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THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:34 PM

("The following testimony was taken & transcribed by Diana Flesher - Court Stenographer*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Good morning. Can I have all Legislators to the horseshoe, please? Can I have all Legislators to the horseshoe?

Good morning, Madam Clerk; please do the roll call.

("Roll call by Ms. Ellis, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature*)

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Here.

LEG. FLEMING:
Present.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
(Not present)

LEG. MURATORE:
Here.

LEG. HAHN:
Present.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
(Not present)

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Here.

LEG. CILMI:
Here.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Here.

LEG. TROTTA:
Here.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Here.

LEG. BERLAND:
(Not present)
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LEG. DONNELLY:
Here.

LEG. SPENCER:
Here.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Present.

P.O. GREGORY:
Here.

MS. ELLIS:
Fifteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, please all rise for the salute to the flag to be led by Legislator McCaffrey.

SALUTATION

Please remain standing as Legislator McCaffrey is going to introduce our person singing the national anthem.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Thank you, Presiding Officer. It's my pleasure to introduce Henry Hortsmann. Henry was born and raised in Lindenhurst, New York. He was heavily involved in the elementary, middle and high school music and theatre programs, which he considers crucial to his upbringing.

Since graduating from the Crane School of Music in 2018, he's been active in several productions in New York City and Long Island. His most recent production was playing Giuseppe in the Gilbert and Sullivan Light Opera Company of Long Island's production The Gondoliers.

Henry will be pursuing a Master's Degree in Musical Therapy at SUNY New Paltz starting this September. Please give a warm welcome to our singer, Henry.

(*National Anthem Performed By Henry Hortsmann*)

APPLAUSE

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Thank you very much.

For the invocation, I'd like to introduce Deacon John F. Sullivan. Deacon Sullivan is currently serving as a deacon at St. Joseph's Parish in Babylon Village. He was ordained a Permanent Deacon in 1983; became a certified National Catholic Chaplain for hospitals and prisons; and for nine years ministered with inmates in the Suffolk County Jail.
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Deacon John Sullivan is a veteran who served as a paratrooper in Korea in the 187th Airborne; he's a member of the National Air Disaster Team and the Disaster Chaplaincy Services of New York City having served at 9-11.

Deacon John served as President of St. Joseph's School Parents Association and has served on the Parish Council. He's involved in Marriage Encounter, Cursillo and Charismatic Renewal and is also a certified spiritual director.

Deacon John has been married to his wife for Loretta for 44 years. He's the father of Maureen Godfrey, Mary Alice Dunn and John Sullivan and is the grandfather of four children. Please welcome Deacon John Sullivan.

DEACON SULLIVAN:
One correction: 55 years.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I'm sorry. We're looking at 55 years married to Loretta. It makes a big difference to her.

DEACON SULLIVAN:
Those ten years make a lot of difference.

In our Pledge of Allegiance we claim to be one nation under God. And in our currency we proclaim in God we Trust. Now, let us all call on that God, however our faith traditions prompt us to; lead us in our deliberations of the People's business. You need to serve our County, to use our resources wisely and well; to represent all members of our community fairly; and to make decisions that prompt the common good. We recognize the responsibility to past and future and to the rights and needs of both individuals and community.

As trusted servants we seek your blessing, oh, God, on our deliberations and our efforts here today. May we act wisely and well. In days of old, oh, God, you gave us King Solomon as an example of extreme wisdom. We pray you extend some of that wisdom to this body, that they may legislate wisely and justly. Amen.

09:40AM

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Thank you, Deacon. Please remain standing for a moment of silence. A moment of silence in memory of James Lupis, brother-in-law of Legislator Kara Hahn. We extend our thoughts and prayers to their family. As always, let us remember all those men and women who have lost their lives in service to our country and those who continue to sacrifice and ensure our freedoms.

MOMENT OF SILENCE OBSERVED

PRESENTATIONS

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, at this time Presiding Officer Gregory is going to head to the podium and he's going to recognize some of our staff members

* Index Included at End of Transcript
who have 20 or more years of distinguish service with the County.

APPLAUSE

P.O. GREGORY:
Good morning. It's a pleasure to be here in front of my colleagues to make this presentation this morning. A couple of months ago our Clerk said, you know, we have several employees who have been here for a significant amount of time. We would like to recognize them at one of the General Meetings. So that led me to think, I said, well, let's talk to Barbara and Lora. Well, I said how many employees do we have that have been here a significant amount of time? We realized we had about 16 employees. Thirteen of them are here today. From 16 years to, I think, 35 years. So we're recognizing those employees for their tremendous sacrifice, commitment to not only the Legislature, some have worked in other departments in the County. There are two public servants. And I'm really proud of them. You know them or many of them. And we wanted to give them what's -- a proper recognition today. And we're going to be doing our luncheon in their honor today. And, as you know, all of you are invited.

So now I'd like to take a few minutes for a very special presentation. A multitude of staff members work tirelessly to keep the Suffolk County Legislature running from the office of the Presiding Officer, Clerk, Counsel, to the Budget Review and our Legislative district offices, some of those staff members have been with us for more than 20 years. Today we would like to recognize 16 County workers for their distinguished service and dedication to the people of Suffolk County. Thank you all for your service and for sharing your time and talent with us and the residents of Suffolk County. It is a pleasure to work with such a passionate and loyal people.

I would like to give a special nod to our Budget Review Director Robert Lipp who is celebrating 35 years with us.

APPLAUSE

So having said that, Robert, please come up.

DR. LIPP:
So my grandfather Philip worked for Prudential Life Insurance for 40 years. And I am wearing a pendent of his from that -- in honor of him.

APPLAUSE

P.O. GREGORY:
Great. So just so you know, Robert joined us July 30th, 1984. I think I was in eighth grade. Trying to figure out -- no, I was a freshman. Yeah, I was a freshman.

Next, John Ortiz.

APPLAUSE

APPLAUSE

So I guess that means I've been out of high school 32 years. Anyway, Kim Castiglione, September 12th, 1988, 31 years.

APPLAUSE

Many of us have worked with Ann Marie, our next person, Ann Marie Pastore, January 9th, 1989, 30 years.

APPLAUSE

I'm trying to think of something. Roz is -- I love Roz because she will tell you what's on her mind. There's no questions about it. And I'm sure she's been doing that since March 20th, 1989, 30 years now. Congratulations.

APPLAUSE

Next is Alison Mahoney, March 27th, 1989, 30 years as well.

APPLAUSE

Okay, next is an Aide in Legislator Tom Cilmi's office, Maria Barbara, February 3rd, 1993, 26 years.

APPLAUSE

Next we have Lucia Braaten, August 3rd, 1993, 26 years. You may know she's a stenographer. She's not here today, but she'll certainly be getting her recognition when she comes back.

Next is Sharon Wagner, February 28, 1994, 25 years.

APPLAUSE

Now, when I saw this, I was like, wow, I was really surprised. I knew she was around for a while, but I didn't know this long. Meghan O'Reilly, June 15th, 1994, 25 years.

APPLAUSE

This person you all know. If you want to get paid, you should respect her and treat her very nicely. Anne Dieck, August 22nd, 1994, 25 years.

APPLAUSE

Catherine Stark, February 5th, 1996, 23 years.

APPLAUSE

* Index Included at End of Transcript
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Michele Gerardi, March 10th, 1997, 22 years.

APPLAUSE

Joe Muncey, June 1st, 1998, 21 years.

APPLAUSE

Next, who are here but I want to still mention their names, Greg Moran, Legislator Trotta's office, July 13th, 1998, 21 years.

APPLAUSE

Denise Weaver, October 5th, 1998, 21 years.

APPLAUSE

All right. So, again, congratulations. So thank you for all your hard work. Yes, all come up, we're going to take an all 18.

PHOTO TAKEN

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, next presentation will be from Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Good morning. I'd like to call Deniz Sinar up, and her parents and her family, come on. Hi, how are you? Welcome. Deniz is a student at Commack High School. And Denise is one of the one percenters in a good way. Deniz has won the National Merit Scholarship. She is the one percent of students who scored in the top one percent on her PSATs and equally high on her SATs. She's pursuing an international baccalaureate diploma. She has love for music. She is in the string orchestra. She received high grades at NYSMA. She's an all-around student, achiever. She plays the violin. I can't go on, but I will. She participated in research programs at Cold Spring Harbor Labs, Hofstra University Summer Science Program as well as Columbia University Science Honors Program. She has a passion for microbiology, I like that, too; very good. And her ultimate goal is to improve the environment so that all living things can thrive. She will be going on to Cornell University in the fall. And Deniz, we are proud that you are ours. Congratulations.

APPLAUSE

P.O. GREGORY:
I recognize Deputy Presiding Officer, Legislator Calarco, to make a presentation.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. And it's really a pleasure to be able to come today and have a presentation for somebody who's done something just extraordinary in our County. And I'd ask Mr. Victor Smith to join me at the podium as well as our Commissioner, Darnell Tyson.
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APPLAUSE

So I'm sure some of you may have seen the story, but Victor Smith started with Suffolk County in April. He is working at the Smith Point bridge, which some of you may know is a drawbridge. So we need an operator there when ships are coming through that need to be able to get under the bridge that would otherwise not be able to. And Victor is one of our drawbridge operators. And he started -- and it's a seasonal job. It's a summertime, because as you can imagine, it's a seasonal thing that happens with the ships. So he started with us in April and is going to be working with us part-time through October, but I'm hopeful that we'll find something permanent for him because somebody of his caliber is somebody we want to have as an employee of Suffolk County.

APPLAUSE

So last week Victor was at his post, working his usual shift, sitting in the tower waiting for somebody needing to be able to get under the bridge and he heard somebody yelling for help. And when he looked out and he was looking around to see what was going on, he spotted somebody in the water under the bridge support in the channel. And that could be a very -- that's a very dangerous place for somebody to be because the currents coming through that area could get pretty strong.

And Victor went down to the bridge support and went underneath the bridge all the way down and called for the man to swim to the edge. And was able to reach out and grab the gentleman and save his life. And if it wasn't for his actions --

APPLAUSE

If it wasn't for his actions, we would have had a real great tragedy on our hands. And from there he flagged down some Park Rangers. And they came by. The Rangers came through with a boat. They were able to get the gentleman safely onto the boat and safely to shore. And Victor, then, just went back up to his post, went back to his position and just kept doing his job as if nothing happened. And that really says something about who Victor is as a person. He is a wonderful individual who is willing to put himself out there to save someone's life. And we can't thank you enough for that, Victor. So thank you for everything you've done.

APPLAUSE

And I know today's a little bittersweet for Victor because he's had some personal tragedy in his life this week and so we thank you so much for coming. We wish you the best and we send all of our sympathy with you. But I do have a proclamation here on behalf of myself and Legislator Sunderman. We often fight over who gets Smith Point Beach. I get the beach; he gets the mainland. You're in between us so we have a joint proclamation. Unfortunately Legislator Sunderman couldn't be here at this time. But congratulations. Thank you for everything you do. And I hope that we find a full-time position for you here in Suffolk County.
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APPLAUSE

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

LEG. ANKER:
Come on up, I have some officers here. Speaking of rescuing people, I also have some amazing Police Officers. You guys can come on up. So this proclamation is for the Marine Bureau Officers Matthew Funaro, Cory Kim and Shane Parker. And Cory was unable to make it here today; is that correct? Yeah, he's away. It is with great pride and gratitude that I have invited these officers to come here to be recognized.

On June 15th, 2019 at 12:30 PM Officer Matthew, Funaro and Officer Cory Kim and also Officer Shane Parker were on patrol in the Long Island Sound when they noticed a man clinging to his overturned kayak one mile offshore of Sound Beach. The water was 64 degrees and the wind was pushing the man further and further to the ocean away from land. So the officers quickly got to him, pulled him out of the water and rescued him. He was transported to the Mt. Sinai Marina, where he was evaluated by members of the Port Jefferson EMS.

So, again, if these officers had not been on patrol, had not seen the man in distress, you know, there could have been a fatality, you know, within the Sound. So it is with great pride that I present you with a proclamation for your courage and brave work and your due diligence in saving, really, our residents here in Suffolk County. Thank you.

APPLAUSE

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Officers. Next, Legislators Gonzalez and Berland will make a presentation; a joint presentation.

LEG. BERLAND:
Ladies and gentlemen, let me introduce to you Police Office Kevin Bell. Tell you a little bit about Officer Bell. He's a Suffolk County Police Officer currently assigned to the Third Precinct in Bay Shore. He's been with the Department since September of 2016. During this brief time with the Department Officer Bell has established himself as a knowledgeable and hard working member of the police force.

Police Officer Bell was working a 7 AM to 3 PM tour of duty in sector unit 311 on June 25th. At approximately 10:05 AM he was dispatched to an emergency call for an adult male who had been hit by a machine inside a warehouse located at the Broadridge Financial Solutions, Executive Drive in Brentwood.

The victim, a 66-year-old employee was reportedly unconscious and bleeding. Upon arrival, Police Officer Bell saw the victim lying on the floor of the warehouse suffering from injury to his upper right leg. The injury caused the victim to suffer significant
amount of blood loss.

At this time the Officer retrieved his department-issued tourniquet and applied it to the upper portion of the victim's right thigh. His Supervisor had arrived on scene and witnessed the pool of blood on the floor and noted that after the application of the tourniquet the blood appeared to have stopped flowing from the victim's wound.

The ambulance crew from the Brentwood Legion Ambulance arrived on scene shortly thereafter and continued to care for the now semiconscious victim. The victim was transported to South Side Hospital in Bay Shore for emergency medical care. The Third Squad Detectives' Units were notified of the industrial accident and responded to the scene for investigation.

Due to the Officer's rapid response, recognition of the victim's injury and the immediate and appropriate medical attention that Police Officer Bell provided to the victim, a significant tragedy was averted and the victim is expected to make a full recovery from his injury.

So, Police Officer Bell, we want to thank you so much for your dedicated service for saving this individual. And let me introduce to you Legislator Gonzalez.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yeah, I'm going to be very, very brief. I'm just so proud of the Officer. And I'm also so proud of the Third Precinct and all the work that they do consistently and all the officers of the Suffolk County Police Department. My hats off to you, to everyone. But it is such a wonderful job that you did. I probably would have fainted if it was me, but that's what you're trained for and congratulations on the proclamation that you're about to receive.

APPLAUSE

P.O. GREGORY:
Congratulations, Officer Bell. Next, Legislator McCaffrey will make a presentation.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Thank you, Presiding Officer. If I could, I'd like to call up Senior Probation Officers Jeffrey Nichols and Caryn Branda.

APPLAUSE

Senior Probation Office Jeffrey Nichols began his career in Suffolk County on April 3rd, 2000. And Senior Probation Officer Caryn Branda began her career on December 27th, 2000.

On March 25th, 2019, Senior Probation Officer Jeffrey Nichols and Senior Probation Officer Caryn Branda were conducting routine home visits when a call received over Third Precinct radio about a forced armed robbery in progress.
After leaving the residence of the probationer, the two officers noticed a vehicle matching a description heard on the radio. They observed three males exit the car in front of a nearby residence. Senior Probation Office Jeffrey Nichols and Caryn Branda radioed the Third Precinct dispatch and within minutes two more cars from the Third Precinct arrived to apprehend the suspects. Senior Probation Officer Jeffrey Nichols and Senior Probation Officer Caryn Branda assisted Suffolk County Police Officers by covering the backyard of the residence while Police Officers from the Third Precinct went inside the home to apprehend the suspect who had tried to flee.

All three suspects at the home were apprehended and a fourth was apprehended in the neighborhood. The handgun that was used in the robbery was recovered and two of the arrested parties face criminal charges in Suffolk County court.

Senior Probation Officer Jeffrey Nichols and Senior Probation Officer Caryn Branda's attention to detail, and I can attest to this personally because when I was first elected to office in 2014, I was trying to cover up Wayne Horsley's old sign with my temporary sign. And I was standing on the very, very top of a stepladder I probably shouldn't be stepping on, and they looked over and they said it looks like it's kind of high. They actually held the ladder for me, I believe.

So they're very attentive to detail. But their detail and use of solid judgement in their actions were essential in assisting the police in the arrest of these violent criminals. These actions uphold their duty to protect the public safety and the residents of Suffolk County along with all law enforcement partners in Suffolk County.

So it is my pleasure on behalf of all the Legislators who signed an all 18 proclamation to give these proclamations to Senior Probation Officer Jeffrey Nichols and to Senior Probation Officer Caryn Branda. Congratulations and thank you for your service.

APPLAUSE

Would you mind if we do an all 18 picture, Presiding Officer?

(PHOTO TAKEN)

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, and for our last presentation Presiding Officer Gregory will be at the podium to present a proclamation to one of our longstanding employees.

P.O. GREGORY:
Don't get too comfortable because we're going to ask for an all 18 photo for this as well. It's certainly well-deserving. If I can ask Lauretta Fischer and -- is Sarah Lansdale here? Please, come forward.
So those of you who are on the EPA Committee found out Monday that Lauretta's going to be retiring. But we wanted to present a proclamation to her today at the General Meeting. Lauretta has been the Chief -- is the Chief Environmental Analyst of the Department of Economic Development and Planning. And Lauretta facilitated the preservation, I can't speak this morning, of 122,000 acres of open space through the use of various funding programs with the Federal, State and local involvement, as well as the preservation of 10,094 acres of farmland through the County's Farmland Preservation Program. And she secured Federal funding and recognition for the County's Preservation's efforts in Mastic Beach.

Lauretta is leaving the County after 37 years of employment. This Legislature recognizes her dedication and contributions to all the Suffolk County community. And we send our best wishes to Lauretta for a long, happy and healthy retirement. We have a proclamation signed by all Legislators. Congratulations to a job well done.

APPLAUSE

P.O. GREGORY:
I want to thank also Sarah Lansdale, Director, you know, for -- she wanted to make this a special moment for Lauretta and so I wanted to thank her in all that she does as well.

(PHOTO TAKEN)

PUBLIC PORTION

Okay. That does it for our proclamations this morning. I would just make an announcement that we will be having an executive session at 11:30.

But now we will be going to our public portion. We have many cards. First speaker that I have is Paul Pressman. Paul, where are you? There you are. And then on deck is Kevin Gironda.

MR. PRESSMAN:
Good morning, Legislators. I know this is not going to be what you think it is but it’s not about buses today. I want to talk about the Board of Elections. All of you are up for election in September. Next year the Governor's up for election and so is Mr. Trump. We people at Board of Elections as inspectors that come from this County to work in every one of the electoral districts, work a 16-and-a-half hour day. There's a lot of changes coming. Starting on this election in November we're now going to be using tablets. All of the people have to go for training. They go every single year for training to work the polls. There are a lot of rules regarding how the polls have to be run. You need to have -- you know, both parties represented at all tables, at all electoral districts.

We don't have that. We have a big shortage of people working. And one of the reasons is the pay that we get. We get $12.50, which four years ago was a big deal. It was a lot better than minimum
wage. By next year we will be making minimum wage. And for those who think that this is an easy job to work 16-and-a-half hours technically with no break and to work tables where you're supposed to have four people working and we only maybe have two at each table makes -- improprieties could happen. And I don't think that somebody would want to have a problem at a poll when it could be your election that has the problem. There needs to be a raise.

I understand the County has problems with money. Well, if they can get money for potholes, I'm sure we can fill the Board of Elections with some competent people to make it easier for the elections to go through; to work 16-and-a-half hours and to get absolutely nothing. We used to get lunch at one time. All that is gone. That's a lot of hours to work. And all I'm asking for is that we should be on par with what I could get at McDonald's. You know, like I said, we haven't had a raise in four years.

And it is up to the Legislature to be able to do this. I've already spoken with the State -- with the New York State Department Board of Elections. I've spoken to the Board of Elections here. They all know I am up here today speaking on behalf of them and asking to please give us a raise. Okay? We do a lot when it comes to elections. That's why this country has elections the way that we do. And there are a lot of rules and regulations and we have to know every single one of them. Thank you very much.

APPLAUSE

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Paul. Okay, Kevin Gironda; and then Joseph Callari.

MR. GIRONDA:
Hello, good morning. My three minutes is going to be on two deceitful and destructive issues: Police corruption and judicial misconduct. Until it actually happens to you, it's inconceivable how downright egregious the system has become by many employees who have all become players like in the Christopher Loeb case. Now please look into standing with your constituents and demand accountability and cleanliness in two of the most important systems in civilization: The police and the District Attorney's Office. The time has come for one more Federal investigation, from pistol whipping and fraud, there are too many issues that victims need a louder voice. Be a louder voice for your constituents. Let us hear you fight for us.

This County has paid millions and maybe they can use it for you (indicating). This County's paid millions, too much, because of the corruption and scandals. The blatant abuse of the systems also trickle down to the court system where false allegations seems to drag on because of the lies with no proof over and over again. Like in the Frank {Vetro} case and myself, Marie Tooker and many, many more. Could you imagine having the Assistant District Attorneys withholding information in cases just to save the case from being lost? Mr. Calarco, am I boring you? Thank you.
We the victims of the hidden crimes are demanding all of you strive
to do more, more than you can ever imagine you could do, strive
harder for the future of innocent people and for the victims and
families that would love nothing more than the peace from justice
that we're looking to receive. This is my worry: We have letters
that are being written to the FBI and the DOJ. We're asking you to
review the letters and write your own letter to help us, help us be
heard; help our children understand that you are here for the
constituents and not just here for a paycheck.

And I applaud some of the good police officers. I don't want to
just make it sound like I'm coming from a bad point. There are a
lot of good police officers out there, but there are a few of them
that are really destroying the infrastructure and the actual fabric
of our community being torn. Think about that. It's simple. And
I'm not asking you to do anything crazy and put a cape on. I'm
asking for you to stand up for your constituents. We are here and
we need to be heard. Thank you very much for your time. Thank
you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Mr. Gironda. Joseph Callari; on then on deck Reverend
Jeannette Phillips.

MR. CALLARI:
Good morning, Legislators. I'm here to represent the Suffolk
Community College Public Safety Officers. There was a recent
statement made by the Presiding Officer referencing the job and the
dangers and the salary that we make. And the officers asked me to
come here and just explain to you a little bit about what we do
because they feel like it was a disrespect to our job and they felt
this way for many, many years.

So when you reference the Suffolk County Corrections contract,
which I believe that they totally -- totally, absolutely deserve
that contract, I think the difference is you represented us as
security guards and we're not security guards. Okay. Our exact
title are College Public Safety Officers, which was voted on by
this Legislature to change that title a few years back through
Civil Service. There is a distinct difference between a security
guard and a Public Safety Officer and I'll just give you a little
bit of background because I don't think everybody is aware and I
think it's been a big issue and I've been asked to just address it
so you guys understand it a little bit.

We are the first responders for every incident that happens on any
of the five facilities that Suffolk Community College has. Meaning
that we respond to assaults, fights, panic alarms, ATM alarms,
active shooter situations, medical emergencies and anything else
you can think of that actually any law enforcement professional
would respond to.

We also have many rules and regulations on the Federal level, on
the State level that most security guards, hence why we call
ourselves Public Safety Officers, do not deal with; even law
enforcement doesn't deal with. We have FERPA laws, which are the
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Family Education Rights and Privacy Acts under the Federal Law which is unique to the College. We also have the Clery Act, which is another -- another law that is unique to the College where we have specific crimes that we have to report and mandated by law.

We have Title 9, which is another Federal law. We have the new New York legislation, which is the Enough is Enough legislation which requires us to actually do sexual assault and sexual crime investigations regardless of whether the police department are called or not.

The biggest complaint I have as far as that is that we do deal with dangerous people. We deal with dangerous people but we're not aware how dangerous these people are. So anybody that's been incarcerated and has a criminal history, we can't ask those questions. They do come to the Community College. We do deal with them because we're the first responders. I can tell you that I've dealt with -- my own personally I've dealt with domestic assaults, serious car accidents with injuries, overdoses of people on heroin, medical emergencies with broken bones. I've been exposed to blood during a domestic call; saliva from being spit at on calls. We enforce Orders of Protection. We just don't sit idly by and wait for the responsive law enforcement. We are trained to respond and interview when appropriate and necessary.

We're trained through Suffolk County EMS. We're first aid AED, CPR, Narcan and tourniquet certified so that we do everything that you can do. And I think it's just the fact that it's been long overdue to give us a little bit of the respect that we deserve because we are all law enforcement professionals, whether sworn or not. And just the men and women that work there do not feel that way. And coming from the Legislative body and the County and even the Community College itself as far as the Administration, we want people to understand that we are just one different arm on that octopus as far as law enforcement goes. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Joe. And I meant no disrespect. I didn't mean to imply that the work that you guys do is not respected and important. So please forgive me for --

MR. CALLARI:
No, I'll pass that message on. And I conveyed that message to them. I just think it's a lack of understanding to actually what we do a lot of times and then we just forget, you know, just because we're not sworn, it's just forgetful to just say, hey, they're just security guards and they don't do anything, but we do do a lot of stuff. And, again, I understand where you're coming from. And, like I said, I will convey that message back to them.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Good to see you.

MR. CALLARI:
You, too.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, there you go. Reverend Phillips; and Elizabeth Justesen on
deck.

REVEREND PHILLIPS:
Good morning. It is certainly a pleasure and a privilege to be
here with you this morning. Over the past six months, we have
waited for this day to come; the day when we're able to come before
you and ask you to affirm your support and commitment to our
community health centers. In my experience, being 86-years-young
and over 48 years in the healthcare services, that the greater
success of healthcare that we have achieved when we come together
as community leaders, elected officials, faith-based leaders,
community organizations and other healthcare institutions, we
recognize the importance of the wellbeing of our residents and to
make a commitment to primary care.

I'm here today to thank all of you. And I've appeared many times
with our Health Services Committee in being able to share the local
impact that community health centers have, and to thank our County
Executive for recognizing the importance of our partnership. Thank
you, thank you, thank you for your patience throughout this
process. And a thank you to our patients through this process.
Because many of them have come and appeared before you to give and
lend their voices: Allyne Germano, one of our patients and
volunteer at Southampton Health Center and a resident of Water
Mill; Ana Carillo, a patient of our Southampton Center in Sag
Harbor. And I understand that she just has a new and beautiful
baby boy; Ashwini Ajjegowda, a second year pediatric resident at
our MLK Center and a first generation child of an immigrant family;
Thomas Salazar and Daniel Jeronimo, two agricultural workers from
Senator Krupski's district, who came out to show their support as
well; Roxane and her sister, both patients in County Legislator
McCaffrey's district, who go to the Amityville Center. So you see,
we're sharing people that have come from the various centers in our
community. Clara Roberts of Amityville, 10-year patient at Hudson
River Health Care, and a mom who has foster children that she's
cared for and has brung.

And, lastly, thanking you for your support of our mission. And
that mission is to increase access to comprehensive primary and
preventive healthcare and to improve the health status of our
community, especially the underserved and most vulnerable. And
while those are words, we give and lend to the patient voices
because that's the mother, the father, the sister, the brother that
comes before us to make sure that access to healthcare is a right
and not just a privilege for some. So, thank you, again.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Reverend Phillips.

APPLAUSE

Okay, Elizabeth Justesen; and then on deck is Joanne, it looks like
Squires.
MS. JUSTESEN:

Good morning, Legislators. My name is Elizabeth Justesen. I'm an attorney that works with clients post-conviction and trying to move forward in their lives. I want to reiterate on Law 1319, the Second Chance Act, that this law does not affect employers' obligations or ability to do background checks and ensure that they do disqualify people who are not appropriate for a position.

That's the liability that they assume as business owners. It does, however, eliminate an employer's ability to illegally disqualify applicants through an arbitrary screening of a check box on a job application. It remains illegal to discriminate against people solely based on a criminal conviction. That's the law. And it's enforced by the Suffolk Human Rights Commission and the New York State Division of Human Rights.

And I'd like to speak a little bit about human rights. Human rights: I'd argue the right to be forgiven; the right to a second chance; the right to show an employer the changes I have made in my life beyond a poor decision that I made; the right to support my family and not have to rely on the state or the county to subsidize my house, my food, my clothing, my place where I live; the right of my elected Legislator to ensure human rights and not allow businesses to perpetuate discriminatory practices in the application process.

This bill is about the inherent dignity of all people, even those who have made a mistake; even those who sometimes made a poor choice. And I'd argue we've all done that. And imagine if that became our defining moment.

This bill is a first step for human rights and dignity. And I urge you do the right thing. And I would just ask that all those here in favor of ban the box, stand up in solidarity and show your Legislators that we're here in support of it today. Thank you.

APPLAUSE

P.O. GREGORY:

All right, thank you, Elizabeth. Next Johan Squires; and then Diana Velez.

MS. SQUIRES:

Good morning. I'm here -- Johan Squires representing Hudson River Health Care and the patients that we serve. I'm here to say thank you and remind you, ask you, plead with you to think about those patients, the same people that you serve, we serve. Keep that partnership that we have with the County and for those patients going.

I know there's a vote today. And I would just want to say thank you on behalf of all those -- all of our patients. Without the County, maybe we wouldn't be here. You started this business years ago and we've enhanced it. And we want to keep that going along with that partnership we have with you.
So I just want to thank you. I want to thank you for remembering your constituents, our patients, us, I'm a patient. Okay. It's our choice and we need it. We need that choice. Thank you. That's it.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. Diana Velez; and then Malgorzata Cueva is on deck.

**MS. VELEZ:**

Good morning, everyone. My name is Diana Velez. I am the operations manager at Hudson River Health Care, Elsie Owens Health Center in Coram. In my role I help maintain service access during operational and extended hours. I ensure the compliance of the safe environment and promote a welcoming and engaging patient experience. I truly believe in our mission.

Coram serves 200 patients a day. And as you know we serve 80,000 patients and have over 500 employees in Suffolk County. I am not only here as an employee of HRH Care, but as a resident of Smithtown. My husband and I are patients of HRH Care as well as our children. I want to know that children with special needs, like my daughter and the elderly, like her grandmother who live on fixed incomes and insured by Medicaid and Medicare will have access to an FQHC with affordable and quality healthcare. HRH Care ensures that we have that access to care of the highest quality.

I shared with you a number of patients' stories last week, which I hope helped to illustrate the appreciation of our patients and the high quality of services we provide as well as our appreciation of your support of our mission.

That is why I'm here today: To ask you to continue your support for HRH Care; to thank you for your patience throughout these past few months; and to thank you for taking to heart the messages of the patients and staff, like myself, who have come here before you to share their passion for our mission of HRH Care. Your support means the world to us. As we strive to keep our communities healthy, we thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you, Miss Velez. Okay. Malgorzata Cueva. And then on deck is Pastor Gregory, looks like, Wilk.

**MS. CUEVA:**

Good morning. My name is Malgorzata Cueve. I'm a clinical assistant from HRH Care as well as part of 1199. Congratulations to everyone, first of all; it's a huge achievement to serve community for 20 something years so, congratulations. I would like to say hopefully not too early thank you very much for standing with us and being patient to the entire process of listening to our stories and, you know, the budget. And I know that's always unpleasant when we talk about money and where it goes, how it's supposed to be and things like that. But as well as you serve community and you dedicated and we've seen this today and that's not prepare anything like that. I believe that we are as a part of HRH Care, we believe in the same thing, to stand with and be there...
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with our people. And to us our people are our patients who we see on weekly, monthly, sometimes unfortunately daily basis.

So the same way that you believe in something at HRH Care, we strongly believe that our patients have the right to come and have medical attention and all that they deserve and they need without worrying about financial aspect. Because sometimes when you're not feeling well, that's the last thing that you want to worry about. And they have no idea what's going on behind the curtain, about the funding and how it works and the budgeting. All they know that they're going to our centers, they're going to see familiar faces and they're going to see always the good service that they deserve. And they're going to be helped. They trust in us that with all the resources that we have, we're always going to be there for them and try to provide for them. And even if we don't have, we trying to strive to bring something new, something better.

And there can be a elderly person who can have the best -- have better medication. They can be someone who unfortunately was in abusive relationship and can't have the mental support that they need. It can be someone who made a mistake and maybe had unprotected sex and right now needs one of our programs that they protect from HIV-post exposure or pre-exposure, you know, whatever the case may be. Thanks to that funding that you guys providing to us, we are able to extend these to our communities and our patients. So I just want to say that we are very grateful for it. Hopefully not to early, fingers crossed, so, but I want to say thank you very much.

10:42AM

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you.

APPLAUSE

Okay, Pastor. And then Halim Kaygisiz is on deck.

PASTOR WILKS:
Good morning, everyone. My name is Pastor Greg Wilk from the Abundant Life Church of God in Holbrook. On the way here today someone asked me "where you going?" I says, "well, I'm going to talk about the red light issue". And he said, "red light issue?"

Reminds me of, I had the wrong red light. I had to emphasize red light camera. Reminds of my granddaughter when I was going to perform a wedding, said, "where you going, grandpa?" I said "I'm going to marry someone." "But you're married to grandma." Well, anyway.

I will just share with you that my concern for this red light program is, one, afflicted. I would say over the years I've had about five tickets. And forgive me, but I want to share with you that I'm really concerned because I think we're in a midst and it's obvious of a transportation crisis; therefore, a commuter crisis.

And government's role, as we all know, is to provide proper transportation and so on and so on. And I think that as we see in the morning hours of commuting, people rushing to work, it's really
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a crisis hour; just coming here along the roads to -- off the
Expressway and being under the challenge and the pressure to get to
a place on time, fighting, be aware of the red light cameras, I
think, might be attributing to the higher reported accidents from
years ago.

And so my proposal is to review this whole -- this whole Red Light
Camera Program. And, secondly, I think that there should be, using
a biblical term, a commuter grace period. My suggestion is that
considering the pressure on commuters going to work to get to their
work on time, that from six to nine o'clock in the morning that the
cameras would be shut off giving a grace period to commuters. And
so I would think that would be a good adjustment for this program
to help work along with people that are being afflicted.

This Sunday I asked people in my congregation, I've been Pastor for
39 years, I'm a part of Long Island Ministers and Covenant for many
years. I asked them how many have gotten, you know, tickets. And
to my surprise over 60 percent of the people got tickets over the
history of this program, if not more. And I guess I'm not doing a
good job preaching, I guess, that's what it is. But nevertheless,
I'm just urging you, I'm just urging you as a legislative body to
reconsider this program, look at the data that's presented through
that survey, amen, that was reported in Newsday last Wednesday and
make an adjustment. My proposal is make an adjustment for the
commuters in the crisis time of the workday. Thank you so much.
Be blessed.

APPLAUSE

10:45AM

MR. KAYGISIZ:
Good morning, Legislators. I am honored and humbled to stand
before you today. This is a very humbling experience for me. My
name is Halim Kaygisiz. And I am the product of a fair chance.
After having served 17 years in prison on an eight and a third to
25 year sentence, I was released in 2010 and came home ready to
work; came home with the skills needed to find meaningful
employment to get ready to become a productive member of society.

I had to face certain employers that when the question was asked on
the application have I ever been convicted of a felony, that that
was the question that they focused on. They wanted to know about
it. Did I get the job with them? No. I went through at least
four interviews a week and I brought 15 applications to my parole
officer each time I went to see him, showing him that I was trying,
and I was trying and I was trying.

And I stand before you today, the Director of Health Outreach
Services for an Employer, the Economic Opportunity Council of
Suffolk that has epitomized what it means to give a second chance
to people like me. I oversee three programs.
I staff nine members. And I provide -- and I help provide services and develop programs to the most neediest and vulnerable residents of Suffolk County. Article 23 of Correction Law speaks to New York State's policy on giving offenders a fair chance and helping employers understand the importance of helping offenders connect to meaningful employment.

We're asking that this Second Chance act supports that; that a person who takes an interview and tells the employer that they have a criminal conviction, be allowed to present themselves with the skill that they've acquired; that the skill that they've obtained in prison during their incarceration to come back home and to become a taxpaying citizen; to become a productive meaningful member of society.

I stand before you today, a homeowner. I stand before you today a registered voter.

I stand before you today an employer, a husband, a brother to my siblings and a son to my father. Had it not been for this second chance that my employer gave me, I do not know if I would be standing before here you today being able to speak and share my story.

We ask that the legislation put forth be given due consideration. And we're not asking that somebody who has a sex offense be allowed to work in a childcare center; and that not be the first thing that be considered, no. We want the law to be supported because Article 23 of Correction Law does support that. What we want is that those people who return to society because they're going to return one day, that they be given that second chance to make themselves walk the shoes that I've been fortunate and blessed to walk in. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you for sharing your story, Halim. Dr. Peabody. Are you here? There you go. And then on deck is Debra, looks like, Pure?

DR. PEABODY:
Good morning. My name is Carolyn Peabody. And I am a professor of Social Work at the School of Social Welfare at Stony Brook. And I'm also a sociologist. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I come before you to urge you -- to urge your support of the Second Chance Act.

As I said, I'm a Professor of Social Work, which means I have the privilege of teaching people who are seeking their MSWs in order to help people; people who really want to make the world a better place. That's not really a bad thing, to be surrounded by all that goodwill by people who have a commitment and a willingness to work
hard for oftentimes like not a lot of money.

I tell this because in my 30 years of teaching, I've had students who have confided in me that they had time in their lives when they had committed crimes and had been in jail or in prison because of those crimes. They had told me that they had worked hard to change their lives. And I could see that in the work they had done in their field placements and in their work in class and in their work with other students.

However, once they finished all their work and they successfully completed the program, that was not the end of it. They weren't social workers. They were unable at the moment to become licensed social workers because they had criminal histories. So in order for them to become New York State Licensed Social Workers, they had to go through an arduous ordeal to apply for a waiver from the New York State Department of Education for which they had to provide letters, evaluations, transcripts. And all of them that had shared this with me and with whom I supported, for whom I supported, they were all ultimately successful. I should note that as it happens that there are not very many men in social work and they were all men. But men in social work since there's not very many of them are very marketable because it's a very good thing to have men who are social workers.

However, even though they had the experience, two different field internships, a masters degree, their license, they could not get in the door. Now, it's hard to say what made their job search so long and more arduous than others. The question that was part of their application process to many jobs, that they never got an interview for certainly seems possible as an explanatory variable. It's important to remember that these people who are like outstanding, people who have changed their lives and who just wanted a second chance, they had a lot going for them that many other people don't.

Another point I'd like to make has to do with public safety. In sociology there's a term alternative opportunity structures. When people are prevented for whatever reason from being able to access legitimate ways to achieve success, opportunities, they often turn to alternative opportunity structures, which you can think of as crime, right? So as a public safety issue, one of the things I want to urge you to think about is that if we make it impossible for people who have made bad choices in their lives and have decided to turn their lives around who want to be able to make their way in society, be able to support themselves, that they be given the opportunity so that they don't have to utilize alternative opportunity structures.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right.

DR. PEABODY:
Thank you very much.

APPLAUSE
P.O. GREGORY:
Debra Pure; and then Marie Tooker.

MS. PURE:
Good morning. I wrote something down so I wouldn't forget anything. I'm here representing New Hour for Women and Children. They helped me when I reentered society. I am employed, but the whole ban the box, when you come home, you never know should I lie on the box. Because if you don't get a chance to meet somebody, they're just looking at the box, "like, okay, they're a criminal," push it to the side.

Ban the box would be a great way to start the process of de-stigmatizing the population of formerly incarcerated individuals. I have accomplished great stride since being released in August 2014. I went back to college and obtained my Bachelor's Degree in Human Services. I'm currently a Case {Actee} as well as a Certified Recovery Peer Advocate. It's not that I am unemployable. I have been working in a diner for the past five years since being home. The issue is getting a career job. Having a low wage job at Walmart or Target defeats the purpose of transitioning off the system. You lose your entitlement benefits and are left to figure out how to survive.

I mention those two stores only because they are on the felon-friendly list. Most organizations who hire felons are low wage jobs. I recently was hired in an established not-for-profit organization, but I never got a start date due to background stuff. I have applied numerous times for reentry positions. I cannot get clearance to go inside the Suffolk County Jail. Once we pay the price for our crime, doing the time, we continue to be punished once we're on the outside.

The most defining factor for me was a higher education; feeling as if I was finally making a life for myself. Now I continue to seek that career position in hopes to one day work somewhere where I'm offered health benefits, sick time, you know, days off. I understand in certain positions as working with children or the elderly or dispensing medication, we would, you know, need to be cleared; not everybody should, you know, have those positions.

Most formerly incarcerated people are good humans that made poor decisions. Ban the box and forgive us already for our past wrongs.

APPLAUSE

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Debra. All right, Marie Tooker; and then Ligia Soto-Cruz.

MS. TOOKER:
Good morning. I just want to thank all the whistleblowers for they are really the real heroes. Thank you to the Deacon for a wonderful prayer and thank you to all the farmers for preserving their land and giving up monetary wealth.
7/16/19 General Meeting

This is now, I'm going to give you guys a letter of demand and intent. We as human beings have a moral duty to act when we see clear, ungodly acts and constitutional violations against any other. If this Legislative body continues to ignore and does not act protecting the residents of Suffolk County from tyranny, theft of service, state-created dangers and fraud, we have no other choice to bankrupt Suffolk County and take away your power that has everyone in this County under siege.

10:56AM

Until these demands are met within a reasonable time, we are going to start removing each and every bad actor from their office for the safety and security of every living person, creature in our beautiful Island that is being poisoned by bad public and private actors working in concert. Until every child is taken from their parents unlawfully is given back; every African American child gets the treated the same as all children; every animal that was tortured by the Suffolk crime family gets their justice; every judge who is corrupt is taken off the bench; every judge is tested for drugs and alcohol abuse; Stephen Ruth gets every document he asked for when it comes to the red light cameras; and every camera is inspected and signed off by a civil engineer; the people of Suffolk County are safe from any kind of illegal act done by government bad actors; Suffolk County Clerk Judith Pascal given her resignation or removed from office for putting her seal of approval on fraudulent, false, illegal documents recorded at the County Clerk's Office including but not limited to deeds, mortgages, legal documents on individual cases; Suffolk County Clerk's Office is fully secured and protected by anyone coming in and tampering with the records and stealing and removing documents from individual cases; Suffolk County District Attorney, Tim Sini, gives his resignation or removed from office for failing to protect the residents of Suffolk County; Suffolk County Executive Steve Bellone gives his resignation or removed from office for running a criminal enterprise; every bad county employee is fired and found accountable for their bad actions. Every police officer that a complaint is filed against is fully investigated and signed to a desk duty until the police officer is found innocent of the complaint; this legislation body stops arguing about 30 seconds when a public citizen of Suffolk County is speaking and that the public's time to speak is extended to five minutes; the legislative body starts having public hearings in the evening and give full notice of what is happening in our County at least seven days before a public meeting including putting the agenda to the web page; DuWayne Gregory gives his resignation or removed from his position for claiming and comparing the Suffolk crime family to the Sopranos and is deposed by the people under oath explaining what he now knows of this criminal enterprise that has destroyed our way of life causing state-created dangers, violations of the constitution of New York State and the United States of America; demand the Administrative Judge Hinrichs' --

10:58AM

P.O. GREGORY:
Miss Tooker, your time is up.
MS. TOOKER: -- resignation or remove him from the bench for covering up criminal activity under his administration. We the people of Suffolk County had enough with the destruction of our God given rights. If these requests are not given within seven days of this letter of intent you leave us no choice but to bankrupt Suffolk County. At any time we the people can amend this letter to add more demands the Suffolk County Legislature. Thank you, DuWayne Gregory --

P.O. GREGORY: Thank you.

MS. TOOKER: -- for finally admitting the Suffolk County is a criminal enterprise.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay.

MS. TOOKER: I have called them the Suffolk crime family --

P.O. GREGORY: Miss Tooke, your time is up.

MS. TOOKER: You know what, you talk to other people, you let them go. You have to let me go now.

P.O. GREGORY: No, no, no. You did already.

MS. TOOKER: And you publically compared them to the Sopranos.

P.O. GREGORY: No, no, your time is up.

MS. TOOKER: I am a hundred percent Italian and I do not find it to be discriminating.

P.O. GREGORY: Miss Tooke, your time is up.

MS. TOOKER: I am grateful you have finally admitted to but publically coming out --

P.O. GREGORY: Miss Tooke.

MS. TOOKER: -- you now admit to the --
P.O. GREGORY: 
Miss Tooker, your time is up.

MS. TOOKER: 
-- (inaudible) criminal activity and doing nothing.

P.O. GREGORY: 
Your time is up.

MS. TOOKER: 
Thank you, Legislator Trotta, for introducing resolution --

P.O. GREGORY: 
Miss Tooker, your time has expired.

MS. TOOKER: 
-- 672 for a request for Inspector General.

P.O. GREGORY: 
Miss Tooker.

MS. TOOKER: 
Although it is too late and irreparable harm has been done --

P.O. GREGORY: 
Security, can we have someone? This is ridiculous. Thank you. 
As a point of personal privilege, I see you smiling, you might find 
this is cute but we have 35 speakers and your actions are very 
disrespectful for their time. Yes, thank you, amen. Go with God. 
All right.

Miss Soto-Cruz; and then Sherrie Godfrey's up next.

MS. SOTO-CRUZ: 
Good morning, everybody. Thank you for the opportunity of allowing 
me to come here. My name is Lisa Soto-Cruz and I'm the Suffolk 
County Manager for ER Services for HRH Care Health Centers. I've 
been working for HRH Care throughout Suffolk County to provide high 
quality care to our patients who are facing most challenging 
certain determinants of health. My team and I see over a hundred 
patients a month. I mean, by that is that our role is to make sure 
to connect patients to HRH Care Services; to make sure they know 
they have the access to primary and preventive healthcare. We want 
to make sure that they avoid unnecessary emergency room visits.

I reside in Shirley where I own two houses. I live with my husband 
and my parents and my two babies. I come here before today not 
only as the first employee for HRH Care, I been employed with HRH 
Care for 15 years, but also as a mother, a wife, a resident of 
Shirley, a daughter of a farm worker who recently retired; and also 
as a patient of the health centers.

I know you have heard many voices, many different stories and I 
just want to make sure that you continue to provide support so that 
we continue serving the patients who are already familiar with who 
we are and what we do. So I thank you for your time and please
vote and continue to support us. Thank you.

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

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Sherrie Godfrey and then Wendy Chiaros (sic).

MS. GODFREY:
Good morning, Board. Can I ask someone to hand these out? Thank you. So I’ve been here several times asking for help from whom I thought people were honorable, when I ran into false, fabricated senses of who are representing us. So this is just a statement that I would like for you all to read and let marinate and hopefully you’ll find and grow a conscience to do what is morally right.

Attention Suffolk County Legislature Board, members, my topic, the injustice of government and/or public businesses, corrupt, broken, unjust and bias policies, procedures, members and/or employees.

For approximately two years I have stood before this Suffolk County Legislative board asking for help and a solution, solution -- let me say that one more time -- to prevent reoccurrence of corrupt, unjust and bias misconduct that I have endured by several businesses and organizations, including those of our local government and both Suffolk and Nassau County. When I address both the Suffolk and Nassau County Legislative boards, one of my requests of the Legislature assembly was to generate a new law that will recommend and prevent recurrence of prejudice, bipartisanship or partisanship, favoritism, unfairness and/or one-sidedness that I endured by several Suffolk and Nassau County businesses, libraries and other organizations such as banks. But the results of my request of both the Suffolk and Nassau County Legislative board was bogus excuses shunning prejudices, partisanship, favoritism, unfairness and/or one-sidedness and retaliation by the very ones of the law whom I had turned to for help, many of whom I had volunteered for.

Any Legislator, County Executive, Assemblyman, Assemblywoman, Councilman/women, Commissioner, Supervisor, Mayor, police officer, chief and other public officials and/or civil servants of the government, along with their affiliates and allies, who intentionally set out to blacklist and destroy the credibility and reputation of an innocent person with disabilities knowingly is unfit and unqualified to be in those positions. When a person of that statute stoops to the levels of violating an innocent, disabled person, human rights and disability rights, along with harassing them, targeting them, antagonizing them, provoking them, retaliating against them, disrespecting them, setting them up, blocking them from getting justice, invading their privacy, among a whole host of other evil tactics to save face for what -- what they know they are corrupting guilty of is disgraceful, even trying to threaten and coerce an innocent person.

(Timer Sounded)
There are many of you sitting on that Legislative board who should not be a member of the board, nonetheless of any type of board because you are unworthy of the Legislator title that you hold. When a member of the law knowingly violates the very laws that they help create and/or supposed to uphold, that kind of misconduct makes them unworthy to represent the law because they have dishonored --

P.O. GREGORY:
Ms. Godfrey --

MS. GODFREY:
-- what their positions are supposed --

P.O. GREGORY:
-- your time has expired.

MS. GODFREY:
-- to represent and stand for. That is just for some of you on this board, including the one at the helm. Have a blessed day.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, you too. Okay, Wendy Chiros? I'm sorry if I messed up your name. Is that correct?

MS. CLAROS:
No.

P.O. GREGORY:
And then James Sinkoff.

MS. CLAROS:
Good morning. My name is Wendy Claros and I am here before you all in support of the Second Chance Act. For the past year-and-a-half I have volunteered with Breaking Barriers whose mission is to assist individuals facing collateral consequences as a result of their convictions. A lot of these individuals fares barriers to employment to housing and to also obtaining professional licensing. So these individuals -- sorry, I'm nervous. But these individuals face these barriers, although they have demonstrated their efforts in rehabilitating. Requiring individuals to disclose that they have been convicted of a crime hinders their ability to their second chance in society. And what a majority of the clients that come before me receive Medicaid, food stamps because they are unable to work, not because they don't want to or they're not seeking jobs, but because they're not given the opportunity to do so. They are unable to go before an interview because they fill out that they have been convicted of a crime on the application.

So when I meet with these clients, I speak with them without referring to their criminal background. I get their story, I hear them out, I hear what the missions are, what their goals are, and this is what this this act is basically -- will allow the individuals to do. These individuals will be able to go before an interview in a job that they are looking to do and the employer will then be able to determine whether they're the right fit for
their employment or not, but not just because they were convicted of a crime that they will be denied the position. So we ask that you guys take into consideration that everyone does make mistakes and everyone does have the opportunity to change their life around, and this all starts with banning the box. This will allow everyone to meet with an employer, tell them what their goals are, what they're looking to do in life. And a lot of these individuals do make changes while in prison, while they're serving their sentencing. They go to school in jail, they take classes, they join programs, so we just ask that you guys understand them and their mistakes and look at their willingness to change. Thank you.

*Applause*

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Thank you, Wendy. You did a great job.

**MS. CLAROS:**
Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Jim, Jim Sinkoff; and then on deck, Taylor Henry.

**MR. SINKOFF:**
Good morning, everyone. Thank you again for letting me address all of you. I simply come before you to say thank you. We've been working hard together over the past six, seven months and obviously many, many months prior to that. I thank you for all your time and your individual offices. I thank you for understanding the issues that were presented, for really digging in to all of the issues, and I just really come before you to thank you. I know you have an important vote in front of you. It obviously is essential to the ongoing stability of the health care system that is Hudson River HealthCare and very much in partnership with all that you do.

As a reminder, we continue to invest, at the insistence of the County, Hudson River HealthCare resources to build the infrastructure of the health care system, including buildings, equipment and technologies to improve on care. So really my comments are very brief. I just really want to stand before you and thank you for your attention to this critical matter. Thank you.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Thank you, Jim. Taylor Henry; and then on deck, Joseph Prokop.

**MS. HENRY:**
Good morning. My name is Taylor Henry and again I come before you to speak on behalf of a proposed legislation that I am very passionate about, the Second Chance Act. As a Legislator, it is your duty to represent the people, all of us who are sitting in this room and those of us who are not present. It is your duty to work on behalf of us and put your personal bias aside to do what is needed for the people that you serve. The majority of your constituents want to reduce recidivism. The majority of your
constituents want people to be employed. The majority of your constituents want to be employed themselves.

Now, if you're working on behalf of your constituents, I believe it is your duty to do what is best for the majority, and this legislation directly impacts the lives of the majority. One in three of us have a criminal conviction which equates to 70 million Americans in total. One point four million Americans are residents in your districts, and for Suffolk County that would translate to roughly 370,000 adults with criminal conviction histories. You should feel compelled by those numbers. With those numbers I can guarantee that everyone in this room knows someone else who is currently struggling because of a past criminal conviction. And in the small chance that you don't know someone or know of someone, then I dare you to go out and meet the people that you're representing. These people are real. These people need your help and you have the power to do that, to help them and give them a chance that so many of them have worked so hard to get back.

I have spoken to these people and the common theme is that this continuous job rejection makes them feel powerless. These people are so disheartened to not be able to get a job because of their criminal conviction. If their employment process is halted before their character and qualifications can even be seen, a sense of hopelessness and devaluation is instilled within them. This feeling is something that encourages recidivism. But by removing the box and having an applicant go through the hiring process and yet still find that a job isn't a good fit for them is different. It is that I as a whole are not good enough to work because I have a criminal past. It's simply that this particular job may not be a good fit for me, but I am hopeful that there are other jobs that may be, and that's the difference that I know we were struggling with one of the last times.

I appreciate your time and consideration and I will leave you with this. This legislation is met with urgency, and if you cannot see the urgency of this issue and the action that is needed on behalf of your constituents, then this will not be the last that you'll be seeing of me. I am young and I am able-bodied and I will continue to advocate and rally and fight until this does get passed. Thank you so very much.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Taylor. Mr. Prokop, you're up; and then Dorothy Ann Price Hill. But first we have to -- I'll make a motion to extend the Public Portion. Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen (Not Present: Legislators Sunderman, Donnelly & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, Mr. Prokop, you're up.
MR. PROKOP:

Good morning, Presiding Officer, Members of the Legislature. I'm circulating a handout that was prepared and presented to the EPA Committee; I think it's of interest to the Legislature also. The Village -- I am here today on behalf of the Village of Islandia regarding Resolution 1488 having to do with the inclusion of properties in existing Agricultural Districts, and specifically one of the properties that's located in the Village of Islandia which is 867 Old Nicolls Road owned by Pal-O-Mine Corporation.

11:14AM

The Village asks that this property be removed from the package and that you not proceed with the approval of this package -- excuse me, of this property within the package. The property -- the use of the property that exists or that is proposed is not an agricultural use. The mere fact that a proposed use may generate revenues does not qualify that property as an agricultural use. You will -- you have heard or you will hear from Pal-O-Mine -- excuse me, there are several approvals that are required from the Village for the property to be used for the proposed use. You have heard or may hear from Pal-O-Mine that Pal-O-Mine will apply to the Village for those uses, you heard exactly the same thing two years ago with two other properties that you allowed to be included. To date, the Village -- no application has been received for those two properties. And in fact, in the package that I am submitting is a letter from Pal-O-Mine's Counsel which states that the Village will be charged with trespassing if the Village enters prior to included properties to do the State required inspections for the use of those properties. So we ask that the property be removed and not proceed.

11:15AM

If the property is included in the package of 1488, the package includes 15,306 acres of property and surpasses the threshold for a Type I Action for purposes of SEQRA. Your resolution recognizes the property -- recognizes the resolution as an Unlisted Action; it's not, it should be a Type I Action and the Village should be lead agency. This property, 867 Old Nicolls Road, requires approvals from the Village to be considered -- to be what the applicant considers to be agricultural use. Those approvals can only be granted by the Village of Islandia and the Village of Islandia should, therefore, be lead agency with regard to SEQRA in the review of impacts for the -- excuse me, the potential for impacts on the environment.

11:16AM

Most importantly, on May 30th the Village of Islandia, because of that, referred the matter to the Commissioner of the DEC for determination as to whether the Village or the County should be lead agency. That has not been determined yet by the State, as far as the village knows.

11:17AM

(Timer Sounded)

And the County is precluded from proceeding without a determination of lead agency status, which as far as the Village knows has not been determined.
Thank you for your consideration. I ask only that several times
I've been before this body or your committees and there's been
extended discussions with the representative from Pal-O-Mine.
I think since this Village, as the appearing party, is a
municipality and another public entity, I think it's disrespectful
to the -- with all to respect to yourselves, please, I think it's
disrespectful to not include the Village in those discussions, what
is basically an open discussion about the points that I'm trying to
make, with a private party or another speaker. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. Dorothy Ann Price Hill. And we have 15 minutes
until we break for Executive Session. So I'm going to apologize in
advance, we're not going to get to everyone. I'm on card 20 and we
have 16 other speakers in 15 minutes, so we're going to try to get
through it. So Dorothy; and then Amanda Acevedo, you're next.

MS. PRICE-HILL:
Thank you. I'll do my best to remain under 15 minutes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Three minutes (laughter).

MS. PRICE-HILL:
Fifteen, I'll try -- I'll shoot for ten. I'm actually a citizen --
I'm a citizen of the United States and a resident of Nassau County.
I am considering a move to Suffolk County. Many of you may already
know me, my background is I went to Dartmouth College with Senator
Gillibrand, I got my MBA from NYU, Stern in finance and technology.
I worked on Wall Street for over 20 years including six years at
Goldman Sachs in four countries. My specialization is cyber
security and money laundering of organized crime including MS-13,
Bloods, Crips, Isis and many other terrorist organizations.
I come here today because I'm asking the Legislature to please
consider some type of motion or act to bring in the FBI as the lead
investigator on the Gilgo and Oak Beach serial killings. As many
of you know, the women who died over the period of time from the
90s until 2016 was the act of not one person but actually a group
of men. There were also murders of an Asian man, a woman by the
name of Peaches and her young daughter, bodies found in Jones beach
and Gilgo matched by DNA. You probably read the article and may
have read the article in Newsday about the need for forensic tools.
The reason why I come to you today is because I'm the one who went
to the FBI and wrote an 80-page memo, very detailed, about the
women who were murdered in New Jersey in 2006 that is directly
related to men who reside in Suffolk County, in Nassau County and
also in Upstate, New York. This is a ring, a cabal, a group of a
secret society of men who had secret parties in Oak Beach hosted by
Joseph Brewer, a former TD Bank employee and very close friend of
my ex-husband. When they found out that I reported this to the
FBI, all hell broke loose. They stalked me, they called CPS, they
told CPS that my children and I were sexually abused; we were not.
They told CPS there was no food in my refrigerator; there was
always food, I'm a great cook. If you want to come over to my
house in Manhasset, I'd be more than happy to make dinner for you
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and prove that.

The bottom line is this is harassment by organized crime. These are very powerful men. I went to District Attorney Kathleen Rice, I went to District attorney Madeline Singas who lives in my town of Manhasset. I was warned by the DA to watch my back. I was warned by the DA to always, always, always protect my children. Unfortunately I could protect my daughter who's heading off to Carnegie Melon, and I'm incredibly proud of her, from Manhasset High School, but I could not protect my son. My son was trafficked into drug trafficking in Manhasset, dealing cocaine and crystal meth. He's now in a placement in Suffolk County. My son was kidnapped from me. I signed a 30-day waiver to Department of Social Services in Nassau County so that he could have a drug test and a psych evaluation. We do not do drugs in my house. I do not allow drugs. I do not keep alcohol in my house, I do not even smoke cigarettes. I was raised by an amazing father, U.S. Navy fighter pilot, to always taught -- who always taught me to do the right thing.

(Timer Sounded)

The bottom line is I'm asking for the FBI to be the lead investigator on the Gilgo case. Jimmy Burke willfully pushed them away, he shut the door. No, he didn't shut the door, he slammed the door in their face.

P.O. GREGORY:
Ms. Price-Hill?

MS. PRICE-HILL:
That's all I have to say today. I will put this in writing. And by the way, Nassau County Police Commissioner Patty Ryder, he believes me, he knows that I speak the truth. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, thank you. Ms. Acevedo; and then I have Renita Grimes.

MS. ACEVEDO:
Good morning. I would like to introduce the Members of the Legislature to see the support of Ban the Box from New Hour; please stand, members of New Hour.

(Audience Members of New Hour stood up)

August 26th, 2002, that is the date my father was released from State prison after serving eight-and-a-half years of a seven to 15 year sentence. My father was fortunate in that shortly after his return home he was able to obtain work despite his record. He was offered the opportunity to obtain a CDL license free of cost, and he later worked an overnight job where he delivered newspapers, and then in an office sometime after that. He currently works in construction after obtaining an OSHA license.
My father’s employability played a crucial role in his reentry journey. Employment and a regular paycheck provided him with a sense of independence that he did not have prior to his incarceration. Having a job set the foundation for a successful re-entry; a job provided income which provided housing which provided stability. My father’s stability directly impacted his relationship with his children. A job allowed for him to travel by car to see us, take us out occasionally, have a place for us to stay on the weekends, all of which contributed to reestablishing our relationship as father and daughter.

It is important for lawmakers to know that Ban the Box not only impacts previous incarcerated individuals but their children as well. Had my father not had employment, he would not have found stability and that would have negatively impacted me and my sister. I am proud to say that after his release, my father has not returned to jail or prison. I know that the structure and insurance that a job provides has a lot to do with that.

I think it’s important to say that my father never held a job prior to his incarceration. He was someone who had been in and out of jail multiple times. However, after serving his longest sentence, he decided that life-style no longer served him. My father’s decision to want better for himself, coupled with his determination and an employer that gave him a chance, all let to where he is today; free, sober and employed.

All of that being said, it is imperative that Ban the Box be passed so that formally incarcerated individuals like my father and the women I support on a daily basis at New Hour have a fair chance.

Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Renita; and then on deck is Danielle Donaphin.

MS. GRIMES:
Good morning. I'm here with New Hour. My name is Renita Grimes, I'm a wife, a mother. I just retired from the United States Postal Service because of a disability, I'm also President of a non-profit organization. And although I have worked hard to get where I am, I find myself back 20 years clean of having a charge, back to having to fill out an application which has a box that says Have you committed a crime. I am guilty of that, which puts me at doubt.

I have watched for years -- I have watched for years people have to overcome this. It's been a disadvantage to be judged and not allowed to obtain gainful employment because of that previous conviction or arrest. Statistics show that without gainful employment, the recidivism rate increases the lack of income. It has and will continue to cause an economic strain on families. It causes emotional stress, conflicts and relationships and separation of parents in which the risk to children will also sometimes follow footsteps. The Ban the Box initiative can have enormous impact and significant social benefit. For example, it
can reduce crime. It can show economic growth, it encourages consumer spending and it enables employers to receive tax benefits, and it enables the application to provide financial support for their family and positive role model for their children. With the success implemented on the Ban the Box initiative, the communities will support the future that has once thought unobtainable is reachable. The increase of job employment, the increase of employment, provides a more stable home and reduces recidivism. Thank you.

11:26AM

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Thank you for sharing your story. Danielle Donaphin; and then Shanequa Levin.

MS. DONAPHIN:
Good morning. I don't have any prepared remarks, but I wanted to just share that I'm here with New Hour and we stand in support of the second act -- Second Chance Act. I work with incarcerated women on a weekly basis. I am in the Suffolk and -- Suffolk County jails, both in Riverhead and Yaphank, and I work with the women who have a very strong desire to be a constructive part of our society. And if we're not able to give that to them, then we're contributing to the rate of recidivism. All they want to do is come home, they have children, one -- actually, three out of four incarcerated women have children. So if they're not able to have meaningful employment, as many of the people that spoke before me talk about Target and Wal-Mart; they offer great jobs, but if they're not paying for the high cost of living in Suffolk County, then it defeats the purpose. So we ask that you consider the Second Chance Act in consideration for the people coming home, not just them but their children. Thank you.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Shanequa. And I'm going to try to squeeze in one more, Serena Liguori. Where's Serena?

MS. LEVIN:
Good morning. I'm Shanequa Levin, Founder and CEO of the Women's Diversity Network. I'm here in support of many of the organizations that are asking for you to pass the Second Chance Amendment law. And the reason why I am so passionate about this issue is because I am a product of a father who was incarcerated for almost my whole life, and when he came out was not able to find adequate job opportunities so therefore he went back to the streets.

My brother spent numerous years in jail because his mother was addicted to drugs and our shared father was addicted to drugs as well as incarcerated. So what ended up happening? The streets raised him and he went to -- took the path down to selling drugs, having children, needing to support those children, not being able to get adequate jobs once he left the system.
My cousin, 14-year old in 9th grade, decides that when his friend comes to knock on his door to go out and hang out with him, he says, *Sure*. They leave their apartment complex, go walking down the complex talking about boy stuff, his friend decides that he sees a person that he doesn't like, decides to take out his gun and kill that person. My cousin, my 14-year old 9th grade cousin, is there with him. The young man then turns around and says *You take my gun*. My cousin -- scared, young, not knowing what to do -- takes the gun so that way his life will not be taken as well. He goes home, doesn't know what to do, decides to put the gun in the dumpster. A few days later police officers are knocking at his door; ultimately he tells them where the gun is, they take him into custody. The other young at the moment doesn't confess that he was he was the one that did the crime. Both children are charged with the crime. My cousin serves time in jail. Eventually the young man did confess that he was the shooter, but because my cousin did not tell about the incident, became an accessory after the fact, got a record, was raised through his adolescent years in jail.

When he came out we were all so happy for him, shared much love with him, had hopes that he would be able to take this experience and leave it in the past. My cousin, who was an amazing young man, has not since then committed -- been involved with any crimes, committed any offense, is now 30 something years old and struggles to find adequate job opportunities to support himself. He was not the shooter but he was another child that was dealing with this. The data shows that banning the box helps with recidivism rates and helps our young people that have fallen victim to the system get a new start. I beg you to support this new act and pass this vote because these people deserve a second chance. Thank you.

*Applause*

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Thank you, Shanequa. All right. Serena, we're going to try to squeeze you in here.

**MS. LIGUORI:**
Good morning, Members of the Legislature, Presiding Officer Gregory. Thank you for fitting me in. My name is Serena Liguori, I'm the Executive Director for New Hour for Women and Children, Long Island.

Over the last five years we've worked with 650 women who are Suffolk County residents who have been incarcerated in the local jails. What that means are thousands of children who live in our community are impacted by this issue, and I would like to express my support for fair hiring practices and the Second Chance bill.

According to the Prison Policy Initiative of 2019, the U.S. incarcerates more people per capita than any other nation at a staggering rate of 698 per 100,000 residents, and the statistics are in my testimony that I've provided you with. But I most importantly want to use this time to talk to you about the women who come through my office every day. We receive anywhere from
five to ten women who return home from the jails each week into our offices and their number one question is how can I get a job? Where can I get a job? Who will hire me?

We don't refute that people do things wrong, that there's intention behind some things that are done wrong, but what we do say is that anyone who's been incarcerated deserves the opportunity to give back, work hard and support their children and families.

I can say that myself, as somebody who was incarcerated 20 years ago in this County, and my son now, I'm able to provide for him. I'm a wife, a mother and it's -- it is emotional in that if you come home from prison or jail, you should be able to find a job and it should be a job that affords you the ability to pay and support your families and your children. I was faced with that at 19 and I'm not the person I was at 19, thankfully.

I will say that New York State passed the Fair Chance Act in 2015 and that Ban the Box delays consideration of criminal records. But it doesn't prohibit an employer, as you know, from asking about a criminal record later in the employment process. So if somebody is an employer and feels that this person is someone they want to offer the job to, they can then say this -- what are the convictions that you have that have been a part of your experience. This means that Fair Chance hiring will allow people with a criminal record to have the opportunity to simply introduce themselves, simply state the case for why they might be a possible candidate for the job.

You've heard from many of us today and I think as a County we have much to do in terms of catching up with what New York City has done. They passed this in 2015, it's 2019 and what I see in my office is many, many, many folks coming home to the County who need jobs. Thank you.

**Applause**

**P.O. GREGORY:**
Thank you, Serena. Thank you for sharing your story.

Again, my apologies to those who filled out cards who we didn't get to yet. But as I announced earlier, we're going to be breaking for Executive Session; we were supposed to do that at 11:30, so we're a little past. I'm not sure how long it goes. We break for lunch at 12:30, so if we're able to end the Executive Session prior to 12:30 we'll get back to the cards; but if not, we'll reconvene at two o'clock for our Public Hearings. So thank you.

So we're going to ask you all to clear the room. We have to make sure we turn off the mics.

**MS. SIMPON:**
You need to make a motion to go into Executive Session.

**P.O. GREGORY:**
I'll make a motion to go into Executive Session.
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second to discuss the litigation as it relates to the Opioid pharmaceutical lawsuit. Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Sunderman & Donnelly).

("Executive Session: 11:35 a.m. - 12:29 p.m.*)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, thank you. All right, we're back on the record after the Executive Session. Can you do a roll call, Mr. Clerk?

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

11:35AM 11:35AM 11:35AM 11:35AM 11:35AM
12:29PM 12:29PM 12:29PM 12:29PM 12:29PM

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Here.

LEG. FLEMING:
Present.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
(Not Present).

LEG. MURATORE:
Here.

LEG. HAHN:
Present.

LEG. ANKER:
Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Here.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Here.

LEG. CILMI:
Here.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Here.

LEG. TROTTA:
(Not Present).
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LEG. McCAFFREY: (Not Present).

LEG. BERLAND: Here.

LEG. DONNELLY: Here.

LEG. SPENCER: (Not present).

D. P. O. CALARCO: Present.

P. O. GREGORY: Present.

MR. RICHBERG: Fourteen. Oh, I'm sorry, Spencer is here; Fifteen.

P. O. GREGORY: Okay, it looks like we have one --

MR. RICHBERG: Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Sunderman & McCaffrey).


LEG. KRUPSKI: Anthony is here.

P. O. GREGORY: Anthony, where are you? All right, Anthony.

MR. GRAVES: Thank you for this opportunity. I'll keep it brief. I'm Anthony Graves with the Town of Brookhaven, Division of Environmental Protection, here to speak in support of inclusion of Town of Brookhaven underwater lands in the Agricultural District.

We believe it will provide water quality benefits, it'll help restore our shellfish resource. It's a benefit to the region, it gives us a source of locally-grown shellfish. Our bays used to supply about 80% of the shellfish consumed in the country, and I'm not sure we'll ever get back to that level but we'd like to get back to -- we were on the map. We're proposing 40 acres of the 15,000 acre parcel that's been identified. So this is a limited project and we've worked hard to avoid any potential user conflicts and we will continue to do that.

We feel like one important aspect of the designation is the recognition and support for our local aquaculturalists as an important part of our Maritime heritage and also their inclusion in

* Index Included at End of Transcript
our agricultural community. So once again, we ask for your support on the inclusion of that parcel. Thank you.

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

Okay, it is 12:30, we're going to recess until 2 p.m. when we will do our Public Hearings. All right, so we are adjourned for now.

(*The meeting was recessed at 12:31 p.m.*)

*********

(The meeting was reconvened at 2:01 p.m.)*

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Mr. Clerk, please do the roll call. Do we have any cards?

MR. RICHBERG:
Yes, they're coming.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Here.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes, here.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Here.

LEG. MURATORE:
(Not Present).

LEG. HAHN:
Present.

LEG. ANKER:
Here.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Here.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Here.

LEG. CILMI:
Here.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Here.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Here.
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LEG. TROTTA:
Here.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Here.

LEG. BERLAND:
Here.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Here.

LEG. SPENCER:
(Not Present).

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Present.

P.O. GREGORY:
Here.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Muratore & Spencer).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, so we are at the Public Hearing portion of our agenda and we have many Public Hearings this afternoon, the first Public Hearing for Procedural Motion No. 15(-2019) - Calling for a Public Hearing for the consent to the acquisition of additional land at Little East Neck Road, Wheatley Heights, Town of Babylon, County of Suffolk, State of New York, by Pinelawn Cemetery for cemetery expansion purposes (Presiding Officer Gregory).

Oh, right, we're still waiting for the cards, right?

All right, I don't have -- it looks like I don't have cards for Procedural Motion 15. If there is anyone here that would like to speak on it, please come forward. Okay, I'll make a motion to close Procedural Motion 15.

LEG. FLEMING:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by -- who was that? Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, (Public Hearing on) IR 1210(-19) - Adopting Local Law No. -2019, A Local Law to gain and retain our workforce (“Grow Act”) (County Executive). I have, it looks like one card, Michael Herbst.
MR. HERBST:
Are we going to set the clock or what, DuWayne? Honestly, the law
doesn't go far enough. You're helping people without helping
people, from my understanding of it. You're like, Yeah, we can
give you the assistance, you've just go to fit certain criteria.
Why not just go the whole way? You know, like honestly, if you're
going to make things easier for people to afford stuff -- actually,
you know, why don't you give them a better wage and a better living
capability; like, you know, the way the system is done.

("The following testimony was taken & transcribed by
Diana Flesher - Court Stenographer")

MR. HERBST: (Cont'd)
Public hearing 1210. Because to me, my understanding of it doesn't
make a lick of sense. It says, like, yeah, it's basically more
style than substance, you know, like Mike Tyson's boxing career.
Honestly, the '80s were good. '90s, not so much. Then, again,
this County's stuck in the '90s. Have you seen '25? That's all
I really gotta say, cut it.

02:04PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, thank you.

MR. HERBST:
Anybody?

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, anyone else like to speak on IR 1210? Okay, seeing none,
I'll make a motion to -- what do you want to do?

02:05PM

MS. KEYES:
We'd like to recess. We're still making amendments.

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

MR. RICHBERG:

02:05PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. IR 1213, (Adopting Local Law No. -2019,) A Charter Law to
improve the process for amending the County operating budget.
(Cilmi). I don't have any cards for this public hearing. Anyone
like to speak on it, please come forward. Okay, seeing none, I'll
make a motion -- oh, I'm sorry. Motion to close by Legislator
Cilmi. This is your bill.

LEG. CILMI:
We're good with this, right?

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, motion to close by Legislator Cilmi; second by Legislator
Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, IR 1266, Adopting Local Law No. -2019, A Local Law to enact a
campaign finance Reform Act to limit campaign contributions from
County contractors and public employee unions. (Trotta). I don't
have any cards for this public hearing. Anyone like to speak on
it, please come forward. Okay, seeing none, what's your pleasure?

LEG. TROTTA:
Motion to recess one more time.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to recess by Legislator Trotta; second by Legislator Hahn.
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Next is IR 1419, (Adopting Local Law No. -2019,) A Local Law
to create a specific exemption from Open Space Preservation in the
Mastic-Shirley Conservation Area. (Sunderman). Alison Branco.

MS. BRANCO:
Good afternoon. My name is Alison Branco. I'm the Director of
Coastal Programs for the Nature Conservancy on Long Island. And I
am here to just provide some additional information about IR 1419.
I just want to remind everyone that the original resolution that
was passed over the last year, that this provides an exemption,
too. It was created in order to prevent new development and
redevelopment in a highly floodable, vulnerable area of the
Mastic-Shirley peninsula. And the exemption that this resolution
would create will sort of reverse something very smart that this
Legislature did.

This area is -- the Mastic-Shirley Conservation area approximates
the marsh migration area, so that's the area where sea level is
rising into and that will eventually either turn into open water or
into wetlands as sea level rises over the next hundred years. And
we have a ton of development in that area all across Long Island.
This is one of most vulnerable areas that we have. And the
previous resolution that prevented the auctioning of those parcels
in that area was a really important step to preventing putting more
people in harm's way in this area and we don't want to reverse that
important action that you did.

I think everybody agrees that the Mastic-Shirley area needs some
economic development, but it is not in the best interest of Suffolk
County or this community to put it in a place where it is
vulnerable to flooding and storms. There are lots of other areas
that are suited.
So I encourage you to re-think this resolution and remember the idea behind the original one, which is to prevent putting more people in harm's way in the Mastic-Shirley area.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Are you finished?

MS. BRANCO:
That's it.

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

LEG. FLEMING:
Thank you. Thank you, Alison, and thank you for all you're doing. You really are on the front lines at Nature Conservancy of climate change and sort of the caretaking of our coastal wetlands; that's going to become more and more critically important not only for nature and the preservation of habitat, but also for the protection of property. And I wanted to ask you, not only with regard to the Mastic-Shirley area, but, you know, I've been doing work in Accabonac Harbor, the Wertheim wetlands are being restored. Could you just speak a little bit about the concept of the migration of the wetlands as sea level rises. And we've seen it everywhere now. We're sort of -- I think of us as the canary in the coal mine of coastal -- the coastal effects of climate change.

But how does this process of the migration of the wetlands occur in terms of preservation of habitat; and what sort of priorities does the Nature Conservancy see as supporting as we look at this level of preserving open space, ensuring that what we can do on the open space in the wetlands will assist in the wetlands, one, being preserved so that the habitat and the wildlife they support is preserved; but also, two, so that they are continuing to serve that infrastructure function of absorbing storm surge, protecting us as these extreme weather events happen. How are you setting priorities and how can we be helpful to you? I understand your point about this one, but generally speaking.

MS. BRANCO:
So the Mastic-Shirley peninsula is one of a few of the most vulnerable areas of Suffolk County. But there are a tremendous number of them all across the County, in particular on the South Shore, where the slope of the land is very shallow. But what happens, wetlands are themselves very resilient naturally. As sea level rises, they are able to sort of keep pace with that movement of the water inland. They will move inland and we will always have that ring of wetlands around our land, which protects not just wildlife and fish but also protects people; it dampens the wave energy from storms, which is really important to the communities behind them.

So they can naturally migrate inland if they have the space. But what's happened on Long Island after a hundred years of shortsighted development decisions, we've developed right up to the edge of them. So in most places, they don't have that space to
move back.

So in the Mastic-Shirley peninsula, there are some already vacant properties. There are some that have been bought out since Hurricane Sandy. The Town is working hard to help other people who still want to get out and haven't had an opportunity yet. So this is another category of properties that we can protect from development so that we're not putting people in harm's way and so that we're making space for those wetlands. Because if we don't do that all across the Island, then, we'll wind up sort of in a concrete bathtub with no wetlands on our shoreline.

And they're so important, you know, they are really driving our fisheries, our economic development, our tourism. And, then, like I said, they're protecting people from storms as well. So it's really important to the rest of the Mastic-Shirley peninsula that we keep those wetlands along the edge. And so to do that, we need to sort of backup and make room for them.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

So you think this is an example of what we're seeing throughout the County where there's a need to preserve wild and open spaces and even return developed spaces to wild and open spaces in order to allow the wetlands to function.

**MS. BRANCO:**

That's right. So over the next 50 years, we're going to see this becoming important in more and more places. And the Mastic-Shirley peninsula just happens to be one of those that's of the most low-lying and already tremendously impacted. So a lot of the people living in this Mastic-Shirley Conservation area now are experiencing sunny day flooding, which is what we call flooding that happens without a storm, just on a regular spring tide. They're pumping water constantly out of their basements. So it's becoming a very difficult place to live. And I think the last thing that we want to do as a county is put more people in that situation.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

It serves as a great example because it's not only on the South Shore. We're experiencing it on the Sag Harbor area, Northwest Woods. You know, the bayside on the north side is experiencing storm surge, increasing storm surge, rising sea level. So I really appreciate your work and I think we need to look toward what's happening in Mastic-Shirley as an example or a model for what's happening in the future throughout Suffolk County.

**MS. BRANCO:**

That's right. And that original legislation that was passed that prevents the County from auctioning parcels that they've taken for back taxes is a great example. And I would encourage you rather than to create exceptions to it, to expand it throughout the County.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, thank you. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
You know, a couple years ago, there was kind of a lack of clarity in parcels that the County took for taxes, what could be done there. And I think Legislator Fleming helped straighten out the kind of the available land use options on some of those parcels that could be used for drainage, that could be used for storm resiliency purposes.

So do you think this is, without that exemption these parcels have that protection already that they could be used -- I mean, and it's not just virgin open space there; it's been developed pretty heavily. And you're trying to un-develop it there. We're trying to un-develop it there and make it more storm resilient for the whole community. So do you think there's any exemptions that you can think of that you could actually -- that would actually help with that process; or do you think it should be just -- do you think there's enough protections in place, there's enough flexibility in place that they could be used for storm resiliency?

MS. BRANCO:
So that's a good question. And I have to admit to not knowing every detail of what -- so they are meant to be preserved as open space. So I do think there may be is a good reason to look at the flexibility in terms of do you need to do a restoration project there to get the wetlands to come back; or will they come back on their own? Because sometimes both things can happen. I think, you know, maybe there's an opportunity to direct stormwater there for additional treatment. So you might want to allow that to happen.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Right.

MS. BRANCO:
But what we don't want to allow is putting buildings, new development, hardening the shoreline and putting people there.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Sunderman.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes, I agree a hundred percent on that. Do you know what we were looking to do possibly with this one piece we're trying to carve out?

MS. BRANCO:
Tell me.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
So I was looking -- and we're working closely with the County Executive's Office and multiple different government officials.
We're looking to do something for marine and educational purposes for the community, possibly a shellfish hatchery. So we're looking at just something for that one location that we have. And that's why we were exploring it. But I can't do much unless I can just carve out that one piece.

MS. BRANCO:
And this is the Violet's Cove parcel; is that right?

LEG. SUnderMAN:
That's the one I'm looking at right at this time. That's the only one I'm looking at at this time.

MS. BRANCO:
So I think that makes a lot of sense, but I would just caution to think a little bit more holistically and not just about what's happening today, but in the next 10 or 20 years or the lifetime of this facility that you're talking about. Many of the roads surrounding Violet's Cove property are already frequently flooded and will be pretty much underwater pretty soon. So think about all the services that would need to get to this building; the ability for people to get there to use it; the ability to create parking areas that are a safe space to put your car, all those things.

I would encourage the County to consider is there a better place that you can still provide that service in this area that really could use it? But in a place that doesn't sort of preclude you from backing up from the edge of the water.

LEG. SUnderMAN:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Anyone else? Okay. All right. Thank you.

MS. BRANCO:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Anyone else like to speak on IR 1419? Nope? Okay. Legislator Sunderman.

LEG. SUnderMAN:
I'm going to make a motion to close.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to -- I missed that. Close? Okay. Motion to close. A second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:
Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, IR 1426, (Adopting Local Law No. -2019,) A Local Law to ensure IDA beneficiaries provide fair and equitable wages ("The
Equal Pay for Equal Skills Act”). (Kennedy). I have one card.

MS. ELLIS:
Seventeen. (Corrected vote. Absent: Leg. Gonzalez)

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, sorry. Michael Herbst.

MR. HERBST:
Trash that, reverse it. It's like Willy Wonka in a chocolate factory. We really need a law to induct common sense? This is what, 2019? What are we doing, 1950s laws? To actually tell somebody you have to pay somebody a reasonable law? I understand Trump and his tax cuts scam, I know that much. But to actually say that just because of the gender you get paid less? Kind of works in the reversal. It's common sense. You do equal work, you get equal pay. It really takes to now to realize that? Where've you guys been the last 45 years? Cut it.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Anyone else -- anyone have any questions for him?

MR. HERBST:
No? Okay.

P.O. GREGORY:
Anyone else like to speak on IR 1426? Nope? Say no. Legislator Kennedy?

LEG. KENNEDY:
Motion to recess for a couple more changes.

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

MS. ELLIS:

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, 1590, considering increasing the maximum facilities amount to be expended for improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 6 - Kings Park (CP 8144). (County Exec.). I have a card from David Barnes. Okay, Mr. Barnes.

MR. BARNES:
Good afternoon. I'm David Barnes. I'm the Assistant Planning Director at the Town of Smithtown. I'm here representing Supervisor Ed Wehrheim. I have a letter from him I'd like to read for you.

"Dear Honorable DuWayne Gregory and members of the Legislature, I would like to thank the Legislature for proposing improvements and expansion of infrastructure within Sewer District 6. The proposed improvements to Sewer District 6 will enable servicing the hamlet of Kings Park and accomplish multiple goals including improving
groundwater quality through the abandonment of old failing onsite sanitary systems, acting as a catalyst for economic activity and facilitate growth within the hamlet of Kings Park, which has suffered economic hardship when the Kings Park Psychiatric Center closed and has not yet recovered.

The Town of Smithtown in cooperation with the Chamber of Commerce, Kings Park Civic Association and Suffolk County have spent significant efforts and resources over the past few years planning for the future of Kings Park. Suffolk County IDA funded a Downtown Opportunity Analysis. The Kings Park Chamber and Civic Association funded and organized the Kings Park Action Plan. And the Town of Smithtown is nearing completion of the Kings Park Downtown Master Plan with funding from the County.

The improvements to Sewer District 6 including connecting the business district and construction of a pump station on town property adjacent to New York State Route 25A are integral part in order to bring these plans to fruition. We need sewers in the downtown and they are the key to transit-oriented development, experiential retail and overall revitalization of the downtown.

Therefore, I want to express my support for Suffolk County progressing this project and reiterate the Town of Smithtown's desire to see this project come to fruition.

Sincerely, Edward R. Wehrheim, Supervisor." Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you. Anyone else like to speak on IR 1590? Okay, seeing none, what does the Administration, what would you guys like to do?

MS. KEYES:
We'd like to close.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to close by Legislator Calarco; I will second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:
Seventeen. (Absent: Leg. Spencer)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. IR 1611, (Adopting Local Law No. -2019,) A Local Law to prohibit the release of helium filled balloons. (Anker). I guess we have a lot of people here this afternoon interested in balloons, it looks like. All right. Excuse me if I screw up your name. It looks like Patrice Domeischel. Is that correct? All right. And then on deck Dr. Arthur Kopelman.

MS. DOMEISCHEL:
Good afternoon, Honorable Gregory and members of the Legislature. The light is on. Can you hear me? Okay. My name is Patrice Domeischel. I speak as a Suffolk County resident concerned about -- I speak as a Suffolk County resident concerned about the
environment and its inhabitants. I'm also a board member of a local Audubon Chapter for Harbors Audubon Society.

I'm here today to express support for and to respectfully urge you to pass into law Introductory Resolution number 1611-2019, to amend Chapter 310 of the Suffolk County Code to ban the intentional release for any reason of all helium-filled balloons in Suffolk County. Released balloons find their way into our oceans. Some latex taking years to decompose; others like mylar never decomposing. Balloons can resemble and be mistaken for jellyfish, squid and other food sources that sea life needs to feed themselves and their young. These ingested balloon parts provide no nutrition and the soft plastic can become compacted obstructing parts of the gastrointestinal tract of the individual so no other food is able to bypass the blockage ultimately causing starvation.

The strings tied to the end of balloons are also a concern. They wrap around the bodies or body parts of wildlife impeding movement, trapping and sometimes strangling the bird or animal. This can lead to the loss of body parts as well as death. At any given time you may walk on any of our Long Island beaches and encounter balloons or balloon parts in various stages of decomposition. These will end up in the ocean with the next tide, sorry, adding to the enormous collection of garbage within it.

So I urge you to join numerous cities on the eastern seaboard, Long Beach and Nassau County as well as locally East Hampton Town in banning the intentional release for any purpose of all helium-filled and/or lighter than air gas-filled balloons in Suffolk County.

Lastly, I would like to thank you for your work on the amendment, most especially Legislator Anker for introducing the bill and for the time I have been granted this afternoon to speak to you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Does anyone have any questions? Okay, thank you.

MS. DOMEISCHEL:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Next I have Dr. Kopelman; and then it looks like Jeannette Hope {Salvin}? Salvito, excuse me.

DR. KOPELMAN:
Thank you. My name is Dr. Arthur Kopelman. I am the President of the Coastal Research and Education Society of Long Island. I am a marine mammal population ecologist, SUNY Distinguished Service Professor and Professor of Science at SUNY FIT and adjunct lecturer of marine mammals at SUNY Stony Brook.

I am here to speak in support of this action to ban the release of any amount of helium-filled balloons. I've been on the water here amongst marine mammals, amongst our whales and dolphins and others for the past 33 years, going out many times. And I will tell you
that almost every time I have found balloons. Sometimes a few; sometimes many. But I've been doing this for 33 years going out hundreds and hundreds of times. I can't keep count anymore.

I have seen the effects, I've seen dolphins dead because of balloons in their guts. I've seen sea turtles, leatherbacks dead because of balloons in their guts. Suffolk County did a great job when they stopped the -- banned the release of 25 or more, but I think it's time to take the step and continue to ban the release. There is absolutely no reason anyone should be intentionally releasing helium-filled balloons. Period. That's my statement.

P.O. GREGORY:
Doctor, I have a question for you.

DR. KOPELMAN:
Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:
So what is the -- why are sea animals ingesting -- they see it as, like, a smaller fish or --

DR. KOPELMAN:
It depends on what it's made of. I suppose -- I mean some of them may confuse balloons with jellyfish perhaps and others may confuse it with their preys, especially mylar stuff. But to be honest with you, I'm not sure. I can tell you that plastic components in the water will give off a chemical, DMS, that is attracted to sea birds and to some other predators just because that's a chemical that they key on so that may be a gator, but exactly why they're doing this, sometime it's purely perhaps by accident.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Legislator Krupski has a question for you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Thank you for your advocacy there for the marine mammals. There are other states -- obviously we're not -- we're not the first. There are other states not releasing items that become garbage into the environment. Do you know of other states, Connecticut, Rhode Island, the City who have banned -- similar bans?

DR. KOPELMAN:
I don't know, but I don't think it's particular germane. I think if we can do it, we should do it. I've seen -- I've had a balloon come there that many, many years ago, that was actually released in Chicago with a note in it four days earlier. It was a student. But obviously we are close; we are right there. And I think we should take that step regardless of what's going on elsewhere.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No, just that their garbage, then, becomes ours.
DR. KOPELMAN:
Oh, absolutely. The prevailing winds will take that stuff out to sea.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Sure, sure. Thank you.

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

LEG. SPENCER:
Thank you. I know -- I'm not sure if this is in your expertise, helium itself, is it true that we're in a shortage of helium.

DR. KOPELMAN:
So I've read. And in their request by many to keep helium limited use for perhaps a medical use. The other thing about helium is that one of the sources, one in which it's made, is by burning fossil fuels at incredibly high temperatures. So we could do without burning fossil fuels at all, but particularly for just the generation of helium. And there are other ways so it's a little beyond my expertise, but I know a little bit about it.

LEG. SPENCER:
What are some of the issues, the uses of helium outside of filling balloons that would be really important with the shortage?

DR. KOPELMAN:
I don't know. I just have read briefly that they're using some kind of medical -- there is some medical use, but I'm not sure.

LEG. SPENCER:
Okay. Thank you, sir.

DR. KOPELMAN:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:
I want to thank you for coming here. Over here, right here. (Indicating)

DR. KOPELMAN:
Thank you.

LEG. ANKER:
For coming here and supporting this piece of legislation. I just recently found an article and it was from March 1st, 2019, it's a new study that found balloons are the highest risk plastic debris item for seabirds. You mentioned dolphins and turtles, but even seabirds, 32 times more likely to kill than ingesting hard plastics. So, again, it's, you know, we're seeing more and more of this. And hopefully, like you've seen with the towns, now with County and I hear the State is also working on similar legislation,
but again, if it wasn't for your voices, the folks here supporting this, I know there's a number of you here, you know, we need you to create legislation like this. I want to thank everybody for coming here. Thank you.

Oh, is there a question? So did you know that in addition to turtles and whales, birds are also being drastically affected?

DR. KOPELMAN:
Yes, I did.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Thank you, Doctor.

DR. KOPELMAN:
You're welcome.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. It looks like Jeannette Salvito. And then on deck Kimberly Williams.

MS. SALVITO:
Hello, everybody. I'm Jeannette Salvito. I represent a number of organizations including my own arts program and animal rescue. And I'll be speaking on other things so I'm going to make this as short and sweet as possible.

We are in favor of doing away with the helium balloons out here, particularly as Dr. Spencer noted, they seem to be at a premium; helium is at a premium right now. The only thing that concerns me and maybe it's my own education background, how are they going to monitor, you know, kids who have a balloon from a party or whatever, are the parents going to be, you know, involved because they are in charge. I think it's something to consider as to how they do that. Because we do have an awful lot of fees out here. And this is particularly concerning, I think, to anybody who has children. And maybe at a party or at a fair or whatever, and the balloons get lost. And I think that has to be considered because you're talking not just about one town anymore, you're talking about the whole County. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, thank you for coming today, Ma'am. Our next speaker is Kimberly Williams followed by John Turner.

MS. WILLIAMS:
In my role as a marine scientist and an educator, I've had the honor of sharing the waters, the wonders of our waters on Long Island with thousands of members of the public, my own students and my family. And when I'm out doing research on a field trip or with my husband on our own little boat, everywhere we go we've been picking up balloons that have been released, not by one child by accident, but intentionally by many unfortunately. It was so out of control a few years ago that my students who I call my squiddos instead of kiddos, they were so upset that every trip we went on they kept finding balloons, that it was getting in the way of what
we were doing on the trip. They just didn't want to stop picking
the balloons up off the beach or out of the water, if we were in
canoes.

So they took to social media, which kids are really good at. They
wanted to teach everyone that they could reach. So they started
hash tags balloons are garbage, balloons blow. They started
following those hash tags and realizing that this is happening in
large numbers all over the place and getting really discouraged.
And so I've been trying to encourage them to stay involved in where
you can have some input, impact and that's locally. And so I'm
here as a -- hopefully standing in as a role model for them, to --
even though it's terrifying to stand in front of figures of
authority and your community members, social media has a great
impact and it can really deter poor choices, redirect balloon
release, things like that, but now we need your help.

All of my squiddos, past, present and future, when they send me
pictures of them at the beach, I would like it to not be of them
holding up balloons that they picked up, but they're really proud.
And I keep telling them keep going, keep trying. Our Legislators
are listening to us.

So, please, pass this legislation. I would like to stop spending
time on our field trips watching their heartbroken faces and
worrying about sea creatures and birds that are entangled in ribbon
and balloons and get on with the business of just loving our marine
world that we have here.

Also I did look up in reference to the question that someone asked
Artie, there are balloon release bans in Connecticut, Tennessee,
Florida and Virginia. And they're underway in New Jersey,
Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Arizona, Rhode Island and Maine. So,
yeah, thank you very much for your time and thank you so much for
helping us get this resolution passed.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Miss Williams. Okay, next speaker is John Turner
followed by Alison Branco.

MR. TURNER:
Good afternoon, Presiding Officer Gregory, members of the
Legislature. For the record my name is John Turner and I serve as
a conservation policy advocate for the Seatuck Environmental
Association. I also represent the Four Harbors Audubon Society,
you already heard prior from Patrice Domeischel. I want to just
reensforce some of the comments she made. I serve as conservation
chair of that chapter. And that chapter, by the way, is a chapter
that geographic boundaries, basically is the Huntington-Smithtown
town line east to the Riverhead town line north of the Expressway.

So that's where we do most of our business. And I'm also
representing the Town of Brookhaven today. So I'm wearing three
hats to express those three entities' strong support for the
adoption of 1611. And we want to express our appreciation to
Legislator Anker for its introduction.
This Legislature had the foresight. I want to say it's probably 20 years ago when you implemented, I think it's Chapter 310 to limit the release of balloons. Dr. Kopelman spoke a little bit about this. And I think the restriction is that you could not release more than 25 balloons or more in a 24-hour period. Well, if you do the math, I know, it sounds absurd, but if you do the math, that means that you're still allowing stuff like each individual who lives in Suffolk County to release something like 12,000 balloons a year. Doesn't make any sense. And we're still seeing balloons. And I spoke to the Executive Director of Coastal Steward yesterday just to get their figures. And the latest figures they have is from 2018. And basically what they found is about 5% of the litter that they pick up at beaches are balloons, almost the same exact figure as the number that relates to straws. And this body very wisely implemented legislation to begin to deal with that issue due to the work of Legislator Hahn.

We know that balloons are a problem. They kill wildlife. They pollute the ocean. And as a number of other speakers have said there is simply no reason to allow their release. It's littering. In a way it's in direct contravention of other chapters of the Suffolk County Code that you enacted with regard to littering.

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

MR. TURNER: (Cont'd) So there's a lot of compelling reasons to actually ratchet down the balloon release number to zero. And I can't think of any counter, really, reason why in the world we'd want ourselves to promote or allow for littering to occur, littering that has a particular devastating impact on wild life and particularly birds, as Legislator Anker mentioned.

I can give you one reference about that. There's a wonderful bird called a Northern Fulmar which is a type of gull. It is found in the wild areas of the world, mostly northern hemisphere, it's found in Iceland, in Greenland and it's a bird that very, very rarely will show up off Montauk Point on Long Island. And so you think that this would be a bird that probably wouldn't be prone to any type of impacts by humanity given where it lives most of the year. Well, due to necropsy work, about 2% -- it sounds low, but 2% of all Northern Fulmars that have died are found to have balloon particles in their stomach. And these, again, are birds that live in high arctic, that live in places you would just not associate with any real adverse impacts. Underscoring how the release of balloons really is an international or global issue and it's wonderful that you're considering acting locally on a global issue. So again, we hope that you'll support this measure, and thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Thank you, Mr. Turner.

LEG. ANKER: (Raised hand).
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Oh, if you'll stay right there, Legislator Anker has a question.

LEG. ANKER:
Hey, John. I know -- you know, again, we talk about sea life and, you know, both fish and birds.

MR. TURNER:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
But as far as the human species, when the balloon or whatever the chemicals are ingested by that sea life and then we eat that fish or whatever, how does that effect human life?

MR. TURNER:
I don't know of any specific studies that address that, I bet they have, but I can't help but believe it's adverse. I mean, we know now, with the related issue of microplastics, that humans are ingesting marine life that has ingested microplastics and that almost all people now have microplastics in their body. I tend to think that there would be a similar impact from, again, balloon fragments as they decompose slowly, finding their way into the food webs, marine food webs and food chains that us humans sit on top of. So I'd be surprised if there wasn't some impact, although I can't quantify it, I don't know specifically. We'll get back to you and do a peer review, look at studies.

LEG. ANKER:
Right.

MR. TURNER:
I think somebody else is going to testify who may have information about that.

LEG. ANKER:
Yeah. And on the record, I just wanted to mention, too, that I think Marie who was up here before, she goes, "How are we going to monitor this?" Well, again, this is almost going to be you, the public, will need to help us monitor this. You can take pictures with your cameras, the Health Department will basically provide that oversight, and there are fines; the first time it's $500, the second time it's $750 and thereafter it's a $1,000 fine. So if you're seeing people literally letting these balloons go, you take a picture and contact us and then we will follow up with that. But I wanted to put that on the record.

MR. TURNER:
May I add one more thing relating to that? And that is as you deliberate this measure, you know, I've had the pleasure working for a number of State lawmakers and dealing with development of law for a long time, and I always have this thought about, well, there's kind of hard laws and then there's soft laws; this is, in a way, kind of a soft law. What you're using is the influence of the Suffolk County Legislature, you help shape and influence social morays in the County. And by making a statement that it's wrong to
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release balloons for the reasons that we say, you're helping
desirably to provide a very important educational role to shape the
public perception about this issue.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. Turner.

MR. TURNER:
Thank you.

02:42PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Our next speaker is Alison Branco followed by Ann Marie Mills.

MS. BRANCO:
I'll be very brief. I just want you to know that The Nature
Conservancy also supports this legislation. My colleague Carl
LoBue would surely have been here if he wasn't off in New England
trying to save our fisheries today.

Balloons are creating a tremendous amount of marine debris and not
to mention pollution on the landscape as well. And there's really
no good reason to release them, there's no cost and benefit to
weigh here, there's nothing in the pro column. So you've done a
great job banning the use of microplastics in personal care
products, you've imposed a fee on plastic bags, this is just an
obvious way to sort of keep up that really important work and not
allow the release of balloons. So thank you for that.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Ms. Branco. Our next speaker is Ann Marie Mills
followed by Michael Doyle.

MS. MILLS:
Good afternoon. I'm Ann Marie Mills, I'm a middle school science
teacher at Islip Middle School for 17 years. I'm also a New York
State Master Teacher, Suffolk County Science Teacher of the Year,
and most recently the proud recipient of the Presidential Award for
Environmental Education and Innovation. I am also here as a proud
mother of two little girls who are currently at the beach,
ironically.

I take tremendous pride in promoting environmentalism within my
classroom and with my children, and I'm here on behalf of my
students to show support for Resolution 1611. I have experienced
firsthand as a beach lover, as a wife of a lifetime lifeguard, the
confusion between sea life and balloons. Very often we will be in
the ocean on particularly clear days and we'll scoop up some
critters. I have documented this on You Tube and I share that as a
phenomenon with my students in my classroom because they do --
these balloons do look like sea creatures in the water after some
time.

So I would like to thank you for supporting this bill and for your
time and making Suffolk County a leader in making impactful changes
to help protect our environment. Thank you.

02:43PM

* Index Included at End of Transcript
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Ms. Mills.

Okay, I was just asked by the Clerk, apparently there are number of people who have their vehicles parked by the dumpster out in unmarked spots. If you could please move those vehicles to a marked parking spot in the complex, that would be appreciated. Thank you.

Our next speaker is Michael Doyle followed by Daniel Morgan.

MR. DOYLE:
Hi. I'll keep this brief because there's already overwhelming support for this bill. My name is Michael Doyle. I've lived in Suffolk County, Manorville, for my entire life, 21 years. I plan on spending the rest of my life here.

Passage of Introductory bill -- Resolution 1611 is a large step forward for Long Island and especially Suffolk County in the fight to minimalize pollution and clean up our County. Releasing balloons is the same thing as littering. I think we all learn in school what goes up must come down, and when balloon goes up -- when balloons go up they come down and have dangerous consequences, as you've already heard, not just for us, for marine life as well. Most latex balloons, when released, can travel from a few miles to as far as 700 miles, while mylar balloons are much stronger and can travel for up to a thousand miles on their own. Since we are on an island, these balloons are likely to end up in our oceans and can effect our marine life drastically.

With the current law in place, each person, as you know, is limited to release 25 balloons a day. But hypothetically, if every household on Long Island released just 25 balloons per year, it would be 27,000 pounds of latex and mylar polluting our Island and our oceans; that's the equivalent of five cars going right into our ocean polluting our Island. Along with this, when mylar balloons touch power lines, they create an electrical surge which can cause fires, injuries and harm to the public.

In conclusion, please vote for this bill for the sake of our marine animals, our Island and the safety for all Long Islanders. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Doyle. Our next speaker is Daniel Morgan followed by Jordan Christensen.

MR. MORGAN:
Hello. Well, all these testimonies were phenomenal. All I have to add is that I'm a lifelong resident of Suffolk County, born and raised in Lindenhurst, and I've chosen to remain -- I'm almost 30, I've chosen to remain here for my easy access to beaches, lakes and all of our parks. I kayak, I surf, my brother fishes and all we ask is that we reduce this useless litter clogging our storm drains, taking up space in the bay, the Long Island Sound, the lakes and threatening our marine life here. Therefore, I
respectfully ask that you all pass Resolution 1611, and thanks for
hearing me.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Morgan. Our next speaker is Jordan Christensen
followed by Jacob Kahrs.

MS. CHRISTENSEN:
Hello. Thanks for the opportunity to speak today. I'm Jordan
Christensen, I'm representing Citizens Campaign for the
Environment, and we are, not surprisingly, here to support 1611 to
ban the intention of release of balloons.

So first off, I want to thank Legislator Anker for introducing this
bill and also the entire Legislature for all the work you've done
over the last few years on plastic pollution. We're really leading
the State right now in cutting down on the single-use plastics that
we have no need for to see on our beaches and in our oceans.

So I know, compared to straws and polystyrene bags, balloons might
seem small because we don't typically use them every day, but they
do have a unique set of challenges and they are a huge form of
plastic pollution. So Operation Splash who cleans up the south
shore embayments every year, they found 6,000 balloons just in our
embayments in the last four years. While globally, Ocean
Conservancy, who does the international coastal clean-ups, they
have found enough balloons to raise a 220-pound walrus off the
ground in 2017 alone. So this weight really does add up.

And I will also add that Sarah Anker said before about how it was
particularly damaging to birds. Ocean Conservancy ranked the 20
most commonly found single-use plastic items that they find on
beaches and then they ranked how harmful they are to marine
species, and balloons actually ranked third above polystyrene,
above straws, above cutlery. It tied with bags and fishing line
for the damage it does to sea turtles, to marine mammals and also
to birds. Not only because of course they ingest it, but also
because the twine and ribbon tend to be a huge entanglement issue
on par with fishing wire for a lot of species.

So again, I want to thank you for your leadership. And we really
are hoping that this sort of like a different polystyrene recently
spreads throughout the State, because we don't want it to be
Suffolk County in the lead, we want all of New York State to tackle
this issue. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Ms. Christensen. Okay, our next speaker is Jacob Kahrs
followed by Scott Kleinberg.

MR. KAHIRS:
Can everyone hear me all right? All right. Good afternoon. I'm
Jacob Kahrs, a lifelong resident of Huntington who is fighting for
the preservation of Long Island's fragile ecosystems and resources.
I appreciate the depth of everyone's inquiries today and all the
concerns expressed with this issue. I'm here with the hope that as
a County we can ensure that balloon releases won't endanger our wildlife, result in power outages or waste our precious, dwindling helium reserves.

I do not support the replacement of latex balloons with biodegradable alternatives as these alternatives can still result in wildlife death, electrical accidents and loss of helium. For my own experience in marine aquaculture and recreational fishing, I've seen the damage balloons have on our shores. Our community has the opportunity to make a statement that not only do we celebrate our sustainability, but we celebrate with sustainability. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Kahrs. Our next speaker is Scott Kleinberg followed by Jessica Goldman.

MR. KLEINBERG:
Hi. Much of my thoughts have been said already so I'll be brief. My name is Scott Kleinberg, I am from Setauket, New York, and I'm a concerned citizen. I have my degree in biology and I have studied wildlife in ecology. Balloons released in the air are hazardous to wildlife in the air and when they fall onto the ground and in the water. Balloons obviously don't just disappear in the sky, people usually don't think of that when they release them for parties or whatnot. They are litter, they're pollution and they get everywhere when they land, you get plastics, you get strings that fall all over. You know, I'm fine with balloons, they're great, but people need to be responsible when they buy them. And just like any other thing you buy, it needs to be publicly disposed of when bought and handled accordingly. Thank you for your time.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. Kleinberg. Our next speaker is Jessica Goldman followed by Susan McGraw-Keber.

MS. GOLDMAN:
Good afternoon. My name is Jessica Goldman and I'm from Commack. I am here to support Resolution 1611, and emphasize what I believe is common sense. It is no mystery that human impact in ecosystems is a widespread problem, but there are simple sacrifices we can make to minimize our disruption to wildlife in their habitat.

Banning intentional balloon releases are one of those sacrifices. Plastic balloons can be mistaken as food by wildlife, strangle them and endanger their ecosystem. They can also take up to four years to decompose. Permitting people to purposefully release balloons is knowingly permitting damage to ecosystems and wild life. We are Long Islanders, our beaches and diverse wildlife are integral to make this Island home. However, with the privilege of enjoying nature comes the responsibility of protecting it. I urge you to pass this ban and make this simple sacrifice of banning balloon releases for the sake of reducing litter that damages our environment. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you. Okay, our next speaker is East Hampton Trustee Susan McGraw-Keber, and she'll be followed by Eric Hansen.
MS. MCGRaw-KEBER:

Good afternoon, everyone. And thank you so much for this wonderful
opportunity to address the Legislature. I would like to thank
Legislator Anker for introducing 1611. And to my friend on the
East End, Legislator Fleming, she was one of our first letters of
support. I have distributed through the office of Legislator Anker
about 35 letters of support. They come from national as well as
local businesses, organizations that are environmentally concerned.
Some of the people who have already spoken, thank you very much for
your letters which came in last Fall.

02:53PM

I am an East Hampton Town Trustee, one of nine, and we voted
unanimously last November to ban the intentional release of
balloons. And I then went to Legislator Fleming and I went to
Assemblyman Fred Thiele, I saw him again last week, and this
wonderful thing started happening, people started to talk about all
the balloons that we find on the beach. I am a certified PADI
rescue diver, so I am very concerned about what's going on
underneath the water as well as on the landscape. As a Trustee, we
are responsible for the waterways, for the bottom lands. And as so
many have already described, the ribbons and the balloons are
mistaken for food by our marine life, they're found in the bodies
of our beautiful dolphins, our whales and fish; yes, all the fish
that you eat has plastic in it.

02:53PM

I would like to make a point about the latex balloons and mylar
balloons. Mylar is a plastic that comes from fossil fuel, it has
to be drilled off-shore, so our Town of East Hampton is dedicated
to becoming fossil free eventually; I think all of us here
understand that drilling off shore is very dangerous. But mylar
does not disintegrate, it does not decompose. It takes hundreds of
years for these things to decompose, and latex is not biodegradable
either. It is in its natural form, but once it becomes a
commercial product like a balloon, it is there. And as everyone
has stated, it's litter; it's a single use item.

02:54PM

As a Trustee, I serve on eight committees, two of those as liaison
to committees. But of the two that I serve on, Aquaculture and
Education, I got very involved with teaching the children, because
when you teach children early on things that are not good for our
environment or for our wildlife, they immediately understand it.
So I'm hopeful, when I visit the public schools as a Trustee, that
they take that information home to their parents. And there is an
awareness in our community. I'm wearing a T-shirt that I designed,
I actually brought in the big picture of my latex balloons that I
found in our neighborhood, in the Village of East Hampton. It's a
very large picture, I had it framed, I bring it publicly when I go
and visit the kids, I also do street fairs, and we make T-shirts
which we're raising money for the {Captain Risen} Scholarship Fund
which goes to the kids who are graduating from college.

02:55PM

I just would like to say that I totally support this bill.
Surfrider could not be here today, but I work with Colleen {Henn}
on this issue. And thank you very much, Legislator Hahn, we'll be
there, I guess, tomorrow, the next day for the Plastics Committee.
LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

MS. McGRAW-KEBER:
And I thank you all very much for considering this very important legislation. Ultimately my goal, I will be honest, is to eradicate all uses of latex and mylar balloons. Thank you so very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Trustee. And thank you for making the long drive here to be with us today.

MS. McGRAW-KEBER:
Absolutely.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, our next speaker is Eric Hansen, followed by Kyle Pilotti.

MR. HANSEN:
Hello. I found out about this accidentally, because I'm here for one of the other topics on the docket. But I say I fully support getting rid of the mylar balloons and the plastic balloons and all that, because as part of maintenance and janitorial, I can tell you without a doubt the most dirtiest animal on the planet is the human being. I don't care what you want to say about any other animal. We create our own waste and we spread it far afield, whether we choose to or not. Even when a person decides to put something in the trash receptacle but doesn't do so with a mindful intent to do such, it ends up as litter. And to think that releasing a balloon into the atmosphere for, we'll say five seconds of joy, to have it end up on the other side of the ocean or the other side of the planet is just preposterous to me. I mean, it's just an insane waste of time, resources and just basically making our environment dirty, less healthy and dangerous for other animals, which is just not fair to the other animals.

I was raised as a Christian and I was taught that you're supposed to be a good steward of the Earth, and I think that this would be good stewardship to get rid of mylar balloons and plastic latex. Because, quite frankly, people were enjoying parties and birthdays well before their invention, and they will enjoy them well after. I mean, I don't see this as a major problem. I'm sure there might be a few people who would stamp their foot and say I want to keep the balloons, but in the long run, to have a planet to give on to our next generation, even if I don't have children, just to be able to do that and to allow the animals to live without having to worry about eating stuff that would kill them I think is a far better gift that anybody can present to anybody. And so I'm a hundred percent backing this. I think there's no need for mylar balloons and I hope you guys will pass this. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Hansen. Okay, our next speaker is Kyle Pilotti.
MR. PILOTTI:
Good afternoon. Thank you, and I'll try to keep this brief. My
name's Kyle, I'm from Stony Brook and I am fully in support of this
legislation which would ban the intentional release of helium
filled balloons.

Nobody wants these balloons washing up on our beaches and
destroying the wildlife that makes Suffolk County so beautiful and
makes its coastal habitat so vibrant. When I swim in the ocean, I
don't want to have to worry about polluted waters, or knowing that
the marine life under me is dying. These are also conditions that
can greatly reduce the revenue generated by Suffolk County, through
our beaches and tourism if our beaches become nothing but a
littering ground. This is more than just a ban on releasing
balloons; this law represents whether or not Suffolk County will
make it a priority to protect our environment and whether they'll
put the long-term well-being of our ecosystem over the short-term
selfishness. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you. Okay, I have no other cards on this topic. Is there
anybody else in the audience who would like to address us at this
time?

MS. TOOKER:
I would.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Sure, Ms. Tooker. Come on forward.

MS. TOOKER:
Thank you, Legislator Anker. This is so important. One thing,
though, that we -- maybe you could amend it, it should be all
balloons. And unfortunately, even though children love balloons,
they should be banned because they are dangerous to children.
A child could die if it swallows a balloon. And also, it also
affects farm life and farm animals; if a horse consumes a balloon,
it could also die. So, thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Thank you, Ms. Tooker. All right, is there anybody -- uh,
Ms. Tooker, I think the Clerk will give you a card to fill out for
that particular hearing so we have the record.

MS. TOOKER:
Oh, okay.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay? Is there anybody else who would like to comment? No,
Trustee, I'd love to let you speak again, but it's only once per
public hearing. Okay?

MS. McGRAW-KEBER:
Okay, I forgot to add something.
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Is there anybody else who would like to address us at this time? 
Sure, come on forward, sir.

MR. WOLFINGER:  
How you guys doing? I am for the banning of the balloons. I just 
want to throw it out there --

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Sir, can you just state your name for the record? I'm sorry.

03:01PM

MR. WOLFINGER:  
Peter Wolfinger; some of you's know me. To tell you the truth, I 
go on the beach sometimes first thing in the morning. I used to go 
with the beach pass, I'll go on there and the balloons are 
everywhere. I've actually documented it and did videos with it. 
It's not just balloons but there's a lot of other items, like 
condoms, but you can't stop sex on the beach, I guess. But that's 
-- it is -- there is a lot of it there. I'm being honest with you. 
I mean, I walk around, we look, you see it everywhere. You go 
first thing in the morning before anybody gets there, you will see 
a lot of it. A lot of these people that came up here were telling, 
you know, the God's honest truth about --

03:01PM

MR. RUTH:  
You have to pick them up.

MR. WOLFINGER:  
What?

MR. RUTH:  
Pick them up.

MR. WOLFINGER:  
You pick em up.

(*Laughter*)

03:02PM

It is true, though. More has to be done. I'm glad to see that 
this is actually in play, because it is on a mass scale. Like I 
said, you go first thing in the morning, get on the beach, you 
know, you drive on with the vehicle, you go all the way down, you 
will see them along the shoreline. That's it. So, I hope it 
passes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Okay. Thank you, sir. If you could hold on right there, the 
Presiding Officer has a question for you.

03:02PM

P.O. GREGORY:  
Just playing devil's advocate. So I thought you made a good point. 
So do we have a balloon problem or do we have a littering problem?

MR. WOLFINGER:  
I think we have a mixture of both. To be honest with all you guys, 
I mean, I love this Island, but let's face it, we've got a lot of
people that just don't give a shit; excuse my language, I'm sorry, I shouldn't curse. But there is, we do have a littering problem. There should be more of -- I really wish that the residents would take more control of themselves when they're on the beach. Because like I said, if I go first thing in the morning and I ride out there, the trash is really ridiculous. I mean, the parks people clean it up, yes, of course, but they can't get everything. So overnight, some of that stuff does end up in the water, unfortunately. I found everything from rolled up carpets, so -- I mean, I picked it up, threw it in my jeep and I threw it in the garbage back then, you know? So yeah, I'd say --

03:03PM

P.O. GREGORY:
So that leads to the next question. There obviously -- I think there's been people certainly like Dr. Koppelman and others who have come here with certainly more knowledge about having studied the statistics, they've said that our sea life are ingesting them.

03:03PM

MR. WOLFINGER:
Oh, yeah.

03:04PM

P.O. GREGORY:
But if you're seeing them on the beach -- there's a certain assumption that some of that's going in the water but not all of it is necessarily going in the water.

MR. WOLFINGER:
No, a lot of it --

P.O. GREGORY:
So we --

MR. WOLFINGER:
A lot of it is going in the water, though, because you see it in the tide. Like I said, if you get there first thing in the morning.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right.

MR. WOLFINGER:
I'm talking I get in there 5:30, maybe six o'clock in the morning I will ride on there. You will see it floating against the edges of the beach, so it does go out there.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right, right.

03:04PM

MR. WOLFINGER:
And like I said, you know, you can't get it all, but I think more needs to be done with that. As far as the metal balloons, they do cause power outages, as I work for the power company. So when they hit the three phases it trips a transformer. So when they release it and it does get caught up in there, it can knock out power to quite a few people. I've been on repairs.
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P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Thank you for coming out.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, sir. We'll try this again; is there anybody else who would like to address us at this time? Sure, come on forward, sir. Just put your name on the record and you'll have your three minutes.

MR. LAINO:
Hi, folks. Mike Laino here. I hear a lot of talk about the helium balloons and whatnot, but I haven't heard any mention of these lanterns that get lit with fire and they get launched into the sky. Now, personally I've done it myself, I had a great 4th of July in Bayville on the beach and a bunch of people were doing it, and these are not mylar, they're not plastic, they're made out of metal and there's some type of a candle that also gets burned in it. And with the heat it creates a lifting type of an effect that launches a fire-lit lantern into the air, and of course, after it burns out, it falls into the sound or the ocean. And I'm sure it is a hazard as well and I'd like to just bring that to everyone's attention, that it should just be more than just a mylar or a latex-type balloon. That's all I have to say. Thanks.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Thank you, sir. I'll try this one last time; is there anybody else who would like to address us at this time on this issue? Sure, go ahead, ma'am.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
You said it was the last time you were going to ask.

MS. GAFFEY:
Good afternoon. My name is Carrie Gaffey. I live in Babylon, I live on a canal in Babylon that's right off the Great South Bay. And what that gentleman just mentioned about the burning lanterns I think should be included in this. We see them go up at night, it's -- it's a burning thing in the sky. A lot of people around me have boats; those boats have canvas and they also have gas tanks in them. It makes me nervous as hell seeing, you know, fire floating by, and I always kind of wonder what happens when they come down. I think it's incredibly dangerous.

Also what he mentioned was it's almost a paper lantern that people light a candle in and it lifts, but there's a metal, round band that keeps the structure together. I've pulled those out of the canal also where there's a little beach down by me, you know, I've pulled those out, too, and I can't help but think of how destructive that is to marine life also. So, that's it.

Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, thank you, ma'am. Okay, anybody else? Okay, Legislator Anker?
LEG. ANKER:
Motion to close.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Motion to close by Legislator Anker.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
It is closed.

03:07PM

(Public Hearing on) IR 1663-19 - Adopting Local Law No. -2019, A Local Law to extend Traffic Control Signal Monitoring System (County Executive). I have several cards for this public hearing. So our first speaker is Michael Herbst. Michael Herbst? Okay, I think we lost Michael. Okay, our next speaker is John A. Corlett, followed by McGrath, Dermot.

MR. RICHBERG:
He left.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
John left? Okay, I don't have John Corlett. Okay, next speaker is McGrath, Dermot; followed by Jeannette Hope-Salvito.

MR. McGRATH:
Good afternoon, everyone. I just want to mention that I never heard about any -- I had no knowledge about this meeting coming up about this traffic camera. If it hadn't been for my Legislator, Kevin McCaffrey, and Bob Trotta I wouldn't be here. And that's the problem with this traffic camera proposal that's coming up; no one knows what's going on. And everybody should be interested in this topic, because I'm sure there are a few people here who have gotten traffic tickets. Could I see a raise of hands of anyone who's got a traffic ticket? Well, there's a problem there, right? So I just want to talk to it from that perspective.

I brought a book along with me here, it's a dictionary, it's Webster's Dictionary and Thesaurus. And the reason I brought it along was that in preparing for my speech last night, I was searching for a word that would best describe the essentials of ethical government; ethical government. I eventually settled on the word honesty, it was on page 294; we all know how to use the dictionary, it's in there. I'd like to read to you some of the words that describe this concept. What is honesty? Well, it's truth, being truthful, being trustworthy, being candid, verifiable, undisguised, being straight-forward, above-board, frank, just, reasonable, unimpeachable, legitimate, realistic, honest as the day
is long, on the level, kosher, fair and square; in other words, it's not being deceptive, false or misleading.

Now, I personally believe the traffic camera law, when it was initially set up, it was filled with good intentions. Unfortunately, it didn't take long for certain planners behind closed doors to realize that this could turn into a lucrative cash cow to pay down the out of control County budget deficit. You know it, I know it, they all know it.

Applause

MS. TOOKER:
We know it.

MR. McGrath:
We are not naive. This has caused considerable ill-will with all Long Islanders. I was a victim of the scam twice, and I'm now completely cynical when it comes to having any faith at all in our current local government. That's a sad statement. Here we are, several years down the pike and plans are being proposed to extend the traffic camera law to the year 2024. I don't know how any politician who votes in favor of this law, with it's outrageous fines and other flaws, can look herself or himself in the mirror each morning and not feel ashamed of what she or he has done.

Applause

(Timer Sounded)

This should not be a politically partisan issue. Common sense will tell you that those who are financially the poorest will suffer the most because of the insidious scam that has been set up. I am a patriotic American, a senior citizen, a lifelong resident --

D.P.O. Calarco:
Sir, your time is up.

MR. McGrath:
-- of Suffolk County. Just one sentence. A veteran who has served my country in war time. I am perplexed by the way so many self-centered people snicker at qualities such as integrity --

D.P.O. Calarco:
Sir --

MR. McGrath:
-- duty, honor, country. Think about that.

D.P.O. Calarco:
Thank you for coming in today.

Applause

Okay, our next -- oh, Mr. McDermot (sic)? Come on up, Legislator Trotta has a question for you.
LEG. TROTTA:
Are you aware that at these locations, you know, we spent $250,000
for a study and that study was shocking to me where it said that
it -- were you aware that the accidents increased 60% at the
locations where those traffic cameras were put up; are you aware of
that?

MR. McGRATH:
Well, yes, I am, and I'll give you an example. I was coming down
scam alley -- that's Route 109 where there are five traffic
cameras, because that's where they make all their money to pay off
the budget deficit -- and there was a sewer truck behind me heading
down Bergen Avenue to go to Bergen Point. And I looked in my
rearview mirror and I looked at the traffic light which was just
turning yellow and I had to make a quick decision; do I want to
die? Do I want to end up in Southside Hospital or Good Samaritan
Hospital, or do I just go through the light and pay the $200 fine
and whatever it is. So I -- that's what I did, I got the fine, and
I'm not happy about it. And I think something should be done, but
none of us know what's going on.

LEG. TROTTA:
If you went to a restaurant and there was a 60% increase in --
decrease in the quality of the food, would you continue to go to
that restaurant?

MR. McGRATH:
There's no way in hell I would.

LEG. TROTTA:
If there was a 60% increase in homicides in this County, would you
be concerned?

MR. McGRATH:
You bet I'd be.

LEG. TROTTA:
Would you be concerned if there was a 60% increase in burglaries in
your neighborhood?

MR. McGRATH:
I'm concerned about all those issues.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay, thank you. So am I.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, thank you, Mr. McGrath. Our next speaker is Jeannette
Hope-Salvito followed by Kevin MacLeod.

MS. HOPE-SALVITO:
Yes, I'm Jeannette Hope-Salvito. I'm going to tell you a true
story regarding this red light camera situation. Several weeks ago
a five-minute straight line storm left my neighborhood without
power, and again, as with Sandy, with 60-year old trees uprooted,
often hitting homes and autos, my own included. We can thank PSEG
for a good deal of the tree trimming blame, as well as the
preceding Huntington Highway Department heads.

I went out late to check on the elderly, only to find Larkfield
Road with no working lights. At another point, when I went to make
a left turn onto Jericho Turnpike in the dark, there was a huge
construction crane lying flat on the stop line on Jericho and
Commack Road, red light camera in tact. Another woman and I made a
U-turn to go back onto Commack Road, barely avoiding an accident
but worried about the red light camera. When this educator, media
writer and administrator, who never did anything to break a rule,
called both the 2nd Precinct and Suffolk County, I was met with
snarky employees and having to make a call to the Carolinas. I
received no information on whether the system issued tickets that
night.

I see more and more Suffolk lifers leaving my Island. This system,
which I term fee-grubbing, is an addition to the instituted fees on
animal rescues and human cremations on down -- or on up as the case
may be -- and it is a disgrace. It does not help that a proscribed
company telling you that they were monitoring the system and that
it works doesn't, okay?

We are situated here in a place where -- and this happened to me
just before I got here. An arrogant, older fellow in a black
Jaguar made an illegal U-turn on Jericho, cut me off, stopped
abruptly and then proceeded to force me into a curb as he made his
way over to Sagtikos Parkway. This is what our officers should be
monitoring, as this activity and the under-the-influence people
causing deadly accidents happen too often to too many. P.S., I did
post his license, but it's after the fact. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, thank you, Ms. Salvito. Our next speaker is Kevin MacLeod
followed by Daniel McCarthy.

MS. HOPE-SALVITO:
Pardon me?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
I said thank you very much.

MS. HOPE-SALVITO:
Oh, thank you.

MR. McLEOD:
Kevin McLeod, Bay Shore, New York, and last I looked, the 16th
District, which is Susan. I've actually voted democratic for a
bunch of years, but I've got to tell you, unfortunately if you
support this program I can't continue to support you, I really
can't. I'm going to be looking at some other candidates here.
And I know --

Applause
-- a lot of you people here for years. Doc Spencer operated on my
boat in the VA, Steve, everybody I know here for years.

I'm looking at this bill here and I'm saying -- and it takes a lot
for me to come out here to actually talk about this if it's not
solar. But camera monitor -- a monitoring system? Traffic
monitoring system? What is this? And where is it in the language
where it says how many years that this extension is for? I mean, I
don't see it in the language here.

LEG. TROTTA:

It's five.

MR. McLEOD:

I know it's five, I know it's five, but it's not in the language.
And I do have some lawyer in me to say Hey, isn't this supposed to
be in the language? But what do we think here -- what do we think
the people of Suffolk County are? Obviously this is cleverly
worded so that people don't know that this was a red light camera
program. And as far as I'm concerned, if it smells like a red
light camera, it looks like a red light camera and gives out
tickets like a red light camera, it is a red light camera as far as
I'm concerned. All right?

But let's talk about how some of you people in here, the people
that you represent, the working families, the working people, the
people who can't come to this meeting because it's at two o'clock
in the afternoon when everybody has to take off from work. All
right?

Applause

Or those people who accidentally go over the white line a little
bit or fail to make a complete stop on the right turn, all right,
that get a ticket and can't afford to take off from work to go to
court to fight it. What about -- and they're not T-boners. These
are not people that blow through red lights, these are people that
make simple mistakes, maybe once in their life. I never got any
tickets, I don't like the program.

But what about the people who are in the upper class that
supposedly we don't represent? They're the ones that go through
these. They T-Bone, they red light, they go through the lights all
the time, they make -- they don't care, because all they can do is
spend thousands of dollars to hire an attorney to go out and fight
the tickets, and they win. We can't do that.

So the bottom line is I can't -- honestly, it takes a lot for me to
come out here. I can't support this anymore. And I'm going to
tell you, food for thought, honestly. You may cleverly make these
meetings scheduled for a time when people can't come out here -- I
came out here because I have my own business. You may make this so
that the people who actually are Suffolk County can't fight this,
but the bottom line is you can't stop me from at the end of the
day, in November from throwing the lever for the person that I want
to vote for. Thank you.
Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. MacLeod. Our next speaker is Daniel McCarthy followed by Brad Bjorndall.

MR. McCARTHY:
Good afternoon. Sorry for my appearance and my Mickey Mouse shirt. I wasn't planning on coming here today, but I got off work a little early, so I apologize for my appearance.

03:19PM
But I just wanted to remind you that the camera is still in front of my house. Those Legislators that weren't here a few years ago when I talked, Suffolk County put a camera in front of my house and no consent, no permission, no asking of my input about the intersection, they just put it up, and it's still there. The accidents have increased dramatically, definitely more Fire, Rescue. I am also a Fire Commissioner in West Babylon, so there's a lot more fire calls to this intersection. I believe the Presiding Officer got a letter from the Fire Commissioners protesting this red light camera and how we don't get any input about safety. If it's about safety, I'm sure you'd consult the fire department, but we have never been consulted. And I can tell you the accidents have at least doubled in the intersection I live in since this was put in.

03:20PM
So I kindly remind you, not only are you interrupting the quality of life with my family, you're jeopardizing the safety of the residents that live in my community and this really is just a money grab that's increasing accidents.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. McCarthy. Legislator McCaffrey has a question.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Hey, Dan. How are you?

MR. McCARTHY:
Good. How are you?

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Good. Thanks again for coming out. So you've heard that -- this is the first time I've ever heard it, but I think it's a great expression. You know that we've got five red light cameras on that intersection, on that stretch of road from 109 down to Montauk Highway, and I think it's a little less than a mile. But I didn't just -- I had to write it down, scam alley; Mr. McDermott, thank you for that verbiage. I know we spoke before. But did you feel that this is a little bit of overkill in that area? I mean, you go, you drive around the rest of the County, have you ever seen any stretch of road where we've had five red light cameras in a one-mile --
MR. McCARTHY:
Well, that's the problem. That's why we wrote the letter, because there's actually five intersections but there's actually seven cameras and they're conveniently located between two firehouses. So it's like you're trying to grab the volunteers racing to a call to grab them. So it's actually between two firehouses. That's why we wrote the letter to the Presiding Officer and I believe a few other Legislators such as Rudy Sunderman and Tom Donnelly and I believe yourself got a copy; we cc'd everybody, I believe. And they're trying to grab the two firefighters -- the two firehouses, so people responding to the firehouses are getting nailed all the time.

03:22PM

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Now you obviously live there. In fact, I know firsthand there's a camera right in front of your house and we helped to try to mitigate some of the opticals, the flashing from the camera, etcetera, with some -- to some success. But are you aware that in few of those intersections, at least two of those five, that accidents with injuries, serious accidents have gone up statistically, according to the report? And also as someone, a first responder to that area, that accidents with serious injuries have gone up in many of those locations?

03:22PM

MR. McCARTHY:
Many of those locations, absolutely. Like I said, before the camera was installed -- I lived there since 2010, they were installed I believe 2012 -- I didn't see any accidents. And I've been responding to -- and I've been volunteering since 2005. So I haven't responded to any accidents in that intersection whatsoever, not one. Afterwards there's been tons, including helicopter calls; that never happened before the camera was installed. Serious, serious personal injuries. My road's been shut down twice for five hours for accident investigations because they thought someone was going to die; luckily no one did, but they thought they were not going to make it so, you know, they shut it down as precautionary reasons and investigated it.

03:23PM

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Right.

MR. McCARTHY:
That happened twice. That never happened before the camera was not -- was installed.

03:23PM

LEG. McCAFFREY:
And as someone who lives right on Great East Neck Road, as you know, as Mr. McDermott pointed out, that is really a thoroughfare for the cesspool trucks, basically, that come down off of Sunrise Highway. They come down Great East Neck Road and that takes them right down to the sewer plant.

MR. McCARTHY:
Well, they're getting all that truck traffic.
LEG. McCAFFREY:
So we're getting the truck traffic --

MR. McCARTHY:
The Great South Bay Shopping Center is right there, so they've got all the shoppers for them.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
But the real -- the other concern, as someone who used to drive a truck for a living, I understand that when you can't judge the behavior of the person in front of you, because you don't know if they're going to stop short for a light and you're driving -- the fact that there's larger vehicles on that one mile stretch of road; does that make the problem even worse? Because you have loaded down, you know, especially coming southbound, you've got the cesspool trucks that are fully loaded coming down there, and sometimes they're in a hurry to get through there. Does that make the problem worse?

03:23PM

MR. McCARTHY:
Absolutely.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay.

MR. McCARTHY:
Yeah, without a doubt.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Right. Thank you.

MR. McCARTHY:
Yeah. Like I said, it's up 60%, I believe. But they're saying the major injuries are down 11%. But a minor accident causes a major inconvenience to 60% of Long Islanders. Just whiplash is a minor -- is a minor injury, whiplash, but you're injured for two months. That's not too minor to the person who was whiplash.

03:24PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah. You said you were a volunteer fireman?

MR. McCARTHY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
And you respond routinely to these things?

MR. McCARTHY:
Yeah, and I used to be an EMT before that. My card lapsed.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay, so you've reported to fires of BBQ's in your life.
MR. McCARTHY:
Yeah.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay. So if there was a 60% increase of a certain type of BBQ or BBQ fires and there was something that made that happen and it was a similar thing, do you think the government should do something about that?

MR. McCARTHY:
And I'm sure the manufacturer themselves would recall it.

LEG. TROTTA:
Exactly. So --

MR. McCARTHY:
It would take responsibility and say, You know what? Something's wrong. Let's recall this and rework it. And I've asked that several times. I said, You know what? You released the program, a Red Light Camera Program. There's flaws. There's flaws, there's flaws. And instead of saying, You know what? There's flaws, let's rework it. Let's get a committee to go and -- let's get -- you know what? All red light cameras, no turns on reds, five second yellow lights, do something like that. No. No, there's no problem.

LEG. TROTTA:
Let me ask you this question.

MR. McCARTHY:
There's no committee set, there's nothing. There's flaws.

LEG. TROTTA:
What if you were a Legislator --

MR. McCARTHY:
It has to be worked out.

LEG. TROTTA:
-- and you spent -- the taxpayers of this County spent $250,000 for a study, and as a Legislator you called the company up who did that, not once, not twice but ten times and they never returned your phone call, they never asked -- would not even answer a question when you would get them on the phone.

MR. McCARTHY:
Cashed the check and left.

LEG. TROTTA:
What message would that send to you?

MR. McCARTHY:
F-U.

MR. RUTH:
Corruption.
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Okay.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:  
No accountability.

MR. McCARTHY:  
F-U, corruption.

LEG. TROTTA:  
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Thank you, Mr. McCarthy. All right, our next speaker is Brad Bjorndall followed by Chris Cloonan.

MR. BJORNDALL:  
Hi, everybody. So last October I got a letter in the mail that my registration is going to be revoked. Now I ask why, and then I see a list of a whole bunch of numbers that I have no idea what they are, and they all ended up being red light camera tickets. So they ended up revoking my registration in January of this year and it cost me $3,000 to pay the red light camera tickets. I don't have that money. So I went to a family friend and they let me borrow the money, so now I work four jobs to pay them back. It's great. And then one time I got a ticket for having no registration, and I asked them why. They said, Oh, you've got 27 violations. I go What's 27 violations? And he couldn't even tell me. He's like, You know more than I know. So I don't know what that was about.

So I'm really preaching on the financial hardship. Because everyone doesn't have the money to pay that, it's a joke. It's a money grab, that's all it is, and I say to get rid of it as soon as we can.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:  
Hallelujah.

Applause

MR. BJORNDALL:  
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Thank you, Mr. Bjorndall. Our next speaker is Chris Cloonan followed by Michael O'Leary.

MR. CLOONAN:  
Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I am a constituent of Legislator Anker, I live in Coram.

Besides the fact that similar programs have been found unconstitutional in other jurisdictions, this issue is a personal one for me. I lost my car; my car was totaled at a red light camera on 83 and Old Town Road. It was a yellow light that I would
have normally gone through, but because of the camera I stopped and
I was rear-ended from behind by a mini van. I was knocked out of
work for a while with neck injuries.

A 60% increase in accidents is no joke, and it's not something that
would have happened without these cameras, it's not a minor
increase, that would be random. I find these are especially
dangerous in the rain if you have to make a split second decision
and slam on your brakes. They're very dangerous. It's also an
issue that it tickets the car, the owner or the registrant of the
car rather than the driver. So if my brother drives my car, I get
the ticket if he blows a red light.

If this was about safety I think you'd have clocks instead of
cameras. In other countries they put clocks at red lights so you
know when the lights are going to change, it makes it much safer.
And instead of a fine, you could have something like a mandatory
defensive driving class, it would probably make our roads a lot
safer. When you have a fine that's a set amount, it
disproportionately effects lower income people. If I make $100,000
a year, an $80 fine or a $100 fine, whatever it is, is a different
impact on me than if I make $20,000 a year and I have to pay a $100
fine.

The fact that these cameras are placed in lower income communities
like Centereach, Coram and Medford, but then when you drive through
places like Stony Brook, Port Jefferson and Old Field, there are no
cameras.

Applause

That is a shameful, shameful reflection on Suffolk County and which
constituents are prioritized. If these cameras were so great, then
they would be in the districts or the towns of your wealthier
constituents; instead they target your lower income constituents
and that is shameful. I find these cameras are just another reason
to leave Suffolk County and I urge you to get rid of them. Thank
you.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Cloonan. Our next speaker is Michael O'Leary
followed by Hector Gavilla.

MR. O'LEARY:
Good afternoon. I'd like to thank the Republican lawmakers for
raising this issue. I'd also like to thank Newsday, because if it
wasn't the fact that they print articles telling me about things
like this, it all goes on without my knowledge and my ability to
express my outrage, which I'll tell you is what -- you talk to most
people about what goes on with these red light cameras, they're
outraged, they had enough of it. And the issues of accidents being
caused by anticipating that intersection, I've experienced it. I
haven't experienced an accident, but I've experienced stopping and
having people behind me blast around me and go through a light and
other instances. It's not something that's increasing safety.

To think that this study that cost $250,000 came back 60% increase in accidents, and somehow they tried to justify to continue the program is insane.

MR. RUTH:
Corruptions.

Applause

MR. O'LEARY:
And then they say -- Newsday released the 60% stat and they said, But there was a drop in fatalities. But to this moment, I have no idea the drop in fatalities. Was it from 11 to 10? I don't have a clue. So this company that did this study had 250,000 reasons to come up with a way of saying we should go ahead with this program again in the future, because maybe they'd get to do another study in a few years since we said it was good for you's.

The issue that you were ignored trying to contact this group that did the study; I'm outraged once again as a citizen. And they should have been brought here to face the public and tell me why they did that.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:
That's right.

Applause

MR. O'LEARY:
That's what should have happened.

So, the other issue that I don't think anybody raised is these accidents, 60% increase in accidents. You know what happens when you get in an accident, no matter what in New York State? Rates go up for three years at least; I'm facing it now, okay? So it's just another way that this is abuse of the citizenry. And that this was ever allowed to be put in place I don't believe was done in good faith. Regardless of that, I do not support the Local Law to extend the Traffic Control Signal Monitoring System. Thank you for giving me an opportunity to express myself.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Hold on one second. Don't walk away yet, Legislator Trotta has a question.

Applause

LEG. TROTTA:
I have a quick question. Are you aware that the reason I called them is because I also couldn't really determine because it said the projected accident, fatality accidents may have increased; not even the actual. So that was one of the reasons. Were you aware that that was one of the reasons why I called?
MR. O'LEARY:
No, sir, I wasn't aware of that.

LEG. TROTTA:
Thank you.

MR. O'LEARY:
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. O'Leary. All right, our next speaker is Hector Gavilla followed by Michael Laino.

MR. GAVILLA:
I have handouts.

LEG. TROTTA:
You can give them to the Clerk. Oh, where is our Clerk?

MR. GAVILLA:
Okay. Hi. Good afternoon. My name's Hector Gavilla and since 2015 I've been coming down here to talk about the problems with the red light camera. And, you know, it's a travesty that we spent $250,000 of taxpayer money to give us a report that we already knew, because every year the accident data is in the annual report, so already knew that this was a dangerous program.

Now, it's alarming to know that according to the report, and that's -- one of the handouts I gave you was just an outline of my summary. That there's an increase of accidents by 59.6% at the red light camera locations, and that's compared to only 12% increase in accidents at intersections all over Suffolk County. So ironically it's safer to drive in the intersections that don't have the red light cameras because they had fewer accidents, according to the report.

The other thing I want to point out is it's very insulting to say that those fifty-nine six percent increase in accidents were not serious accidents. All accidents are serious accidents. If you've ever had a rear-end accident like I've had a few times where I got hit from behind, I had months of pain and not being able to get out of my bed. So it's really insulting to read any of you being quoted in the newspaper saying that that type of accident is not serious, because it is. In addition to that, it also creates damage, property damage to the car and your insurance rates go up and it's just really painful to have to go through that.

The third point I want to mention is that there's data that's missing on the fatal accidents before the cameras. So there are some intersections such as the one by Comnack Road and the Long Island Expressway that has a long history of fatalities before and during the cameras, and the reason for that is because there's an engineering flaw in there and I point it out because there's a major blind spot, and I continue to see accidents and fatal accidents there. It's right near where I live, and almost on a daily basis that continues to occur, but you ignore that because of

* Index Included at End of Transcript
the flaws in the system.

All right, the last thing that I just want to mention, too, is that in the courtroom we have problems. If you ever go to the traffic court, the judge -- people are told to get there at 9 a.m., the judge shows up at 9:30 a.m., he spends the next half hour talking about how great the Red Light Camera Program is, then it's 10 a.m. and he says that he has to take a coffee break because he loves to drink coffee. It's true, anyone who's been at the red light camera court knows this; it's not being reported, you have to investigate this. And then he comes back at 10:30 and they don't see the first case until an hour-and-a-half, an hour-and-a-half after the people took off of work to show up to the red light camera court. And you're telling me that you're not abusing the people? Paul Margiotta has to go. It comes from the top. He has to be forced to resign and that has to be investigated.

And then why is -- this resolution, why does it not have the words red light camera on it? This is the first time we have a red light camera hearing and the word red light cameras are not in it. I have a list of every single hearing since the inception of this scam and it has the word.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Mr. Gavilla --

MR. GAVILLA:
-- red light in it. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
-- your time is up.

MR. GAVILLA:
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you for coming today.

Okay, our next speaker is Michael Laino; followed by Barbara Rose.

MR. LAINO:
Good afternoon, folks. Does anybody here support the program?

("No" shouted from audience)

Hands? Okay, we have one, two people, okay.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:
Lobbyists.

MR. LAINO:
Okay. Hey, you never know.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Mr. Laino?
**MR. LAINO:**
My name is Michael Laino, I'm a resident of Dix Hills.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**
Mr. Laino, if you hold on --

**MR. LAINO:**
I live on Half Hallow Road for 16 years in District 16.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**
Mr. Laino? Mr. Laino?

**MR. LAINO:**
I also own several businesses, I pay a lot of money in taxes.
I create a lot of jobs and I operate in District 15. And I would just like to say I love the United States because it gives us an opportunity to come to a place like this and give our opinion to influence or support/oppose these types of laws, so thank you for your service and thank you for the hard work that you do put in. Sometimes we like it, sometimes we come together against it, but that is the American way.

03:38 PM

So I'm here because of the Red Light Camera Program, it's something that can bring out some heated debate over its existence. And before I came here I asked a ton of people have they ever gotten a red light camera ticket; every single person said yes. So I said what did you do about it? They all said they paid it because they don't want any problems with their license or their registration or their credit report. And after that I said, What do you think of the program; they all said they think it's a money squeeze, it's just another way to generate income for the County.

03:38 PM

So I also asked them, I asked Do you think this promotes safety? All of them said no, and most of them said that it promotes rear-end collisions. I'm going to tell you why I came here;

I came here because I'm tired of Stephen Ruth.

(*Laughter*)

03:39 PM

I swear; I'm tired of him being here alone, you know, stating his case. And I said, you know what? I'm a business owner, I control my own time, I'm going to come down and support something that I just think it's unjust, it's not right. The engineering report that came out, 250,000 came out of the County to pay for this, over 5,000 documented accidents. I mean, that's a big number for a safety program, right; don't you think? That's a really big number. I mean, people lost their lives, real humans. We're not talking about dolphins or sea turtles.

03:39 PM

**MR. RUTH:**
Children.

**MR. LAINO:**
Real humans. And I think all life is precious, trust me, trust me, I really do. One thing, a report of human fatalities or severe injuries at red light camera intersections would trump any report.
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Was any of that information compiled on severe injuries or fatalities? Was any of this made like the top line of the report? One might ask how are the lives being lost, how are people becoming severely injured? One someone enters the yellow light zone, you either stop or go. It's pretty simple; if you know there's a red light camera at the intersection, there's a chance that you're going to hit the breaks pretty hard because you don't want to pay that 80 bucks or however much it is. Now, if you have a big truck behind you, it could be a lot of different scenarios, but it's a recipe for disaster. Because we could have a pedestrians waiting at a traffic light, we could have someone who has health problems and can cause cardiac arrest by being injured. I just think -- forget about the money for a minute, and I know my time is up, but forget about the money, the dollar signs. Forget about the zero engineering sign-off on installations of the intersections. This is a safety program. People have died, been severely injured --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

03:40 PM

Mr. Laino? You --

MR. LAINO:

-- and I think that it should be abolished. Thank you very much.

03:40 PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Your time is up. But if you can stay right there, Mr. Laino, Legislator Krupski has a question for you. Legislator Krupski has a question.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Welcome. Thank you for coming. So when you started you said it was good that there's a forum where people can come and express their views; you're absolutely right. So this is a process and I thank everyone for coming here to express their views on this. And if you read the AAA report about the -- and this Red Light Camera Program has been in place since 2009 in the County, right? So this is an attempt, I would hope, to have a consultant take a look at and reviewing it, reviewing the intersections to make it better and to make our roads safer. And I do a lot of driving now and I see a lot of horrific driving, so things that can make it safer would be better.

03:41 PM

Now, do you know that there is -- I'm supposed to ask you a question, I'm getting there, Mr. Presiding Officer. Do you know that at the next Public Safety (sic) meeting -- I'm Chair of Public Works, Transportation & Energy. It's on August 26th at 2 o'clock right here -- 2 o'clock, I know, during the day -- and we're having the consultant that wrote that report come to -- you know, to give a presentation on how they conducted their study. So just for you and for anyone else who is interested, they can come here, there's a three-minute public comment period, the same as there is today.

03:42 PM

We can't really ask questions of you then, but you can listen to the presentation and get a better idea of how their study was done.

MR. LAINO:

03:42 PM

I appreciate you giving us the information.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Right, okay.

MR. LAINO:
Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Public Works, you mean.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Public Works, the 26th of August, two o'clock.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. That's a Monday.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I have a question.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Sure, Legislator McCaffrey. Mr. Laino, could you come back up? Legislator McCaffrey has a question for you. And again, the Public Works Committee is August 26th at two o'clock, it's a Monday afternoon, and the firm will be here to answer questions of the Legislators.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And it is a little less formal than this sitting because it's just the Public Works Committee, so it's a little less formal.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:
So why are we voting today then? Why are we voting for that?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
This is a public hearing.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, okay, let's not get into a back and forth with the audience. Legislator McCaffrey, you have a question for Mr. Laino.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Thank you. Over here. So you seem to know a little bit about the program and how it works, etcetera. Are you aware that there isn't a single red light camera in the five eastern towns or in any Incorporated Villages?

MR. LAINO:
No, I was not aware. I heard some, but I don't know exactly where they are and are not located.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Do you think it's because there aren't any problems out there with safety in an Incorporated Village or in the five eastern towns?

MR. LAINO:
(Laughter) I have no comment.
LEG. McCAFFREY:
Would you be surprised to know that that is because if the County were to put those red light cameras in those jurisdictions, that they would have to split the revenue for the red light cameras?

MR. LAINO:
No, I did not know that. I could imagine that there would be no money generated at all.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay, now you know that. Thank you.

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER:
Thank you for telling us that.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Laino. Our next speaker is Barbara Rose followed by Sylvia Ditkovosky.

MS. ROSE:
Hello. Thank you so much for letting me address you. I'm here for thousands of people that can't be here because of the meeting and when it's done. And I wrote some things down. I'm against the red light cameras, I'm here for the hundreds that can't because they are at work. I think cameras are against our government laws. The right to face my accuser was set forth in the Constitution; I can't talk to a camera. I did go to try to fight a late charge one time because I didn't get notification of making a right on red, which we've been doing, I don't know, 30, 40 years safely. I stopped but I didn't stop long enough, so I got a ticket. I went down and we went through a whole thing, it was like a kangaroo court. I had no rights. I got out of there four hours later and the fine, the extra fine was never taken off. So I tried to do right thing, pay the camera.

We all know about the traffic on Long Island, I don't have to remind anybody that leaves at five o'clock in the afternoon. Sometimes I'm behind a truck that I can't see in front of. I don't have a big car, some people have bigger cars than me. I find it very dangerous. I move to the right away from trucks so I can see the cameras, or the lights. At this point we're calling them cameras, right? The reason -- why do we make rights on reds? I heard it was because of the gas crisis.

MS. TOOKER:
That's exactly right.

MS. ROSE:
And it was saving gas, saving idling time. We have lights all on Long Island, we have stop signs. I left and came back, I asked my son-in-law to please talk for me because I had to pick up my grandson at a sport thing, and I was explaining how the law works in our country, that we have a right to protest and a right to speak our mind, and I appreciate the time that I can do this. And I explained why I was here and he said, "Grandma, my friend has a big scar on his face." I said, "How come?" "Well, two people were
killed in the car and it was at a red light camera." I said, "Really? At a red light camera? What happened?" He said he was making a left turn and the woman went through a light, or whatever, I don't know the specifics. But people are dying from this and my grandson has to know about a scar and maybe it linked to red light cameras? That's sad.

I don't know why we have this law passed. For safety reasons? I don't see the safety. I read the Newsday article, I didn't see it. They never mentioned our safer cars; our cars are so much safer nowadays. They mentioned texting, which is very dangerous, we know that. You want money? Fine more people texting. You want more money? Fine the people going in and out of HOV lanes without being -- with the double lines. You know? I think the red light cameras are a crime.

(Timer Sounded)

I think it's against my civil rights as a person of the United States of America to be judged by a camera.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Ms. Rose, your time is up.

MS. ROSE:
I'm done?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Yes, your time is up.

MS. ROSE:
I guess I am done. Thank you so much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you for your time. Thank you for coming in.

MS. ROSE:
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, our next speaker is Sylvia Sylvia Ditkovsky, and I hope I got that somewhat close; followed by Rachel Lugo.

MS. DITKOWSKY:
Hi. Thank you for having us. My name is Sylvia Ditkowsky, I live in Commack, New York, and I'm here to dispute the supposition that these red light cameras are a safety factor; they're not.

I got a ticket on Commack Road by the LIE a couple of years ago and I didn't fight it. I didn't drive any differently than I did dozens of times on that corner. The very next day my daughter got a ticket there. Obviously something changed in the yellow lights, but of course I can't prove that. So I decided in the future I was going to stop when I saw the light turning yellow. So one day I'm
on Jericho Turnpike approaching Larkfield and the light is turning yellow, and I stopped and a truck came smashing into me, so I had to be towed to a repair place. Of course my insurance went up; I had repairs with a deductible, and I decided, well, that's the way it is.

So another time, stupidly I stopped at a yellow light and I got hit again, only this time it was a young man who didn't realize I was going to stop, smashed into my Subaru, the car was demolished. He lost control of the car, came around and hit me on the other side and we ended up in St. Catherine's emergency room. I don't see where these red light cameras are helping anybody except to make money for the County, and I think we pay enough taxes that that should be well sufficient.

Applause

Thank you.

LEG. TROTTA:
Wait.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, ma'am. Stay right there, Legislator Trotta has a question.

LEG. TROTTA:
Have you ever gotten a ticket before in your life? Have you ever gotten a traf -- has a police officer ever pulled you over and given you a ticket in the past 30 years?

MS. DITKOWSKY:
No, never got a ticket.

LEG. TROTTA:
You never got in an accident before this?

MS. DITKOWSKY:
No.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay, thank you very much. You said it all.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Thank you, ma'am. Okay, our next speaker is Rachel Lugo followed by Merri Kanzenberg.

MS. LUGO:
Good afternoon. My name is Rachel Lugo, I am a Division Director for a local non-for-profit agency, EAC Network. I am also the Vice-President for Region I for the New York State Association of Traffic Safety Boards, the Sergeant-in-Arms, and I'm also sitting on the New York State Governor's Traffic Safety/Child Passenger Safety Advisory Board.
I have devoted over 20 years of my professional and personal life to providing education and saving lives through highway safety initiatives. I know there's a lot of people here that have a lot of ill feelings towards the red light cameras, but what they have to look at is the bigger picture, and I hope there's one thing they can take away from today which are what's happening on our roads.

MR. RUTH:
Yellow lights are being shortened.

MS. LUGO:
And Suffolk County has the most dangerous roads out of 62 counties.

MR. RUTH:
(Inaudible).

MS. LUGO:
With or without.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Wait, wait, wait, wait.

MS. LUGO:
With or without --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Ms. Lugo, can you hold on one second, please?

MS. LUGO:
Sure.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
I'm going to have to pause your time. I'm not going to allow any more interruptions from the audience. If anybody else is going to blare out while somebody is speaking, we'll ask the Sheriffs to remove that individual. We're going to respect everybody's time here today.

MS. LUGO:
Again, Suffolk County has the most dangerous roads out of 62 counties in the entire State of New York, with or without these red light cameras.

With respect to the proposed legislation that reauthorizes red light cameras for five years, we know that red light cameras were initially designed to reduce T-Bone side-impact crashes, which they have done. In 2017, Suffolk County had 1,152,192 licensed drivers on the road. There are also 1,284,386 registered vehicles driving in Suffolk County on our roads. Everyone in this room can attest that speed, highly -- high traffic volume areas, as well as poor road construction and designs with distracted driving is a very dangerous formula, regardless of red light cameras.

Add into this formula of 62 counties in New York State, which I said before, Suffolk County has the lowest percentage of seat belt usage rate in the entire State of New York, which means 61 counties
are using their seat belts more than we are which also contribute to injury. Rear-end collisions have increased; yes, we see that. But you also have to look at, and what I've said before, it's also driver attention behind the wheel. How many times have you been sitting at a light and the person in front of you doesn't go because her head is down and they're sitting there texting because they don't want to do it while they're driving, they do it at lights. Same thing happens, whether they're looking at a baby in the back or they're trying to pick something up or picking up a water bottle. There are a lot of death and injuries occurred by distracted driving and that's another issue that we have. However, if you're distracted while driving and you come across one of these intersections, which is totally public so you know where everything is, what's going to happen? You're going to stop short because you realized, Oh my God, the light's red. The person behind you is texting, looking down at a text and they're going to hit into the back of you. If you follow the rules of the road, you don't turn right-on-red where it says no turn on red, you come to a complete stop, you will not have to worry about any money or revenue going to the County.

(Timer Sounded)

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Ms. Lugo, your time is up.

LEG. TROTTA:
I have a question.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Legislator Trotta has a question for you.

MS. LUGO:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Could you explain -- you know, your -- what boards you were on again?

MS. LUGO:
I'm on the Governor's Traffic Safety/Child Passenger Safety Advisory Board, I've been on there for over ten years.

LEG. TROTTA:
When was the last time they met?

MS. LUGO:
When was the last time we met? Are you talking about a call-in conference or a meeting?

LEG. TROTTA:
A meeting.

MS. LUGO:
We met in May.
LEG. TROTTA:
Okay. And what qualifications do you have in determining accident
reconstruction or accident --

MS. LUGO:
I didn't say anything about accident reconstruction.

LEG. TROTTA:
I didn't -- I just asked you.

MS. LUGO:
I didn't say anything that I was qualified. I'm not a doctor, I'm
not an accident reconstructor.

LEG. TROTTA:
Would you say that if the County commissioned a report and it came
back that accidents at other locations giving distraction at -- or
distracted driving or texting, whatever, has increased 10% and at
the locations where the red light cameras were increased 60%, that
would be a cause for concern to you?

MS. LUGO:
But those aren't the stats.

LEG. TROTTA:
They are the stats.

MS. LUGO:
Those aren't the stats.

LEG. TROTTA:
Well, a 59.6% increase --

MS. LUGO:
With a 10% of texting you're saying? It's not 10% texting. Yes, I
understand what you're saying, 60% increased, but your stat of 10%
of people who were texting is incorrect.

LEG. TROTTA:
No, that's not what I'm saying. At the other locations where they
didn't have the cameras there was an increase of only 10%, so where
the increases were at the red light cameras was 60%. So wouldn't
that be a cause of concern for you?

MS. LUGO:
No.

LEG. TROTTA:
Well, then --

MS. LUGO:
It wouldn't.

LEG. TROTTA:
-- you just embarrassed yourself. Thank you very much.
**MS. LUGO:**

No.

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

Okay. Hold on, Legislator Hahn is next.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Hello.

**MS. LUGO:**

Hi. How are you?

**LEG. HAHN:**

Thank you so much for coming here. I know I took a driver safety class at Ward Melville High School, I don't know if you took it when you were there, because I'm pretty sure you went there, too. Do you happen to remember -- and maybe from what you do on these boards and as you educate people about safe driving, do you happen to remember what you're taught? And I'm right now looking at the DMV brochure, Guidebook on Driver Safety, what a driver is supposed to do when they see a yellow light.

**MS. LUGO:**

They are supposed to proceed with caution and slow down.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Be prepared --

**MS. LUGO:**

To stop.

**LEG. HAHN:**

-- to stop. So that's the rules of the road.

**MS. LUGO:**

Correct.

**LEG. HAHN:**

That is what every good driver is taught to do. And so it's very frustrating to sit here and hear people -- and this isn't a question, but I did just ask it. But it's very frustrating to hear people arguing for any kind of decreased enforcement on our roadways when there is so -- I was a Civic President before I became elected. The number one --

**MR. RUTH:**

(Inaudible)

**MS. LUGO:**

Did you just say something? You should not mock someone.

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

Please, folks, let's be respectful. Legislator Hahn.
LEG. HAHN:
The number one complaint from citizens at civic meetings was fast
driving, people going through stop signs, people running red
lights, traffic craziness, just crazy driving on our streets.
We don't have the ability to put -- and we'd, you know, love to
have an officer at every light and every intersection because that
would be wonderful, but we can't. And this is a way of enforcing
the laws and changing --

MS. TOOKER:
(Inaudible).

D. P. O. CALARCO:
Please, Ms. Tooker.

LEG. HAHN:
Changing behavior in a way that people will actually -- and we
heard it, people saying they're stopping --

D. P. O. CALARCO:
Legislator Hahn, I need a question.

LEG. HAHN:
-- at the light. I already asked a question.

D. P. O. CALARCO:
Okay.

LEG. HAHN:
So, you know, I've asked a question of her, so thank you very much.

MS. LUGO:
Thank you.

D. P. O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Legislator Hahn. Okay, Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Thank you. No, one more, over here. So let me -- are you a
traffic engineer?

03:57PM
03:57PM

MS. LUGO:
No, I'm not.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Oh, you're not, okay. So you really don't have a basis in terms
of -- in terms of your background.

03:57PM

MS. LUGO:
I have been providing educational services, I've been educating
parents and caregivers about safety in the vehicle, in and around
the vehicle. I have also been involved with TPVA and Traffic
Court, providing an educational program instead of parents and
caregivers and motorists coming into Traffic Court getting tickets
for speeding and going -- you know, distracted driving, not having
car seats and seat belts; we provide them an educational program as
opposed to them just paying a fine, because it's all about the education. And that's what I do and I've been doing it for 20 years.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Oh, so -- so do you work with TPVA?

MS. LUGO:
No, I do not. We provide an educational program at TPVA for those motorists who are in violation. Instead of just pleading and paying a fine, the parents, the child -- if you have a child doing 70 in a 55 on the LIE at 17 years old --

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Right.

MS. LUGO:
It's not just paying the fine, you have to teach them, you have to educate them. And we work in collaboration with Stony Brook University trauma surgeon and the Suffolk County Police Department.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay. So you don't have a professional background in traffic engineering.

MS. LUGO:
Engineering? No.

("The following testimony was taken & transcribed by Diana Flesher - Court Stenographer")

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay. That aside, let me ask you this: Do you believe that people's behavior changes when they approach a red light camera?

MS. LUGO:
Absolutely.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay. Do you think that that behavior could cause an increase in accidents in certain locations?

MS. LUGO:
Depending on what the motorist is doing behind them; if they're traveling too close, if they're texting behind the wheel. There's over variables and components involved.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Regardless of the person behind them, going back to their behavior changes, and we heard an example of a woman who's never gotten a traffic ticket before, never had an accident, she was -- this is exactly what happened to her. Her behavior changed because she knows there's a red light camera there and a yellow -- and I've done it myself, all right.
MS. LUGO:
A-huh.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Where I have stopped at lights because I know there's a red light camera there and I looked up and it's still yellow. Okay? And thank God there was nobody behind me. So could that be a case? It's not the person behind them that is texting or inattentive. This is normally a light that people would go through, proceed with caution and they'd be through the intersection before it turned red. But in the cases that they know there's a red light camera, is it possible that people are prematurely because of the red light camera stopping when normally they should not.

MS. LUGO:
Absolutely.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay. Now, if we documented at certain intersections where that behavior has caused an increase in accidents with injuries, do you think it's appropriate that we keep those locations with red light cameras?

MS. LUGO:
As I said at the last hearing, I think it's really important that you do a study; that you look at the calibration; that you look at the software that's used. Because everything can be upgraded; everything can be adjusted. And certainly what you're saying is the locations that the cameras are placed at can absolutely be addressed and you should have a committee for that. Absolutely.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Wouldn't you go years, when year after year we get reports of the same intersection where accidents continue -- accidents with injuries continue to go over those locations? Do you think we should form committees? Do you think we should take years before we take action?

MS. LUGO:
I don't think you should years to take action. But perhaps you'd like to chair the committee and then you can take the action yourself.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
I wish I could, but, believe me, I won't be. But -- now additionally do you think, when we talked about scam alley there, there's five -- the five red light camera intersections in a one-mile stretch of road, on a road that's leading to a sewage treatment plant where routinely tractor trailers weighing over 85,000 pounds are traveling down that road, do you think those are good locations for red light cameras?

MS. LUGO:
I did not look at where the placements were nor do I have that information. However, I think it would be valid for those individuals that are interested in that area to find out what was
the reason for those placements in that particular area.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
We know what it is. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, don't go anywhere, Miss Lugo, I have a whole list of folks. Legislator Flotteron is next.

04:01PM
LEG. FLOTTERON:
Right here (indicating). It seems to my understanding these red light cameras were started before I was here ten years ago. And the language was enhance public safety. Would you agree that maybe in some -- like everybody else has been asking, some intersections, like, maybe they're just not working there; this is not the magic pill for that intersection. And maybe it's other things like re-engineering that intersection, timing, is that red light cameras is not going to solve it at that intersection.

04:02PM
MS. LUGO:
I attend all the traffic safety meetings over at Town Hall. And they have the traffic safety engineers from each: Town of Brookhaven is there, Town of Islip is there, Babylon is there. They should all get together and there should be some type of forum and meeting to discuss where exactly these cameras are placed, what is the positive, what is the negative. And they should be looked at. I agree with that. I'm not saying that they shouldn't be where they are.

04:02PM
What I will say to you is I'm not the one who placed the cameras in those particular intersections, nor do I have that information. However, I do know that when the cameras were initially designed, they were designed to prevent those T-bone -- we don't even call them accidents; we call them crashes. You can look at the Governor's Traffic Safety, you can look at the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. They do not use the word accident anymore. They are called crashes. And, yes, they are avoidable.

So I would say, in my best interest and in everyone here, that we need to look at -- you need to look at the design of everything. You need to look at where they're placed. You need to look at everything that's gone on. I can understand their frustration behind me. I get it. But what they don't get is Suffolk County has the most dangerous roads out of 62 counties in New York State. And it's not just red light cameras because we've had this problem. We don't buckle up; we don't put two eyes on the road; we don't put two hands on the wheel. So this is something that we need to pay more attention to. And you know something? It's the kids that are now driving that we're having a lot of more issues -- more issues with because our teen -- our teen fatality rate is also one of the highest. So that's something that we need to work on as well.

04:03PM
LEG. FLOTTERON:
One thing I -- little bit of understanding, this report, again, I'm waiting for the engineering firm to come in front of us, but I think it gave a little light on, that this -- for the supporters of * Index Included at End of Transcript
red light cameras, that this is not the panacea to work at all locations. Some are paying for it. My own Legislative District, I think there's five of them. And there's like two of them where the numbers went up. To me it's unplug those two, minimum, and let's re-engineer where the problem is. I'm still worried about the T-boning, but it seems like this is not the prescription to solve the problem at that intersection by just plugging in a red light camera.

MS. LUGO: Absolutely, but it also doesn't mean just take it away. What it means it has to be reviewed and it should be reviewed at least annually, if not every six months, to see what the reports are saying and what's happening at those intersections.

LEG. FLOTTERON: But right now I'm looking at is the report saying it's gotten more dangerous, it did not go down. So that is a problem. Unplug it there. This is not working there. We need to look at other things to fix that intersection.

MS. LUGO: Any particular intersection, correct.

LEG. FLOTTERON: Thank you.

D. P. O. CALARCO: Okay, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA: So who do you work for?

MS. LUGO: I work for EAC Network.

LEG. TROTTA: What is it called?

MS. LUGO: EAC Network.

LEG. TROTTA: And who is the managing partner of that?

MS. LUGO: EAC Network is a non-for-profit organization and we are in our 50th year.

LEG. TROTTA: Echo, Apple, Charlie?

MS. LUGO: I'm sorry?
LEG. TROTTA:
E --

MS. LUGO:
EAC Network.

LEG. TROTTA:
And they're a contractor with the County?

MS. LUGO:
We have contracts with the County. We have contracts with the State. We have contracts with the Feds. We have --

(LAUGHTER)
We also have private donations.

LEG. TROTTA:
Thank you very much.

AUDIENCE:
Just like the company who did the study.

MS. LUGO:
It's a little different.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
No more comments from the public.

MS. LUGO:
I hold many roles. So injury prevention is this much of what I do. I also work with Child Support. I also work with re-entry population, individuals who have been incarcerated 20 years with a mental health illness coming out of jail. I do a lot of different things. So that's what our agency does. And injury prevention, we do get a grant from the New York State Governor's Traffic Safety Committee. We do not get a grant from the County.

LEG. TROTTA:
I didn't ask you that.

MS. LUGO:
But I'm saying we don't get a grant from the County for traffic safety.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. You done, Legislator Trotta?

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Legislator Anker.
LEG. ANKER:
Over here (indicating). I want to thank you for coming out. Because, you know, the reason why I sponsored the red light camera -- I call it investigation or the study, was to try to figure out what is working and what is not working. And that's what we have to focus on. You know, the main reason that we had support at the beginning, and it was Republicans and Democrats, and by the way, you know, I'm a Democrat and I'm not happy how the report turned out. So, again, it's reality.

04:06PM

The question is -- okay, I'm getting to the question -- what can we do to provide some type of safer way, especially when they're making the right-hand turns. Because what has happened and we're all agreeing, is that it's the rear end crashes that have increased because of people's behavior.

04:06PM

Now, what I was disappointed with the report, it did not include distracted driving. The entire country has seen a massive increase in rear end crashes, whether or not they had the red light cameras, because of distracted driving, those you-know-what, IPhones. It's really -- it's been bad.

04:07PM

But moving that aside, in addition to, and I'm taking notes, educational programs and that's what you're focusing on, a gentleman had mentioned, I think, in Europe they have clocks that count down how long that, you know, the light will be on, it'll go from yellow to red. What are some other ideas? Because that's what I wanted from that report. And unfortunately it did not give us that type of information.

MS. LUGO:
As we know and working with a lot of different programs, you can't change behavior overnight. It is something long term. It is something that it's emulated from; a parent who's texting behind the wheel to a 12-year old in the back seat seeing mom or dad texting behind the wheel or a caregiver. Again, it's about providing the education and just keep instilling what the rules of the road are, what we could do to better help the community and keep our children safe; keep our friends safe; keep our neighbors safe.

04:07PM

I mean we have people -- when I give those stats on the millions of -- 1,284,000, those are only the registered vehicles. And we know how many people drive on our roads illegally and how many people drive without licenses. So you could only imagine how overly-populated our roads are. It's very hard. And we know Long Island, we're building, I mean, it's getting out of control and it's becoming very populated.

04:08PM

I think the most important thing is just keep providing the education. We go to all the high schools. We provide education to parents and caregivers. If they want to park on campus, we go through all that with them. We go through the permit laws, the GDL laws. We go through everything with them. We have -- sometimes we also work and coincide with the Suffolk County Sheriff's Office as well as the Suffolk County Police Department to provide that
education. But, again, it's starting when they're young and just keep providing them the education so they make better choices.

LEG. ANKER:
Right. And I remember growing up, I was -- I'm from Florida, defensive driver; you have to be a defensive driver. I don't care how good of a driver you are. It's not -- you know, it may not be your fault, it could be the person behind you, so you always have to leave a lot of room. And if we could instill that idea, you know, I'm sure we will see a decrease with the rear end crashes. But, again, I thank you for your comment.

MS. LUGO:
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, Mr. Presiding officer.

P.O. GREGORY:
Hi, Rachel.

MS. LUGO:
Hi, how are you?

P.O. GREGORY:
Good to see you.

MS. LUGO:
You, too.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you for coming out here today. You and I have teamed up, I don't know, four or five times.

MS. LUGO:
We provide car seats to low-income communities so parents and caregivers can provide and transport their children safely.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right.

MS. LUGO:
I just want to make that clear, that we give out free car seats, which are compliments of the State; not the County, not your taxpayer dollars. And the car seats are given to them and the education's given to them so they can drive their children around safe.

AUDIENCE:
I'm waiting to speak.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Ma'am, please, no outbursts. We're trying to get through this.

P.O. GREGORY:
And it's always been a successful event, but the point being that
you have a background in traffic safety. You're not an engineer and I doubt --

MS. LUGO:
I did not say I'm an engineer.

P.O. GREGORY:
-- any traffic engineers in the audience but they certainly have an opinion. I would think with your experience and training and association with different organizations and committees, that you probably have a little bit more traffic safety knowledge than the average person.

MS. LUGO:
Correct.

P.O. GREGORY:
Although not necessarily making you a traffic safety expert. And that's why you're here today.

MS. LUGO:
I am here today to talk about how dangerous our roads are basically with or without the red light camera; and how important it is that we all come together and work something out and come to an agreement so we can keep our community safe.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right. You're not being compensated in any way, shape or form to be here today.

MS. LUGO:
No.

P.O. GREGORY:
Anything obvious or anything like that, right? You are just --

MS. LUGO:
I am not. I am here -- I am here because I advocate for safety on the roadways.

P.O. GREGORY:
Your opinion is based on your --

MS. LUGO:
It's strictly my opinion and some data that's given to me and that I research. And we know, I mean, there's an observational study that was done about our seatbelt laws. And unfortunately we don't have any universal seatbelt law in New York State. And they do an observational study and Suffolk County has the lowest percentage of usage, which also attributes to injuries in those rear end crashes because your back seat passengers are not buckled up and they end up with either traumatic brain injury or they have some type of injury because they're a projectile in the back seat.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you. Thank you for coming.
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:
Thank you. Thank you, Miss Lugo, for coming and putting up with all this. A question for you. Rate the quality of our drivers in Suffolk County. What do you feel, are they good, are they poor, are they --

MS. LUGO:
Under-educated.

LEG. MURATORE:
Under-educated, most definitely.

MS. LUGO:
Under-educated, especially new drivers.

LEG. MURATORE:
I taught police driving for nine years when I was a Police Officer. So I can get my guys and girls to go from the Huntington line to the Montauk line 100 miles an hour without having a problem. Okay. Why? Because we taught them the right way. And I think we're dropping the ball on educating our people. I don't know, is Driver Education still available in schools or you have to pay for it?

MS. LUGO:
Driver education is now mandatory in schools under the GDL that you have to have hours driving under a supervised -- a supervised driver instructor.

LEG. MURATORE:
That's all schools. And you don't pay for that; that's part of the program?

MS. LUGO:
Some of them -- you do have to pay for that in programs.

LEG. MURATORE:
So we know that some of our parents can't afford that.

MS. LUGO:
Absolutely. And there should be some type of program or some money that is set aside for those parents and caregivers who fall below the 200% of Federal poverty level who cannot afford that. And that's -- I guess that's a different topic to talk about, but there are some initiatives that are underway that we'd like to work on. And some people here have reached out to me in regard to providing driver education to those families, single parents, mothers, fathers, caregivers who cannot afford driving classes for their children. And that's why we come into the schools and we do it for free under the New York State Governor's Traffic Safety Committee.

LEG. MURATORE:
When we first got sold this, this red light camera bill, you know, it was going to be an arm of law enforcement. It was going to cut
down on intersection-type accidents. And, you know, being a cop for 35 years, I looked at some of these videos. And if I was standing on the corner, I would probably not write 99.99 percent of them. You know, they do the slow stop. I mean, to me going through the red light, and maybe I'm a little bit liberal than most cops, but if you go straight through it, you know, and you really violate the law -- I mean, you know, a California stop, as they call it, and they don't do -- they don't it the right way, now they're getting whacked with it. So I mean --

**MS. LUGO:**
I understand.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
We need -- you, too, we need to find a way to better educate our drivers. Do you see a way to do that?

**MS. LUGO:**
There's lots of ways you can do that.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
Such as?

**MS. LUGO:**
In terms of educating drivers? What was your question, I'm sorry.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
How can we, you included --

**MS. LUGO:**
It takes money. And that's what we don't have, is money to provide the education to the children and to the drivers who are driving. I don't know if you know this, but in New York State in terms of the Department of Motor Vehicles, a child with a permit 16 years of age, can only drive with a parent, a guardian, a certified driving instructor, not Uncle Joe and/or a guardian ad litem, someone appointed as a guardian to them who has to be 21-years-of age.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
You have parents who have bad driving habits. Where are those habits going to be passed on to? Your children.

**MS. LUGO:**
Correct.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
I mean, I watch people drive. The most important thing you should do when you go through an intersection is look left. People don't they look left anymore. They look right. Why do you look left?

**MS. LUGO:**
Left, right, left.

**LEG. MURATORE:**
That's the first lane of traffic you're going to encounter a side in crash.
MS. LUGO:
A-hum.

LEG. MURATORE:
I mean, so we need to reach out to the parents, and maybe you can
do this and maybe we can do it, and, you know, take some of this
money we have and start a driver education program or a public
information program on how to drive safely. Because -- I mean, we
teach cops. They get a five-day program. And these are qualified
drivers. But, you know, they're out of the academy and they get
five days of intense driving.

I remember going to a class down in Virginia. We went through a
thing of tires, a set of tires before a tank of gas. But we were
taught how to handle a car. I don't say the kids have to do that,
but a 16-year-old going out there, you need and we need to find a
way to have them drive safely and it's not through the parents.

MS. LUGO:
It's not. And I'm going to say something that now the high schools
in Suffolk County, in order to get a parking permit pass to park on
campus, they have to go through -- it's about a three-hour
educational program with their parent or caregiver. And it's done
at night; it's done in the summer. So if you want to park at your
school as a senior with your license, you have to go through this
program. And this is the time where we're able to give the parents
and guardian information regarding that. And we do talk about the
judiciary system as well as red light cameras, stop signs and every
other type of safety device that's out there.

LEG. MURATORE:
Good. So things are being done.

MS. LUGO:
A-hum.

LEG. MURATORE:
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Is Lance Elder the person in charge of your organization?

MS. LUGO:
That is correct.

LEG. TROTTA:
Do you know how much he donated to the Suffolk County Democratic
caucus?

MS. LUGO:
I don't know.
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
All right, Legislator Trotta, I don't really think that's relevant.

LEG. TROTTA:  
I think it's perfectly relevant. I don't think there's anything more relevant than that. He didn't spend a dime on the Republican caucus but he spent hundreds of dollars, I didn't add it up correctly because I switched through because I wasn't sure if it was him --

MS. LUGO:  
I'm going to tell you this:

LEG. TROTTA:  
You're standing here, your boss is donating money to the Democratic caucus.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
That is not a relevant question for Miss Lugo, who's come here on her own accord.

MS. LUGO:  
Can I just please respond? That I do know because I did talk about going and supporting whether they were Republican, Democrats, that it is not an agency money; and whatever he does on his own personal time, that's what he does on his own personal time. And it's through a non-for-profit dime.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Okay. Any other question for Miss Lugo relevant to the program at the public hearing?

LEG. TROTTA:  
There has never been a question more relevant.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Thank you, Miss Lugo, for coming today.

MS. LUGO:  
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Our next speaker is Merri Kanzenberg followed by Amy Keyes.

MS. KANZENBERG  
Well, hello. I'm really angry. I sat here for a longtime. I hope you afford me the time you afforded her. I'm a Democrat, all right? I can spew out -- I'm talking here -- I can spew out a lot of titles, too. I've lived in this county for a longtime. I had my own civic association. I've been before town boards. I go before my Legislator. But the most important thing is I'm a retired nurse. So I have more to say about the patients that are being harmed by these cameras. And you know something? You sit here, do you understand that they are -- sometimes the yellow light is three seconds, sometimes it's five. And the other woman that just spoke, I've never seen you here. I've come to almost every
meeting that I can get to since these darn cameras were put in.

You've been told, now you have a 200 -- you wasted $250,000 of my money, your money and it's already told you, it's a failure, it's a scam. Steve Stern was on cable news network. He said, he was so happy these cameras, I wish he was here, that these camera were so successful because in my neighborhood, one camera, Dorthea, where there's never been a fatality, brought in over a million dollars. And he was happy he said, will help us balance the budget.

You guys, your priorities are all screwed up. These cameras don't do anything to help anyone. They've created more accidents. You know, and now as a nurse and a son who's a service provider with the FDNY, worked out here as an ambulance runner, guess what? Nobody's moving because of the red light camera. Wake up.

I have spoke before you about all of this. And it falls on deaf ears. And then to sit here tonight and this woman comes up here with all these titles. I got them, too, you want to hear them? Means nothing. A red light camera is not going put a seatbelt on a kid. A red light camera is not going to stop the kid from texting. But the gentleman over here, the cop, the police officer, you had a great suggestion. Put Drivers Ed back in the program. Take that 250,000 and hire more cops to ticket. Who you kidding? It's a scam. It's a scam. I'm tired of it.

Democrats, you represent me. I put you there. And you're failing me. This is not working, you know it. Now, let's spend another 250? I'm so angry. And you know what? I apologize for my anger, but I had to sit here since two o'clock this afternoon and I gotta go for back surgery, okay? It's not a picnic. And I've sat here before. And it falls on deaf ears. And I've been a resident, an active resident. I go before my board. Thank you very much, Leslie Kennedy, Susan Berland for coming down to my block where we dedicated to a fireman who died in 9/11. I appreciate that. And I appreciate all of you. You get these cameras out of here. They don't work. And I'm here for questions. You want to hear about patients that have been injured? Go ahead, bring it.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Miss Kanzenberg. Does anybody have any questions? Okay, thank you very much for coming today, Ma'am.

APPLAUSE

MS. KANZENBERG:
No questions? No questions? Because you questioned her to death.

LEG. TROTTA:
You're telling the truth.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Our next speaker is Amy Keyes followed by Walter O'Hare.

APPLAUSE
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MS. KEYES:
Hi. I have a statement from Paul Margiotta who is in court today so couldn't be here. He's the Executive Director of Traffic and Parking Violations Agency.

"The purpose of the Red Light Camera Program is to seek to make Suffolk County roads safer by reducing right angle crashes and serious injury crashes through enforcement of the Vehicle and Traffic Law. Every quote unquote report for the past nine years has consistently determined that right angle accidents and serious injury accidents have decreased at monitored intersections. These facts are indisputable.

The nine annual crash analysis reports along with the study commissioned by this board conclude that the program has been effective. Even though these reports failed to properly present the outstanding success of the program's objective to reduce serious injury and help make Suffolk County roads safer to travel, they do still show that the program has been effective.

If all the relevant facts and data were presented properly, it should be impossible to conclude anything less than that, number one, the program is effective; number two, increases in rear end accidents are occurring at all intersections in this County; and number three, there is a crisis resulting in the serious increase in rear end accidents across this County. And the evidence leads to the conclusion that they are being caused by distracted driving.

Not only is there incontrovertible lack of evidence to support the misguided claim that photo enforcement is causing the increase in rear end crashes in Suffolk County, there is significant evidence that this claim is completely falls. If one takes the time to investigate rear end crashes not only in Suffolk County but across the entire state and country, the facts and data do not support the attempt to correlate increases in rear end collisions with anything other than distracted driving. If there is truly an interest in public safety, the preponderance of evidence leads to the conclusion that the cause is distracted driving.

Our roads have been made a great deal more dangerous by motorists who are more preoccupied with using their cellphones and smart phones on roadways than with maintaining safe driving behavior. As many can attest it is all too common to see someone driving alongside you while holding a cellphone or smart phone in their hand, usually looking away from the road and down at their phone.

Nine annual reports and the independent study found and continue to find that the evidence showed that the program is doing what it meant to do: Decreasing right angle and serious injury crashes. What these nine reports and this independent study do not do is even hint at the proposition that photo enforcement is responsible for an increase in rear end accidents in this County. That is simply the rhetoric meant to scare the public.
To date, note one iota of evidence has ever been presented that would support the assertion that red light cameras are the cause of the increase in rear end crashes at any intersection. The evidence shows that rear end accidents have increased exponentially across the County, not just at photo enforcement intersections.

I am asking this body to focus on addressing distracted driving which will actually make the road safer, rather than discussing turning off photo enforced intersections, which evidence shows would result in an increase in death in our roads."

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Hold on, Miss Keyes. You've come up and now I've got a host of Legislators want to ask you questions.

MS. KEYES:
This is Paul's testimony. Paul will be at the Public Safety meeting to present. I'll do the best I can.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
So before I have the first speaker, this is a public portion. This is a time for us to hear from the public. We have 12 more speakers on this issue. And Mr. Margiotta and the Administration will be here at future meetings for us to ask as many questions as we want.

LEG. TROTTA:
I don't think she --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Go ahead, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
I don't think she should have read that, then, if we couldn't question --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Legislator Trotta, I'm allowing you to ask the question. I'm just prefacing it.

LEG. TROTTA:
You might not be able to answer this because you're not familiar with it, but, you know, I looked at all those studies, I looked at -- even by their own studies that at 34 locations, accidents with injuries increased over a hundred percent. So wouldn't it make sense to take those down? And over the years we didn't. And I think the liability on the County is ridiculous. To have those up there where I think at Sarah Anker's 25A and Miller Place Road, it was over 700% increase with accidents with injuries. Now, that's not right. And we've been going on talking about it, it's just a cash machine. And my question to you is why don't we shut them down?

MS. KEYES:
I don't have an answer for that.
LEG. TROTTA:
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:
Thank you. Amy, do you share the opinion that you shared with --
from Paul Margiotta? Do you agree with Paul Margiotta?

04:25PM

MS. KEYES:
Absolutely.

LEG. CILMI:
You do, okay.

04:25PM

MS. KEYES:
I personally support the Red Light Camera Program.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. So let me ask you this question: If distracted driving has
been the cause of rear end accidents, wouldn't distracted driving
also be a cause of fatal right angle crashes? And if people are
driving distracted more so today than they were yesterday and that,
as Paul said and as you may agree with, is what's causing the
increase in rear end accidents throughout the County, why is it not
causing an increase in fatalities at intersections?

04:25PM

MS. KEYES:
Well, I think based on conversations with Paul, and there's
information that I'm happy to share and I'm sure Paul will share
when he's at the Public Safety Committee next Thursday, there have
been studies specific done on distracted driving. And the type of
behavior it causes in the car is more likely to cause a less
serious type of accident. And that because there are other
measures in place specifically designed to target the right angle
crashes and the more serious types of crashes, that offsets where
you might see an increase in those types of accidents. Because the
idea is you're distracted by a cellphone, you're looking down for a
second, you're much likely to rear end somebody than cause a
different type of accident.

04:26PM

LEG. CILMI:
That just doesn't make any sense.

MS. KEYES:
And there's data to support that.

04:26PM

LEG. CILMI:
Just doesn't make any sense. If you're distracted, you're
distracted. And you're gonna -- you're gonna either hit somebody
in the side or you're gonna hit somebody in the rear. It doesn't
really matter. If you're not seeing that the light in front of you
is red and you go through that light because you're distracted by
your cellphone, you're going to hit somebody in the side and you're
going to get into an accident.
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Now, I've seen some rear end accidents. And the damage that can be
done to somebody's physical well being as a result of a rear end
accident can be nothing short of tragic. We've seen people's heads
slam against windshields; slam against dashboards. If there's a 60
percent increase in rear end accidents, and the number that we
started with was 3,000 something, and so now we have more than
2,000 additional accidents, rear end accidents at intersections
just at the intersections where there are red light cameras, how
can you say that those intersections are more safe?

04:27PM

MS. KEYES:
Because you're -- here's the thing. With comparing the red light
camera intersections to non -- the rest of the intersections in the
County, the whole reason that the intersections with the red light
cameras have the red light cameras is because they are the most
dangerous in the County to begin with. So it's not fair to be
comparing an intersection that was specifically targeted because it
had a high number of accidents, to compare that to, there was a
speaker who said, an intersection that never had a fatality.
You're comparing apples and oranges. They were more dangerous to
begin with. And then when you compound -- like Rachel from EAC
said, there are a huge number of increase of cars on the road,
licensed drivers on the road; and then the addition of distracted
driving which smart phone usage in 2008 was less than a third of
the population, it's 90 percent, you can't discount that stuff.

04:28PM

LEG. CILMI:
Amy, you can't. But you have to apply that logic across the board.

04:28PM

MS. KEYES:
Sure.

04:28PM

LEG. CILMI:
You can't just apply it to rear end accidents. So the second thing
that I wanted to ask you about is why in the report that was done,
and, again, I know you said Paul will be -- in fact, correct me if
I'm wrong, but McLean, which is the engineering company that did
the report, will be here for Public Works.

04:28PM

MS. KEYES:
Yes.

04:28PM

LEG. CILMI:
Monday the 26th of August at 2 PM.

04:28PM

MS. KEYES:
Yes.

04:28PM

LEG. CILMI:
You said to me that Paul Margiotta will be here at the same time to
answer any questions --

04:29PM

MS. KEYES:
That's right.
LEG. CILMI:  
-- that we might have. And that Paul will also be coming to the  
Public Safety Committee meeting, which is that Thursday. I'm not  
on Public Safety.

MS. KEYES:  
At 9:30.

LEG. CILMI:  
04:29PM  
It's Thursday; correct? Thursday at 9:30. But the question is why  
did McLean look at actual data to describe the increase in rear end  
accidents at red light camera intersections? They compared  
intersections with red light cameras, pre-red light camera, they  
gave us a number, how many accidents there were during that  
two-year time period. And then they said here's the number of  
accidents that occurred with the red light cameras there, and it  
was like a 60% increase, like 2,100 additional accidents. To me  
that's makes driving a lot more dangerous. But that aside, why  
then when they -- when they talked about fatalities, did they not  
tell us what the pre-camera data was, but instead used some formula  
to forecast what the accidents would have been had there not been  
red light cameras at those intersections?

MS. KEYES:  
04:30PM  
That's a question for McLean about their methodology. The only  
thing I can tell you is that they used what our industry-wide  
accepted practices for how they prepared the report.

LEG. CILMI:  
04:30PM  
Now -- all right, we'll ask them that question.

MS. KEYES:  
04:31PM  
Anything beyond that, you have to ask McLean.

LEG. CILMI:  
04:31PM  
So as I recall the report, though, showed that they projected that  
there were maybe two or three fewer fatalities at these  
intersections than there would have been had the red light cameras  
not been there; that compared with 2100 additional accidents at  
those intersections. I mean don't you think that the odds are  
against drivers in Suffolk County at these intersections? If there  
are 2100 additional accidents at these intersections, even if we're  
saving two lives, and that's debatable because they use projected  
numbers, I don't know why they did that, but don't you think  
there's an increased potential for fatal or serious injury  
accidents just by sheer nature of the number of accidents that  
increased at these intersections?

MS. KEYES:  
04:31PM  
No. That report says there's not. The report said --

LEG. CILMI:  
04:31PM  
I know what the report said.

MS. KEYES:  
04:31PM  
Right. So I mean you're -- don't I think that what the report
found is false? No, I don't.

LEG. CILMI:
Do you believe the report?

MS. KEYES:
Yes. It was professionally done.

LEG. CILMI:
Okay. Thank you.

04:32PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Anybody else? Thank you, Miss Keyes. Okay, our next speaker is Walter O'Hare followed by Stephen Ruth.

MR. O'HARE:
Hi, Walter O'Hare, resident of Smithtown. I retired so I now have available time to come to the Legislature, but for some years it's been a concern, the camera lights. And I really appreciate my Legislator, Leslie Kennedy. I voice concerned; called her office maybe two or three times at least on that issue. And, again, I think it goes along political lines, he said Walter, look what we have in the Legislature. Fiscal conservative, I don't know, Democrat, Republican but the powers that be want it there and my hands are tied. And I'm sure all Legislators are getting phone calls and whatever like that, their concerns, about all the issues we're talking about today. Okay.

Another question I had to ask that lady that gave all the expert, the non-profit, was she a plant? Because she consumed a lot of our time. And, you know, in our news media, when we want to focus on what we should be focusing, they put our minds on something else. And I was just wondering that. I'm just trying that out.

Anyway, my experience well, one, I received one traffic light violation. It was commack Road, the one that was sited for all the fatalities and everything. And I got the ticket, okay, got it, got the notification, blink, website and everything, played the video. I said, my God, see the L train, worked with National Grid, the power company, drive a train and everything, I came to a complete stop. And, you know, years ago I played flag football, one Mississippi, two Mississippi, I did five Mississippi. Five seconds, maybe more than five seconds saying the Mississippi.

I said I'm going to fight this. I go over here to Hauppauge, oh, my God, there's like 30 people ahead of me and, like, guilty, guilty, guilty, guilty. People are giving up and walking out because they're so disillusional, we're not going to get anywhere with this guy. And we heard opinions about the judge over there earlier. I am not surprised.

Okay. I get my turn, we play the video. You know what the judge says to me? Well, you're supposed to come to the stop seven seconds. I said where in my driver training years ago, I was 17 years old, 40 something years ago, motor vehicles laws and everything, where does it say that amount of time? They wanted my
money. This thing's a farce.

Number two, thank God no accidents, but I seen many, many people almost rear ended. My sister lives off Portion Road between North Ocean and 112. There's a notorious camera there. Thank God I had wits behind me and thank God people ahead of me enough, but only the four cars go through that light before it changes. And then bing, it's like the paparazzi with the lights going off all over the place. And, again, the engineering, almost like it's entrapment. That's the thing about it with them.

The other thing is fiscal responsibility. I was a democrat, too. Grow up in a blue collar household and everything else. But my God, when there's no fiscal responsibilities how you spend our money. Right now Suffolk County has the worst fiscal situation we ever had. Your bonds are --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Mr. O'Hare, your time is up. Legislator Trotta has a question for you. I'm sure you can get it in with a question.

LEG. TROTTA:
I just want you to provide me with those numbers. Because quite honestly, I've looked at a lot of these. And if you really stopped, even if it's just for one second, they don't give you a ticket. So after this, call my office and give me the numbers if you still have them because I find that hard to believe.

MR. O'HARE:
This is about five, six years ago.

LEG. TROTTA:
All right.

MR. O'HARE:
When it came ut. The fact was I was fighting the ticket.

LEG. TROTTA:
I have looked at a lot of these. And when they do -- I've only seen one or two where they really -- I thought they stopped and they did take care of them. They said, okay, you're right, I did stop. So the one, two, three things don't go over with me because I've never -- if you stopped, you're not getting a ticket. It's the one you just roll through at one mile an hour, you think you're stopping --

MR. O'HARE:
I came to a complete stop.

LEG. TROTTA:
No problem, I don't want to belabor this. But if you get the numbers, call me.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Thank you Mr. O'Hare. Thank you for coming in.
MR. O'HARE:
Again, I had a lot more to say and I'm afforded that. And a lot of our time was consumed by that non-profit person --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Everybody gets the same three minutes, sir. And I can't control the questions that Legislators ask.

Our next speaker is Stephen Ruth followed by Victoria Neuhaus.

04:37PM

MR. RUTH:
Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I find it hard to believe that any legislator would accept a study from an engineering firm paid $250,000 of our tax money; to accept a study that wasn't signed and stamped with a license number on it. I know if I sign a contract with a seller to sell their house and I get to the closing table and my documentation isn't signed, I'm not getting paid and that's a fact. So them getting $250,000 of our money, not taking responsibility for the study, that's a crime against the people of Suffolk County. You guys shouldn't let it go on. You should have intercepted it, said, no, take responsibility for this study. That's first of all.

Second of all, after a Supreme Court order we learn that none of our cameras or traffic signal plans are signed off by a professional engineer? And nobody did anything about that? That's more crimes against the people of Suffolk County. It's becoming more and more obvious to the people of Suffolk County that nothing's going to change unless they take action. And I don't mean coming here.

04:38PM

APPLAUSE

Not just November. I mean that eventually people are going to start ripping down your cameras, which is what should be done. I proved it over and over, you installed them illegally, you got kids killed. I proved that you shortened the yellow lights. We had police officers come in, testify, which must have made you cringe. But you know what? They did it. And we got it on video. Just like we got the e-mail the Department of Transportation sent to their employees telling them to shorten our yellow lights and to prioritize red light camera intersections. All of this we have is evidence.

The only reason that you guys who have very few cameras in your districts, if any, keep voting on the contract is because of the corruption and the money associated. No legislator should be allowed to vote on those cameras if they don't have cameras in their district. This is more corruption associated with the program. And the public's going to get fed up, just like in 1773, when the public took action. And that's what I suggest, in 1773 because of a small tea tax, which didn't even make the tea more expensive than the other tea, we took arms and we said, no, we've had enough. And that's what's happening here. We're going to take arms and we're going to say, no, we've had enough. We are going to rip your cameras down.

* Index Included at End of Transcript
Keep it up. I knocked on an engineering firm's door. I asked that engineering firm nicely to take responsibility. They wouldn't even open their doors. So keep pushing the people of Suffolk County and watch what you get. Because I'm warning it's gonna happen. Keep pushing it. Thank you.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**
Thank you, Mr. Ruth. Our next speaker is Victoria Neuhaus followed by Mara Mermelstein.

**MS. NEUHAUS:**
Does it start right now? I've been waiting a longtime for this. All right. First I'd like to start by giving my condolences to the Suffolk County families that lost their loved ones at the hands of the red light camera intersections.

Secondly, I would like to thank Stephen Ruth for his gallant efforts to stop the corrupt Red Light Program despite the demise for doing so. Suffolk County residents paid $250,000 for a report to determine whether the Red Light Camera Program is safe or not. L.K. McLean Associates was hired to perform this report. I'd like to point out that the L.K. McLean Associates not only works for but makes political contributions to the groups and political parties that advocate for the Red Light Camera Program; thus making it a biased report.

In addition, the report lacks a sealed, signed stamp from an engineer thus breaking New York State Article 145 Professional Engineering and Surveying Section 7209.

As per the National Drivers Safety Council, there is a point of no return for yellow lights. The rule of numb is that if you are 100 feet or less from the intersection, you have passed the point of no return and cannot stop safely before the intersection. Therefore, it is best to continue at your current speed through the intersection, but be cautious as you pass through.

Even the biased L.K. McLean report cites a 60 percent increase in accidents at the red light camera intersections. Residents are afraid to go through the yellow light because they cannot afford to pay the ticket. The 11 percent decrease in fatal accidents cited in the report is based on hypothetical data. The County would like to continue this program based on hypothetical theories instead of factual truth.

As the great Robert F. Kennedy said, every time we turn our heads the other way when we see the law flouted, when we tolerate what we know to be wrong, when we close our eyes and ears to the corrupt because we are too busy or too frightened or the point where the meeting is at 2 PM when people are working, he didn't say that but I'm going to add that, when we fail to speak up and speak out, we strike a blow against freedom, decency and justice. Thank you.

**D.P.O. CALARCO:**
Thank you, Ms. Neuhaus. Our next speaker is Mara Mermelstein followed by Jeff McCarthy.
MS. MERMELSTEIN:

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Mara Mermelstein. I am a -- can everyone hear me well? Okay. I'm a school bus driver for Middle Country Schools. Speak into the mike, sorry. So I have a CDL that 60 of my children are coming on my bus every single day. Red light cameras have a much heavier impact to a school bus. You know, it puts actual -- like, it makes my heart thump and I know I discussed this last time when I came in. But the other drivers and the way they are responding to the red light is now putting 60 babies at risk. I mean, it's a horror, but buses can slide in weather.

Humans have judgement. We have a police force. They can see something that happens. That's part of their job, to give out tickets. I actually without a true stop, one bus in front of me, one bus behind me, our reds out, would you believe there was someone right between our two buses, sat there with 604 coming this way, he didn't do anything. He didn't stop him. Nothing. No bill, nothing.

So these kids, I mean, they'll pass you on the right. If you're going to do anything for us, start protecting the children. I mean, these are our future. They're not educated in high schools unless you're of a higher income district. I'm a bus driver. I make 30 grand a year. So, you know what? An $80 ticket, that would mean something to me. I paid for my children to have a good education and I have taught them to have good driving habits. So we'll invest the time and money, over $1,000 each at the very least to make sure that these children are going on the roads and they're taking it consciously, they're driving a bullet. This bullet, and that is way I look at it. You have to look control it or it controls you. And you have other people's lives at stake and a camera has no judgement. None. I want this seen as people. We're for the people, by the people. Unlike a human interaction that can actually take other factors and cause.

Please protect our children. They're very important to me. And we can't wait 'til August 28th. Just spend it now. Because we don't know what's going to happen between now and then. And if someone else's life is put on the line or they're damaged, who is it on? It's not on me. It's on you. So if it's worth the extra time, the extra month, I really would think twice about that. Because it's summer. Children are running in the roads. Things are happening. Mother's get frazzled because they don't know what to do because they're overstressed.

You know, there's so many things that go into being alive, being a parent, being a driver, but do the right thing. Let our officers do what they may. We just have so much to lose. I just feel like it's optional now for police to become complacent because now cameras are doing it. What are they doing? He didn't even pull over the red light; the double red light.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay, Miss Mermelstein, your time up. I have a couple of Legislators with questions. Legislator Krupski.
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MS. MERMELSTEIN:
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Over here, Ma'am (indicating).

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
Hi.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you for coming. And you're a school bus driver.

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
Yes, large.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So there's a lot of -- and I've heard a lot of complaints because we do in our office, we get a lot of complaints about driving, all problems associated with driving, right? Stop signs, lights, speeding, the whole thing. A lot of the complaints are also about people passing school buses with their lights on. Have you experienced that?

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
Yes. And I've actually went to officers inside the 7/Eleven and anywhere else they gather and said please be here at this time because someone's going to blow my reds today.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
All right, thank you. So, there's -- the suggestion is putting cameras on the school buses in order to document that car went by the school bus when the lights were on in order to document it because there can't be a police officer following every school bus in the County. Do you think that would be effective in --

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
They are two separate --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
-- improving safety?

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
They're two separate issues. So do I believe the red light cameras at the intersections are wrong? I do believe they're wrong. I would believe that's a good thing because someone will blow a red light and get a ticket. You know what, you deserve it. Those are babies on there. But don't do it at an intersection that can kill people. Don't.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
Thank you.
D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Okay, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:  
That was the exact same question. Again, I chaired the School Zone Traffic Safety Committee. And the number one concern were the illegal school bus passings. And it's incredible the amount of people that totally ignore the law and go around and could hit, you know, a child crossing the road, so. Right now I think the legislation, it's in New York State. I believe it was passed by the Senate and the Assembly and the Governor's waiting to sign to put the cameras on the bus so we can see who these people are that are passing illegally with the school buses, so. But thank you for providing the transportation for our kids.

MS. MERMELSTEIN:  
Thank you. And I would like to think, okay, what are we going to do with this money instead of it going towards, you know, the town and giving extra money, put that into education in the schools. Put that back in. The kids need instruction. Suffolk Community College is the only one that did it for my daughter. That was almost $1,000 right there. Then I had to do a driving school. So let the money towards those blowing reds fix the next generation. And maybe we'll get something figured out here. Don't put the money in a private place where no one can see it. It's public money. It should be publicly transparent. We should see everything.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Okay. Legislator Muratore has a question for you.

LEG. MURATORE:  
As a bus driver young lady -- over here, over here (indicating) -- are you aware of the fact that once a year in Suffolk County we have Operation Safe Stop?

MS. MERMELSTEIN:  
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  
You're well aware of that. You know, so we are -- you know, this body is doing its best to educate the public. You know, they're trying. You know, I mean, it's like Al asked -- Legislator Krupski asked it's 50,000 cars per day pass stopped school buses in the State of New York. That's a lot of possible, you know, fatal accidents. So we are working on it. You know, it's going take a giant effort, you know, to -- I mean, we can't get right turn on red correct nevertheless stopping for a school bus, so. We are working on that, though, just to let you know.

MS. MERMELSTEIN:  
It disheartening to see police put to the side resting and doing their --

LEG. MURATORE:  
It sends a good message.
MS. MERMELSTEIN:
It's frustrating. Because I'm telling you literally, one school bus zone ticket, I'll tell you where to get it. It's almost like they're complacent and I'm not putting that on everybody. But if more of a focus were to be put on that on two days out of the school year, we have 180 days of the year. That's not enough.

04:50PM

LEG. MURATORE:
I know. Like I said, we are working on it. We have a poster contest.

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
I'm aware.

LEG. MURATORE:
It's getting involved. So I have a whole bunch of them in my office, you know, the kids are so smart.

04:50PM

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
But, again, myself, my own looking at it, that's not putting a real fix on the issue. The fix on the issue is when you hit someone who ran a school bus red, you hit them with a $300 ticket, watch things change.

LEG. MURATORE:
Well, that's Operation Safe Stop, because the cops go out and they go behind --

04:50PM

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
They didn't pull over one on my route.

LEG. MURATORE:
Well, maybe not yours but, you know, there are only so many cops and there's a lot of school bus routes.

MS. MERMELSTEIN:
College Road, South Evergreen Road, Mooney Pond Road, Bald Hill Apartments. I've been hit by someone who is on drugs with 28 children in my bus. Three times, 8:27 AM. Hit me once, backed up. Hit me once, backed up. Hit me again, backed up, drove off, the entire time this individual who's clearly drugged, their face nothing, nobody was home. Let's deal with the drug issue. It was a known heroin den in that area.

04:50PM

LEG. MURATORE:
We're going all over the place here now, you know, so, we're going with drugs, we're going with school buses --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay.

04:50PM

LEG. MURATORE:
So thank you for everything. Thank you for coming forward. And like I said, we are working on it.
MS. MERMELESTEIN:
Thanks.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, thank you, Miss Mermelstein. We appreciate your time. All
right, our next speaker is Jack McCarthy followed by Eric Hansen.

MR. McCARTHY:
Hi, I'm a mechanic. And I recently moved from working at KIA,
which is an economy car company to Mercedes, who sells luxury cars,
some of which can cost up to a few hundred thousand dollars. And
if it tells me anything, is that a dollar doesn't mean the same to
everyone. I've seen customers at KIA cringe when they were told
they need a $5 brake light. And you can tell that they were
thinking about if they have enough gas in the car to get to work,
if they had enough food in their house to feed their kids.
Meanwhile Mercedes some customers say yes to a $5,000 job without
blinking an eye.

It's the same thing with red light camera fees. Eighty dollars to
some isn't much, but I see the number, I think of the customer that
couldn't afford that $5 brake bulb and how much that unexpected $80
must hurt them. These cameras are a money grab by the County --
money grab by the County. And it is coming at the expense of the
people struggling the most in the County. Yes, we need laws, and,
yes, we need to enforce those laws, but it is not possible to get
ahead in life when every single time you make a mistake, Suffolk
County sends you a fine to your house.

I know it might be hard for some of the Legislators to relate since
you guys earn a tiny bit over $100,000 a year which is well above
the income for Suffolk County residents, that $80 simply doesn't
hurt you guys nearly as much as most Suffolk County residents,
especially the ones struggling to stay afloat in this already
overpriced and overtaxed county.

So I'm here today to ask all of you -- to ask all of you not to
approve the new red light camera contract that has turned our
County into a police state hurting the average person already
trying -- struggling to live on this beautiful island we love.
I would like to thank the Suffolk County Libertarian party for
continuously standing against this program as well as the Republic
party and all the Legislators who decide to do the right thing and
vote down this new contract.

APPLAUSE

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Thank you, Mr. McCarthy. Our next speaker is Eric Hansen
followed by Carrie Gaffey.

MR. HANSEN:
Hello. I'm here to oppose the red light cameras. And the reason
for that is everybody has a different fight or flight response.
And you can't judge that fight or flight response on a general
basis. I truly believe that, like other people have mentioned,
that this is a cash grab, really like unwritten tax on the poor. A red light camera is not going to stop somebody who's bent on passing the red light. I've seen a commercial bus go through a red light on the LIE service road where it was unheared of because they have people on the bus. But a red light camera's just going to take the picture. It's not going to stop the fatality of the accident.

So I don't believe the red light cameras are making it safer. I do believe they're just adding an additional cash burden on this. I believe that there are vested interests in the government because I was not informed of this and I don't believe the general public was informed of this meeting. And because you have it at this time rather than a later date, like later in the day, that's harder for people to come out in mass to oppose this.

But if this is truly about safety, if the red light camera thing is truly about safety, whether or not the numbers have increased or decreased, I think, you need to post the signs not on the side of the road, but where the light is. So if you're driving and your eyes are supposed to be on the road, they should be right where the camera -- the light is. So if you see the sign there, at least you're aware this is a red light camera. Maybe I need to slow down.

I think they could also look variables if they're not going to take this off the table, increasing the time for the yellow lights so that people can respond more accordingly. Somebody also mentioned that she was from an educational thing. Maybe they should make the first two violations where you have to go in lieu of the fine. This way it'll give people a chance to not have to pay that money.

If it's truly about safety, let it be about safety and not about money.

APPLAUSE

All right? Honestly, if that was -- if that was the only reason for this whole program, then we should be looking to modify it so that it is truly about helping the people, not harming the people. And I don't believe that's the case in this matter. I truly believe that this is just money to be grabbed, to put into whatever they need to put it into and it's very expensive to live on Long Island. It would be a shame to see more people be turned away because of the lack of affordability when this is put under a safety umbrella. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Hansen. Okay, our next speaker is Carrie Gaffey followed by Greg Fischer.

MS. GAFFEY:
Good afternoon, again. I'm Carrie Gaffey. And I oppose extending the red light camera contract, or whatever it is. I feel it's very dangerous. I live in Kevin McCaffrey's district and that's Great East Neck Road that has -- it feels like a million. I'm not really sure how many it has. And it's dangerous. I
avoid it if I can, but I really can't because I work locally. And what they were talking about where the sewer district being down at the end, we had so many big heavy trucks there, the sewer trucks are going down all the time. And, you know, you drive slow, you're trying to -- you know, you're trying not to blow red lights. I don't. I actually have not gotten a ticket there, you know. But I think it's very dangerous, I really do.

And I think that -- I think that humans are more important than these fines. I think that we really should look at what it's costing people in accidents, in injuries. And, you know, look at things that way. I really also do, I think we should definitely get rid of this whole red light camera thing. But I really liked what some others had to say about other traffic related fines. Why are we getting fined when we make errors? Why aren't we being mandated to take safety courses and make everything safe here for everybody. A fine hurts you financially, but a safety course makes you a better driver. And it's better for everybody. So that's it. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

04:58 PM

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Miss Gaffy. Okay, our next speaker is Greg Fischer followed by Maryanne Maltese.

04:58 PM

MR. FISCHER:
Hi, I'm Greg Fischer from Riverhead. And it's good to see everybody again. I think we have a very complex problem with this red light camera issue, which revolves around three main areas which is safety, justice and money. So from a safety perspective, and I'm wearing a yellow shirt to highlight one issue, which is I don't see how shortening yellow lights, which seems to be done at these red light camera intersections, I don't see how that increases safety at all. It seems to be clearly tied to the rear end collisions. And it also seems to have bleed over effect to other intersections that don't have red light cameras that is creating a behavior. And I agree with the gentleman from EAC, I agree with Mr. {Matori} that driving is a behavior. And if that behavior's being created at the red right camera intersection, certainly it's being repeated at other intersections.

04:59 PM

The second thing about safety is you really want safety if you want to achieve the goal that they say; they want to achieve a goal of reducing T-bone accidents at intersections, then you don't shorten yellows. You actually delay greens and prevent those other oncoming vehicles from coming into the intersection. So the reports have never dealt with that issue about delaying greens to create safety. It has never dealt with the issue of shortening yellow lights that creates danger. So those two issues are constantly ignored in all the reports and that becomes even worse during inclement periods where there's slick roads from rain or especially snow and ice.

05:00 PM

The second thing is we can never put in engineering anything, any stop lights, signals, nothing in an intersection or anywhere without engineering justification. Now, what has been clearly lacking making it illegal are signatures at these red light camera
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intersections for that equipment, for those devices. None of them, I know of, have been signed off on. And certainly what has not been justified is the issue of delayed green or shortened yellows. So we are -- we have knowing injury, we are causing injury knowingly to the people around the County both in those intersections and tertiary to other intersections as a result of negligence.

Now, money, I'm not going to really go into that too much. But I do have a 75-page document to leave with the Clerk that I wrote. And also the issue of justice. And I'm really excited to hear that Mr. Margiotta is going to come here because that is an illegal fake court. When you have Mr. Margiotta operating as both prosecutor and judge, that is a fake court. When you have the prosecutors serving the -- acting as court clerks, that's a fake court. When you have people being denied regularly access to counsel, and that's been overturned many times by the Appellate term, that is a fake court. And a lot of that is in this 75-page document. So we don't just commit injury at these intersections; we create repetitive injury and stress when we take them to the court. We have double jeopardy.

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

MR. FISCHER:
I'm glad to leave this document.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Please leave the document.

MR. FISCHER:
The issue is double jeopardy is shocking.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay.

MR. FISCHER:
One copy is bound for the Clerk. Another copy is not bound so it could be scanned easily or disseminated.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Leave it with the Clerk and she will hand it up.

MR. FISCHER:
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Mr. Fischer.

APPLAUSE

Okay, our next speaker is Maryanne Maltese followed by Maria Videl.
MS. MALTESE:
Good afternoon. It's been an interesting delivery of information here on your red light camera enforcement law. I'm coming with a background from the New York State Legislature as I was a Regional Director for over 17 years. I live in East Northport. I live in the Twelfth Assembly District. My district, where I live has been plagued with camera installation and all of you know the locations so I don't really think I need to go through them.

But my daughter was a victim of one of them at the intersection of Larkfield and Cedar Road. And if you travel along Larkfield, you'll notice that every major intersection there has a camera light. I'm not in favor of the cameras because I don't really believe that they bring enforcement. I do believe that they provide some sort of budgetary venue that's really not coming back to my district. I do believe that the monies that are being collected, I realize that it's public safety money. However, what more public safety can you get from the cameras that are installed than to try to take care of the potholes that are all along Larkfield that's horrendous. We're finally getting the Huntington section repaved. The Smithtown section was a year-and-a-half ago.

So I am asking you to consider not extending the existing ordinance that you have with the $250,000 because the present program is not working. There have been a lot of suggestions here. I don't want to, you know, re-advocate for them. But coming in as a regional planner with prior experience, obviously the program's not working. I'm happy to be of local resource and I do live here. And I appreciate your time. And thank you so much.

APPLAUSE

D.P.O. CALARCO:

MR. KOPPELMAN:
I had no intention of being here today. None. I was on my way home from work. My mother-in-law's Barbara Rose. First off, before I say that, I want to say hello to Mr. Trotta because I think you are doing a fabulous job and thank you so much for standing up.

APPLAUSE

I'm upset right now because of what I'm seeing. I see people that are talking and I see Legislators that are ignoring what they're -- what these people are saying. They're being disrespected up here at this podium. I'm sorry to say that but that's what's happening.

APPLAUSE

I retired as a radio broadcaster. I now drive a bus. I drive a bus from Manhattan to Montauk each and everyday doing the line runs. I see what happens out there. I see the car accidents. I see the red light camera problems. The problem is I don't see them on the East End. I see accidents but I see no red light
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cameras out there. And I have to question -- my one question is this: Is this legal? Is what's being done right now legal? When someone is not returning phone calls to a Legislator when questions are being asked when the County is spending $250,000 on a report and he's not getting phone calls returned? Possibly maybe this should be directed to Tim Sini. Maybe the District Attorney should investigate Xerox and the other companies that are involved to determine exactly what's going on.

Because you know what it is? The reason I sat here all this time is because now I found out something that I didn't know. My nine-year-old son Martin knows about an accident that I didn't know about with regards to a red light camera where people were injured. And you know when you can tell when this is going too long? I've known Stephen Ruth since he started doing this. And when he stood up today, he's become a very good speaker and he used to have problems getting up here. He used to have to carry a piece of paper to be able to talk to you people. But he has so much enthusiasm and so much in his heart. And you might dislike him. You might not think what he's doing -- and you might think that he's threatening everything with regards to what's going to happen, but you know what the problem is? Is that the people of Suffolk County are paying taxes and we're not getting answers to what's going on here.

That's all they're asking for. My question is this: Is this legal? Is what's being done legal? I hear all these different things about red light cameras and Xerox and they're not a legal law enforcement agency and it shouldn't be in the traffic court and it should be here and you should be able to face your accuser. You know what, let me tell you something. I do podcasting. I have a lot of listeners. I did radio here in Suffolk County. I have a lot of listeners all across Suffolk County and across -- and I stopped doing that.

But I'm going to tell you what: I'm going to address each one of you. I'm going to be calling each one of your offices and I'm going to ask you for an interview. And I want to talk to each one of you individually with regards to the red light camera situation. And I want you on record, on recorded record as to what you're telling your constituents in Suffolk County as to why you are supporting a program that could possibly be illegal. And if it is illegal, it needs to stop.

Let's forget about safety for a second. You could teach kids -- I teach my children not to vape. They vape. I teach my kids not to have pre-martial sex. They have sex. I teach my kids birth control. They do that anyway. You could talk until you're blue in the face, but people are getting killed and people are getting hurt. And this is -- I paid $850 in red light camera tickets last month or whatever it was, two months ago. My wife's a New York State Court Officer. Okay, and we did not want to have our cars booted. We were threatened with having our cars booted so we paid those. I'm guilty of it. On 111 on the Long Island Expressway, sometimes at three o'clock in morning when I'm going to work, I head for that yellow light. And as soon as I hit that yellow
light, it turns and I get a ticket. And I pay them. I pay them because that's my responsibility as a taxpayer. For you letting me talk. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you for coming in today. Okay. I have no other cards. I'm sure there are lots of people. Come on up. The Clerk will provide you with a card to fill out if you haven't. I don't have any more before me. You can hand your cards to Clerk. And just state your name for the record and go ahead, ma'am.

05:09PM

MS. GARCED:
My name Tara. And I'd like to ask each and everyone of you, do you have children? Do you? Good. Well, I do. And I had the luxury of meeting Mr. Trotta about two years ago. Because my daughter, following the rules of the road, was rear ended and forced into an intersection and damn near killed. And when that happened, she got a ticket for a red light camera. I had to go to court. And you know what I was told? If you're going to bring up your constitutional rights, the judge doesn't want to hear it. Go see your Legislator.

So with fire under my ass, I went to go see Mr. Trotta. And you know what he told me? "I agree with you." But where do you get off picking and choosing my constitutional rights? I have the right to face my accuser, but you took that away from the officers of the law. You gave it to a camera that has no judgement whatsoever. And then when I go to speak and I go to follow protocol, basically I'm told "go screw yourself," because I'm going to tell what you what's good in this court.

Well, now, I'm standing before you because I was here two, three years ago and the same thing was happening. Nobody did anything. There was a vote and we were outvoted. And you know what's funny? The last I was here, you guys voted before we even sat down. We sat here and waited for hours and the vote was already done and we were told "sorry, you lose again."

Well, I am a taxpayer. I own a beautiful home, but I'm done with the bullshit. My house is going up for sale and I'm leaving Long Island because I'm done. I'm done with your red light cameras. I'm done with my kid damn near getting killed. And you don't care. The judge is like, "sorry, go see your Legislator. I really don't want to deal with you."

So what do you have to say? Answer my question as to why you get to choose why my constitutional rights are not? Tell me. Tell me why I go into a court of law and when the constitution is presented, it doesn't qualify to me or my kid. So now I'm before you, aside from Mr. Trotta, answer me, why are you picking and choosing what is relevant and what is not? The floor is open. I'm waiting. Anybody? I'd love to hear from you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
We are asking questions of the audience and here to hear from comments from the public. Go ahead, Legislator Kennedy.
LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay, how do I make this a question?

MS. GARCED:
Any way you feel.

LEG. KENNEDY:
First I have to say I agree a hundred percent with you, what you're saying.

MS. GARCED:
I appreciate it.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Was it from a judge when you're saying you were denied the --

MS. GARCED:
It was clerk.

LEG. KENNEDY:
It was a clerk.

MS. GARCED:
He asked me to review the camera. And when I did, it was Stephen who said "Tara, pay attention to the yellow light." Well, it didn't even make a difference that it was the yellow light. She was approaching the yellow light. She attempted to stop because there was a red light camera there. The guy coming behind her didn't. He hit her and jammed her right into the intersection.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Into the intersection.

MS. GARCED:
Oncoming cars. That's my kid.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I agree with you. I agree with you.

MS. GARCED:
And you know what? For all of you who do -- that agree, I appreciate it. For those of you who don't, what are you going to say to me when my kid's dead or somebody else is dead? "I'm sorry"? You going to reincarnate? You're going to pull her back? Because you're voting yes, yes, yes. We all know it's BS. It's a money scam. It's for you to line your pockets. We already know, you make us look like we're a bunch of morons. You make these meetings at two o'clock in the afternoon knowing damn well that half the people can't show up because they can't leave their job. And then you have the audacity to say, Stephen, and I'll quote, if more of your people cared, they'd show up. Well, why don't you have it at Friday on a seven o'clock and I bet you they damn would. But what's going to happen is more people are frigging leaving.

I'm done. I put up with this shit time and time again. And as I come to the -- I go to the meetings. What happens? Nothing. Nothing happens. Your opinions don't change because the ones that
are justifying this, what's happening? You're justifying BS. Each
report tells you it's not working. But you're going to sit there
and justify it. Whatever you can pull out of your butt to make the
sheep -- roll your eyes one time, Miss Hahn, because you're the one
I'm referring to.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, ma'am, we appreciate you coming in today. I think you
answered Legislator Kennedy's question. So we appreciate your
time.

MS. GARCED:
I appreciate yours, too.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you very much.

MS. GARCED:
See ya.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Is there anybody else? Yep, I don't think I had a card from
you, Miss Tooker, so go ahead.

MS. TOOKER:
I might have put the wrong number or I was supposed to put two
numbers.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. Go ahead, Miss Tooker.

MS. TOOKER:
Okay. As we know this morning that I came in and gave a letter of
Demand of Intent. And I went over my time. And this Legislative
body had the Sheriffs remove me. That was more important than
listening to all these people speak about issues that we have.

But, Mr. Calarco, I really would appreciate an apology because you
-- the fact that you violated my first amendment this morning, you
made a comment and said that it was me speaking out of line. And
it was not me. So I just want that for the record. You said "Miss
Tooker, you are not speak." So can you apologize to me? It wasn't
me.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Miss Tooker, you made several comments during the public portion.

MS. TOOKER:
The time you called my name --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Miss Tooker, go ahead with your comments, please.

MS. TOOKER:
You called my name, it wasn't me. Let's use the cameras.
Maybe they'll work on that.
Stephen Ruth has been a one-man fight fighting this, begging and pleading to make, if you choose to have the cameras, safe and legal. We know across America that other states are getting rid of them. Are they really a safety issue if people are dying? Are we really concerned about safety? You want to know -- that you talk about educating? The permit -- our permit to get our driver's license has changed. And it asks questions about drinking and driving. It should talk about red light cameras, right on red. Does it talk about that? But I do know I asked an 18-year-old and he told me that drinking and driving is on the permit. If you want to educate the children, then, yes, maybe this money from the red light cameras should go to Drivers Ed in all the schools so the parents can afford it. Most importantly, safety, you have judges making decisions drinking and driving. Where are you concerned about safety with them? Especially Judge Rebolini, who just got arrested for drinking and driving.

I just want one thing, also; the gentleman that came up and talked about the Fire Department. If a fireman or somebody who's doing something for safety, definitely his red light ticket should be dismissed. Very important that anyone who is trying to protect us on any level, especially a fire, and he gets a red light camera, he should definitely get it dismissed. So thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Miss Tooker. Come on forward, sir.

MR. HUMMEL:
Hello, my name is Richard Hummel. And I live in East Patchogue. And I'm here to strongly oppose the Red Light Camera Program. Part of the reason that I'm here today is I managed to retire so I can actually find out about this meeting, which by the way, I only found out through Mr. Ruth, thank you. And I think the program -- everyone said it all here so many times. I keep hearing so many conflicting things coming from the proponents of the program. Everything from smoke about how to drive and teaching kids how drive better, what does that have to do with the Red Light Program?

We're here to talk about this program that is causing a huge increase in accidents, possibly injuring people long-term. And yet here we are listening to hours and hours of people talking about we donate time to teaching people about driving and all these things that seem so irrelevant.

I think it was Tom Muratore, you were the former police officer. Ninety nine point nine percent you wouldn't give a ticket for. And that's why 99.9% of the people who get tickets should be here. And I'm guilty of not being here all these years and I'm sorry. But you people need to get rid of this program. It's horrible. Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, sir. Okay. Anybody else? I got another one. Come on forward. The Clerk will give you a card. Please state your name
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for the record and then the Clerk will give you a card to fill out.

MR. ROSARIO:
Sure. Steven Rosario. And I'm from Rocky Point. And, wow, I've been to many public meetings. And the frustration and anger is pretty high here. And I can understand it is justifiable. And if I look around the room, I am probably the one person who's followed this issue and been involved in it the longest.

I go back to the '80s. I'll tell you a little story because this started with the death of an 18-month-old little girl who was in a stroller, who was crossing the street with her mom and someone ran a red light and killed her instantly. It made national news and it made it to City Hall where I happened to be working at the time for Mayor Ed Koch. Please don't shoot me. I was assigned by the Mayor to shepherd legislation through the Legislature for the first pilot program in New York City. It was the foundation for the 1993 law that allows red light cameras here in New York State.

I met this young mother. And she dedicated her life to her daughter so that it wouldn't happen to other families. We worked; we worked hard. And most people who have worked in Albany know that legislation can take years. We did this in two legislative sessions. She did a phenomenal job for her daughter. And I couldn't have done it without her.

But what I am so troubled with is the monster that this law has created. A good law that was meant to provide pedestrian and motorist safety has been corrupted. And you hear the frustration. We never envisioned this outcome in 1988. Money was never even in the equation. It was always safety pedestrian and motorists.

In the early years this was an effective law; in the beginning because there were few in number and at the most dangerous intersections. I believe that this is a tool that can be effective if used properly, but it's not being done now. And I do have some recommendations. You know, back in the '80s, we didn't name bills after people as we do today. This little girl, who would be a woman today, remains anonymous as she has been for 37 years. If we truly believe that safety over money is paramount, then, you will do the right thing in addressing these issues head on and addressing the anger that you hear today. If we do that, we can honestly say that the life of that little girl in that stroller was not in vain. Thank you.

APPLAUSE

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, sir. If you could hold a moment, Legislator Trotta has a question for you.

LEG. TROTTA:
I have a couple question for you, actually.

MR. ROSARIO:
Sure.
LEG. TROTTA:
You mentioned some recommendations. You know, I agree with everything you said. I mean, in a perfect world, this got out of control and it became about money. My question to you is recommended some recommendations. What would they be?

MR. ROSARIO:
Well, I think one of them, and this goes back to my comment about being effective. One is, I think it can be a good tool if it is very limited in numbers and put in and placed in intersections that are truly dangerous; not because some consultant said so. Because that consultant may have an interest in the contract. But based on transportation, hard core factual data; that it would serve a purpose at that intersection.

LEG. TROTTA:
Do you sense the frustration by the woman who spoke, I don't know if you were here earlier, where, you know, she was probably about a 60-year-old woman who never got in an accident, never gotten a ticket and then she got rear ended twice. Is that what you're talking about; things like that?

MR. ROSARIO:
I think that could be part of t. And, you know, again, certainly it should be based on hard data. Right now I see them all over the place. And I know there's one right in Rocky Point. In all the years that I've been there, I've never really seen a major accident there. I mean, there have been, but I'm not so sure that a red light camera would have prevented that accident.

LEG. TROTTA:
That's very interesting.

MR. ROSARIO:
That's anecdotal.

LEG. TROTTA:
Would you agree with me, because we had the Director of Traffic Safety come in sometime ago and he showed a bunch of videos of buses running and trucks running and accidents happening. And in my mind that was living proof that they don't work. Because they're doing it even with the cameras there. What's your feelings on it?

MR. ROSARIO:
Again, I'm not an expert in terms of whether or not a camera should be in one location versus another. But I think that there are factual criteria that can be used that would purposely put a camera at a dangerous intersection and that can be defended especially for the public so they could understand why it is there and not just for the money aspect.

LEG. TROTTA:
You understand the frustration of the Legislators who, you know, year after year have gotten these studies and we've seen that 34 of the locations, they vary from time to time; accidents with injuries
increase over a hundred percent and nothing is done. So how can you say it's about safety when you know of these ones in particular are causing more accidents with injuries and you do nothing. That's the problem.

MR. ROSARIO:
That's an issue that men and women of the County Legislature will have to deal with and grapple with. Thank you.

LEG. TROTTA:
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. So I have a question. So thank you for coming and speaking because the public hearing is when we're supposed to get information so we can make the decisions and appreciate your comments.

So you were -- you said the program changed over the years. Do you think that when the program started nobody was constantly on one of these (indicating) either holding it and being distracted by it, which I still see for some reason all the time on the road; or actually texting and, you know, with a head down looking at it. Do you think that's a factor in all the problems that we're having with, you know, traffic safety? And is it a factor in this program.

MR. ROSARIO:
I think it is, but I wouldn't just rely on IPhones. Back in 1988 I had a very old Volvo and it had one of those big old telephones in my car because I was traveling back and forth to Albany and I couldn't constantly stop at the throughway service stations. So yeah, I had this huge monster of a transmitter in my trunk. So I had a phone and there were many others who had phones. Obviously it is exponential today, but I think you have to factor that in.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
But you also see people, you know, fooling with the radio, eating, drinking, putting on makeup, shaving, the whole thing also. So that's -- I wonder is that -- do you think that's a factor in the program itself? I mean, obviously it's a factor in traffic safety

MR. ROSARIO:
I think it is a factor certainly in anything dealing with traffic safety whether it's this program, whether it's the use or non-use of safety belts, whether you're distracted not only the phone, look at the radio, how many people now have screens in their cars. I know I do. And it is very hard. I think it does go back to driver education. It's very easy to get a license here in New York and that's, again, way beyond my expertise. But I really believe that more driver education, even as we get older, now I've taken Driver Ed courses. I'm not proud.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you, sir.

MR. ROSARIO:
You're welcome.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, thank you for coming in.

MR. ROSARIO:
Thank you; it was a pleasure.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
I have a couple more people who haven't spoken yet, but there's no
-- if you spoke already, it's only one opportunity in the public
hearing. Come on forward, sir. Just please state your name for
the record and then the Clerk will give you a card after you're
done speaking.

MR. MONTELEONE:
Thank you. My name is Eugene Monteleone. And the only reason I'm
here is because of this person right here, Stephen Ruth. He's
influenced me and everybody else as far as I've known just by
expressing life and moving forward. The only reason I have life is
because it was given to me. Now what I ask you guys to do is
continue to give and stop taking from everybody in Suffolk County;
stop taking the money and actually move forward.

Now, when somebody gets a ticket, which ever one traffic -- yadda,
yadda, yadda, but this is traffic. So with these red light cameras
whenever anybody passes through a red light, they should know
exactly why they're not doing it and not exactly why you're taking
their money because they did it. It's not because the fact that
like we need the money so whoever goes through these red lights
are, you know, condoning and donating. That's not what this is.
You're taking; you're no longer giving. That's what these laws are
for. Thank you.

APPLAUSE

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, sir. Okay. Anybody else? Alex, do you want to come
up?

MR. STRAUSS:
Let him go first.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Sure, I got another gentleman in the back, whoever wants to -- Alex
like to defer. Go ahead, sir.

MR. GRINDLE:
Hello, everyone. Do I need to state my name?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yeah, please state your name for the record and they'll give you a
card after.

MR. GRINDLE:
Paul Grindle from Centereach. Hi. So I'm here today to speak about obviously the Red Light Camera Program but I'm not here to scream and I'm not here even to specifically speak to the republicans who are thankfully standing up against the program. There are some that are like Trotta who have been lions of the Legislature on this; there are some who are afraid that Stephen Ruth will beat them in the general election.

But I'm -- but I'm actually here to speak to the democrats. Because everyone in this room knows that the only way that this program goes down is if democrats choose to vote against the expansion of the -- the continuation of this Red Light Camera Program. And I believe that you should do this. You should vote this program down because it is a social justice issue that you have been ignoring for years.

APPLAUSE

You need to look at where the cameras are installed. They're not installed in the rich white neighborhood in this County. They're installed in the poor neighborhoods, in the neighborhoods that have higher populations of African Americans and Latinos. That's just the reality. The fact that they're not installed in the rich neighborhoods is because those people are donors and they would complain. And everyone knows this and it's okay, we get it, politics is awful and it's terrible and you're in a tough position. We all get that.

But you've heard people bitch at you for hours now about the fact that everyone hates these cameras. And you know that if this meeting wasn't at two o'clock when working families are unable to attend these meetings, you would have more people here and they would be telling you the same thing. Look, you guys got elected on the idea that you were supposed to be progressive champions. Please be those progressive champions that you said that you were.

APPLAUSE

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

MR. GRINDLE: (cont'd)
Somebody also brought up a good point earlier about the fact that -- I believe it was actually Hector. And Hector and I have gone back and forth on many things, I'm sure he knows that I don't see eye-to-eye with him on many things. But he brought up a good point, that when somebody gets rear-ended, the fact that it's not a fatality does not mean that it's insignificant or that it can be shrugged off like other people have tried to suggest. There are people who, from these rear-end accidents, will experience severe pain. But there are also, when you look at the intersection reality of where these cameras are installed, people who get in these accidents will be at risk of their insurance costs.
increasing, and who are the people who's insurance costs will increase? They're the poor, working families of color who are affected by these mother fucking cameras. So will you please --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Please, sir.

MR. GRINDLE:

-- please move the cameras.

Applause

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Okay. Alex, come on up.

MR. STRAUSS:

Good evening. Alex Strauss, 184 Radio Avenue, Miller Place, New York. This morning we had a fine gentleman gets up here, a pastor, and he had a suggestion, which didn't make any sense to me but maybe it made sense to you, that you should knock off the cameras from eight o'clock to 11 so the people won't be late for work. So that makes a lot of sense to me, because this way here they can beat the yellows, beat the reds and get to work on time. Of course they might kill a couple of people in between, but, you know, what's the big deal?

I heard people say about the yellow lights. The only person that gets up that knows about the yellow lights is myself, because Stephen Ruth is not an electrician. The person that he had come up here as an electrician never installed one of the damn lights period. All right? They don't touch the yellow lights. They don't install -- when they install the red light cameras, they don't touch the timing. The timing on yellow lights, the minimum timing is three seconds, it gets expanded further than that by how many lanes are in the intersection. So that's another fallacy. People that don't know what the heck they're talking about pull this crap out of the air; Oh, they cut down the yellow lights, that's why we have accidents. People have to learn that when you're driving and a car in front of you has ten -- has -- I'm sorry, I'm a little confused now. Okay.

MR. RUTH:

You think? Tell that to the two kids that died up the block from you.

MR. STRAUSS:

Oh, that's a felon, by the way. That's a felon, the one that everybody is following. He was convicted of ripping down the red light cameras. He's a felon.

Applause

(*Comments shouted out by unknown audience members*)

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Hey! No comments from the audience.
MR. RUTH:
(inaudible).

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Mr. Ruth.

MR. STRAUSS:
Unbelievable.

MR. RUTH:
Two kids got killed up the block from your house. What do you have
to say about that?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
All right, if the Sheriff would please remove Mr. Ruth. I've asked
everal times for people to be respectful and he is continuing.

(*Mr. Ruth was removed from the auditorium*)

05:35PM

MR. STRAUSS:
You should have a car length for every ten miles an hour you're
going; so if you're going 50 miles an hour, there should be five
cars between you and the car in front of you. And that's what
would happen, if you do that you won't have rear-end collisions.

And as far as stopping at a yellow light, what the hell are you
doing that for? That really causes an accident. Because the
person behind you sees a yellow light and he doesn't expect to be
stopping. You don't even have to bother, nobody going there
(laughter). All right, any questions?

05:36PM

And also, by the way, all of my fine Republican people that are on
the board, I don't consider you people being wrong or being dumb or
corrupt. I just think we have a difference of opinion, and that's
the way it should be, all of you. I know there's nobody that's
stupid here. Thank you. Have a great day.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Thank you, Alex.

05:37PM

Okay, I have no other cards, and I don't think I have any other
speakers.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
There's someone, one more guy.

MR. FLORES:
Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Mauricio Flores,
for the record, from Brentwood. I'll try to keep it short; I don't
want to keep preaching to the choir about why I disagree with the
red light cameras.

05:37PM

First of all, we can't face our accuser. You use a camera, but if
you go to a traffic court for -- to fight those tickets, you know,
we don't get to cross-examine anywhere from Xerox. You know, the
most they might say, Hey, the camera was working and just some
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random signature, no stamp, nothing.

Just another thing. You know, just because the law is the law, you know, we have to do our best to obey the laws that we believe are just and are for public interest or public safety. But if a law is unjust, you know, we might have to disobey, you know. A little civil disobedience here, there, and we've got to take risk. You know, we might risk getting our license suspended, vehicle registration suspended or a renewal denied because, you know, we chose to keep fighting the red light camera tickets. And that is why I believe that just -- I'm also an Uber driver as well, you know, just driving along Long Island I notice, hey, all the red light cameras are in the poor, working class neighborhoods. And I am, you know, doing my best to tell people, Hey, you know, don't just give up that easily. Yeah, I understand, you know, I've got to take off work but, you know, letting everyone know, Hey, you want to do a little civil disobedience. And my previous County Legislature kept ignoring me when I tried to get information about why she supported the Red Light Camera Program and now she's in Albany now, but that's a whole nother story. That's why I -- you know, the gentleman that want to interview every Legislator, I would like that -- I would be interested in seeing that about why you voted yes and why you voted no for those that actually support our rights. Other than that, that's all I have. And if you are going to vote yes, please go on the record and tell us why you voted yes against this illegal, unconstitutional program. Thank you. Have a good day.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Thank you, sir.

Okay, I think at this point the whole room has had a say. Anybody else? No? Okay. So with that, I'll make a motion to close.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Second by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to recess.

LEG. FLOTTERON:

Second.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion to recess by Legislator Cilmi. Second by Legislator Flotteron. Anybody on the issues? The recessing motion goes first. All those in favor? Opposed?

MR. RICHBERG:

Seven.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I think they got everybody. Okay. Recessing motion fails.
Motion to close --

LEG. TROTTA:
Wait, we had more than seven I think, didn't we?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Did you need a roll call? Okay, roll call.

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

LEG. CILMI:
Yes to recess.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Yes to recess.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No to recess.

LEG. FLEMING:
No.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
No.

LEG. ANKER:
No.

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes to give the public more input.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:
No.

LEG. DONNELLY:
No.
LEG. SPENCER: No.

D.P.O. CALARCO: No.

P.O. GREGORY: No.

MR. RICHBERG: Seven.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Okay, recess fails.

Motion to close goes next. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. CILMI: Opposed.

(*Legislators Sunderman, Muratore, Flotteron, Kennedy, Trotta & McCaffrey raised their hand in opposition*)

MR. RICHBERG: Eleven.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Okay, it is closed.

(Public Hearing on) IR 1671(-19) - Adopting Local Law No. -2019, A Local Law to require Installation of Advanced Wastewater Treatment Systems at auctioned parcels (Hahn). I do have one card, John Turner. I don't know if John's still here. It looks like he has left. I do not have any other cards on this public hearing. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to address us at this time? Seeing none -- oh, go ahead. On 1671?

MS. TUCKER: No, 1672.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Okay, we've got a few more left to go and then we have to actually, go back to Public Portion. Legislator Hahn, what's your preference?

LEG. HAHN: Motion to close.

LEG. CILMI: Second.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Motion to close by Legislator Hahn.

LEG. CILMI: Second.
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D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second by Legislator Cilmi. Anybody on the issue? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Opposed.

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Opposed: Legislator Sunderman).

D.P.O. CALARCO:
It's closed.


MS. TOOKER:
Hello. I hope that you all got my letter of demand and intent. I am definitely for this Resolution, 1672, for request for an Inspector General. Thank you, Legislator Trotta, for introducing this to us. This is so needed. Although it is too late and irreparable harm has been done, it is -- we still need it no matter what. But my recommendation is that we need to -- if we table this now until the people help, that you get a panel of people that whoever you choose, I don't know how it works that you're going to get, how the person's going to be interviewed, how this person would be picked, but I really think the public has to be involved on who would be the next Inspector General if we have one in Suffolk County. Especially when we have our Presiding Officer, DuWayne Gregory, and I want to thank him for finally admitting that the Suffolk Crime Family is a criminal enterprise. I have called them the Suffolk Crime Family and you publicly compared them to the Sopranos, so thank you. And I am 100% Italian and I do not find it discriminating at all. I am grateful for you finally admitting to it. But by publicly coming out now admitting that you've been hiding it, I believe that you've committed a theft of service and I want and I'm asking for your resignation.

And Mr. Calarco, when you called me out and accused me falsely in the public of speaking out when I didn't, you put a false claim against me and I asked you to apologize and you chose not to. At that moment in time it was not me and you called my name. So if again, we're going to have an Inspector General, we definitely want to be part of who you're picking. And thank you again, Mr. Trotta, for recommending this, it's very needed.

LEG. TROTTA:
Thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, thank you, Ms. Tooker. I have no other cards for that -- oh, go ahead, Mr. Gavilla.
MR. GAVILLA:
Thank you very much. And thank you, Mr. Trotta, for proposing this resolution. Obviously one thing that I noticed today is that most of you in this room are ignoring what everybody is saying. We're being abused by the system and we need an independent Inspector General to look out for us and to stop this abuse by government.

You know, for example, we need somebody who can inspect the Red Light Camera Program and try to understand why it's not being stopped, because it is a criminal enterprise.

What's going on over there at the Traffic Courts is a rogue system. They're running on their own. They're doing things and threatening people with things that this body isn't even approving. And what the heck is going on over there? There are things happening that you don't even know about, you're not even authorizing as a body, and that's anarchy. It could also help with things, for example, like the Burke investigation. We could also try to understand what's going on with the nepotism issue that's, you know -- and there's major corruption in this government.

And then I know that there are issues that instead of coming to this Legislative body, it goes to the Waiver Committee and totally bypasses the process. This is really -- I mean, I'm not using the word lightly. We have a very corrupt government and you're all a part of it. And so thank you, Mr. Trotta, for proposing this and I hope that it happens. Thank you very much.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay, thank you, Mr. Gavilla. Okay, is there anybody else who would like to address us at this time on this issue? Seeing none, Legislator Trotta?

LEG. TROTTA:
Motion to recess.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Motion to recess by Legislator Trotta. Second by Legislator Kennedy. Anybody on the issue? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:
Eighteen.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
It is recessed.

/Public Hearing on) IR 1673-19 - Adopting Local Law No. -2019, A Charter Law to ensure accountability to the Suffolk County Operating Budget (Flotteron). I do not have any cards on this issue. Is there anybody in the audience who would like to address us at this time? Seeing none, Legislator Flotteron, what's your preference?

LEG. FLOTTERON:
I'd like to recess to next meeting.
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Motion to recess by Legislator Flotteron. Second by Legislator Cilmi. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:
Eighteen.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. I would like to make a motion to set the date for the following Public Hearings to September 4th, 2019, at 2 PM at the Rose Caracappa Auditorium in Hauppauge;

IR 1621, Considering increasing the maximum amount to be expended for improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 7; 1626, Considering increasing the maximum amount to be expended for improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 1, Port Jefferson; 1627, Considering increasing the maximum amount to be expended for improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 23, Coventry Manor; 1733, a Local Law amending Chapter 189 of the Suffolk County Code in accordance with General Municipal Law § 103 to exercise the option to authorize the award of purchase and service contracts on the basis of best value.

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

MS. ELLIS:
Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Krupski).

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Okay. With that, I'm going to hand it back to the Presiding Officer.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, thank you, Deputy Presiding Officer. Okay, so after the Public Hearing, now we go back to the Public Portion (Cont'd) because we did have cards that we didn't get to this morning; we'll see who is here. Patricia Farino, are you here? No. Anita Blue? Joshua Barker-Ortiz? Trey Ward? Lavonne Angle? Rebecca Carbone, I guess? Basile Walters? Lee Snead? I see you, Lee, okay.

MR. SNEAD:
Good afternoon, Members of the Legislature. My name is Lee Snead, I represent Pal-O-Mine Equestrian, and in front of you today is one of the applications that Pal-O-Mine put in for inclusion into Agricultural District No. 3. We've gone about this discussion a number of times and I just would like to address a couple of the issues raised by the Village attorney this morning.

With regard to the property at question, there's three structures on it. We are not adding any structures, we are not taking any structures away. We're not changing the view of the site. There's absolutely no construction happening on the site other than some interior renovation of the buildings to clean them up, none of
which requires a permit. We are using those buildings, intend to use those buildings in exactly the same fashion that we are using buildings on our other properties. Those other properties have already been identified as being in the Agricultural District, voted on by this body. And the uses that are being made there have been identified as agricultural uses by the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets. So what we're planning to do is fully consistent with agriculture.

There has been an issue raised by the Village that we started using the property without having gotten a permit from them. Indeed, as I spoke with Legislator Cilmi and as we raised in the last Public Hearing, we did, in fact, use one of the buildings in -- on this property for meetings of two different kinds of classes in the sense that number of veterans who were coming in to have a dissension about their traumas was required in a building where no other people could be around, so this happened one time a week for a period of about a month and a half. Similarly, another visit by youth who were sent to us by the New York -- by the Supreme Court came in there so they could learn how to cook, one time a week for about a month and a half.

When the issue was raised we talked -- I talked to my client and they voluntarily discontinued this. [Andus Ann] let me know, and I let Legislator Cilmi know, that we will make whatever applications the Village thinks are required; even though we don't believe that there are any required, we will make them. Two days -- three days after I spoke with Legislator Cilmi, I went down to the Village of Islandia, obtained applications for building permits and zoning applications and asked for a copy of the file for this property so that I could make a complete application. I received the permit application but was told I had to weight and make a FOIL request for all the documents relating to what the uses were that were on this property. I made a FOIL request two days later. I received a note back from the Village saying they could not respond to that FOIL request until June 26th of this month -- excuse me, July 26th.

(Timer Sounded)

We have tried to work with the Village as best we can. We intend to work with the Village the best we can. But I need you to know that none of the approvals that the Village is talking about are anything that we're not going to have an opportunity to get, because we will be doing exactly what was done on this property before, using the buildings as residences and as make-shift rooms for people to meet. This property used to be a child care center, so it has already had special permits from the Village --

P.O. GREGORY:
I'm sorry.

MR. SNEAD:
-- intended to be used in this fashion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Mr. Snead, I got distracted, so your time has expired.
MR. SNEAD:
Finally I just want to leave one point. The issue of SEQRA has been raised. The Department of Agriculture and Markets has already sent a letter to the County --

P.O. GREGORY:
Mr. Snead, please wrap up.

MR. SNEAD:
-- indicating that it's your responsibility for this.

P.O. GREGORY:
Mr. Snead, I've already been accused of allowing you more time than the village officials, which I don't think is accurate.

MR. SNEAD:
Fine.

P.O. GREGORY:
But we will be --

MR. SNEAD:
It's been a pleasure --

P.O. GREGORY:
We will be, as Mr. Prokop mentioned -- he's not allowed to abut now, but when we discuss the bill, if you guys are here and if it's appropriate, there's a question that either one of you can address, you certainly can be invited to respond to that.

MR. SNEAD:
And I'll be happy to be here.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay? All right.

MR. SNEAD:
It's a pleasure to appear. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. Rob, I see you waiting, Rob Carpenter.

MR. CARPENTER:
Thank you for the ability to speak. My name is Rob Carpenter, Director of Long Island Farm Bureau. I'm here today to speak upon the application for the Ag Districts, and we are in support of including all properties that have been submitted as part of the resolution into the Ag District Program.

I would just like to point out that Ag & Markets Law specifically names the County Legislature as the lead for each Ag District Program throughout the State of New York. And it's in there that you are the ones that make the decision for inclusion of properties, and by that you also have the ability to be lead agency through the SEQRA Program.

* Index Included at End of Transcript
The Village of Islandia has had the opportunity to address at each and every step in the process, from the Ag Protection Board when this first started through CEQ through the Public Hearing, the ability to weigh in on each and every time. So I think that they've been well heard by you, as has the Pal-O-Mine and the Farm Bureau for all of the parcels.

I would like to reiterate that the Ag District Law only weighs in on local ordinances that are unreasonably restrictive, and each and every farm operation must follow existing Town Code as it's written and there are no exceptions. So in the case of a village being overly restrictive, that's when Ag & Markets has the ability to look at it and weigh in, if possible.

And furthermore, I am concerned about any village or any local municipality making determinations about what is agriculture and what is not and making rulings on uses and determining practices. That's why we have Ag & Markets Law Section 301, and that is generally the accepted guideline for agriculture to follow when it comes to agricultural practices.

So in closing, I would really appreciate if you could include all of the parcels that have been put forward. This is the last opportunity, to vote is today, and it's important that this vote happen today and that the bill passes because of the 120-day time limit from the end of the open enrollment period till the closure which is also an Ag & Markets code.

I appreciate all of your continued support for the farming community on Long Island and, as always, you know where to find me if you have any questions. Once again, thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, thank you.


DR. CHINEA:
Good evening. Thank you for all your patience and hearing all of us. But I am a physician with Hudson River HealthCare, and first I want to say thank you for all the time and energy and effort you've taken to look through all of the information that we have asked you to look at and what we've accomplished with our health centers.

The main point that I want to make is that years ago when we first started talking here the Opioid crisis was really at a peak in Suffolk County and it still is. And I do want you to know that since we have been with all the health centers, we have opened up multiple sites to distribute and give patients and help them with the Opioid crisis. We have medication assistance treatment programs, we give out Naloxone kits, we have gone to the residency programs and taught residents about the Opioid crisis and how to treat it and we still get calls on a regular basis for patients who want to come for treatment along with grants, we have received at least three, maybe four grants across Suffolk County in order to
help patients.

So I do want you to know that your efforts are being placed in the
County for the patients that really need it, especially for the
crisis that has hit New York State but even more Suffolk County.
That's all.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Doctor. Thank you for being here and thank you for speaking.

That's the last card that I have. Is there anyone that has not
already spoken this morning? I believe you spoke this morning,
ma'am. This morning, like --

MS. HOPE-SALVITO:
No, I just came in.

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, okay. At this point it's all one big blur, so --

(*Laughter*)

I don't drink coffee, so I'm like getting very tired. So you have
three minutes, again, ma'am,

MS. HOPE-SALVITO:
My name is Jeannette Hope-Salvito and I am -- I have a couple of
points that I want to make in terms of something that hasn't been
addressed, and I notice it more than a lot of other people, I
think, because I'm involved in animal rescue.

I think something should be done about the constant igniting of
fireworks long past the holiday season. I probably am one of the
few people that says this, but if you go on-line and you even look
at Facebook you'll see countless people writing about this. And
the charges are no longer ash cans, M-80's and cherry bombs as they
were when I was a kid. As an animal rescuer they positively freak
out most animals regardless of the techniques that you use to try
to calm them, and with so many people with PTSD on this Island, I
think it is time that this modern artillery stopped unless employed
by skilled practitioners. I just think it's something -- I mean, I
knew the Grucci's years ago, and even one of their own family was
killed in an accident. So, I mean -- and these are people who knew
what the heck they were doing. So now you've got people all the
time just having them go off and and off and off and after
a while I just thought I'd bring it to your attention, maybe there
is something that the Legislature can do to minimize it. It's
supposed to be illegal, at least it was (laughter) when I was
-growing up, but somehow it's everywhere and you hear it constantly.
Literally the houses shake from some of it, that's how bad it is,
and I just thought I'd bring it to your attention. Thank you very
much for listening.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Ms. Salvito. All right, would anyone else like to speak
that has not already spoken? Okay, I make a motion to close the Public Portion.

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

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

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislators Spencer & Hahn).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, at this time I'm going to recognize Legislator Sunderman for a point of personal privilege

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Thank you, Presiding Officer. By now most of you have seen the news media, but I just want to set the record straight. You've all seen my hard work, dedication and passion to the community as well to the Legislature. These allegations are so untrue and nothing but a political attack on my career. I will continue to serve my community, both as a Legislator and a Fire Chief, 24/7/365 because I believe -- and when I started as a public servant in 1987 is what I will continue to do.

I am demanding an immediate, speedy trial to fully clear my name. I am innocent of all these charges and I am fighting vigorously. I'm going to do what the people have elected me to do, fight every day for the people of the 3rd Legislative District. As you could see, that's why I was here immediately following, to do the work of the people of the 3rd Legislative District. Thank you for your time.

Applause

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Next, I make a motion to approve the Consent Calendar.

LEG. CILMI:
Second.

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

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

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. We have some folks from Hudson River, I promised them I'd try to get them out of early because some of them have to take a several hours trip back to their home districts.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
We saved you from driving in rush hour.
P.O. GREGORY:
Yes, we saved you from driving through rush hour, that's it.
So I'm going to -- if you look in the red folder, CN IR 1735.
I'm going to make a motion to take IR 1735 out of order.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Second.

06:03PM
P.O. GREGORY:
Second -- who was that? Second by Legislator Donnelly. All in
favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
I make a motion to approve IR 1735(-19) - Requesting Legislative
ratification of a contract with Hudson River Healthcare, Inc.
(HRHCare) for the operation of health centers in Suffolk County
(County Executive).

06:03PM
LEG. DONNELLY:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Donnelly. And discussion; who wants to start?
Legislator Kennedy.

Well, maybe we should have -- who from the Administration would
just like to give a brief, I guess -- or maybe Mr. Sinkoff, just a
kind of overview of the contract so we can just kind of lay the
foundation.

MS. KEYES:
I can kind of go through what I went through at the Health
Committee and then turn it over to Jim, if that works?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MS. KEYES:
Okay. So what you have before you is a five-year contract to
extend the relationship with Hudson River HealthCare for the
operation of the health centers in the County. We're proud at how
the relationship has worked out thus far for taxpayers and for the
patients of Hudson River HealthCare. We have saved the County
$62 million since 2012 since beginning the transition to Hudson
River HealthCare. We've seen a 25% increase in the volume of
patients seen during that same time period, and we project out
through this new contract, through this five-year contract to save
an additional $93 million for County taxpayers.

06:04PM
This -- the five-year contract before you represents a $12 million
subsidy per year for five years. And again, that represents a
dramatic increase in patients seen, a dramatic increase in the
services that are available to patients. We have Dr. Tomarken here and Health Department staff who can speak to some of the expansions in services including dental services, other things. But that's sort of really the big picture and I think Mr. Sinkoff could kind of take it from there.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, thank you. Mr. Sinkoff, you want to add anything or you just want to make yourself available for any questions?

MR. SINKOFF:
No, probably just take any questions as they come.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, sure. Legislator Kennedy; and then I have Legislator Trotta was it?

LEG. KENNEDY:
This is just a statement to the administration of HRH. On Saturday I received a phone call from a constituent extremely, extremely upset that on your HRH website you put something up which was -- I read it and it was not worded poorly, but it was purely political in nature, and then it was picked up by Suffolk County Health Department and put up on their Facebook. I support you in your medical care, I can't support you in your politics. And what I'm going to ask is while you operate in Suffolk County, please refrain from putting up political statements; is that possible?

MR. SINKOFF:
Honestly, I unfortunately have no idea what was put up.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I don't want to entertain the argument so I'm not bringing it up, but take a peek.

MR. SINKOFF:
But I will follow-up rather immediately.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay, thank you.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
You know, I'll say what it was, it was something to do with how to avoid ICE, some type of -- honestly, I just read it quickly, but Legislator Kennedy went over it with me. I don't have any questions for you, I just -- I'm all for health care for the County, I'm all for this, but I don't -- it's very troubling to me that in 2012 you had $69 million of revenue, you know, before you got involved, this was $4 million in profit, and last year you had $232 million of revenue and $22 million in profit. You currently have $171 million on hand and we're subsidizing you. I just don't think that the taxpayers of this County are getting the best deal for their money here. And I don't mind people making money, I
don't mind not-for-profits, you know, surviving and doing the right thing, but I don't think it should be on the taxpayers' back.

I mean, this gentleman makes quite a bit of money, I'm sure he works very hard, the CEO works very hard, but I think that this County is in such deep financial distress, we should be cutting a better deal than this. Because I can't -- you know, I thought this was over, we weren't going to be subsidizing any more and here we go with more and more and more and we're buying buildings and giving them away. I just can't support that, so I will not be voting for this.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. So this proposed contract will guarantee that the existing health clinics stay open for the term of the contract?

MR. SINKOFF:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And does it -- will any services rendered to the customers there, the patients change during that period?

MR. SINKOFF:
They won't change in the -- in terms of a diminishment in services. They will hopefully expand in the complement of services, most specifically we're hoping to implement more robustly a telemedicine program that has already begun in Southampton and some of our remote --

MS. MAHONEY:
Please speak into the microphone.

MR. SINKOFF:
More remote health centers; sorry about that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And who makes those decisions to make those changes?

MR. SINKOFF:
It's done by administration and chief medical consultations, so Dr. Chinea has been the leader on promoting telemedicine.

DR. CHINEA:
(Inaudible).

MR. SINKOFF:
Carmen is urging me to remind everybody of urgent care, so we'll have urgent care in many of our sites as well.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Donnelly.

LEG. DONNELLY:
I'm good.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Kennedy.

06:09PM
LEG. KENNEDY:
All right, just another question on telemedicine; not to you, to the Doctor, if that's okay. As a nurse for a lot of years, I have some concern with telemedicine. There are basic parts of medicine, as you know, that are observed and through a television screen, depending on your color of your equipment and the clarity, there are things that you can easily miss. How do you deal with that?

DR. CHINEA:
So telemedicine is now a part of medicine across the country and the world where the prediction is by 2024, 30% of all medicine will be practiced by telemedicine. And so there is special equipment, it's not a regular television, we have stethoscopes, we have autolaryngoscopes, we have retina -- retinoscopy exams, and even down the throat where we can examine patients and hear everything actually even better and see it better; because, for example, we have dermatology scopes that actually make it much larger on the screen so you can see it much clearly.

Right now we do restrict our telemedicine program to diagnoses that do not need any hands-on examination like an abdominal exam.

06:10PM
LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay.

06:11PM
DR. CHINEA:
But we have spread it out across the County for both our Opioid Crisis Program, and so it's being practiced across the County for patients that can't travel from one end of the County to the other to receive care, and also for our HIV patients. And so we've started a pilot for primary care also in Greenport so that patients from across the County, again, that need to be seen can come in for something as simple as a medication prescription refill where they don't need an exam but they can't get an appointment and a quick telemedicine appointment can get them their refills, their oral contraceptives, many, many things.

06:11PM
LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay, that's fine. But how about something like a diaphoresis or a mild jaundice or --

06:11PM
DR. CHINEA:
We will see the patient, we will definitely --

06:11PM
LEG. KENNEDY:
Yeah.
DR. CHINEA:
That's the other reason why urgent care is spreading, so we have urgent care at two sites now, we're going to spread it to two more. So again, earlier hours, later hours, Saturday hours all day so patients can come in without an appointment at any time spread out throughout our sites.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Good afternoon. Thank you for being here this afternoon to answer the questions. My question would be in regards to the Affordable Care Act. Since you've seen the dismantling of the Affordable Care Act, have you seen a dramatic increase in the number of patients coming into your facilities?

MR. SINKOFF:
Yeah. So over the last seven years we've seen -- when we started there were about 50,000 unduplicated patients, today we're seeing almost 80,000 unduplicated patients across the system. It's not uniform, but because of the Affordable Care Act we've seen a reduction in the uninsured rates, generally, so that's been a net/net positive.

You might also know that beyond the Affordable Care Act, New York State actually went off the Federal system and was already a State that provided a higher rate of eligibility. So New York State, unlike other states, had either expanded Medicaid or adopted the ACA on the F-Map Program and the Fairer Share Program. New York State saw an increase in eligible patients for the exchange programs, the commercial programs. So we're seeing more patients using commercial -- the commercial products in the ACA versus expanded Medicaid.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Do you anticipate that those trends can continue as those programs wind down, or does it become less affordable for people to participate in?

MR. SINKOFF:
I don't anticipate that happening. I think that regardless of what happens Federally, New York State will stand in the vanguard of this work. I think New York State firmly believes in health coverage as a key motivator to reduce barriers to care and wants to make sure that access is there. I think it will be interesting to see what happens in the Federal Courts and how that might have some implication across the country, but I think New York State is very much going to stand in promoting open access as much as it can afford to do so.
LEG. LINDSAY:
Sure. And I think that last phrase is the key, can afford to do. And my concern is that as more and more people fall off of insurance roles and become uninsured, the needs are going to be greater for facilities like yours. And, you know, are we going -- where are we going to be in three years? Are you going to be back in front of us again saying that, you know, we're going to need even greater subsidies because of the amount of demand that's out there in the marketplace.

06:14PM

MR. SINKOFF:
Yeah, I don't see the trend moving in that way. I mean, here we are, you know, things of course can change in five years. What the labor market is showing, certainly in New York, is that the number of individuals on the Medicaid roles is dropping. So we're seeing a shift, to some degree, between Medicaid and commercial insurance, not Medicaid to uninsured. A robust economy is net/net good for just about every sector, whether it's health care or, you know, for consumers and so on and so forth.

06:15PM

So, you know, I don't see the trend lines going in the way that you might be seeing them going. I think we're -- I think we are in for stability over health insurance coverage over the long run.

06:16PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
I hope that you're correct, because that stability is desperately needed within the marketplace.

Just shifting gears a little bit, what about just the cost of delivering health care. Do you see any plateau in how these costs continue to spike year-after-year with really no end in sight, from what we can see.

06:15PM

MR. SINKOFF:
So our medical inflation is 1.4%. That's well below short-term inflation rates, it's well below money market rates, and it's certainly -- you know, it's about similar to 10-year Treasury rates. So our medical inflation is about 1.4%, that's pretty -- pretty modest given the industry and how it's one of the largest employers, you know, in New York State, in the country.

06:16PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
What do you attribute that to? How are you able to keep those rates lower?

06:16PM

MR. SINKOFF:
We attribute it to two things. One, it's a Federal imposition and it's codified in statute that what our rate of inflation can be, so that creates an external pressure on us to keep our rates, internal increases in check against the Federal mandate, that we get in our rate structure. I also think that what is happening, although much slower than anticipated, was the reduction in ED utilization and a reduction in unnecessary hospitalizations. We certainly have seen through our Care Management Program, in transitions of care, in embedded care managers in the hospitals, we are definitely seeing a reduction in ED utilization and unnecessary hospitalizations. The
Urgent Care Program is another access point to help continue to reduce the cost that's associated with hospitals.

I think the other piece that is macro that's going to make a big change, whether or not the hospital industry will fight this, is transparent pricing. So right now we know that the President has put out an Executive Order to require all pricing be transparent for all consumers in all hospitals. The hospital industry is fighting it currently, but I think that people will see that going to the emergency room is going to cost them 800, 900, a thousand dollars, I think they're going to start choosing alternative sites of care when they start seeing this transparency.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Thank you, I appreciate it. Do you have something else you wanted to add?

DR. CHINEA:
I just wanted to add that the cost of care in primary care is very low as compared to specialty care, which procedures and specialty care is really what drives up the cost of medical care in our country. And so because we are all primary out-patient care, that cost isn't something that is focused on us and on our care.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Thank you very much.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
I'm good, thanks.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Oh, Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Thank you. Hi. How are you?

MR. SINKOFF:
Good. How are you?

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Good. I just have a question; how is -- how do you charge for your services? If somebody comes in, how do you determine ability to pay, etcetera?

MR. SINKOFF:
Sure. So every patient, whether they are insured or not insured, goes through an assessment process to assess their income and their ability to pay. So we ask for tax returns, we ask for pay stubs, and then we assess their income relative to the Federal poverty guidelines, and their family size. Depending on those criteria, either they are going to pay full charge, and a charge for an office visit is between 160 and $185 depending on the type of visit, if it's comprehensive or it's brief. If they are eligible
for a sliding fee discount, and let's they're the poorest of the poor, we will slide it all the way down to a nominal fee which is $15.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
What if someone doesn't have the ability to produce income tax returns?

MR. SINKOFF:
So we're a 501(c) corporation, and as a 501(c) non-profit corporation, after we finish out any accounting year, we must fill out a 990, and that 990 then is the equivalent corporate tax return for a non-profit organization.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
No, what I mean is say someone comes to you -- I understand all that.

MR. SINKOFF:
Sorry.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
My question is if someone comes to you and says I need medical care, I don't have tax returns, do you know what I'm -- if someone comes in --

MR. SINKOFF:
Sorry, I misunderstood.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay.

MR. SINKOFF:
Yeah, so if somebody comes in and indicates that they don't have at the time of visit the requisite paperwork for us to assess what their sliding fee is, we will take a self-attestation and we give them essentially a 24-hour grace period; for the next visit that they come in, they must bring the proof of income in. So for that visit we will allow them to self-assess, so they will say I make $300 a week, I'm just making it up, they will self-declare. We will accept that self-declaration for that visit, we will then ask for proof of income for the next visit; if they don't have proof of income for the next visit, they will be charged the full amount of the visit.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay.

MR. SINKOFF:
So they -- so we're not -- so again, remember our core mission is to see everyone regardless of ability to pay, so we're not, at the point of access, going to let the fact that they didn't bring their tax return in --
LEG. McCAFFREY:
Right. I'm not asking you -- say someone -- and I don't care how
much time you give them, and I'm trying to dance around this. An
undocumented immigrant and they come in, there's no way that they
can produce -- and we are providing health care for those
individuals; what do we charge them? How do they say -- do you go
by the words, well, I work off the books, I make $400 a week, or
whatever; how do we do that? I'm just asking a question. I'm not
saying --

MR. SINKOFF:
No, I got it.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
-- that we shouldn't be providing that coverage, I want to make
that clear. But how do you assess somebody that obviously would
not be able to have a tax return.

MR. SINKOFF:
Sure. So number one, and most importantly, we don't ask about
immigration status, so it's not known to us at the time of care.
It's not -- we don't ask for immigration status, we don't ask for
Census status, it's not even part of our protocol but it's also not
permissible under Federal law.

Number two is that regardless of whether the individual -- whatever
their citizenship status is the same protocol applies. So they're
undocumented individuals, Southampton is a perfect community; most
of the day laborers, many of them may have no documentation. That
doesn't mean they don't have a pay stub or some other form of
income that we can use to try to assess what their sliding fee
discount is. We are -- we are not asking about their citizenship
status, we're asking about their ability to pay.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Right. But so -- in this case you -- there is no way that they
could provide this documentation, so they're paying the full rate
because they can't document what they're making.

MR. SINKOFF:
Exactly.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay.

MR. SINKOFF:
Yeah.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
What if they come in and say I'm homeless, I have no money?
MR. SINKOFF:
Yeah, so we assess homeless status. So there are many special
populations that we do assess and we do know an individual's
homeless status. Most homeless people are on Medicaid, they are
not actually uninsured; the rates of uninsured amongst the homeless
is extremely low. But we know homeless status because we know
public housing, we know doubling-up issues, we know people that are
literally living on a park bench, if you will, so we actually know
the homeless status. We can report out to you the complement of
our patient population that's homeless, that's in public housing
and so on and so forth. That's a direct assessment that we do
during the registration process.

06:23PM

LEG. TROTTA:
What percent of your business comes from Suffolk County?

MR. SINKOFF:
In total, the total book (brief pause), it's about, in total about
a third of our business.

06:24PM

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay, thank you.

06:24PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Donnelly.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. Hi; over here. How are you
today?

06:24PM

MR. SINKOFF:
Good. How are you?

06:25PM

LEG. DONNELLY:
First just, you know, a few shout outs to your staff as well as the
Administration as well as the Presiding Officer for his leadership
in getting this agreement reached. You know, the centers are
really critical to the public health policy of the County. So I
just wanted to comment on a couple of things and then just ask
really kind of one simple, direct question.

06:25PM

Legislator Kennedy did refer to a Facebook posting that your agency
had posted and, you know, you should be assured that the Federal
law enforcement officers are out there risking their lives every
day, you know, enforcing our Federal law and they're not part of
anything. So, you know, I just want to put that on the record.

06:25PM

So I serve -- I represent the Legislature in a portion of south
Huntington that has, along with Legislator Spencer, that has a
large immigrant population. And one of the things that I've worked
on is to try and help the immigrant community get access to
government services, access to health care properly and really
learn how to become good, American citizens; that's what we want.
So Legislator McCaffrey asked a couple of really good questions and
I just want to follow up, because it's a matter of -- at least from
my simple C-view of the world, so to speak, it's a matter of
public health policy.

So if an undocumented resident with little to no identification comes to a health center seeking assistance, do you provide that assistance, and then how do you actually start that in-take process? If you follow my line of questioning, it's more about public health, making sure that they're well.

MR. SINKOFF:
So we --

LEG. DONELLY:
Does that -- does the question make sense to you?

MR. SINKOFF:
It -- let me see if my answer -- if my answer gets to your question.

LEG. DONELLY:
Okay.

MR. SINKOFF:
So as it pertains to citizenship, there's no assistance that's going on within the health centers to help an individual on the pathway to citizenship. The prime objective and the prime mission is the rendering of health care services. If an individual has the proper documentation, no documentation, that is not going to be a barrier or an impediment to delivering those services to that patient. For all patients, regardless, we are going to try to move that individual into a public health program. So if they are eligible for a government-sponsored program, we are going to try to make sure that they can move into a government-sponsored program. The reason for that is as much about improving the overall payment structure at the health center, but more importantly is what happens down-stream for speciality services and other services that they might need.

Now, Medicaid is, you know, is a really good insurance program. There are still a number of specialists that won't take Medicaid, but God forbid they end up in the hospital or other down-stream provider, at least they are having medical coverage. So we will work and we work with the Managed Care plans, they are in our sites and they're trying to enroll individuals in all sorts of insurance programs.

LEG. DONELLY:
That was a really terrific answer, and that's like the message that we want to give to the local communities that we represent and some of the other not-for-profits like Family Service League that does a lot of work, so that people are -- they're educated and there's hope and there's not fear, if you kind of follow my line. Thank you.

MR. SINKOFF:
So I'm going to take the moment to just highlight. With Family Services League in Huntington, and this is outside of the contract,
we basically co-located behavioral health and mental Health Services with Family Services League and primary care services. So if a mental health patient walks through the Family Services League door, they can then very easily get referred over to primary care and vice versa. So one of the activities that's going on here in Suffolk County, both within the health centers that are covered by contract and outside of that, is co-location of mental health services and behavioral health services with primary care services working with the other community-based organizations and delivery system to actually begin to make the entire community healthier.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Very good. And again, thank you to you, to your staff, as well as the Administration, as well as the Presiding Officer for everybody's role and leadership in getting this agreement accomplished. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Legislator Donnelly. And Jim, I want to thank you and Anne and your staff and everyone for the great service that you provide, and certainly your leadership and your patience over these past several months. We're here so I'm just going to leave it at that. I'm glad that we're here and that we're able to continue to have a working relationship with you and providing the great services and expanding the number and level of care, the number of patients and the level of care certainly into the near future. So congratulations.

MR. SINKOFF:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, so we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. TROTTA:
Abstain.

P.O. GREGORY:
Excellent, excellent. All right, thank you.

MS. ELLIS:
Sixteen (Not Present: Legislator Hahn - Abstention: Legislator Trotta).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, next I'm going to call IR 1670 out of order, it's on page eight under Government Ops.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Second.

P.O. GREGORY:
I have a second by Legislator Calarco to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen (Not Present: Legislator Hahn).

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Second.

06:30PM
P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Flotteron to approve IR 1670(-19) -
Authorizing the County Executive to execute an agreement with the
Suffolk County Correction Officers Association Inc. Covering the
terms and conditions of employment for the employees covered under
the bargaining unit No. 10 for the period January 1, 2019 through
December 31, 2024 (County Executive).

06:31PM
MR. RICHBERG:
Sorry, can I have the motion and the second again?

P.O. GREGORY:
Calarco and Flotteron. Anyone on the -- actually, where is -- oh,
Benny, can you give just a quick overview of the contract?

MR. PERNICE:
Sure. The contract covers a period of 2019 to 2024 for existing
officers, or I should say officers hired before June 5th, 2015.
The increases are as follows; 0% in '19, 2% in 2020; 1 1/2% in
2021, 1.75% in 2022, 2% in 2023 and 2.75% in 2024.

06:31PM
For correction officers hired after that, after the June 5th, 2015
date and going forward, they will remain on a 24-step schedule
where they move every six months, so it takes them 12 years to
reach top step. But there's a new schedule that replaces the one
that's currently in place. And similar to the PBA contract, the
new -- now the Correction Officer I's will reach the same maximum
salary as those hired before, where it was set quite a bit lower
than that under the previous contract.

06:32PM
There's -- we think that there's a savings as far as the one
provision that has to do with sick time, where currently they are
giving unlimited sick time for when any time they don't feel well
enough to come to work, so they're going to be given an allotment
of 13 days. It's believed that giving them a fixed amount as
opposed to having unlimited amount of time will reduce the amount
of absences that need to be covered on overtime, so that's one
thing that has a savings.

Overall, we estimated a net cost of $683,000 this year, 4.6 million
in 2020, 6.9 in 2021 and 20 -- and in 2022 almost $10.1 million.
Through 2024, which is the length of the contract, eight -- I'm
sorry, 2024 it was the 18 -- is 18.9 million. So the difference
between the analysis we did and what the County Executive's fiscal
impact statement is is two-fold. Their fiscal impact statement
just is the five years that go through 2023, we extended it out
through 2024. So we estimated a five-year cost of 34 million, or
52.4 million over the life of the contract. The primary difference between the cost that we came up with of what the Executive came up with in their fiscal impact statement was there is a provision in the previous contract that would allow the COA to participate in any benefit fund that they would so choose at some point; currently they have not exercised that option. This agreement will prohibit them from leaving the -- currently in the least expensive one, the AME Benefit Fund, so that's approximately about a million dollars a year as cost avoidance. Since we didn't -- since they weren't exercising that option now, we didn't subtract that from our total estimated cost. They actually took that amount and subtracted it. Other than that, when we factor in what we -- with both offices, costing out the different elements, we're extremely close in what we think the cost of the contract would be.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, great. President Viscusi, would you like to make a statement?

MR. VISCUSE:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Sure, come up, Lou.

MR. VISCUSI:
Thank you. First I'd like to thank the County Executive's Office, Labor Relations for working with our association to work on our needs for our officers. The new hires have been suffering with a very low pay scale and I appreciate their willingness to work in a speedy manner since our contract just expired. This will go a long way in helping this be a long-term career option again. We have been losing Correction Officers at a very high rate as compared to traditionally since this new higher pay scale came into existence in 2015. I'd also like to thank the Legislature for those who have reached out and have advocated on our behalf to help us with that issue. And I'm here if you have any questions.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. No, I just want to congratulate you. I'm glad that you were able to resolve the contract in a short order and not like, I know in the past it's been years in arbitration, and just especially going through what you're going through with your newer recruits, I'm glad we're able to resolve it quickly.

MR. VISCUSI:
Yeah, we've had some painful experiences in the past where we've been five or six years without a contract, that's why six months is actually pretty good for us. So I'm happy with that.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right, right. Excellent. Okay. Anyone?

LEG. SPENCER:
Congratulations.
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Lindsay?

LEG. LINDSAY:
My question would be for Budget Review. And I -- it's probably a loaded question because I know this might be a hard number to factor in. But we know, from not only testimony from President Viscusi but other testimony that we received as well, that we have recruits that come in, they go through the training at great expense to the County and then leave, then we have to go out and rehire and the cost associated with that. Are any of those cost savings now -- assuming that that problem is going to be eliminated, are any of those cost savings assumed or calculated within your calculations?

MR. PERNICE:
No, I don't believe it was included in ours or the Executive's. But there was somebody from the Sheriff's Office that did put a number to that during committee that I don't remember what it was, but that -- theoretically, yes, there is a cost to hire, so if we don't have to hire as often or rehire, there should be some savings from that.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay. All right, thank you. Lou, you don't have a number on that or anything, do you?

MR. VISCUSI:
The number that was said was about 60,000, that's for the time that -- the 12 weeks in the academy, eight weeks of field training afterwards and the price of all the instructors and you divide it by the amount of recruits, plus all the equipment that you supply them with. And, you know, in one two-week period last year we lost 14 individuals, so right, you know, that's -- quick math, yeah, $840,000 --

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yeah.

LEG. TROTTA:
A lot.

MR. VISCUSI:
-- just in that one period of time that we lost. But we've lost dozens. And, you know, we used to lose like one or two, they would go to like Suffolk PD. We started losing them to NYPD, we started; losing to the private sector, we lost to Costco, CVS and just landscaping. It's been a very tough time for us and, like I said, I'm glad that we could put this past us and now it's more of a livable wage for the new hires. And I think that we're going to see more people choose this as a long-term career option instead of just a stepping stone.

LEG. LINDSAY:
If any of those individuals come back now, do they have to go back through the academy all over again?
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MR. VISCUSI:
Two of them have already requested to come back because they have
within one year, as long as they completed probation. Since we've
put this contract offer we have had two of them request to come
back; as long as it's within 365 days, the Sheriff does have the
ability to allow them to come back.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Okay, great. Thank you.

06:39PM 06:39PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Not to you, to the County Executive's Office. I think this is a
fair contract. I think it's not over the top, except maybe near
the end because we don't know what the future holds.

06:39PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Are you suffering from heat exhaustion?

LEG. TROTTA:
Huh?

("Laughter")

P.O. GREGORY:
(Laughter). Is someone going to -- is there a doctor in here?
I'm only kidding.

06:39PM

LEG. TROTTA:
I'm just going over the contracts. You know, I went back and I
looked because we didn't really have much time for the AME or PBA.
It's, you know, 52 million, 108 million and 84 million, it's about
$244 million. My question is how are we going to pay for this?

MS. KEYES:
There's an operating budget process every year we go through to --
and we figure out how to cover costs. I mean, it's not a real
question, but that's the answer.

06:40PM

LEG. TROTTA:
It's a real question because --

MS. KEYES:
Okay.

06:40PM

LEG. TROTTA:
-- we had to sell the Dennison Building, we had to borrow $171
million from the Sewer Stabilization Fund that could have been put
sewers in, we had to borrow $385 million from the pension fund with
the last one. So I think it's a legitimate question, the taxpayers
deserve an answer. So do you have an answer to the question?

MS. KEYES:
There's an operating budget process every year, so that's when we
discuss and determine how we're going to pay for things.

LEG. TROTTA:
Are you going to resell the Dennison Building if we have to, or
remortgage it?

MS. KEYES:
I don't know, I don't think so, but that's the operating budget.
The operating budget process --

LEG. TROTTA:
So you can't answer the question is what you're telling me.
You don't have an answer. You don't know.

MS. KEYES:
During the operating budget process is when those questions are
answered.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay, what additional revenue --

MS. KEYES:
I didn't come here today prepared to discuss the operating budget
for the next six years; I mean, I didn't.

LEG. TROTTA:
Well, maybe that's the reason we're in the problem we're in,
because we don't think ahead. We just think, Oh, we can do this
and we're going to sell the Dennison Building or steal 171 million
from the Sewer Fund or 385 million from the Pension Fund, and then
put red light cameras up and mortgage fees and every other fee to
drive people off Long Island. That's the problem we're in right
now because we don't think.

And while I think this contract is fair, I think the other
contracts are probably fair. It would be irresponsible for anybody
to just say, Oh, we're going to -- we'll just take care of it in
the future, we'll cross that bridge when we get to it. It's like,
you know, bizarro world that we just do this and not think about
the future and how we're going to pay for it.

LEG. FLEMING:
Point of order, Mr. Presiding Officer.

LEG. TROTTA:
Look, I think the guys deserve the money.

LEG. FLEMING:
I mean, the Legislator is asking a question that -- first of all,
repeating himself and also putting a question that really isn't a
real question, not to the matter before us.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay. Legislator Fleming, how we're going to pay for something
isn't a real question? I feel sorry for you then.
P.O. GREGORY:
I tend to disagree. I -- You know, we convene, we meet, we
deliberate on legislation, we ask the Administration to come here
to be able to ask questions. It's my opinion that a Legislator has
the right to ask whatever question he wants. He didn't ask what
she had for lunch, he asked her how -- you may not like the
question, you may think it's an obvious answer, but he has the
right to ask the question. So I think what Ms. Keyes did, I think
it's inappropriate to respond to a Legislator and say, Oh, you
don't have a real question; next. The submissiveness, I just don't
think it's appropriate. I know she may not feel comfortable. I
mean, you know, you don't always have, I guess, the good bedside
manner, but you're still a Legislator and so I think -- you know,
I don't think that was appropriate.

LEG. TROTTA:
I appreciate it. You know, I come from the Town of Smithtown that
has no debt, and I learned from that gentleman that you have to ask
these questions and you need to know where the money is coming
from.

MS. KEYES:
With all due respect, I do everything in my power to answer
legitimate questions, but it's not fair to call me up here to ask a
rhetorical question just so I can stand here and be a whipping
post. So I --

LEG. TROTTA:
It's a legitimate question.

MS. KEYES:
I'm sorry.

LEG. TROTTA:
You could have said, Oh, we're forecasting sales tax, we're this,
we're doing that.

MS. KEYES:
Come on. You wanted me here to be here as an audience to what you
were going to say.

P.O. GREGORY:
Well, Ms. Keyes, that's your job.

MS. KEYES:
Ask legitimate questions --

P.O. GREGORY:
You are the --

MS. KEYES:
To answer questions, I totally agree, and I do that.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right, and your answer could have been We feel that through savings
and cost measures that we're going to be able to find appropriate
funds to add to it.

MS. KEYES:
I gave an answer, multiple times.

P.O. GREGORY:
Not to state that, Oh, I don't think it's a legitimate question.

MS. KEYES:
I gave an answer; the operating budget process is when that --

P.O. GREGORY:
After you made I think what was an inappropriate remark, that's all I'm saying.

LEG. BERLAND:
Well, that remark was after she said that twice.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, all right.

LEG. BERLAND:
She said operating budget twice.

LEG. TROTTA:
That's still not an answer.

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

LEG. TROTTA:
Abstain, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Congratulations.

MR. VISCUSI:
Thank you very much.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Whoa, what was that? It's looking like hostages. What was that?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
No, no, I don't think you have the right vote.

MR. RICHBERG:
No, it's 16; Donnelly's out.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
What --
P.O. GREGORY:
All right, call the vote. We have Legislator Calarco was the first --

D.P.O. CALARCO:
No, I don't think it was 16.

P.O. GREGORY:
-- Legislator Flotteron was the second.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Who was the other no or abstention?

MR. RICHBERG:
Trotta abstained.

MS. SIMPSON:
Have him do the roll call.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, roll call.

("Roll was called by Mr. Richberg - Clerk of the Legislature")

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.
LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. TROTTA: Abstain till you tell me how to pay for it.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. BERLAND: Yes.

LEG. DONNELLY: (Not Present).

LEG. SPENCER: Yes.

P.O. GREGORY: Yes.


P.O. GREGORY: Okay, it's passed. (Side bar with Ms. Simpson). All right. Well, the vote's called.

Okay. All right, congratulations.

All right, **Tabled Resolutions:**

**IR 1319(19) - Adopting Local Law No. -2019, A Local Law to ensure a second chance in Suffolk County** (Presiding Officer Gregory).

I'm going to make a motion to approve.

LEG. FLEMING: Second.

P.O. GREGORY: Second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? No, I'm kidding (laughter).

(*Laughter*)

All right, I thought you weren't paying attention. All right, all right.

Tabled Resolutions -- I should have -- oh, I had him! I almost had Berland as cosponsor.

LEG. BERLAND: No, no, you didn't.
P.O. GREGORY: (Laughter). Okay. So we had a motion, a second. I'll open the floor to Legislator Berland if she wants to make a comment, or anyone else.

LEG. BERLAND: Sure. Yes, thank you. We've had lots of discussion on the banning the box. I don't have a problem with banning the box, I have a problem with this particular resolution and how it extends the point where you can't discuss anything until after you've received a preliminary offer. I would be fine to ban the box and then have them come in for an interview and then any time after they come in for an interview you can have that conversation. But to delay that conversation until after a conditional offer is made I think is unfair to the employer and also unfair to the employee. So I am going to abstain because I would ban the box if the time was moved up to before a conditional offer, not after conditional offer.

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

LEG. KENNEDY: Ditto, but also I want something put in there about the sexual predators in the ban the box thing, that they cannot be considered for jobs working with children.

P.O. GREGORY: That already exists, that's State law.

LEG. KENNEDY: I didn't see that in there.

P.O. GREGORY: That's State law.

LEG. KENNEDY: It's in State law but it's not in this bill. I have difficulty with not having it written.

P.O. GREGORY: That's not a real objection. (*Laughter*)

LEG. KENNEDY: I didn't object, I just want it changed. I'm going to put in a motion to table for change.

P.O. GREGORY: (Laughter) Okay. All right, Legislator Flotteron.

LEG. BERLAND: I'll second that.

P.O. GREGORY: Legislator Flotteron.
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LEG. FLOTTERON:
I actually agree with Legislator Berland. And also, part of the reason --

LEG. BERLAND:
I'm sorry, I didn't hear you? I didn't hear you.

("Laughter")

LEG. FLOTTERON:
I agree with Legislator Berland. And one of the main -- one of the reasons also is just that small businesses are struggling and having a lot of different rules that can maybe open them up to other litigation is a real concern for Mom and Pop stores.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Donnelly.

LEG. DONNELLY:
It wasn't on this resolution, Mr. Presiding Officer. It was a point of personal privilege to have my vote recorded on the contract; I had stepped out of the room for a minute, I apologize.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, we have to -- we'll make a motion to reconsider that.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Thank you, sir.

P.O. GREGORY:
Anyone else? No. I'm just going to state, I mean, there has a lot -- a lot has already been said. You've heard -- you've seen a lot of speakers here today and in the past. This is really -- you know, it's more than just a title about giving people a second chance who have made mistakes in their lives. It's already -- part of the problem is exactly what Legislator Kennedy had said and I think what maybe some others are thinking, that this bill would usurp already existing State laws, which that doesn't -- it can't happen. I can't mention the number of times that speakers and it has been mentioned that if you have committed a crime and you are applying for a job, there can't be a nexus between that. I think the term was used several times that if you're a sex offender you won't be allowed to work with children, if you have a drug addiction you won't be able to get a job in a pharmacy. So if there's a nexus that exists, it's already -- I forget what section of the State law it is, but it's already a State law.

But getting past that, you know, to me it's simple. I try to simplify things as much as possible because I think it just works better that way. When you think about these individuals and you hear the stories about the struggles that they have endured to try to gain employment, there are career criminals, there are people that are going to keep re-offending, you know, you can't legislate that, obviously. But there are people who have made mistakes who are sincerely trying to turn their lives around, haven't committed any other acts, criminal acts, and they're finding that they're
running up against a brick wall. And what is troubling is we're going to pay for them one of two ways if we don't act, and we are already doing it because it's already an existing problem. One, they're going to re-offend. Because if you tell me that an individual that has a wife and a child or has whatever, if he has -- he or she has family obligations or just basic survival and they can't get a legitimate job, there is a chance, and I would say probably a 50/50 chance at least, that they re-offend just to survive -- just to provide for their families and themselves. So we're going to either pay for them when we re-incarcerate them which is going to -- increases the recidivism rate, or we're going to pay for them through Social Services and those types of costs.

So this is an opportunity to get them a chance, just a slim chance to get their foot in the door, to make a decent, honest living where they're contributing, you know, to their local economy because they have a job, they're paying taxes, they're not being a dredge on society, they're not, you know, increasing crime and those things. They're actually providing for their families, and we've seen multiple people who have testified to their story and how it was a struggle for them. So I think in my perspective, not banning the box is really -- it is -- you're hamstringing them and you're limiting their options to the point where, you know, it's going to be difficult for them to turn their lives around. Some people also have been able to kind of endure that and make it through there, but there are a lot more people that haven't had the opportunity because they're being discriminated against. I think {Akeem} mentioned he was going to -- you know, he had to prove that he was, to his parole officer, you know, going on multiple interviews a week, week after week and being turned down because of his criminal history. He is not the only person, there's a lot of people out there.

And with the Opioid epidemic, we heard in our briefing today, second highest, what, number of Opioid deaths in the country, right? Those aren't even tracking the people who are surviving and then living with an addiction. Those people have criminal records, or there's a likelihood that they're going to have criminal records, and there's a likelihood that that's going to be a challenge for them getting work. So we've got to think out the box and say what are we going to do to help those people? You know, Sally who lives next door who's -- you know, there's a woman Rebecca {Finneran}, Sarah knows her, she had reached out to me on LinkedIn, she said -- excuse me if I said this -- told you this story before, but I think it's worth repeating. She reached out to me on LinkedIn, you know, she messaged me and said, Look, you know, I'm in a halfway house, I was a former school teacher, I had a surgery, or I forget the exact story but she had some type of procedure, got hooked on Vicodin and her life spiraled. Three years later she was in jail, she was in a halfway house, she wanted to talk about -- she wanted to get into the high schools, said she reached out to the school districts, she reached out to other elected officials, she wanted to tell her story. If you looked at her, she looks like someone -- you know, she looks like Olivia; I mean, she's just like -- no one who's gone through the trauma -- not to pick on you, Olivia, but, you know, she doesn't look like
someone who is going through a lot of trauma in her life, and she has gone through tremendous trauma. And she wanted to speak and try to lend her voice to have young people avoid the path that she had taken. So I reached out to her, I thanked her for reaching out to me and we -- she's on Sarah Anker's Opioid Advisory Board. Now she's working for Central Nassau Guidance working with people who have been suffering through addiction. But even she mentions, she's had troubles because of her history.

So there are -- the point being there are a lot of people out there that we know about and that we don't know about that are going to have difficulties gaining employment, so we can't continue to do things the way we are -- were, we have to change it, you know, think outside the box. And I think this is something that's not necessarily outside the box because we're kind of behind the curve on this from being one of the most progressive counties, I think, in not only the State but in the country, we're really behind the curve on this and I think it really is going to, you know, give people an opportunity. And so I'm just going to leave it at that, and Legislator Berland wanted to chime in.

LEG. BERLAND:
Yeah, I don't want to belabor the point, but, I mean, I agree with everything you say. And if you think that, you know, there's going to be recidivism if people, you know, have to put the box, don't you think there's going to be recidivism if they don't have to put the box and they get a conditional offer and then it gets ripped out from under their feet? You know, I think going down the process so much longer is just going to make it so much more difficult. You know, I ask again if there's any way you'll amend that to move it up in the process and then I would support it whole-heartedly.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I share my colleague's concerns. As an employer of someone who has to interview a lot of people and go through the hiring process, sometimes you interview people four and five times. And to go through that process then to only be able to allowed to ask the question once a formal offer is ready to be made I think is really an undue burden on the employer. It should be something I think that should come out at the first interview. I mean, the whole purpose of the legislation is to get them -- get their foot in the door, give them an opportunity to make their case and I think you could still accomplish that by just changing the timing mechanism on when the question could be asked. Otherwise I'm a hundred percent in favor of the legislation. I think these people do deserve a second chance and with that small change I could be in favor of this.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I respect your opinion on that, I disagree. I think given some -- you know, if you're asking at the first interview you're just delaying, you know, what they did. You know, I don't -- I
think the first question's going to be, you know, if we ban the box and as soon as you get in the interview have you had a criminal record and they say yes; okay, well, it was nice seeing you and, you know, we'll be in touch with you.

LEG. BERLAND:
Yeah, but isn't part of your argument that you want the ability of the person to be able to talk to the interviewer face-to-face? And if they're in the door they have that ability. And I don't think it's necessarily the first question that employers are going to ask, but I think that they should have that conversation before they make the offer. But if you're sitting across the table, if they like what they saw based on the application that doesn't have a box and they like it and they bring you in, then you have an opportunity to have that discussion and you either win them over then or not. If you put it down five interviews later, you know, you are still in the same -- you still have to have the same conversation, you're just pissing everybody off by the time you get there because the employer is going to have wasted all that time and the person's going to be upset that they had their hopes up and it, you know, may or may not happen at that point. So I guess we're just going to have to --

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:
-- agree to disagree on that one.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes, we do.

All right. So there's a motion to table. I just ask my colleagues that we just have an up or down vote. I don't want to -- you know, this is -- I just ask for that. So, you know, you don't have to support it, but it's up to you guys. I think it clearly stands on its merits. I think --

LEG. DONELLY:
I'll second it if you want. It's a good resolution, I know you did a lot of work on it, so -- America is all about second chances.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I think to do an up or down vote is a mistake because honestly, I don't think it's going to pass and I want to see this passed. I don't want to see it fail, I just want to see a slight adjustment to it so that it can pass.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, but I think what you're asking is only making the problem less worse, less bad, slightly less bad.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I disagree, DuWayne. As someone who's sat at countless interviews, I can't tell you how many, in an industry that doesn't even have a job application, we hire off of resumes. We ask the question -- we
disclose that we're going to do a criminal background check and
that's usually the trigger to say, Okay, you might want to let us
know if there's an issue that's going to come up on there because
we'd rather hear it from you than hear it from the report when we
get it back. And I've heard people tell me, Yeah, you know, I had a
DWI five years ago; I hired them, no problem. As long as it wasn't
in the financial crime, you know, because we had people that are
dealing with money on a day-to-day basis, I had no issue with it.
But the people who didn't tell us, even though they knew that was
going to happen and we found out after we made the offer and the
report came back that they did commit a crime, those people we
didn't hire, so.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right, and rightly so because they were dishonest.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Right, but I had no -- I didn't see any issue with it asking it at
the first interview rather than the last one, wherever that occurs.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:
Can we send it back to committee to reevaluate, maybe redo it or
work on it some in committee?

P.O. GREGORY:
That would be a third motion. My cosponsor is looking at me.

MS. SIMPSON:
Technically yes, you can make a motion to recommit, it would
require a second. That would be just a third motion.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
I'll second it.

P.O. GREGORY:
You guys are killing me by a thousand cuts. All right, all right.
So I'll make a motion to -- no, you make the motion. I don't agree
with it but I'll go along with it.

LEG. MURATORE:
I'll do it, I'll make the motion to recommit.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
(Raised hand);

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yeah, I'll second it.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, motion to recommit by Legislator Muratore. Second by
Legislator Sam -- Sam Gonzalez.
LEG. GONZALEZ:
Listen, I think in listening to all my colleagues, I mean, this is something that we -- I'm very emotional on this here. I haven't said anything, I've been pretty much quiet listening to everyone. But to just allow this thing to die here would be a tragedy. It is a tragedy, we are letting the people of Suffolk County down. We're not doing what we are here are supposed to do. And I understand, I understand, we're close. And we need to do this, we need to ban this box. And I do believe that if we bring it back, all right, we can tweak it, we can work it and we can make this thing pass. Because guess what? This affects me very closely, my family, all right? Individuals who have made a mistake 20, 30 years ago, okay, are still suffering. And to listen to everybody that's come here today and every single day every time it comes up and we don't listen, we're doing an injustice, guys. So I agree, let's bring it back, you know? I just can't see this thing die, I can't, all right? There are success stories out there and future success stories out there and we cannot allow this to die, okay? We can't, we really can't. All right? So listen, I second.

07:02PM

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, so -- yes, I'm going to -- Counsel has something to say.

MS. SIMPSON:
So if we table this -- we can recommit, or you can table it on the floor, make the amendments, after the amendments are made we can reopen the public hearing and then close the public -- after the new public hearing, close the public hearing and then it would be votable on the floor. You don't necessarily have to recommit it to committee to make the changes.

07:02PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Right. So I will support a tabling motion to consider making changes I don't agree with, but I will respect my colleagues opinions on it. So I guess we're back to your motion to table. Who was the second?

MS. SIMPSON:
That was Kennedy; Kennedy and Berland to table.

07:03PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Oh, it was Berland Kennedy?

LEG. McCAFFREY:
No, Kennedy made the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
No, that was recommit. I'm talking about tabling.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
It was Kennedy/Berland.

P.O. GREGORY:
So which goes first?
MS. SIMPSON:
I believe -- I believe tabling goes first. Recommitting goes first?

LEG. MURATORE:
I'll withdraw my recommit motion.

MR. RICHBERG:
Recommitting was withdrawn.

07:03PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, he withdraws his recommit.

MS. SIMPSON:
All right, so recommittal is withdrawn.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right.

MS. SIMPSON:
So tabling goes first.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, so all in favor to table? Any opposed?

LEG. FLEMING:
I want to vote on it.

P.O. GREGORY:
Abstentions? I'm going to abstain.

07:03PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen.

LEG. SPENCER:
No to table.

P.O. GREGORY:
No to table.

MS. SIMPSON:
Roll call.

P.O. GREGORY:
Did you get it?

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen (Opposed: Legislators Donnelly & Spencer - Abstention: Presiding Officer Gregory).

P.O. GREGORY:
Huh, 15?

LEG. DONNELLY:
Opposed to tabling.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, all right. Motion is tabled, yes.

All right, Legislator -- I'm going to recognize Legislator Krupski for the purposes of making a motion out of order.

("The following testimony was taken & transcribed by Diana Flesher - Court Stenographer")

LEG. KRUPSKI:
To take 1488 out of order, please.

P.O. GREGORY:
Which page is that again?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Of new parcels into an existing Ag District.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Krupski makes a motion to take IR 1488 out of order. It's authorizing inclusion of new parcel(s) into an existing certified Agricultural District(s) in the County of Suffolk for 2019 all in favor? (Co. Exec.). I'll second the motion to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I'll make a motion to approve.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion to approve IR 1488. Page seven, EPA. You second on the approval motion? We got a second. Any discussion? Cilmi. Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yeah, this has been -- I mean this has been a discussion since March, really, when the Farmland Protection Board discussed this, whether these parcels should be voted on separately or as a group. And I certainly have -- and Bob Braun and I have been talking about this for months, right. So if -- and I think this has gotta be the discussion next March when the Farmland Protection Board meets, or earlier maybe, to see whether these parcels should be separate or not. There is merits and value to every applicant that comes in the door. All the applicants don't automatically get approved. Some have been sent away in the past to establish agricultural record on the site; establish an operation. Those people generally
come back the next year with an operation. And then they are, you know, voted for inclusion. So, you know, there is a process there. But to separate these next year I would not be against. And we can have that discussion later. Right now we have these in one block to vote on. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Spencer.

07:06PM
LEG. SPENCER:
I strongly support that. We come into this issue and note sometimes where we look at where there's a block of money and we're distributing that money and the committee or the department works on those recommendations, we have to take it kind of in a block. But there are issues that come up and these Ag Districts have pretty significant impact on these communities. I think they're extremely important. And where there could be an issue or concern with one, and that it's kind of like if you either take them all or nothing, I don't think it's fair to this body. I think it limits our power to a certain extent and it sort of makes us in a sense by having it all together almost a rubber stamp, it puts pressure on us. So these should be separated. And I am going to press for that in the future.

07:06PM
P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Krupski.

07:07PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
I think some of the concern was that Ag and Markets would somehow be able to run roughshod over a municipality and their laws. I don't think find that the case. Ag and Markets has their place protecting agricultural production. Local municipality has their place in land use and zoning. And, you know, public safety. And I think they both play a role there and I don't think this process threatens either role.

07:07PM
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I'm sorry, Legislator Spencer.

07:07PM
LEG. SPENCER:
I must rebut. I know I - I think that in theory I agree and that's the way it should be. I think in reality when I ran into this particular issue in my district where there is a particular concern where that Ag and Markets designation can maybe used as a -- kind of a shadow to kind of circumvent that authority. It doesn't happen a lot. I don't think that was the intention or the set up, but I do think that sometimes that could be the case. So that's -- you know, I agree with you in theory but sometimes that may not be always the way it plays out.

07:08PM
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right. We have a motion and a second on IR 1488. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

07:08PM
LEG. HAHN:
(Indicating)
LEG. MURATORE:
(Indicating)

LEG. CILMI:
Abstain.

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen.

07:08PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, I'll make a motion further up on page eight, yes. Oh, I'm sorry, on page eight, I make a motion to reconsider IR 1670. It's the CO's contract. Legislator Donnelly stepped out of the room for a second. We have a second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen. (Corrected vote: Seventeen: Not Present: Leg. Hahn)

07:09PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Calarco makes a motion to approve. Flotteron was the second on the approval originally. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Corrected vote: Sixteen: Abstain: Leg. Trotta; Not Present: Leg. Donnelly)

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, back to Table Resolutions. IR 1566, Amending the 2019 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Improvements to Bomarc Site, Westhampton (CP 1830). (PO Gregory). I make a motion to approve; second by Legislator Fleming. On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

07:09PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
This is for Budget Review, do we have $20,000? Must we bond $20,000 for this? Don't we have $20,000 that we can use already? Twenty thousand dollars.

DR. LIPP:
We didn't adopt a budget with this. So this is additional money. If you wanted to use cash, the resolution would have said they wanted to do cash.

07:10PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Well, I know they put in for a bond, but I'm asking, does anybody know if we have $20,000 in any of our --
DR. LIPP:
So the last few years because of financial problems, we have not identified spending cuts for resolutions.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, I'm sorry. So it's IR 1566 A, the bond. Again, just to remind folks, this is for the security upgrades to putting a key pad, I forget what's the exact name for it, to provide more security. There have been some issues with security out there. The Sheriff's Office with the PD, Public Works have worked together on this issue. They think it's important to secure the facility. As I said, there's been some issues there and we're just looking to address it. So roll call on IR 1566 A. (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $40,000 Bonds to finance security-related improvements to the BOMARC Site, Westhampton) (CP 1830.310 and .510)

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

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
No.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.
LEG. TROTTA:
No.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:
Yes.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, thank you. IR 1566, (Amending the 2019 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Improvements to Bomarc Site, Westhampton) (CP 1830). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1575, Authorizing the sale of Tax Lien Certificates on 294b Old Northport Road, Kings Park, NY (SCTM No. 0800-042.00-01.00-026.002) to the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation, Landbank Corporation. (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Trotta to table.

LEG. TROTTA:
Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:
I'll second. All in favor? I spoke with Director Lansdale this morning and, I think, Dorian Dale. They're okay with tabling the motion. They are in conversations with, I think, some folks, about to get some more information for our next meeting and they feel confident that they'll have more information to provide to us in relationship to this particular resolution. So, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1584, Amending the 2019 Operating Budget to assure the security of the BOMARC facility. (PO Gregory). I'm going to make a motion to table; second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1596, Identifying County property holdings located in Sewer
Districts. (Hahn).

LEG. HAHN:
Motion to table.

07:12PM

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

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right IR 1665A, Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New
York, authorizing the issuance of $877,000 in Bonds to finance the
payment of a judgement in a liability case against the County.
(Co. Exec.).

LEG. FLEMING:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Fleming; second by Legislator, was it Calarco?
Does anyone have a question. Okay, roll call.

07:13PM

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

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

07:13PM

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

07:13PM

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.
LEG. GONZALEZ: Yes.

LEG. CILMI: Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON: Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. TROT TA: Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. BERLAND: Yes.

P. O. GREGORY: Yes.

MR. RICHBERG: Eighteen.

P. O. GREGORY: Okay, IR 1665, (Amending the 2019 Operating Budget and appropriating funds in connection with Bonding for a verdict in a liability case against the County) (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG: Eighteen.

P. O. GREGORY: IR 1650, Amending Suffolk County Code, Chapter 948-32 to revise the fee schedule for Francis S. Gabreski Airport. (Co. Exec.). Motion by -- was that Krups? No. I'm sorry, motion by Legislator Lindsay. I'll second. On the motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI: On the motion.

P. O. GREGORY: Legislator Krups. Okay.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
I wonder if we can get the airport operator here. So I know we spoke the other day. I appreciate the time. There's a concern about aircraft traffic over the North Fork. It all lands on the South Fork. And, you know, the concern I had was is this going to increase or decrease flights out of Gabreski.

MR. CEGLIO:
I don't think it'll increase or decrease. We have a certain number of flights that are coming in internationally. That's what the fee is all about. The number of flights since we started the fee process in 2014 increased slightly. Over the last three years, I think, we've been averaging about 300 international arrivals a year, though.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Is the fee structure set every year or can it be set during the year?

MR. CEGLIO:
Actually the last time it was set was back in 20 -- I believe the resolution's 2013. And the reason why the fee was set was because US Customs and Border Protection used to process passengers on board an aircraft. 2013 they changed their policy, which required them to have office space. I guess they thought it was unsafe to go up on an aircraft and do what they had to do.

They requested office space meeting certain criteria. They were looking for about 4,000 square feet that they wanted the County to build. We actually came up with some office space about 1,000 square feet that didn't meet their requirements but the way we came with a fee was we took the going rate or the fair market value for the office space, divided it by what they estimate it to be, about 70 flights a year and came up with about $350 per arrival. So that's where we were.

The reason why we're changing the fee is now the number of flights have increased since that period. Customs and Border Protection realize that the office that they're using right now is not adequate, doesn't meet their requirements. One of our tenants Sheltair Aviation built a new facility, which finished in 2018. And Customs requested that they be moved into that facility.

So the reason of the fee change is that now Customs and Border Protection is not using county office space; they're using a tenant office space. We're still going to retain some of the fee, though, because of the use of the international flights of the airport.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
All right, thank you.

P. O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:
Okay. So the fee was established in 2013.
MR. CEGLIO:
Correct.

LEG. HAHN:
And hasn't been raised since. Can it -- why can't it be raised to accommodate the cost of this?

MR. CEGLIO:
Well, the FAA, Federal Aviation Administration governs most of the things we do at an airport including rates and charges. What they do require is that the rates and charges be fair and reasonable so what we did is we looked at the rates and charges in the surrounding area. There are two other airports on Long Island that provide the same services; MacArthur and Farmingdale Republic Airport. And MacArthur's $250 an arrival; Farmingdale is $150 per arrival. We're the highest at 350.

I looked at other airports in the tri-state area. Morris Town Airport, New Jersey's about 350; Teterboro doesn't charge anything; Bridgeport doesn't charge anything. We're right up there at the top at this point.

LEG. HAHN:
And the value of the property at Gabreski, how does that compare?

MR. CEGLIO:
As far as?

LEG. HAHN:
I don't know, is cost of living higher there that it would warrant a higher fee?

MR. CEGLIO:
Well, I would guess it probably would. And, again, the value of the office space at the time was about $24 a square foot per year, which is how we came up with the $350 fee.

LEG. HAHN:
And now that's more.

MR. CEGLIO:
Well, it's not more. Actually what we're doing is because they're not going to be using the County office space anymore, they're moving to another space, we're just reallocating the fee. We're keeping it the same.

LEG. HAHN:
Okay, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Berland.

LEG. BERLAND:
Hi. I know we had this conversation in committee but didn't you say that Gabreski has a longer runway; it can accommodate planes that other ones can't?
MR. CEGLIO:
Well, that's the reason why East Hampton Airport doesn't have international arrivals. Their runway's too short. So, yes, we have a longer runway. It's 9,000 feet so the international arrivals will come to Gabreski if they want to go to the East End of Long Island.

07:20PM

LEG. BERLAND:
Okay. So how do the other airports, MacArther, for instance, does that also have --

MR. CEGLIO:
A long runway?

LEG. BERLAND:
Yes. As long or longer or shorter?

MR. CEGLIO:
MacArther's runway is about 7,000 feet.

07:20PM

LEG. BERLAND:
And ours is what?

MR. CEGLIO:
Nine thousand.

LEG. BERLAND:
Right. So ours is longer.

07:20PM

MR. CEGLIO:
Correct.

LEG. BERLAND:
Right. So you said that we have the longer one that should accommodate the larger planes. So that's why we're keeping the fee the same, but maybe our fee can be more because we are accommodating the bigger planes, so.

07:20PM

MR. CEGLIO:
As I mentioned, we are the highest already. MacArther's at $250. We're at $350. You add the fee than Sheltair charges, another hundred to process the baggage, carry the people from the airplane to the office, it's another hundred so it's about 450. So we're the highest around right now.

LEG. BERLAND:
Okay. But if you're taking incrementally -- I mean you -- I think you led everyone to believe that the Federal Government is controlling these fees. What is the, you know, maximum we can charge? Is there a maximum or minimum that you can charge?

07:21PM

MR. CEGLIO:
There isn't a maximum. But as I mentioned, the Federal law states that you should charge fair and reasonable fees. We could get a complaint if some of the aircraft realize or believe that it's unfair and unreasonable. The other issue is if we don't
accommodate Customs, you know, like I said, they want to move because our space is inadequate in the roughly thousand square feet that they took over a couple years ago. They could say they just don't want to do it anymore. They could say we're at low process and I mentioned this at the committee, we'll process aircraft at another airport. Bangor, Maine, for instance, which I called the other day and they also don't charge for international arrivals.

LEG. BERLAND:
Right, but that's a big leap, saying that if we raise it $100 or if we cut the difference between what you're asking us to give up, $150 on each arrival and give that to them, if we split the difference and added 75 back to it, I don't think the Federal government is going to now say you can't fly into Gabreski anymore and you're going to have to go to Maine. These are, like, huge jets with very wealthy people and you're talking $75 or $150 more. I just can't reconcile that.

MR. CEGLIO:
It's a delicate balance, I think. And as I mentioned, we're at the delicate balance of the highest rate right now so we're not -- but we're not getting any complaints, which is a good thing. We also talking about landing fees the other day. Our landing fees are among the highest on Long Island and probably in the tri-state area, too. So we're doing what we need to do to maintain the balance, to collect the fees, to operate the airport in a positive manner.

Actually the Budget Review Office could probably confirm this that over the last three to four years, maybe it's five years, we've actually started operating at a profit to a point where somebody mentioned not bonding $20,000. We don't bond for our capital projects anymore. We have a capital reserve fund because we have excess revenue every year. So we're maintaining the balance that, I think, allows aircraft to still come in and not overcharge.

LEG. BERLAND:
Well, if I could ask Budget Review, with the passage of this and the decrease in the fee that the County will be collecting, what do you anticipate the long-term result of that being on the amount of money that they have to do what they're doing?

DR. LIPP:
Well, for starters, it wasn't out fiscal. It's the County Exec fiscal.

MR. CEGLIO:
I can answer it, if you want.

LEG. BERLAND:
I wanted them to answer.

MR. CEGLIO:
So just to jump in while he's looking that up, for instance, last year we collected about $103,000 in international arrival fees. If this goes through, our fee will go down, or the amount that we'll collect on an annual basis will go down to 59,000, difference of
about 44,000. It's less than 2% of the operating revenue at the airport.

**LEG. BERLAND:**
I'm done. I don't like this.

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

**LEG. FLEMING:**
Thank you. Could I just ask Tony what the length of this arrangement; I mean we're approving a fee schedule and there's no -- there's no expiration date or grandfather date for the fee schedule. But it's based on the fact that Customs will now be using space that -- actually the property belongs to the County, but Sheltair owns the building and they're going to be in the building. Do they have a lease with Sheltair?

**MR. CEGLIO:**
No, they don't have a lease with Sheltair. Customs, typically, and we found this out four or five years ago, doesn't lease property from any airport. If you want them to operate at your airport, you provide them space to do their work.

**LEG. FLEMING:**
What does Sheltair get out it?

**MR. CEGLIO:**
Sheltair gets the $200 per international arrival. And basically that covers the cost of their office space that they could rent to some other tenant.

**LEG. FLEMING:**
So it's the determination of the Legislature how much they get for allowing their space to be used?

**MR. CEGLIO:**
Well, no. What the Legislature has to vote on is back in 2013 with the original resolution, it called for, and I have a copy of it here, that the $350 fee would only be charged if the -- if Customs used the office space -- the County's office space at the airport. So in this case, and as I mentioned, Customs has outgrown that; they don't want to use it anymore. So, they won't use the office space anymore. And if the legislation stays the same, the County won't collect anything.

So what I'm trying to do is, again, reduce the fee, even though it's down to $200, Sheltair will get some of that -- well, Sheltair will get $250. The County gets $200. We still retain some of that revenue that we initially planned on back in 2013.

**LEG. FLEMING:**
But there's a landing fee that's going to be the same but is going to be divided differently because the County is not providing the space.
MR. CEGLIO:
That's correct.

LEG. FLEMING:
So who determines how that landing fee, which is remaining constant, is divided? I'm looking at the exhibit A -- when you and I spoke earlier today, was the first time I had an opportunity to talk to you about this. I had asked if the lease agreement was a year -- a month-to-month agreement so that if we had a more -- a different planning approach to this, we might be able to pivot or change the way we were doing it were we able to provide Customs with adequate space. And my understanding was from that conversation was that we had a month-to-month opportunity to do that. But now I'm seeing that the -- we're only being asked to approve the exhibit A, which is fee schedule. That doesn't have any termination date.

MR. CEGLIO:
Right. It will change when the -- when a new resolution comes up before the Legislature to change the fees.

LEG. FLEMING:
Right. But it does not, from the way I'm reading it, and I have -- as I said, I haven't been in the discussions here with either you or the Administration on this important infrastructure in my district, I don't see anything that says how these monies are going to be divided between yourself and Sheltair. Where is that contract?

MR. CEGLIO:
Well, as that exhibit describes, it describes not only the Customs fees but also the other landing fees, which don't change. But where it talks about Customs, it describes that the fee is $200. And so there's an addition - an additional letter agreement or rider, there will be a rider to Sheltair's lease to describe how the fee is broken down.

LEG. FLEMING:
Right. But we haven't -- I haven't seen that. So that's happening separate and apart from what you're asking us to approve.

MR. CEGLIO:
Correct.

LEG. FLEMING:
Okay. And so what we're approving -- but that lease, which I haven't seen, is a month-to-month lease; the rider to the Sheltair lease?

MR. CEGLIO:
Well, it could be -- the way it's written is it could be changed within 90 days. Any change in the rate has to be approved by the airport at least 90 days in advance. To understand a little bit better, if we do decide to build Customs a facility, which is in our Capital Program to try to do, Customs will move immediately. They'll move into their new space, you know, the space that's
provided for them to process passengers.

LEG. FLEMING:
Okay, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Gonzalez.

07:30PM

LEG. GONZALEZ:
I just have two questions. How many international fights are coming in?

MR. CEGLIO:
Last year about 295; I rounded it to 300.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Around 300. And in total how many flights are coming in?

MR. CEGLIO:
Total at the airport?

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.

MR. CEGLIO:
About 60,000, I think, we had last year.

P.O. GREGORY:
Are you done?

07:30PM

LEG. GONZALEZ:
That's all.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Flotteron.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
I just want to understand how this airport works. If this airport makes a profit, does the County enjoy that profit or not? Is there a --

07:30PM

MR. CEGLIO:
Well, just like every airport, required by Federal law, the airport -- the money that's made at the airport has to stay at the airport. So the County, if you read the Budget Review Report that we get every year on the Operating Budget, we're one of two enterprise funds in the County. So all the revenue and the expenses stay within one fund.

07:31PM

LEG. FLOTTERON:
And, again, if we didn't do this deal, we would have to expand the building or build a building to get the square footage they need.

MR. CEGLIO:
That's correct. And they've mentioned that before. They're looking to get into a better space for them to operate. The cost
of that space at 4,000 square feet at $250 a square foot's about a million dollars; might even be more than that.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
I was doing the math quick, projections we'll be losing 45 to 55,000. Rent-wise that's in between 2250 and 2750 a square foot, which seems rather reasonable from looking at rents in the past of different places, so.

MR. CEGLIO:
That's about the going rate out at the airport.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Okay. Okay, thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:
Sorry, my daughter just texted me and I got distracted so hopefully I'm not asking what Steve just asked. Do you know what you're doing with the building that the Customs is currently in? Was there a plan for that?

MR. CEGLIO:
Well, they'll be moving out. It's about a a thousand square feet so we can make it available to any private enterprise at the, you know, fair market value.

LEG. HAHN:
That's the plan.

MR. CEGLIO:
Yes. Yeah.

LEG. HAHN:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Is there any down side to table for one cycle, you know, vet this a little more thoroughly?

MR. CEGLIO:
Other than Customs would like to move as soon as possible, they were hoping to get in there by August 1st, which is the beginning of probably our busiest month at the airport. If it was tabled, it would go to after the season, I would believe, right?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Well, you said 300 a year. So I don't know how it's spread out.

MR. CEGLIO:
Most of them are between Memorial Day and Labor Day. Our busiest
months are July and August.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
What I guess I'm getting at is so if we approve this tonight, there's no limit to when we can adjust the rates going forward. We can adjust the rates in September if we want to.

MR. CEGLIO:
Correct.

P. O. GREGORY:
Oh, I'm sorry, I thought you were still asking questions?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No. Thank you.

P. O. GREGORY:
All right. Okay, so we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Please raise your hands if you're opposed. Oh, abstained, oh. Okay. All right. All in favor, raise your hands? All opposed?

LEG. BERLAND:
(Indicating)

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Indicating)

P. O. GREGORY:
Abstentions?

LEG. BERLAND:
(Indicating)

LEG. SPENCER:
(Indicating)

P. O. GREGORY:
Abstentions?

LEG. KENNEDY:
(Indicating)

LEG. ANKER:
(Indicating)

LEG. HAHN:
(Indicating)

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
(Indicating)

LEG. FLEMING:
(Indicating)
LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Indicating)

MR. RICHBERG:
Seven.

P.O. GREGORY:
This is America; you can vote but you can't vote twice, man. What are you doing? (Laughter)

MR. RICHBERG:
Roll call?

P.O. GREGORY:
All right, we're going to do roll call.

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

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Abstain.

LEG. FLEMING:
Abstain.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Abstain.

LEG. MURATORE:
No.

LEG. HAHN:
Abstain.

LEG. ANKER:
Abstain.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Abstain.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.
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LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:
No.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Abstain.

LEG. SPENCER:
Abstain.

MR. RICHBERG:
Seven. Oh, sorry, Calarco.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Abstain.

MR. RICHBERG:
Seven.

PO. GREGORY:
So you want to make a motion to recommit and then we just table it? All right, one of you abstainers make the motion because I can't do it. Who is it now? Motion by Legislator Muratore; second by -- to reconsider. Second by Legislator Kennedy. To recommit -- to reconsider, I'm sorry, Jesus. Reconsider. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

PO. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Fleming to table. Okay. Second by Legislator Sunderman. We're tabling or recommitting?

LEG. CILMI:
To table or recommit, you guys?

PO. GREGORY:
Recommit.

PO. GREGORY:

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

PO. GREGORY:
All right. Now where were we? Okay, IR 1655, To reappoint Patricia Snyder as a member of the Suffolk County Citizens Advisory Board for the Arts. (Krupski). Motion by Legislator Krupski; second by Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P. O. GREGORY:
IR 1635, Approving the reappointment of Michelle Bonnie Cannon to
the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission. (Co. Exec.). Motion
by Legislator Hahn; I'll second. All in favor?  Opposed?
Abstentions?

07:37PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P. O. GREGORY:
IR 1636, Approving the reappointment of Beena Kothari, to the
Suffolk County Human Rights Commission. (Co. Exec.).

LEG. HAHN:
Motion.

07:37PM

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

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P. O. GREGORY:
IR 1637, Approving the reappointment of Augustus G. Mantia, M.D. to
the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission. (Co. Exec.). Motion by
Legislator Kennedy; I'll second. All in favor?  Opposed?
Abstentions?
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MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P. O. GREGORY:
IR 1639, Approving the reappointment of Luis E. Rodriguez, Esq., to
the Suffolk County Human Rights Commission. (Co. Exec.). Motion by
Legislator Hahn; second by Legislator Donnelly. All in favor?
Opposed?  Abstentions?

07:38PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P. O. GREGORY:
IR 1640, Approving the reappointment of Dr. Yu-Wan Wang to the
Suffolk County Human Rights Commission. (Co. Exec.). Motion by
Legislator Hahn; second by Legislator Donnelly. All in favor?
Opposed?  Abstentions?

07:38PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P. O. GREGORY:
IR 1659, To appoint member to the Teen Pregnancy Advisory Board
(Judith Montauban). (Spencer).
LEG. SPENCER:
I'm going to make a motion, but I'm going to -- she didn't appear, but she serves currently on a youth advisory board so she's familiar to this body. I know it's the tradition of this body that they have to appear. So I just wanted, you know, I was going to ask -- you know, I don't want to establish precedent. I know it's important but she has appeared. We work with her so I'm hoping to ask for an exception in this case.

P.O. GREGORY:
What other committee is she on?

LEG. SPENCER:
She's on the Youth Advisory Board. She's Legislator Calarco's --

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, but the Youth Advisory Board doesn't come before the Legislature. It's a direct appointment, isn't it?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
(Side bar)

P.O. GREGORY:
No. I have people on the Youth Advisory Board. And I just do a letter.

LEG. SPENCER:
Has she appeared before this body in the past?

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Youth Advisory Board members that are legislative appointees, we send a letter to the County Exec's Office and then it comes over to us as a resolution.

P.O. GREGORY:
No, I've never had an appointment come before the Legislature for Youth Advisory Board.

LEG. SPENCER:
I think, you know, she's capable of serving. If she hasn't appeared, then, obviously we would have to, you know, have her appear. But she's someone that I reviewed, it's on my committee. It was very difficult for her to make it this time around, but while I will respect whatever, you know --

LEG. HAHN:
Maybe we can pass over it and do a search as to whether or not she's ever come before us, you know, maybe then we can determine that. And if she has, we can think about it.
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LEG. SPENCER:
That's fair enough. Okay. Pass over.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Yeah, because I know -- I may know who she is, I don't know her all that well but I know, you know, she's a fine person, but I
don't think she's ever come before. And I don't recall any of my
appointments ever coming before. Just send a letter to Reverend
Pearson and they get appointed. They don't come before this body.

But anyway, 1664 -- okay, we're going to go to 1664, we'll come
back, Amending the voting requirements for the Women's Advisory
Commission. (Sunderman). Motion by Legislator Sunderman; second by
Legislator Muratore. This is the one, if there's a vacancy, you
get to appoint everyone.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
We cleaned it up to make it easier. It's not a problem.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right. Okay. Everyone -- it's Coram, yeah, there were people that
weren't permanent members or something like that, right. Okay.
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ELLIS:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, I stand corrected on 1659. They is a resolution. I'm
getting amnesia in my old age. So I will -- so there's a -- you
have a motion to approve IR 1659?

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes, sir.

P.O. GREGORY:
What was the second?

LEG. CILMI:
I'll second.

P.O. GREGORY:
Second by Legislator Cilmi. IR 1659, to appoint member to the Teen
Pregnancy Advisory Board Judith Montauban. (Spencer). All in
favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

LEG. SPENCER:
Thank you, everyone. I appreciate it.

P.O. GREGORY:
All right. You owe us lunch at the next meeting. IR 1655, (1654)
Reappointing Philip Schmitt as a member of the Suffolk County Soil
And Water Conservation District. (Krupski).

LEG. KRUSKI:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Krupski; second by Legislator Cilarco. All in
fAVOR?  OPPOSED?  ABSTENTIONS?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1657, Authorizing approval of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Carmen Property - Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-019-00-01.00-003.000.) (Krupski).

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Same motion, same second. All in favor?  Opposed?  I'm sorry. Motion by Legislator Krupski; second by Legislator Fleming. I don't want her pouting. She was pouting a little bit. All in favor?

MS. SIMPSON:
May I before we vote?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MS. SIMPSON:
So this resolution, as well as a couple other resolutions, are going to have technical corrections brought -- put on the table as late starters today. Traditionally we've not made amendments, scrivener's errors in terms of part of versus the whole property after it's passed out of committee. So those technical corrections will be laid on today that will correct those errors.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you for that correction.

P.O. GREGORY:
There's a motion and a second. All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1666, Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed improvements to Peconic Dunes County Park, Town of Southold. (PO Gregory). Motion by Legislator Hahn; second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.
P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1668, Authorizing appraisal of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Torkan Property-Town of Huntington (SCTM No. 0400-209.00-02.00-005.006) (Berland). Motion by Legislator Berland; second by Legislator Donnelly. On the motion.

07:44PM

LEG. BERLAND:
On the motion, Counsel?

07:45PM

MS. SIMPSON:
So this is a similar problem to the prior one. These were written as whole. The next two, 1668 and 1669 were written as appraising the whole parcel. And after these were passed out of committee, it came up that it was only supposed to be a portion of each parcel. So, again, technical correction resolutions are being laid on as late starters today to correct those errors.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. So we got a motion, a second on 1668. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1669, Authorizing appraisal of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Torkan Property-Town of Huntington (SCTM No. 0400-209.00-02.00-004.001). (Berland). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1670 we did earlier. IR 1634, Authorizing a Custodial License Agreement with Farmingville Historical Society for the “Farmingville Historic District” Property. (Muratore). Motion by Legislator Sunderman; second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1645, Endorsing the application of the Trust for Public Land for a grant for the Empire State Trail Extension Project. (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Hahn; second by Legislator Anker.
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LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
On the motion, Legislator Krupski.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Gotta question for someone on this. So, thank you, Amy. So listening to the Parks Committee the other day, there was a map that was sent around. And it was -- it was -- I didn't really understand how it was worded. There was a description with it. So I'm looking at the resolution here, and it says in 2018 the Trust for Public Land and New York Bicycling Coalition completed a feasibility study including multiple rounds of stakeholder and community input for an Empire State trail extension mapping out a potential east/west multiuse trail across Long Island.

So I didn't know anything -- I don't know who did the extensive outreach to any stakeholders or community input. And I did call Economic Development and Planning and I did reach out to -- after that I did send this information onto my towns to see if they had heard about this. And I don't think I've gotten a response yet.

So I would -- because the trail going through my district is on roads with no shoulders, certainly, you know, windy, hilly roads, and the off-road trail, is through a life of right away, where there's a lot of agriculture going on including grapevines and trellis and wires and everything, I'm not sure where the outreach went. I did reach out to the author of that from New York State --

MS. KEYES:
Trust for Public Land.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
That's the people, to see if they had any answers. So I would like to table this for a cycle just to see where -- you know, what the input is and where they got that -- where they -- I don't want to endorse that map until I have some answers from the people whose you know, towns it's going through. There's a lot of extensive wetlands there, too, that the off-road trail is going through. It would require a building -- some pretty big infrastructure to get a bike trail through some of these areas.

MS. KEYES:
Right. And I know that infrastructure is part of the phase when they start getting to the build-out. The only thing I would say in terms of tabling it for a cycle is that, this is an endorsement or an approval for a grant application. I don't know when the grant is due. It doesn't say it in the backup. So that would be my only hesitation. I assume that this was time sensitive which is why we brought it, but it doesn't actually say. It's due at the end of July.

So I mean I think your questions are legitimate. I think that it's my understanding that in terms of the, you know, the wetland piece, the roads that are narrow, that the infrastructure to make the bike path safe in those spaces is -- would be included in the later rounds. They're still in the feasibility piece of it. So none of this is final. That outreach is still happening. The map you're describing is not finalized. Like all of that, you know what I mean, this is to continue the--
LEG. KRUPSKI:
But since the map is out, without doing any outreach that I know of, and so then if I'm going to vote to endorse this, I'm endorsing their map and I'm also -- I'm also, you know, endorsing the fact that they said that they've done outreach, which I don't know that they had.

MS. KEYES:
I mean, I was told that they have by the -- I think you spoke to John Keyes in Economic Development.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
He didn't indicated that they had.

MS. KEYES.
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No, no, he didn't say that they had, no. And what he said was that this was for a really mostly a study of a trail system further west, somewhere in Bethpage or something like that, to connect up different parks -- public parks there.

MS. KEYES:
That's the start of the trail.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
My objection is that the map is concluded with that, included with a text that says there was outreach on these proposed trails.

MS. KEYES:
If it says it, I believe it. If they said they did outreach, I have no reason to believe they they didn't. And I don't -- I was not lead to believe -- in fact, I was lead to believe that the map, all of this is still part of what they are developing. They're asking for additional funds to continue developing the plan for the extension of the Empire State Trail. So I don't believe -- the map, I would consider in draft form.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Where is the funding -- where are we looking to get the funding from?

MS. KEYES:
So this grant application -- they've gotten funded from the state through other rounds of the consolidated funding application. That's what this is for. For state funding.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So, we're getting state funding to do the state trail.

MS. KEYES:
The state's going to fund this whole project.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
What doesn't the state -- why are we doing the state trail, then?
MS. KEYES:
I don't know what you mean.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I'm missing the point. We're getting state money to do a state trial. Why is the County getting state money to do the state trial?

MS. KEYES:
The County isn't getting money. The County -- one of the requirements of the grant application is that any jurisdiction where the trail is proposed to pass through, has to sign -- has to sign off on the grant application. So the County is not getting any money. This is all being done by the Trust For Public Land. This is before you because the trail will traverse through Suffolk County. It's a requirement of the grant application.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Let me just find the original e-mail.

P.O. GREGORY:
We'll freeze the moment in time.

P.O. GREGORY:
Can we pass this over?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, thank you. How about we do that, all right.

1658, Authorizing use of Cedar Beach County Park for Cornell Cooperative Extension Marine Program Taste and Tour Fundraiser. (Krupski). Motion by Legislator Krupski; second by Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1606, Accepting a --

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Not present: Legs. Muratore, Hahn)

P.O. GREGORY:
-- donation of software from RapidSOS for the Suffolk County Police Department's information technology section for the purpose of enhancing our current 911 system. (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Donnelly; second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Not present: Legs. Muratore, Hahn)

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1478, to Appoint member to the Community Choice Aggregation Task Force Gordian Raacke. (Fleming). Motion by Legislator Fleming;
second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen. (Not Present: Legs. Muratore, Hahn)

P. O. GREGORY:
Okay, IR bond resolution 1607 A to appropriate funds in connection
with Reconstruction of CR 86, Broadway-Greenlawn Road, Town of
Huntington (CP 5090) (IR bond resolution 1607A, bond Resolution of
the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of
$100,000 Bonds to finance planning cost associated with the
Reconstruction of CR 86, Broadway-Greenlawn Road, Town of
Huntington) (CP 5090.110). Motion by Legislator Donnelly; second
by Legislator Berland. Roll call.

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

LEG. DONELLY:
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.
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LEG. TROTTA:
  Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
  Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
  Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
  Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
  Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
  Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
  Yes.
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MR. RICHBERG:
  Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
  Okay, IR 1607, (Appropriating funds in connection with
  Reconstruction of CR 86, Broadway-Greenlawn Road, Town of
  Huntington) (CP 5090). (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second.
  All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstained?

MR. RICHBERG:
  Seventeen. (Not present: Leg. Muratore)

P.O. GREGORY:
  IR 1608A, Bond Resolution, Appropriating funds in connection with
  improvements to Vector Control Buildings - Yaphank (CP 5520).
  (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing
  the issuance of $175,000 Bonds to finance improvements to the
  Vector Control Buildings – Yaphank) (CP 5520.313).

07:53PM

LEG. FLEMING:
  Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
  Motion by Legislator Fleming; second by Legislator Sunderman.
  Roll call.

  (*Roll call by Mr. Richberg, Clerk of the Legislature*)
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LEG. FLEMING:
  Yes.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
  Yes.
LEG. KRUPSKI:  
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:  
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:  
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:  
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:  
Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ:  
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:  
Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON:  
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:  
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:  
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:  
Yes.

LEG. DONNELLY:  
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:  
Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:  
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:  
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:  
Okay. IR 1608 (Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Vector Control Buildings - Yaphank) (CP 5520). (Spencer). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1809A, Bond Resolution, Appropriating funds in connection with
the Improvements to Building 158 – Civil Service/4th District Court
(Capital Program Number 1140). (Bond Resolution of the County of
Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $125,000 Bonds to
finance Improvements to Building 158 – Civil Service/4th District
Court, Hauppauge (CP 1140.311). Motion by Legislator Kennedy;
second by Legislator Donnelly. Roll call.

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

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
(No response)

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.
LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. BERLAND: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Yes.

P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

MR. RICHBERG: Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY: Okay, IR 1609, (Appropriating funds in connection with the Improvements to Building 158 – Civil Service/4th District Court (Capital Program Number 1140). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG: Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY: Authorizing execution of an agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. Eighteen Hauppauge Industrial and Motor Parkway Plaza (IS-18006). (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Kennedy; second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG: Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1621, Calling a public hearing for the purpose of considering increasing the maximum amount to be expended for improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 7- Medford (CP 8194). (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Calarco. I’ll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG: Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1622A, Bond Resolution, Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to the Suffolk County Farm (CP 1796). (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $150,000 Bonds to finance the cost of Improvements to Suffolk County Farm) (CP 1796.316 and .512). Motion by Legislator
Calarco; second by Legislator Donnelly. Roll call.

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

D. P. O. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. DONNELLY:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.
P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1622, (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $150,000 Bonds to finance the cost of Improvements to Suffolk County Farm) (CP 1796.316 and .512).

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, IR 1623A, Bond Resolution, Appropriating funds in connection with Traffic Signal Improvements (CP 5054). (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $600.000 Bonds to finance the Traffic Signal Improvements). (CP 5054.587). I'll make a motion; second by Legislator Calarco.

ROLL CALL.

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

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.
LEG. CILMI:  
Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON:  
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:  
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:  
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:  
Yes.

LEG. DONNELLY:  
Yes.

07:57PM

LEG. SPENCER:  
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:  
Eighteen.

07:57PM

P. O. GREGORY:  

MR. RICHBERG:  
Eighteen.

07:57PM

P. O. GREGORY:  
IR 1625, Accepting and appropriating 100% NYS PAVE-NY program funds in the amount of $1,391,570 and amending the 2019 Capital Budget and Program appropriating (additional) funds in connection with strengthening and improving County Roads (CP 5014). (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Cilmi; second by Legislator Donnelly. All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:  
Eighteen.

07:57PM

P. O. GREGORY:  
IR 1626, Calling a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 1 – Port Jefferson (CP 8169) (Co. Exec.).

07:57PM

LEG. HAHN:  
Motion.

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

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1627, Calling a public hearing for the purpose of considering increasing the maximum amount to be expended for improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 23-Coventry Manor (CP 8149). Motion by Legislator Anker. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen. (Not Present: Not present: Leg. Hahn)

P.O. GREGORY:

LEG. FLEMING:
I'll second it.

P.O. GREGORY:
Roll call.

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

D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

* Index Included at End of Transcript
LEG. ANKER: Yes.
LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.
LEG. GONZALEZ: Yes.
LEG. CILMI: Yes.
LEG. FLOTTERON: Yes.
LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.
LEG. TROTTA: Yes.
LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.
LEG. BERLAND: Yes.
LEG. DONNELLY: Yes.
LEG. SPENCER: Yes.
P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

MR. RICHBERG: 
Eighteen.


MR. RICHBERG: 
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY: IR 1651A, Bond Resolution, Amending the 2019 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with replacement of Major Building Equipment (CP 1737). (Bond Resolution of the County
of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $450,000 Bonds to
finance the Replacement of Major Building Equipment at the
County-owned building located at 423 Griffing Avenue, Riverhead.
(CP 1737.335). Motion by Legislator Donnelly; second by Legislator
Krupski. Roll call.

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

07:59PM

LEG. DONNELLY:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.
D.P.O. CALARCO:
Yes.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
1652A, Amending the 2019 Capital Budget and Program in connection with the County share for the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project, Town of East Hampton (CP 5383). (Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of $502,000 Bonds to finance the County’s share of the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project, Town of East Hampton) (CP 5383.310). Motion by Legislator Fleming; second by Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

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

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So I understand that the County, you know, we made an obligation for this project five years ago and I did not support it because I understand that it’s really a failed coastal erosion policy to try to armor the shoreline and try to truck sand into a beach and think that Mother Nature’s just going to ignore what Mother Nature does. And so while I understand our obligation that we made five years ago to this project, I think we should use this project as a, the old adage you’re not useless if you’re a bad example in coastal erosion and shoreline management. And even without considering sea level rise, this is a not a good coastal policy to continue.

P.O. GREGORY:

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

LEG. FLEMING:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

* Index Included at End of Transcript
LEG. KRUPSKI: No.

LEG. SUNDERMAN: Yes.

LEG. MURATORE: Yes.

LEG. HAHN: Yes.

LEG. ANKER: Yes.

LEG. LINDSAY: Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ: Yes.

LEG. FLOTTERON: Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY: Yes.

LEG. TROTTA: No.

LEG. McCAFFREY: Yes.

LEG. BERLAND: Yes.

LEG. DONNELLY: Yes.

LEG. SPENCER: Yes.

D.P.O. CALARCO: Yes.

P.O. GREGORY: Yes.

MR. RICHBERG:

Sixteen.

P.O. GREGORY:

IR 1652, (Amending the 2019 Capital Budget and Program in connection with the County share for the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project, Town of East Hampton (CP 5383). (Co. Exec.).
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LEG. TROTTA:
On the motion for 1652.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. Motion to approve. On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
If I could ask Legislator Krupski, is this the one where you voted
against the hardening with the sand bags; and that you predicted
this?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
(Nodding yes)

LEG. TROTTA:
Now weren't we not supposed to -- it was the Town's obligation to
fix that afterwards?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No, I think once the Army Corps was done with the job that it was
-- they needed -- the Army Corps needs a partner for the
maintenance. And they wanted the County and the -- the DEC somehow
passed their partnership obligations off. And the County and the
Town picked them up. And so the County and the Town are obligated
to partner on some of the maintenance on this project.

LEG. TROTTA:
Look, I remember this because I actually went back to this. I
regretted -- I think I voted -- I didn't vote with you. And I
regretted it when I went out there and looked. But I'm pretty sure
that it was the Town's responsibility after we spent the money to
fix it, the Town will be responsible to fix it up.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
You can check with DPW. I'm pretty sure that we were partners with
--

LEG. TROTTA:
Is anybody here from DPW?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yeah.

LEG. TROTTA:
I don't have much of a memory left, but that I remember looking
into.

LEG. FLEMING:
I can fill you in. There was an IMA, excuse me, entered into in
2014; that the County and the Town would be obligated in equal part
once the Army Corps had finished their work. So it was 50/50 and
this is 50% of the total cost for the 2018 -- '17 repairs.

LEG. TROTTA:
I remember voting for it because once we were done, we were done
and then the town was going to hold it. I'm have like an idiot
savant, I can remember certain things and this is one of them.

LEG. FLEMING:
That's half right.

LEG. TROTTA:
What do you think?

ACTING COMMISSIONER TYSON:
Actually what the Legislator says is accurate. We are on the hook for the operations and maintenance.

LEG. TROTTA:
For how long?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
That's a good question.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TYSON:
I think the overall intent is that this would be in place until there is a larger project, which is called the Fire Island to Montauk Point project once that comes through.

LEG. TROTTA:
And build a wall.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TYSON:
Once that project gets out there, then that would sort of obviate this agreement.

LEG. TROTTA:
I'm not going to support this, but I think if you check, I voted no for the bond.

LEG. FLEMING:
Mr. Presiding Officer. Oh, I'm sorry.

LEG. TROTTA:
Don't worry, go ahead, I'm sorry.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:
I just wanted to note that I've said it before that Montauk is sort of the canary in the coal mine on climate change. It's such a narrow spit of land sticking out in the Atlantic Ocean. And to their credit the community has developed a hamlet plan that includes retreat from the coastline. One of the problems for this hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of real state is that it's a very narrow amount of space that you have. So they are taking a hard look at it. They're willing to make sacrifices.

I know in other parts of my district, we're looking at living shore lines that are less of a hardened structure and more forgiving in terms of what the ocean is demanding as sea level rises. So that's
one of the reasons why I'm so anxious to support their efforts. I agree, the ocean is taking over the land and we have to be mindful of it, but we're talking about a huge amount of revenue for the County in sales tax and hotel/motel tax alone that is being protected with this effort. So I do appreciate the support of my colleagues.

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

MR. RICHBERG:

WAYS & MEANS COMMITTEE

P.O. GREGORY:
Ways and means IR 1311, Repealing Chapter 1065 of the Suffolk County Code and substituting a New Chapter 1065. (Co. Exec.).

LEG. CILMI:
Motion to table.

P.O. GREGORY:
That was quick. You have somewhere to go? Motion by Legislator Cilmi; second by Legislator Kennedy. On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So I've got memo here from our Counsel and it raises a lot of really interesting questions. Wouldn't it be better to recommit this to committee and take a look at in committee again in light of, you know, what I've read.

LEG. CILMI:
As you like.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I mean, I think --

P.O. GREGORY:
I'm in favor of that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Sarah, could you give us an explanation?

P.O. GREGORY:
If it ain't legit, you gotta recommit. (Laughter)

MS. SIMPSON:
So we did write a memo explaining the highlights. I have a longer memo that I have not distributed. But if Legislators would like to read a four-page version of this, you're more than welcome to, that details all of the exact changes.

* Index Included at End of Transcript
My main concerns on this were making sure that the Legislature was aware that their oversight was going to be limited and violations of General Municipal Law, making sure that those corrections were made. And if anyone would like to ask further questions --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
All right, so I'll make a motion to recommit.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. We have a motion to recommit.

08:07PM

LEG. BERLAND:
Can I just ask a question?

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

08:07PM

LEG. BERLAND:
I'm sorry, I think I heard part of that. Is the -- it was just the procedural stuff? I mean, was it substantive also or just --

MS. SIMPSON:
It had some substance concerns about it as well. In its current form procedurally there are defects.

LEG. BERLAND:
Right.

08:07PM

MS. SIMPSON:
But additionally from a substantive perspective, it's in violation of General Municipal Law in its current form, in section 104-b. But I also was reading -- in my memo was raising concerns about, you know, the specific limitation of our review from -- of more regular basis to 4 to 8 years. Those were the highlights of the memo. And I have a much longer form version that I didn't think people were going to want to read.

LEG. BERLAND:
Can we get the County Executive's take on that?

08:08PM

P.O. GREGORY:
Yeah, sure.

08:08PM

MS. KEYES:
We fully expected and would request that it be tabled on the floor today. We spoke about it a little bit at Ways and Means. Basia Braddish, who is the primary attorney from the County Attorney's who worked on this and spoke a little bit about her extensive experience with procurement -- with public procurement with General Municipal Law, is not here tonight because it was our understanding it would be tabled on the floor so we're -- we understand there are formatting issues, which is why we are asking that it be tabled on the floor because it can't be published in the General Code books; that's what we were told.
But in terms of substance, it is in its final form. We would be more than happy and were anticipating looking forward to a discussion at the September 4th General Meeting so we would just ask that we stick with tabling on the floor.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Recommitted question: If we recommit it back to committee, couldn't we still -- then if it's moved, if it's ever unsatisfied, move it out of committee and have that discussion in September also.

MS. SIMPSON:
Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Okay.

LEG. BERLAND:
That doesn't change the procedure.

MS. SIMPSON:
It still procedurally needs to be amended.

LEG. BERLAND:
Right. But recommitting, does that start it over or is that --

MS. KEYES:
It would need -- the committee can vote again.

MS. SIMPSON:
Yeah, it would just require the committee vote a second time to get it out.

LEG. BERLAND:
So tabling would --

MS. SIMPSON:
Tabling would not.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, we have a motion to recommit. Do we have a second?

MR. RICHBERG:
I have a second. I need a second on the motion to table. I'm sorry.

P.O. GREGORY:
We have seconds for both.

MR. RICHBERG:
I didn't get the second. For the tabling, I didn't hear it.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Me. Recommit.
LEG. CILMI:
Recommit goes first.

P.O. GREGORY:
And Legislator Calarco wanted to speak. No? Okay. Motion to recommit, roll call.

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

08:10PM
LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
Pass.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
I'll pass.

08:10PM
LEG. MURATORE:
Yes, to recommit.

LEG. HAHN:
Yes.

LEG. ANKER:
Yes.

08:10PM
LEG. LINDSAY:
Yes.

LEG. GONZALEZ:
Yes.

LEG. CILMI:
Yes.

08:11PM
LEG. FLOTTERON:
Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

LEG. McCAFFREY:
Yes.

LEG. BERLAND:
I'm no. I'd rather table.

08:11PM
LEG. DONNELLY:
Yes.

LEG. SPENCER:
Yes.
D.P.O. CALARCO:
No.

P.O. GREGORY:
Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:
No.

LEG. SUNDERMAN:
Yes, to recommit.

LEG. LINDSAY:
I said yes.

MR. RICHBERG:
Fifteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, so 1311 is recommitted.


LEG. CILMI:
Second.

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

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1631, Authorizing an extension of the lease of premises located at 100 Marcus Boulevard, Suite 100, Hauppauge, NY for use as offices by the District Attorney. (CO Exec.). I'll make a motion.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Second.

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

LEG. TROTTA:
(Indicating opposed)

LEG. MURATORE:
(Indicating opposed)

MR. RICHBERG:
Sixteen.
P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1641, Sale of County-owned real estate to Section 72-H of the General Municipal Law Incorporated Village of Poquott. (SCTM No. 0205-009.00-01.00-008.000). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Hahn. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
I'm sorry, can I have the motion and second.

P.O. GREGORY:
It was Hahn, then me.

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1644, Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Local Law No. 13-1976 David Taormina and Debra Taormina (SCTM No. 0400-129.00-03.00-042.000). (Co. Exec.) I'll make a motion; second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1667, Directing the Division of Real Property Acquisition and Management to prorate the grant from the New York State Department of Housing and Urban Development for a certain parcel (SCTM No. 0300-182.00-01.00-007.022). (Fleming). Motion by Legislator Fleming; second by Legislator Krupski. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. In the manilla folder, we have some Local Law 40s, IR 1694, Accepting and appropriating a grant award amendment from the State University of New York for an Educational Opportunity Program, 100% reimbursed by State Funds at Suffolk County Community College (Co. Exec.) Motion by Gonzalez. I got the Chair. And then Donnelly. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1695, Accepting and appropriating a grant award from the Empire State Development (ESD) Minority and Women's Business Development Lending Program (MWBDL) for the Suffolk County Community College Certification Assistance Program (CAP), 100% reimbursed by State Funds at Suffolk County Community College. (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Gonzalez; second by Legislator Berland. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1698, Accepting and appropriating 100% reimbursable state grant funds from the New York State Office for Aging for unmet needs. (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Anker, our Chair; second by Legislator Sunderman. All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

08:14PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1729, Accepting and appropriating 100% state grant funds from the New York State Department of Health in the amount of $99,178 for the Community Health Worker Expansion (“CHWE”) administered by the Suffolk County Department of Health Services, Division of Patient Care and to execute grant related agreements. (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Spencer; second by Legislator Donnelly. All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions.

08:14PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1730, Transferring 100% grant funding in the amount of $10,000 awarded by the US Department of Justice from the Suffolk County Medical Examiner’s Office to the Suffolk County Sheriff’s Office and Suffolk County Police Department. (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Donnelly; second by Legislator Berland. All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

08:15PM

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1737, authorizing certain Technical Corrections to adopted resolution number --

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen.  (Not Present: Leg. Krupski)

P.O. GREGORY:
I'm sorry?

MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen.

P.O. GREGORY:
-- 326 of 2019 for the Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) FY2016 Grant.  (Co. Exec.).  I'll make a motion; second by Legislator Calarco.  All in favor?  Opposed?  Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.
P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1738, Authorizing certain Technical Corrections to Adopted Resolution No. 325-2019 for the State Homeland Security Program (SHSP) FY Grant. (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

08:15PM

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1739, Accepting a grant in the amount of $993,861 from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services for the Gun Involved Violence Elimination (GIVE) VI Program. (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Donnelly; second by Legislator Berland. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

08:16PM

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1730, Transferring 100% grant funding in the amount of $10,000 awarded by the US Department of Justice from the Suffolk County Medical Examiner’s Office to the Suffolk County Sheriff’s Office and Suffolk County Police Department. (Co. Exec.).

MR. RICHBERG:
You just said 1730.

P.O. GREGORY:
I'm sorry, I did a double. Procedure motion number 19, 2019, setting land acquisition priorities in accordance with Triple A program requirements to 2019 phase II. (Hahn). Motion by Legislator Hahn; second by Legislator Fleming. On the motion anyone? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1537 we did earlier. In the red folder, we have a few CNs left. IR 1677, Declaring a superior governmental interest to retain DuWayne Gregory as Presiding officer (laughter) -- oh, I'm sorry, Superior governmental interest to retain parcel (SCTM No. 0500-382.00-07.00-007.000) in County ownership for Downtown Revitalization purposes. (Lindsay).

LEG. LINDSAY:
Motion.

P.O. GREGORY:
Motion by Legislator Lindsay; second by Legislator Muratore. On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
I just have a quick question with this. It's a parking lot?
LEG. LINDSAY:  
So, yeah, the parcel of property was privately owned for the last  
however many years they haven't paid property taxes on it. And we  
took title of the property on June the 1st. And rather than allow  
them a remittance period, we are going to keep the property to use  
it as a parking lot in perpetuity. It's right on Main Street in  
Sayville.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
So it was used as a parking lot previously?

LEG. LINDSAY:  
It was. And then the owner blocked the parking lot; wouldn't allow  
anybody on for the last year.

LEG. TROTTA:  
Didn't pay taxes.

LEG. LINDSAY:  
Didn't make taxes and blocked the property, yeah.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Can I ask question of Real Estate?

LEG. LINDSAY:  
Sure.

MR. SMAGIN:  
Good evening.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Good evening. So am I correct that they only -- a business only  
has to not pay taxes for one year period before it's taken?

MR. SMAGIN:  
That's normally the case. Sometimes it's a longer period where  
they're trying to enter into payment plans and things like that.  
So I believe this one was actually -- the tax lien was a few years  
old prior to us taking a tax deed. But the normal rule is for a  
vacant parcel for it to be one year before a tax deed is taken.  
Normally in that process it's about two years before we'd actually  
would take a tax deed once it's reviewed by the Comptroller's  
Office.

LEG. KENNEDY:  
Okay. Did the prior owner have a business next to it; or he just  
had a parking lot?

MR. SMAGIN:  
It just looked like a parking lot, as Legislator Lindsay was  
stating; was leased and then he had blocked off from the community.

LEG. LINDSAY:  
Just to answer your question, he had several commercial buildings  
that he owns on Main Street in Sayville. This was just an empty  
parking lot. It also had a tree that was a historic tree that was
over 150 years old and he cut that down to, you know, the great
dismay of everybody on Main Street. And then was in a dispute with
the Town over rental payments for the parking lot and then just
decided to block the parking lot off all together.

LEG. KENNEDY:
And this is going to us, not the town.

LEG. LINDSAY:
Correct.

08:19PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
So are we going to hand it over to the town after it goes to us?

LEG. LINDSAY:
No, we're going to keep the property.

LEG. KENNEDY:
And this is in what town?

08:19PM

LEG. LINDSAY:
Sayville.

LEG. KENNEDY:
All right. Sayville does not charge for parking?

LEG. LINDSAY:
No.

08:19PM

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
Pass.

P.O. GREGORY:
No? Okay, so we have a motion, a second on 1677. All in favor?
Opposed? It's Lindsay and Muratore. All in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
IR 1728, Authorizing use of the Long Island Maritime Museum in West
Sayville by the Boomer Esisaoon Foundation for their At Your Service
CF Waffle Run and Walk Fundraiser. (Co. Exec.). Motion by
Legislator Lindsay; second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor?
Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.
P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I did make a mistake. We did skip over -- did Legislator Krupski get to check your e-mails. We have to go back to 1645.

MS. KEYES:
Can I clarify, too, because I was able to speak to John -- to the other Keyes who is the expert on this. So the math that was included shows the entire Empire State Trail on Long Island as it's proposed. The community outreach, which she said you guys did speak about, and that he -- because he attended one of the community outreach meetings at the Hauppauge Public library, this grant application is for a nine-mile segment of trail. It's part of a 21-mile segment of the trail that they are doing the conceptual plan for now; nine miles of which is in Suffolk County between Bethpage State Park and Edgewood Preserve. That's where this -- this grant application, the segment of the trail that they're in the conceptual -- yes, yes, I'm not lying, I promise, it's not on the -- they're not out, they're nowhere near even conceptual design further at the East End of Long Island.

So the map was included -- the map that was included, what is entirely draft; entirely proposed. As they go through -- this started up in Niagara Falls. There's a huge infrastructure that's been built up Upstate. As they work their way down the trail, the idea being it will ultimately connect from Niagara Falls all the way out to Montauk, as they work their way down the state, each section of the trail is broken out and they do community outreach, which then results in a conceptual design. It's a multistep process that they work their work through the trail. They're only at right now the point in the trail that is between -- at the Suffolk piece, Bethpage State Park to Edgewood Preserve.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And so Mr. Keys explained all that to me.

MS. KEYES:
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Right. Just like that. And I was -- you know, I was satisfied with his explanation. My objection was the letter from Danny Gold, Project Manager for the Long Island Extension because -- I mean, it's got nothing to do with the County because it says --

MS. KEYES:
The Town of Huntington passed a resolution supporting this.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
They completed a feasibility study in late 2018 that won the support of all these people, but they didn't do any -- this is local businesses, local foundations.

MS. KEYES:
Local to this section of the trail. Right? Local to this section of the trail Western Suffolk.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
It doesn't say that. It says map out a multiuse east/west path across Long Island. So, you know, I would --

MS. KEYES:
I'm just clarifying. And it does state in the resolution, I just missed it -- I understand what you're saying. I think that maybe the letter, if you interpret it one way, it could be broad applying. What this grant application is actually for, what the resolution that's before you is actually related to is a nine-mile section of the trail completely off-road between Bethpage State Park and Edgewood Preserve. It's not anywhere eastern of that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
But they did send a map showing a proposed on and off-road trail.

MS. KEYES:
The only part of the map in Suffolk County that is -- has progressed anywhere beyond a very broad draft stage is this nine-mile section. The rest of the trail, as they work their way east, will have to go through the same community outreach and design process that this nine-mile section is going through now.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
But in their bold vision, and those aren't my words, and this is coming from Carter Strickland, who's the New York State Director, they did extensive outreach. And I reached out to Mr. Strickland and to Mr. Gold to find out what kind of outreach was done and how they came up with all this.

MS. KEYES:
Well, like I said, I confirmed with John, they did do outreach. He attended some of the meetings.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
He told me that.

MS. KEYES:
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And he told me exactly what you said, but, you know, you can't answer for what the New York State Empire State trail people sent out, because their wording to me was kind of --

MS. KEYES:
I understand what you're saying, that maybe the letter that they submitted was a bit confusing. But I'm clarifying, John's clarifying and he's in touch with the folks from Trust of Public Lands so --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I reached out to him also. So we haven't heard anything.

MS. KEYES:
Okay.
LEG. KRUPSKI:
So that was, I think, Wednesday.

MS. KEYES:
And as it moves east or -- you know, as it moves east, they will be
doing outreach, you know, with those stakeholders as they move
east. Right now they're in this one section of Suffolk so that
would be why the towns, etcetera, that you reached out to might not
-- you know, wouldn't have had that outreach.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I would have been happy to support that.

MS. KEYES:
Right, I get it.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Okay. Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, Legislator Berland.

LEG. BERLAND:
I just want to state the Friends of Edgewood Preserve are totally
in favor of this connection. So we have been working, you know,
for years to say that Edgewood Preserve can actually connect to
Bethpage. So that is -- I think this -- part of this, they've had
lots of outreach in the past.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And to have a trail, off the road trail system is a wonderful thing
and very safe in light -- no, really in light of all the people --
you know, it's a dangerous road. And when you have cars and then
pedestrians and then bicycles, it's a dangerous scenario, so I
understand that.

LEG. BERLAND:
Right. That's why this body may then, depending on what happens
and how this actually makes it to the Edgewood Preserve, may have
to re-entertain the bridge that this Legislature prior to me under
Steve Stern voted to take down when they were expanding Commack
Road, but no bridge has been put back up. So, if this goes
through, that may mean that we have to put the bridge back up. So
keep that in mind, too.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I don't know if that was a disincentive on purpose or what.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, so we have a motion, a second on 1645. All in favor?
Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Opposed.
MR. RICHBERG:
Seventeen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. I'd like to waive the rules and lay the following
resolutions on the table: IR 1734 to EPA; IR 1736 to Ways and
Means; IR 1740 to Government Ops; IR 1741 to Public Safety; IR 1742
Public Works, set a public hearing September 4th 2 PM in Hauppauge;
IR 1743 Economic Development; IR 1744 to Public Works; IR 1745 to
Ways and Means; IR 1746 to EPA; IR 1747 to EPA; IR 1748 to EPA.
Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. RICHBERG:
Eighteen.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay, that is our agenda. We stand adjourned. Please get home
safely. See you in September, late August.
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