumpkin's wearing down, You're right.

LEG. CILMI:
This is sponsored by the Deputy Presiding Officer, but we have no Deputy Presiding Officer.

P.O. HORSLEY:
That's right.

LEG. CILMI:
So what happens?

P.O. HORSLEY:
It's a nasty scenario, isn't it? The Great Pumpkin rules.

(*Laughter*)

LEG. KENNEDY:
The great conundrum.
P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. 1760-13, let's move, Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 1790 Route 25 LLC (SCTM No. 0200-350.00-02.00-013.000). (County Executive) Do I have a motion?

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Gregory, second by Legislator Calarco. All those in favor?  Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1761-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Brian J. DeCanio and Monica DeCanio, his wife (SCTM No. 0500-482.00-04.00-027.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second all right?  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you.

1763-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Joseph Zachary Gazza (SCTM No. 0900-325.00-01.00-010.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1764-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 James D. Clark (SCTM No. 0100-160.00-01.00-019.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1765-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Donald P. Bartunek (SCTM No. 0200-447.00-02.00-024.002). (County Executive) Same motion, same second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1766-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 CLA Family Holdings Six, LLC (SCTM No. 0100-039.00-03.00-036.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.
MR. LAUBE:
Seventeen (Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. HORSLEY:
1767-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law - Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No. 0200-166.00-05.00-025.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second; is that all right? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1768-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law - Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No. 0200-987.00-01.00-046.003). (County Executive) Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1780-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Leisure Village Association, Inc. (SCTM No. 0200-192.00-07.00-034.000). (County Executive) All those in favor? Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1781-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Dawn M. Olave (SCTM No. 0100-162.00-02.00-031.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1782-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Robert Slomkowski and Rosetta Slomkowski, as joint tenants with right of survivorship (SCTM No. 0100-155.00-02.00-115.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1783-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 Joseph Zachary Gazza (SCTM No. 0900-145.00-03.00-037.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

MR. LAUBE:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).
P.O. HORSLEY:
1785-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 A.B. of Sayville, Ltd. (SCTM NO. 0200-235.00-01.00-015.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

1786-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate -- the budget is starting to look good -- pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 A.B. of Sayville, Ltd. (SCTM No. 0200-213.00-03.00-008.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1787-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 A.B. of Sayville, Ltd. (SCTM No. 0200-213.00-03.00-014.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1789-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 A.B. of Sayville, Ltd. (SCTM No. 0200-234.00-03.00-003.000). (County Executive) Same motion, same second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1799-13 - Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 72-h of the General Municipal Law - Village of Patchogue. (Calarco)

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Want to do this, Mr. Calarco?  Yours.  Seconded by?  I'll make the second.  All those in favor?  Opposed?  So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1800-13 - Approving reappointment of Penny Wells LaValle as Director of Real Property Tax Service Agency for the County of Suffolk. (County Executive)

LEG. KENNEDY:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion by Legislator Kennedy.
Leg. Muratore:
(Raised hand).

P.O. Horsley:
Second by Legislator Muratore. All those in favor? Opposed?
So moved.

Mr. Laube:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. Horsley:
1812-13 - Authorizing the sale of the H. Lee Dennison Building to the Suffolk County Judicial Facilities Agency (JFA), and the Leaseback of the H. Lee Dennison Building from the JFA. (County Executive) I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Gregory. On the motion; everybody good? All those in favor? Opposed? So moved, it has been approved.

Mr. Laube:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).

P.O. Horsley:
Manilla folder, one Procedural Motion. Okay, manilla folder, we have one Procedural Motion.

Procedural Motion, No. 15-2013 - Authorizing the retention of a consultant to project sales tax revenue. (Horsley) I'll make the motion. Seconded by Legislator Nowick. On the motion, Rob, do you want to tell us about it, or do you just -- or you just -- or you're feeling good?

Mr. Lipp:
I'm feeling good. If people have questions I will answer, otherwise I will not.

P.O. Horsley:
Okay. We're good? Okay. We're moving fast. Okay, the Procedural Motion 15-2013. Lynne seconded the motion, or made the motion.

Mr. Nolan:
Manilla folder.

P.O. Horsley:
Manilla folder.

Leg. Cilmi:
Oh, manilla folder. Okay.

P.O. Horsley:
Okay? We know what it is? Okay, all those in favor?

Leg. Schneiderman:
Wait, I had a question.

P.O. Horsley:
Oh, we have a question. Legislator Schneiderman.

Leg. Schneiderman:
Robert, what are we looking for here in terms of methodologies for improving our forecasting?
MR. LIPP:  
Okay, so what happened was I've been doing the forecasts every year and so, for instance, this time last year Gail was out here without me because I was doing the forecast. I don't have the time now, so I put out a request to several vendors and asked them to get back with what their methodology would be -- I'm not going to tell them, okay, they're supposed to be professionals, too -- and a price quote. And I got two price quotes and methodologies back; one I wasn't happy with the methodology, the one that I chose has a very unique methodology. I could bore you with the details if you'd like.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Just a little bit, because the sales tax growth has a huge impact on our budget.

MR. LIPP:  
That's right and that's --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
If we're wrong, we end up with a big hole.

MR. LIPP:  
correct. And, in fact, that's why I wanted to -- I mean, I would have been up all night for several nights to try to do this on my own, which I guess I could have, but I wanted to get it right and I knew I -- it would have made other parts of the budget review not as good as I would have liked, so that's why we're doing this.

Mr. Conoscenti has a track record; I'll say it's comparable to mine, number one. Number two, he has a unique methodology that others don't. He has a model that he developed from his PhD thesis that relates employment -- that sort of translates employment to income, which is a better predictor than employment for sales tax, and it has to do with some technical -- it's a lot of technical, theoretical stuff that he's doing. I mean, I could see what he's doing, too. So it's -- it also is a good thing because it gives me a different methodology for me to learn, so it makes my abilities to forecast sales tax all the more better also, a different way to approach it.

And I'm going back and forth with them on assumptions. What I requested of them to do is to go over the assumptions with me in terms of what the predictors would be to predict the sales tax, and once we finalize that and he comes up with his forecast, I also asked for them to look at what is in the Recommended Budget, assuming it's not the same number, and what would be required to come in on budget. So, in other words, would economic activity would have to be higher or lower and by how much? So that'll give us a -- it'll give the Legislature a good view as to how high the Recommended Budget is, or low, for that matter, we'll see.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Your estimates in the past have been pretty good; if anything on the conservative side, which I guess is safe. But I get a little nervous when you say kind of innovative and new methodology, you know. Typically, you know, you're forecasting sales tax, you want to look at like preorders for durable goods, those kinds of things, give you a pretty strong indicator of what type of sales are coming up ahead.

MR. LIPP:  
It's -- I wouldn't say new, I would say it's different than other modeling approaches that are typically out there. And he does have a good track record. He satisfied me with some of his methodology on sort of the econometric techniques so that I'm comfortable with it.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:  
Is it tested, his ideas? Have we seen what he's predicted and whether it's --
MR. LIPP: Yes, he's actually -- he's actually done sales tax for the County Executive for years and he begged out of the last two years for health problems, but he's feeling better now and he's doing it with a member of his staff that has extensive experience, and also he's on the faculty at NYIT, member of the staff.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Are we also going to compare whatever he is suggesting to what Nassau is predicting and what New York City and some of the regional economies to make sure we're in line with regional and national projections?

MR. LIPP: Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yes?

MR. LIPP: Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY: Okay?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

P.O. HORSLEY: All right. So, Robert, if he comes in a little high, you're not going to scold him?

LEG. CILMI: If he comes in high? (Laughter).

P.O. HORSLEY: No, not that kind of high.

MR. LIPP: No. I would say we would all be sad if he comes in low and we'd all be happy if he comes in high.

P.O. HORSLEY: There you go, smile face. Yes, I've got a -- okay, we have a motion and a second, right?

MR. LAUBE: That's correct.


MR. LAUBE: Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Montano - Vacant Seat: District #8).
P.O. HORSLEY:  
All right.

MR. NOLAN:  
Red folder.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Red folder. All right. You know which ones we've done?

MR. NOLAN:  
Yes. 1849 is next.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Okay, the first one we've got is 1849. We're on the **CN's**, by the way.

MR. NOLAN:  
Red folder.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Red folder.

1849-13 - **Accepting and appropriating a grant in the amount of $200,000 from the United States Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Assistance for the Intellectual Property Crime Enforcement Program. (County Executive)**

LEG. STERN:  
Motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:  
*(Raised hand)*.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Legislator Stern made the motion, Legislator D'Amaro makes the second. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:  
I'll switch them around, if you guys want, for the next one.

Resolution 1873-13 - **Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of SCSD No. 11 --**

MR. NOLAN:  
We did it.

P.O. HORSLEY:  
Oh, we did it. Good. Okay.

1878-13 - **Accepting and appropriating Federal Assistance from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for reimbursement of the extraordinary costs for response and infrastructure recovery from the effects of Superstorm Sandy. (County Executive)**
LEG. D'AMARO:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. 1880-13 - Accepting and appropriating 100% Federal grant funds awarded by the U.S. Department of Justice to the Suffolk County Departments of Probation, Police, Sheriff, and District Attorney. (County Executive)

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Browning makes the motion, second by Legislator D'Amaro. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
1882-13 - Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to lift salary cap for Commissioner of Health Services and Chief Medical Examiner. (County Executive) We've had much discussion on this. Who wants to make the motion?

LEG. BROWNING:
I'll make the motion.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Raised hand).

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Browning makes the motion. Is there a second on the motion? Legislator Muratore makes the second.

LEG. CILMI:
On the motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
On the motion, Legislator Gregory first, then Cilmi.

LEG. GREGORY:
Just a quick question. Is there -- I guess to Counsel; is there a sunset provision or is this open-ended?

MR. NOLAN:
No sunset provision, so this would be permanent.
LEG. GREGORY:
All right, thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay? Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
My concern here is the open-endedness in terms of the number. So I had asked a question before with respect to are there any safeguards or other bites at the apple, if you will, in terms of us having control, the Legislature having control, ultimately, over what the salary is; recognizing that we're here authorizing the salary to exceed that of the County Executive, but there's no cap inherent in this resolution that I can see. So I asked Counsel and Counsel said that we really don't authorize the salary -- if I'm -- forgive me if I'm misquoting you, George. But that we don't necessarily get a -- we don't have the ability to approve or disapprove the salary level, it's just -- it's just the person that we get to, you know, confirm or not confirm.

Subsequent to that conversation and having a conversation with Tom Vaughn, Tom now has found some other information. Tom, could you -- would you care to share that with us, please?

MR. VAUGHN:
Sure. So I spoke with Chief Deputy County Executive Dennis Cohen who reached out to Director of Personnel, Alan Schneider, and Alan Schneider stated that salaries -- positions are set by the Legislature. So it is our understanding that there would be essentially two more pieces of -- two more pieces of legislation that would eventually need to come forward; one would be setting the Salary & Classification Plan, essentially, for this position, and then the other would be -- pardon me, the resolution accepting the nomination.

LEG. CILMI:
Robert, do you -- do you concur with that? So -- so what I heard from Mr. Vaughn, by way of the County -- Deputy County Executive Dennis Cohen, by way of the Commissioner of Civil Service, Alan Schneider, is that we would have to -- subsequent to this approval, we would have to approve two separate resolutions, one to confirm the Medical Examiner and another to approve a salary. Do you -- do you concur with that, Robert?

MR. LIPP:
Well, it is a legal question, I would rather defer to George. I do know for a fact that you need to put the title in the Salary & Classification Plan before you could have the person.

LEG. CILMI:
And let me just -- let me just articulate my concern here. My concern is that we passed this resolution and all of a sudden we have -- and I'm not saying that this will necessarily happen, but we could theoretically be authorizing a salary level of a half-a-million dollars for a Medical Examiner here, and I just want to have some safeguards in place so that that doesn't happen.

MR. VAUGHN:
I don't think that anybody has that intention and I do think that those safeguards are in place through what need -- what will need to happen through -- through that other piece of legislation that I mentioned.

LEG. CILMI:
George, do you -- can you comment?
MR. NOLAN:
Legislator Cilmi, when there's a Civil Service question, you know, I usually go to Alan Schneider. If he's saying that there's going to be a resolution --

MR. VAUGHN:
I'm sorry.

MR. NOLAN:
But I don't know if that's -- I don't know exactly what that resolution's going to do in terms of a salary.

MR. VAUGHN:
So what I -- as we have changed departments in the past, for example, when we established the Department of Environment & Planning and whatever else we called it back during the previous administration, at those points in times we have had to change titles in those bills that put in Commissioners, so this would be similar to that. When we did layoff resolutions we had to include the exact positions that were being included. We would have to -- we are being told that we do have to come back to set that salary here.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:
(Raised hand).

LEG. CILMI:
And Robert, you've -- you're hesitant to comment because you think it's more of a legal question. Let me ask you this question, Robert; is there a line in our budget for the salary of the Medical Examiner presently?

MR. LIPP:
Yes, I'd have to look at our write-up on that. I can get back to you as to whether or not it's shored or not. I can't answer that part yet.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. My subsequent question would be, if there is, what does that salary line say in the proposed budget?

MR. LIPP:
Yeah, the budget doesn't list individual salaries, it just gives a total for permanent salaries. So usually there's some play in the budget. That being said, hypothetically, if this person was hired for a number that exceeded the budget at the end of the year, they'd have to move money around, which is -- is doable. That wouldn't be, you know, a make or break situation.

LEG. CILMI:
Right. But basically, I mean, if the -- if the -- that only happens if the entire budget is -- is blown, right? I mean, they could --

MR. LIPP:
Right. So the --

LEG. CILMI:
If other salary lines were -- came in at less than predicted, they can make up for it.
MR. LIPP: Right. There are a few different ways to do it, that would be one. You know, there -- so, for instance, you're allowed to move -- the Executive's allowed to move unexpended balances within the department, 10% of it around as -- as the Executive chooses. If that's not sufficient, then -- or and they would need more than 10%, then they would come over, the Executive, with a resolution, and if -- if there aren't sufficient funds in the entire department there, there could be like, as part of the housekeeping resolution that the Executive and Budget Review sign off on at the end of the year, it could be part of that.

LEG. CILMI: I mean, we're at the eleventh hour here. I don't suppose there's any way to effectuate a change in this Certificate of Necessity to insert some sort of a cap; is there?

MR. VAUGHN: No, because we believe that we have to -- because we're being told -- I'm being told from my boss that we have to come back to you with another piece of legislation that sets that salary, or the Legislature has to come up with another piece of legislation that sets that salary. Either way there's another bite --

LEG. CILMI: Okay. Let me ask you --

MR. VAUGHN: There's another bite at the apple.

LEG. CILMI: Okay. Let me ask you this question, then. Irrespective of what ends up to be the case legally, do you commit to coming back to us with another resolution that sets the salary?

MR. VAUGHN: Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Okay. Thank you.

P.O. HORSLEY: Okay. Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO: Yeah. Mr. Vaughn, I missed the -- your last dialogue, I was talking with Counsel, but I just want to be clear I understand this. It was my understanding that in the budget, the position of Commissioner would have a corresponding grade attached to that position; would it not? And that grade -- and I'll compound the question by saying that grade would have an entry-level step and a higher level. You know, in other words, it would start at one step and end at another, so the person that was hired could be hired at any salary within the low or the top step; am I correct?

MR. VAUGHN: That's my understanding of it as well.

LEG. MONTANO: So we already have in our budget a grade for this Commissioner, or I mean this position?
MR. VAUGHN:
I believe that there is currently a grade for the Office of Medical Examiner. I believe that when Alan Schneider is telling us that we have to come back, we were talking about changing that grade.

LEG. MONTANO:
Well, what he's talking about is that we're going to change the grade upward.

MR. VAUGHN:
Change the grade upward --

LEG. MONTANO:
What is the grade --

MR. VAUGHN:
-- to best support the salary --

LEG. MONTANO:
What is the grade now and what is our highest grade for any Commissioner? Robert?

MR. LIPP:
I'll look that up.

LEG. MONTANO:
Because not every Commissioner is paid at the same grade.

MR. LIPP:
Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
At least that's the way I understand the budget.

MR. LIPP:
Yes. I think, for instance, the Health Commissioner is Grade 42.

LEG. MONTANO:
And do we go with a higher grade? Is there a higher grade than a 42 in our system? I would think not.

MR. LIPP:
I'm going to look as we speak. Forty-two is the highest grade, but there --

LEG. MONTANO:
In the system.

MR. LIPP:
Yes, but there are exempt, like ungraded also.

LEG. MONTANO:
Excuse me?

MR. LIPP:
There are also exempt or non-graded positions, but there's -- you know, there are a few people that are Grade 42's.
LEG. MONTANO: All right, so 42 is the grade that we have for our Commissioner. There are a couple of exempt positions that go higher than --

MR. LIPP: No, I didn't say that. I'm not sure what those positions are, I could --

LEG. MONTANO: And what is the top step in Grade 42?

MR. LIPP: These would be -- actually, they are in the exempt class and these would be -- that would be the top step would be 11.

LEG. MONTANO: Right, but what is the amount? I mean, not the steps, the amount of the -- the ultimate pay, the highest pay we can give this Commissioner is how much?

MR. LIPP: In our current system --

LEG. MONTANO: Forty-two Grade 11 equals what?

MR. LIPP: One hundred seventy-six thousand.

LEG. MONTANO: So 176.

MR. LIPP: Approximately, yes.

LEG. MONTANO: And --

MR. LIPP: That would be considerably less than what they're looking for, though.

LEG. MONTANO: Excuse me?

MR. LIPP: That would be considerably less than what they were talking about before, though.

LEG. MONTANO: What do you mean it would be less?

MR. LIPP: Well, they were talking about salaries in the $200,000 range.

LEG. MONTANO: Oh, in other words, this salary would be less than --
MR. LIPP:
What they're asking for.

LEG. MONTANO:
This grade and step would be less than what they want to offer the employee.

MR. LIPP:
Exactly.

LEG. MONTANO:
But there's no cap in this bill.

MR. NOLAN:
No.

MR. LIPP:
Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
That's the problem. So -- or that's the problem that I see and I think that's the problem that Legislator Cilmi is attempting to address. Right now it says, "No exempt management employee shall receive a salary, I guess, in excess of the salary of the County Executive."

MR. LIPP:
Okay, we could speak to that if you'd like also.

LEG. MONTANO:
And it's not what he's making, it's what he can make, his budgeted salary; am I correct?

MR. LIPP:
I believe -- well, I think it's a matter of interpretation, but I think that's a valid interpretation.

LEG. MONTANO:
Well, what is the top -- what is the salary that the County Executive --

MR. LIPP:
Okay.

LEG. MONTANO:
-- is entitled to take? Not what he's making.

MR. LIPP:
Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:
He's taking less. What is his entitled salary?

MR. LIPP:
Okay, let me give you both. Okay.

LEG. MONTANO:
Give me both.
MR. LIPP: Okay, so the County Executive is making 187,000, according to position control.

LEG. MONTANO: He's accepting 187.

MR. LIPP: Correct. According to the calculations that we've made which set -- based upon inflation, which sets all of the --

LEG. MONTANO: I got you.

MR. LIPP: -- electeds, including you guys; 218,361 in 2014.

LEG. MONTANO: So if we offered this incoming Commissioner $218,000, and whatever cents you mentioned, we would not be in violation of the existing statute; am I correct?

MR. LIPP: Umm.

LEG. MONTANO: Maybe I'll ask Counsel?

MR. LIPP: No, I don't think that would be correct. Because you're talking about electeds, this would be -- this wouldn't be an elected title.

LEG. MONTANO: I think -- I'll let Counsel jump in. George?

MR. NOLAN: The law says the cap is on the -- on exempt salaries is the budgeted annual salary for the County Executive, so it depends what's in the budget as the budgeted salary for the County Executive. Whatever that is --

MR. LIPP: That would be 187 right now.

MR. NOLAN: That's what's budgeted?

LEG. MONTANO: That's what budgeted, or 200 and something is budgeted?

MR. LIPP: Well, it's -- if you look on position control, what he's getting -- here's the problem. You look on position control and you see what he's getting, he's getting 187,000. You don't have individual salaries listed in the budget. So, in other words, your salary, my salary are just implicit in a large line item.
**LEG. MONTANO:**
But wouldn't we budget or did we not budget the full amount that he's entitled to when we passed the budget? If he accepts less, that's a different story. In fact, I think there were some Legislators that kickback some money also, but the money that's budgeted in -- the money that's allocated in the budget is the maximum that they're entitled to receive.

**MR. LIPP:**
I think that's a matter of interpretation. That's a valid interpretation, but you could interpret it differently, too. I mean, and I think that's -- at the end of the day, it's a legal question, simply because there's just so many people in a line item for salaries and, you know, there's assumptions about how many positions will be filled that might be vacant and, you know, it never comes out exact because of a laundry list of reasons.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Right. Well, you see, the difference to me in this bill is that it exempts the President of Suffolk Community College from being limited to what the County Executive is allowed to make. But his salary is set by the Board of Trustees; am I correct?

**MR. LIPP:**
It's set by resolution; Local Law 42 of 1999 established what the growth rate is in the salaries.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
So who approves his salary, we do, or the College Board of Trustees?

**MR. LIPP:**
Oh, I'm sorry, you're talking about -- I thought you're talking about --

**LEG. MONTANO:**
I'm talking about the President of the college, that's set by the Board of Trustees.

**MR. LIPP:**
Correct.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
But these other two positions, their salary in this bill would be set by the County Executive when he makes the offer, and he can make as high an offer as he wants under this bill because there's no top limit, there's no limitation. And as someone said, he could literally offer someone half-a-million dollars. Now, it would have to come back here for approval and they would have to amend the Salary Classification Plan, but the offer could be made unilaterally by the County Executive at any amount that he chose, whether it be 500,000 or a million or whatever. Am I correct in -- in reading this bill in that fashion?

**MR. LIPP:**
Well, I'm probably not the person to ask.

**LEG. MONTANO:**
All right, I'm sorry, and I agree. I'm making a point.

**MR. LIPP:**
If you want, I could give you my view, but --

**LEG. MONTANO:**
Your view is always welcome. What's your view, Robert? *(Laughter).*
MR. LIPP: 
My view is if -- that there -- that the -- that Tom Vaughn is saying that they would come over with a resolution with a dollar amount, number one. Number two, even if they decide otherwise, supposedly they will be coming over with a resolution to amend the Salary & Classification Plan to put the position --

LEG. MONTANO: 
Well, they would have to.

MR. LIPP: 
And --

LEG. MONTANO: 
They would have do that simultaneous with the introduction of the bill to approve the Commissioner.

MR. LIPP: 
Right, but my point is then at that point you could say *We want that bill to include language about the salary*, otherwise you might not want to vote for it. So, I think you --

LEG. MONTANO: 
Well, would we approve -- could we approve -- maybe I'll ask Counsel.

MR. LIPP: 
Yeah, why don't you do that.

LEG. MONTANO: 
Could we approve the appointment without amending the Classification & Salary Plan first? How -- we can't do that. We have to amend the salary classification first, otherwise the offer is not a valid offer is the way I'm looking at this.

MR. LIPP: 
I believe the individual cannot be in the title until there is a title in our Salary & Classification Plan.

LEG. MONTANO: 
All right. So you want to -- I mean.

P.O. HORSLEY: 
Do we have any motion on this?

LEG. BARRAGA: 
Motion to approve.

MR. LAUBE: 
You have a motion and a second to approve.

LEG. BARRAGA: 
Motion to approve.

LEG. CILMI: 
If I -- if I could just respond, through the Chair, to Legislator Montano. You know, I've heard a commitment from Mr. Vaughn that they'll come back to us with two bills, one to confirm a Medical Examiner eventually and another one to approve salary level, and I'm happy with that commitment.
LEG. MONTANO:
Right. But just so we're clear, that's going to be done -- that has to be done probably simultaneous with the approval of the Commissioner and at the same time, just before we approve the Commissioner, we have to approve the salary. So it's a one-step -- it's a one-shot deal. So the man is -- or the man or woman is going to be before us with an offer of "X" amount of dollars and we've got to say yes or no, as opposed to knowing beforehand what an offer is going to be made. That's really the issue.

LEG. CILMI:
I'm happy --

LEG. MONTANO:
I think your points are valid.

LEG. CILMI:
I'm happy with that.

LEG. MONTANO:
Okay.

LEG. CILMI:
As long as we have some control over the -- over the level of salary.

LEG. MONTANO:
Right, then I won't belabor the point, but I think your comments were on the money.

P.O. HORSLEY:
That's key. Legislator D'Amaro, you had -- you had a question in there? Yes, why don't you go.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Well, I think -- I think Legislator Montano is exactly right. I think that -- I'm reading the copy of the bill as well and it says that no one can make more than the budgeted amount of the County Executive, which was 200 and something, low 200's, I think.

LEG. MONTANO:
I think so, yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So, you know, the question in my mind becomes do we want to live with that and do a search under those parameters, or do we want to just open it up that there's no limit and then we're going to get one opportunity when a qualified candidate is presented to the Legislature to say yes or no.

You know, and there's also the underlying policy of whether or not we want to say that the Commissioner of Health Services and the Chief Medical Examiner maybe shouldn't make more than 120% more than the County Executive. So there's -- there are other ways to approach this. And I'm not sure that it's in our best interest to do this open-ended, especially when Nassau and Westchester are paying examiners that are in the 170's or the 180's. I don't -- I don't see how this is helping the County in negotiating with a potential Medical Examiner, especially if they can live -- if they can start off with an offer of about 215 or 218,000.

So, you know, I guess we'll have an opportunity to look at the salary later on, but, you know, it's basically giving marching orders to the Executive Branch that there's no limit, just whatever they think they can get by the Legislature. You know, I'm a little uncomfortable with this, to tell you the truth.
LEG. MONTANO:
May I follow-up?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Barraga first.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I have some concerns when we talk about limits. Often what you offer an employee, cause I'm sure many of you have had experience like I've had, it often depends upon the experience and the background of the person you're interviewing and the person you want. I mean, certainly if somebody comes along and they're currently making, say, 172, you could, well, probably hire that person for maybe 190 or $200,000; you're not breaking the bank. But if you interview a number of people and the individual you want, the person you know is right for the position, is going to do an extremely effective job is someplace else now and making 220, you may have to offer 250 if you want that person. If you choose not to do that, then you'll get somebody else who's not as qualified, who, in essence, is not going to do the job that you thought the person you just could not afford, who walked out the door, was able to do.

So a lot of it's predicated on the experience and the background of the individual and where they're coming from. So I think there has to be some flexibility.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second.

LEG. BARRAGA:
It isn't a question of a ceiling or a limit, it's a question of what the market will bear.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

LEG. BARRAGA:
All these fellas are asking for is what any school board in Nassau and Suffolk currently has, is discretion when it comes to hiring superintendents. There's always flexibility and the salaries will be adjusted or changed based on what the competition, what adjacent districts are giving and the qualifications of the individual. And I think that's what this administration's asking, just give us some flexibility. No one's going to give away the store, but a lot of it's predicated on the person who walks through the door and their qualifications. And if that's the person you want, you have to say to yourself, well, what's the salary he or she is getting now and what do I have to offer to get that person to come to Suffolk County. If it's 200,000, so be it; if it's two-and-a-quarter, so be it; if it's 250, so be it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Wayne, could I just respond to that?

P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes, and then Legislator Montano, because you didn't really finish.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Legislator Barraga, I agree with you, I agree with you. You know, I'm not struggling with the fact that the Administration needs more flexibility and probably does have to pay more than what the County Executive makes, I understand that. But what I'm not hearing is what is the market rate?
Because Nassau and Westchester are below -- are below 200,000, and this law would authorize them, at least in my interpretation, to go over 200. So, you know, then why have the law at all, is what I'm saying.

LEG. BARRAGA:
The interesting thing with that, Lou, and you have valid points. What I remember is you sitting here with the former Medical Examiner coming in and making all sorts of strong, I'll use the word suggestions, but they were demands, that she wanted certain things done, she wanted to be a separate entity and everything else, and all of a sudden, you know, I pick up the papers and she's gone. Now, my sense is, they never indicated why she left, I think it was a bit of a shock to people, but I have a feeling she probably went someplace that was offering a lot more than 172. I don't know.

LEG. D'AMARO:
That's not my understanding.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Well, I don't know what --

LEG. D'AMARO:
But we'll save that discussion for another time.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yeah. But I just feel that, you know, you have to have some flexibility here based on, you know, who's coming and who's qualified for the job and who you want.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay. Again, I don't disagree with that, if we want to give that flexibility beyond what the County Executive is making. I'm a little uncomfortable just with the fact that we don't know going into -- if we -- if we pass this bill today, we don't know ultimately what the salary offered is going to be, but I guess we're always in that position. So, like Legislator Cilmi, I guess I can live with that. We'll get another chance to vote on it.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay? All right, Legislator Montano, you have the -- you may have the last word here, I guess.

LEG. MONTANO:
Yeah, I don't want to belabor this either.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Unless someone else wants to jump in.

LEG. MONTANO:
But just with respect to what Legislator -- the point Legislator Barraga made, you know, and he used the example of the school districts. We have some superintendents that make 200, we have other superintendents that make outrageous salaries, they've been in the newspaper.

But, generally, as I understand the way these things work, is that we have a salary range, and right now the top of that salary range is no more than the budgeted amount of the County Executive, which I believe to be about 217, whatever figure was out there. Now, that doesn't preclude us or that doesn't include the County Executive, at some point in the future, after he interviews candidates -- because you might find two candidates with the same qualification, one wants half-a-million, the other one wants 220. That doesn't preclude them from coming back to us later and saying, Hey, look, we found a great candidate. We started out at, you know, 175, he's asking
250, we agreed on 225, will you guys go along with it? You know, will the Legislature go along with it? I would rather be, you know, in that position than just do an open-ended and say, You know what? This salary is whatever I want to give you and whatever you want to -- you know, whatever you want to ask. So our negotiating position, I think, or the negotiating position of the person that's making the selection is somewhat diminished.

I would rather keep it the way it is, or, as Legislator D'Amaro indicated, put some kind of cap. We can always raise the cap. If they found a great candidate, we could say, Okay, you know what? Submit your classification bill, submit the nomination and we can deal with it then. I don't think we have to do it now and open-ended, but I'll go along with whatever you guys want.

LEG. CILMI:
Another question.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Oh, boy.

LEG. CILMI:
Sorry, it'll be quick. What did we do with the -- with the Health Commissioner previously? I mean, we did it a year or two ago; what was it that we did with the Health Commissioner?

(*Laughter*)

I don't mean physically.

LEG. MONTANO:
The one we have now?

LEG. CILMI:
With his salary, right. What did we do with his -- didn't we authorize a higher salary for him at some point, a year or -- Legislator D'Amaro, do you remember that?

MR. NOLAN:
I don't remember that.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I thought we did, but --

LEG. CILMI:
I thought we did something with the -- otherwise, I mean, how would we -- how else would we -- would he be -- I mean, I don't know if he is making more than the County Executive at this point.

LEG. D'AMARO:
I think -- I don't -- I'm not sure that we authorized an exemption to this law. I think there was also some other source of grant funding or something going to the Health Commissioner to make up the difference, if I recall.

LEG. CILMI:
Tom, do you remember any of that?

MR. VAUGHN:
I asked the Commissioner of Health what he was making, he informed me that his salary was $176,000.
LEG. D'AMARO:
There you go.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. You know what? Maybe they asked for it and we -- we declined. Maybe we didn't approve it at that time.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And they came back with the other way of going with -- with grant funding.

LEG. CILMI:
Right, right. So, I mean, I wonder if that's why his title is included in this resolution, because then that would allow them to pay more to -- to him.

LEG. D'AMARO:
And also grant funding is disappearing at a record pace, so they're anticipating having to pay more.

LEG. CILMI:
We don't have -- Tom, just out of curiosity, we don't have any knowledge at this point that we're -- that Dr. Tomarken may be leaving the County, do we?

MR. VAUGHN:
I have no knowledge of Dr. Tomarken leaving the County. We love working with Dr. Tomarken (laughter).

LEG. CILMI:
Good, okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:
He has left the building.

MR. VAUGHN:
Yeah, he has left the building. That's an excellent point, sir.

(*Laughter*)

P.O. HORSLEY:
We sent him home.

LEG. CILMI:
All right.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay. We're good?

LEG. CILMI:
Yeah, that's fine.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right, we've got -- what do we have? I have no idea.

MR. LAUBE:
You have a motion and a second to approve.
P.O. HORSLEY:
That's it?

MR. LAUBE:
That's it.

P.O. HORSLEY:

LEG. MONTANO:
Abstain.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Praise the Lord.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Kate's here.

MR. LAUBE:
I know.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right. Okay, 1884 - Declaring November 4th through November 11th, 2013 as "Veterans Awareness Week" in Suffolk County. (Stern) Legislator Stern?

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Makes the motion. Is there a second on the motion? Second by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

LEG. HAHN:
Cosponsor.

LEG. CALARCO:
Cosponsor.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:
Cosponsor.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Is that cosponsor's all around? Everybody want to cosponsor? Yeah, everybody wants to cosponsor.

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

MR. NOLAN:
We did 1885.
P.O. HORSLEY:
We did 1885? Okay. Well, there's 84, I found it. Okay, we did 1885A, too, then, right? We're good.

MR. NOLAN:
Late starters.

P.O. HORSLEY:
All right, we're almost there, gang. All right. Motion to waive the rules and place on the table the following Late Starters. Are we ready?

1879 to Public Safety; 1880 to Public Safety; 1881 to EPA; 1883 to Budget & Finance; 1886 to Public Works & Transportation; 1887 to Economic Development & Energy; 1888 to Ways & Means and to set the public hearing for November 19th at 2:30 in Hauppauge; 1889 to Public Works & Transportation.

And I'll need a second on the motion. Mr. Barraga, you want to make the second on the laying of the late starters?

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yes.

P.O. HORSLEY:
Second on the motion. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved.

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

P.O. HORSLEY:
We are adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 6:37 PM*)
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