

LILCO Defies Logic

The Shoreham nuclear plant was created on the premise that it would provide cheap electricity for the future. LILCO management proposed the project knowing that the cost of constructing the plant and the cost of providing a return for shareholders could be passed on to the consumer.

At the time the plant was sited, there had been no major nuclear plant accident of note. Federal officials told those who raised the issue that emergency planning would be addressed during licensing hearings on the plant. Thus the plant was sited before it was ascertained whether a timely evacuation could be accomplished in the event of a major accident.

It is now 1983, and the licensing hearings continue, but economic conditions and safety requirements have changed dramatically since the days in which the plant was first envisioned.

The cost of the plant - originally estimated by LILCO at about \$250 million - has risen more than tenfold to \$3.2 billion, and it is not yet complete.

Because of the cost hikes - much of which resulted from changes in Federal regulations - and increased prices of uranium fuel, the plant will never produce "cheap" electricity as once promised.

In fact, estimates are that the plant will not have paid for itself until around 2010. Only then could it save anybody money, and only if oil prices continue to climb. If unexpected

repairs and shutdowns are factored in, it becomes clear that the chances of the plant every being considered cost effective are very slim. The cost of decommissioning has been set by LILCO at \$370 million. The contents of the reactor vessel will be toxic long after the concrete from which the reactor was formed has turned to dust.

The March, 1979, accident at Three Mile Island Unit II proves unequivocally that chances of once in 5,000 years can happen during any of those 5,000 years. When that plant melted down, it had been in operation only three months.

An evacuation plan that can work on Long Island simply cannot be developed. After weeks of testimony by experts, elected officials and the public at large, it is apparent to all concerned - probably even to the management of LILCO - that an evacuation plan is as much a fantasy today as it was 10 years ago.

Because of LILCO's corporate structure, the ratepayers will pay for the plant whether it goes on line or not. If the plant is going to generate electricity more expensive than that generated by oil, coal, or imported hydro-power, why open it? If there is even a minute possibility that the health and welfare of Long Islanders will be jeopardized, why subject them to this risk at no benefit.

Logic tells us unequivocally that Shoreham should not be opened.

And why not?

Innocent Until Proven Guilty

New York City utilities were successful, about a year ago, in getting Legislative approval of a law that makes the accused guilty until they prove themselves innocent. If the user of a utility is suspected of evading utility charges through manipulation of a meter or the use of a by-pass device, they are deemed to be guilty, under this law, until and unless they can prove their innocence.

This law flies in the face of our

Constitution, which guarantees our rights as citizens to be considered innocent until the state proves to a jury of our peers, without question, that we are guilty. This legislation should, and probably will, be challenged on Constitutional grounds. We fail to see how the Supreme Court could possibly uphold such a law that is so blatantly unconstitutional.

Apparently taking heart from this law, the state Cable Television

Association has asked for a similar measure pertaining to that industry. The cable industry has, reportedly, been hard hit by private individuals who purchase for their own use descramblers and satellite-type antennas which enable them to pick up signals while escaping the charges imposed by the cable firms.

While we can sympathize some with the cable companies who are having difficulties protecting their investments, we believe there are alternatives other than the proposed law.

The industry can utilize more sophisticated electronic scrambling devices that cannot be as easily decoded, and, just as every other American citizen, they have recourse

to the law if they feel their property is being stolen. They can file a formal complaint with the proper law enforcement agency, prove their charges in court and, if warranted, obtain a conviction.

They should not, however, be in the position of being the accuser, the prosecutor, judge, jury and enforcer without due process of law.

The utilities should not have been granted this power, and the law that grants it should be revoked. And, the State Legislature should not consider it for the cable industry either. Innocent until proven guilty is the foundation upon which this nation has survived, and it should continue to be so.

And why not?

Readers' Opinion

"Have the correct facts"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

I read the (proposed Suffolk County and C.S.E.A. contract, Jan. 19, 1983) editorial and hope that you are a better newspaperman than mathematician whereas the arithmetic used in said editorial would make a sixth grader blush.

You obviously have assessed valuation and full valuation confused, since at the top of the second column you state that the effect of the proposed "contract on county real estate taxes is projected to be an additional \$1.91 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation." If that were true, the county tax on the average assessed home of around \$4,000 would only increase by 4x\$1.91 or \$7.64. The county does not use assessed value since each of the 10 towns uses a different equalization rate. (See enclosed copy of page IV-1 of the county budget which clearly shows that the correct nomenclature is FULL VALUE.)

When I tried to explain this fact to one of your employees, I was rudely told that I did not know what I was talking about although I use these terms daily.

You fail to point out that the full valuation of the county increased \$1,732,349,000 or 7.56 percent from 1982 to 1983 during a depressed year and not the 4 percent that you state in your article. Therefore, if the recession ends in the near future, that increase could rise at a greater rate so as to negate the increases in the C.S.E.A. contract.

The end of the recession will also mean increased revenues from the sales tax which will pay for the increases in the county budget other than labor.

The revenues from property taxes are only 32.3 percent of the total revenues of the

county; therefore all increases in costs to the county are not necessarily reflected in PROPORTIONATE higher taxes.

The total estimated labor costs of the county for 1983 is \$283,610,000 without benefits. If the proposed C.S.E.A. contract will increase labor costs between \$51 million and \$58 million-year without benefits, as you state, that will be an increase of 18 to 20.5 percent and not 81.3 percent as stated in your editorial. As stated above the increase in sales taxes and the increase in the full valuation of the county will be able to absorb most of that increase.

I think that when you write an editorial on a particular subject, it behooves you to have the correct facts.

Joseph J. Risso
County Employee

Editor's Note: Information concerning the future tax impact of the CSEA agreement, based on the county's growth in valuation, came from a county official with full knowledge of the facts. He noted the growth at the 4 per cent mentioned in our editorial. Carrying out the future tax impact based on full valuation, a home valued at \$50,000 would be impacted by an additional \$95.50 in taxes for the increase alone, based on the \$1.91 per \$1,000 estimated impact. Your assessment of the future impact of this agreement differs totally not only with our editorial viewpoints, but also with those expressed in a report by the Legislature's Budget Review Office. That report indicated the impact in 1984 and 1985 would leave the county with two choices: substantial tax hikes, or extensive employee layoffs.

"100 percent adoption rate"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

I am writing to thank you for permitting the Brookhaven Animal Shelter the space in your newspaper for our animal adoption program. In the past eight weeks since I have taken over the program we have had a 100 per cent adoption rate on the animals that have been featured in your paper. This may not seem startling in itself, but the dogs featured have been with us for sometime and no one had shown any interest in them. They have not been the most adoptable dogs, in fact they have often been the most unwanted of all dogs we have at the shelter. But these dogs had shown a personality that endeared them to

our kennel staff. Although not particularly pretty on the outside, their beauty came from within.

We have many more dogs in desperate need of a good home, more than we can ever put in your paper. We, who work at the Brookhaven Animal Shelter ask that those of you who are in search of a pet, whether it be a dog or cat, to come down and look here first. Your reward will be knowing you saved a life, because try as we do, we have more animals than we can find homes for.

Sincerely,
Linda Pew
Dog Control Officer I

"A lot of us are just getting by"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

I'm sick and tired of you implying that us county employees aren't taxpayers because we are. We have mortgages, property taxes, LILCO bills, etc., etc. just like everyone else.

The way you go on leads me to believe you wish you were a county employee. Well, Mr. Willmott, why don't you take a civil service test or two! The answer to that would be because all you know how to

do is shoot off your mouth!

Our salaries aren't as fantastic as you also imply. A lot of us are just getting by.

I wish you would remember that Mr. Cohalan and the legislators got their raises with no hassle and tie-ups. You didn't make half as much a fuss as you are now with our contract. Quit picking on the county employees by trying to use us as a scapegoat!

Kathi Stepnoski

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 22 NO. 24

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 19 market zone editions every Wednesday
North Fork Patchogue Centereach Rocky Point
Riverhead Medford Selden Port Jefferson
Hampton East Holbrook, Holtsville Coram Three Village
Mad Hampton Sayville Mastic Shirely
Westhampton Oakdale
Moriches Ronkonkoma



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of

194,000 Circulation Weekly

Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton, Town of Islip, Suffolk County, County of Suffolk, Rocky Point School District, Patchogue-Medford School District, Suffolk County Life published weekly each Wednesday, is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Islip, Town of Riverhead, Town of Brookhaven, Village of Port Jefferson.

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher
John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Martin J. Cann - Director of Sales
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator
Claire Swanik - National Sales Director
Ted Conlon - Retail Sales Manager

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughly - Adv. Art Director
Sharman Gordon - News Art Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County: \$4.99 per year Outside Suffolk County: \$17.00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue. Suffolk County Life: In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year; outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year; newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue.

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the Letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume.

NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason.

ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.

Will Cuomo Hear?

Governor Cuomo is being urged to intervene in the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant controversy. Cuomo is on record as stating, during the recent campaign, that he would not allow a nuclear power plant to go on line if there is a question as to its safety. Enough questions have been raised concerning not only the construction of the plant, but the safety of the people in case of an accident.

If Cuomo is to be believed, he has no choice but to intervene as the head of New York State government. The Assemblymen from the East End, Joseph Sawicki and John Behan, both

have asked for his intervention. Both have asked for him to meet with all other elected officials from Long Island to help formulate and execute a plan of action to protect the citizens who call Long Island home.

Cuomo will be under the same pressure his predecessor, Hugh Carey, was. LILCO through their high priced lobbyists, former elected and appointed officials have the inside track.

Will Cuomo hear the people or the paid professional? Will he act as a man of courage and wisdom?

And why not?

New York's Own Senator

The United States Senators elected from the State of New York have, in the past, become renowned as Senators of the United States, sacrificing being Senators from New York State. Jacob Javitz and Patrick Moynihan are prime examples of this. Once elected from New York State, their concerns and their attentions become national and international in scope. The State of New York as a result, is neglected, and the needs of New York State people become secondary.

Senator Al D'Amato is a refreshing change from this past tradition. He not only is aware and cares, but he does get things done for the people of this state that elected him.

A recent example is his securing \$8.2 million for a 120-bed Veterans Nursing Home at Northport. This badly needed project for New York

State residents had been constantly shunted aside for the past eight years. New York State, particularly Long Island, has a large contingent of veterans, many who are now entering their senior years. They have earned, by their service to their country, some V.A. benefits. But the medical care they require has not been available at Northport. D'Amato, by caring, has brought the bacon home.

This is just one of the many projects D'Amato has been effective in securing for New York. We certainly look forward to having D'Amato continue to be an outstanding Senator for all the people of this State, first and foremost.

Thanks Al, it's good to have a real New York State - United States Senator.

And why not?

Thank You, Dr. Ammerman

Dr. Al Ammerman has retired as president of Suffolk County Community College system. For 22 years, he worked night and day to build this college into one of the outstanding junior college systems in the country.

During his tenure as president, the school grew from under 500 students to an enrollment close to 20,000. The school today operates year round, night and day. It offers educational opportunities to the recent high school

graduate, as well as our working populace who seek to expand their horizons and their educational opportunities.

Under Ammerman, the college grew from its modest beginning in the basement of a high school in Lake Ronkonkoma to the Selden campus, which has been expanded to the western campus in Brentwood and an eastern campus at Riverhead. The school offers thousands of young

people each year a top flight college curriculum at a reasonable cost. It offers higher education that could not, and would not, be secured if Suffolk County Community College was not as available nor as good as it is.

This college grew in stature and quality because of the love and devotion Dr. Ammerman provided during his professional life. Many of this school's graduates have gone on and made names for themselves in business and the professions. The

school offers an excellent foundation in the basics plus the practical courses needed for the foundation of jobs as well as the first 2 years of a 4 year college education.

Suffolk Life thanks Dr. Ammerman for his outstanding contribution in making Suffolk County Community College such an outstanding educational facility.

We wish him many years of health and enjoyment in retirement.

And why not?

Riverhead Forever

Suffolk County will celebrate its tricentennial this year. Although it should be a happy occasion, controversy has been rampant concerning the location for the celebration. Erroneous information obviously was circulated by misguided or misdirected deputies and aides of the County Executive.

When we approached County Executive Cohalan as to where the celebrations would be held, he emphatically stated that Riverhead is the historical and traditional County Seat of Suffolk. All major celebrations will be conducted at this historical site, he declared. As far as he is

concerned, as the executive of Suffolk County, history and tradition will be preserved.

The only plans he has for the annex at Hauppauge is the possibility of a few minor resolutions being passed at this location. Riverhead, The County Seat of Suffolk, is the designated site of this historic anniversary.

We were delighted to hear County Executive Cohalan refute this misinformation and to confirm that history and tradition will be preserved and observed at Riverhead.

And why not?

Readers' Opinion

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Upon review of all the media coverage concerning the pro's and con's of permitting LILCO to put on line their new Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant it is obvious that the major problem is monetary over and above the safety of Suffolk and Nassau County residents.

I do not want to highlight all the implications associated with the cost overruns but when you speak of a project of 3 billion plus it appears evident that not only was business and labor involved but politics right up to the Federal level also had their fingers in the pie.

Considering the above, the solutions for settling this dilemma consist of the following:

a.) Permit LILCO to go on line and call for Federal Legislation permitting citizens the right to bring suit against LILCO and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or the Federal Government if a nuclear accident occurs.

b.) Allow LILCO the opportunity to convert the Shoreham plant to coal or oil with financing through stock purchases given automatically to each ratepayer based upon a percentage of his monthly billing. This type of stock would be voting stock thereby allowing ratepayers a clear voice in the operations of this public utility.

c.) Take condemnation proceedings against the plant based upon environmental considerations with remuneration to LILCO to establish upon the lesser of the fair market value of the property (not as a power plant) or the current property assessment as recently appraised by LILCO.

Although the above solutions may require some additional considerations or actions either through the courts or special legislation enacted by congress it nevertheless suggests alternatives at a period when we are running out of time, patience and maybe life itself. Mr. Congressman, Mr. Local Politician we need your help now! You are the guardians of public safety and social responsibility and as such it is your responsibility to make certain that the final solution to this problem is not nuclear holocaust.

Michael DePaoli
Centereach

Dear Mr. Willmott,

I am one of the majority, who does not want to see the Shoreham plant go on line. They talk about acceptable death levels. Ask any of them if they would give up their lives for this plant. I'm sure there will be no takers. Even if this plant goes on line and never has an accident, it will still change the life-style of Long Island from tranquility to an island of fear, night and day, week after week, year after year. It will always be there and we will always be afraid. I ask you, for what?

If they want to use the Shoreham plant, let them convert it into a fossil power plant. Maybe it would be advantageous if you printed a ballot in your paper for or against the Shoreham plant and let your readers send it to you.

I pray to God that this plant will never go on line as a nuclear power plant.

Yours truly,
George F. Ruggiero

Dear Mr. Willmott,

As the new year for the Patchogue-Medford Arts Council begins it seems only right and proper to take this time to thank those who have helped to make last year a most successful year.

The Suffolk Life has been helpful to our young and growing organization. Publishing our events has helped to make them the successes they were.

We truly appreciated your most helpful support. Again thank you.

Sincerely,
PAMAC
Patchogue-Medford Arts Council

Dear Mr. Willmott:

I've been reading with interest your articles on Shoreham. I suggest why don't the residents within the 20 mile limit vote on this issue in the schools. I know the majority of people will vote no don't open the Shoreham plant. This way the issue will be settled once and for all. If we are the ones that have to live with this, well then we should be the ones to decide whether we want it or not.

Name withheld

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 22 NO. 25

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
Mailing address: Box 267, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 107, Riverhead, N.Y. 11951

Suffolk Life is published in 11 market zones every Wednesday.
North Fork Patchogue Centereach Rocky Point
Riverhead Medford Selden Port Jefferson
Hempstead Harbor Medford Clarksville Thru Valley
Medford Selden Clarksville
Westhampton Oyster
Montauk Ronkonkoma



Total circulation audited and reported in excess of 194,000 Circulation Weekly
Suffolk Life is an 11-page newspaper of 34,000 copies of which 10,000 are copies of the Patchogue-Medford edition. It is published weekly except on Wednesdays. It is published by David J. Willmott, Editor and Publisher, 288-3900 Montauk Highway, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977.

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher
John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Martin J. Cann - Director of Sales
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator
Claire Swanik - National Sales Director
Ted Conlon - Retail Sales Manager

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughy - Adv. Art Director
Sharman Gordon - News Art Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County: \$4.99 per year Outside Suffolk County: \$17.00 per year Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue. Suffolk County Life: In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year; outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year. Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue.

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the Letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume.

NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason.

ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.

Three Cheers For Brookhaven Dems

The current battle over the Shoreham nuclear plant, which focuses on questions of safety and the credibility of any evacuation attempts should there be an accident at the facility, has witnessed the involvement of more and more concerned people. The growing number of residents who now express their concerns at meetings and in letters to officials and newspapers is clear evidence the public is alarmed. In recent days a new voice was heard: The Brookhaven Town Democratic Committee.

The Democratic Committee recently gathered over 200 postcards and letters which are to be sent to Governor Mario Cuomo and Dr. David Axelrod, chairman of the New York State Emergency Preparedness Commission, which is reportedly prepared to approve the "LILCO evacuation plan" if the County Legislature does not adopt the plan which was the subject of recent hearings. The letters and cards focus on "the impossibility of evacuating Suffolk County in the event of a radiological emergency" at Shoreham.

We applaud Brookhaven Town Democratic Chairman David Goldenberg and his committee members for their action. It is high time the local political organizations put their full weight behind the effort to protect the people of Suffolk County.

Although this issue transcends politics, that is the game LILCO has been playing for some time. They have hired a former key aide to Governor Hugh Carey for their public relations staff. Just recently they named Basil Patterson, former

Secretary of State who stepped down from that position late last year, as a member of LILCO's board of directors. A former county legislator and a former key aide to a presiding officer are also now on LILCO's staff. And David Garth, the political "king maker" with many political ties is a LILCO consultant.

The public, however, doesn't have the finances to hire such political big guns. The public has to rely on its government to wage the battle, such as Suffolk County is now doing. But it's time, as we have said before, that the local political organizations come into the battle, and extend their political pressures on the very same politicians who are now being lobbied by LILCO and its staff.

Governor Cuomo pledged, during his campaign, that unless he could be assured the plant is safe, he would oppose its opening. He owes it to the people who supported his election efforts, and, in fact, to all of the people in this county, to stand behind that promise. He has been invited to attend a summit meeting here on Long Island to discuss this vital issue. Thus far he has not responded to that request. If Cuomo is true to his word, he will. And soon.

It is our hope that other town political organizations will get involved, to stand shoulder to shoulder, Democrats and Republicans together, in this battle for public safety. This is a people's fight for Suffolk's future, and a battle for the protection of its residents. We applaud Brookhaven Democrats for taking that first all-important step, and would hope that the other political organizations will join these efforts.

And why not?

Time For Fairness And Reason

Last Tuesday, facing a hostile crowd of over 1,000 county employees, ten members of the Suffolk County Legislature had the courage to vote "no" on ratifying the proposed C.S.E.A. contract that had been negotiated so poorly by the County Executive's office.

The contract called for increases in wages of between 30 per cent and 70 per cent and would have left the county with an estimated shortfall in revenues of over \$20 million in the year 1985 - 1986.

We have often criticized the Legislature for not having the courage of their convictions. However, the Legislators who opposed this contract acted in a courageous and thoughtful manner, and should deserve the thanks and gratitude of not only the taxpayers of Suffolk County, but the C.S.E.A. workers themselves.

If the contract had been passed as proposed, it would have meant that by 1985 the county would be faced by substantial tax increases, or would have to schedule massive layoffs of county workers. This warning was contained in a recent report issued by the legislature's Budget Review Office. The Legislature has now given the county executive's office and the union leadership an opportunity to redeem themselves by renegotiating a contract that is both fair to the county workers and the taxpayers who must fund it.

The first item on the agenda should be the immediate agreement between the county and the union that negotiations for last year, 1982, be settled with an immediate payment of the 7 per cent bonus the county workers have been promised. Many of the County workers owe bills and had planned purchases based on receipt of

this money. It should not be held up any longer. It's a disgrace that it has been this long.

Separate 1982 out of the negotiations for 1983, 1984 and 1985! Get this done immediately. A quick agreement between the County's labor negotiating office and the union leadership could bring this measure before the Legislature by next Tuesday with a certificate of necessity from the county executive. This is fair, this is right and it is just for all concerned. Let's do it and get 1982 out of the way.

The contract covering the other three years, as negotiated by the union leadership and the County Executive's office, has been a farce from the beginning. The contract was not negotiated in good faith. It should have been completed a year ago. Unfortunately, the union leadership was asking more than the county could afford. The county held out and then caved in, giving much more than the taxpayers could ever absorb.

Unfortunately, the membership of the union was led down the primrose path and it is now going to be difficult to offer them less and expect it to be palatable for them to swallow. But the fact remains there is not money available for large increases without large corresponding increases in taxes and a reduction in the work force to insure funds are there to pay those who remain.

One of the original objectives of both the union and the county was to increase the pay of those on the lower portions of the grade and step system, a worthy goal. The proposed agreement addressed this by giving two step increases a year until those below the top step reached that level. This, combined with a cumulative 32 per cent increase in wages, resulted in salary increases of up to 72 per cent for a good number of the county's employees. The total impact at the end of this proposal, when all raises have been given, is staggering.

We suggest there is a possible compromise that would be fair and equitable to all concerned. County

employees now work 35 hours a week. If that work week is extended to 40 hours, with the additional five hours paid at straight time rate, the employees' gross pay would be increased by 14 per cent. The added work hours and salary could be offset by a reduction in the number of county employees, achieved through attrition and a two year hiring freeze.

With this as a start, both the county and the union should be able to sit down and come up with a sensible method to eliminate the inequities claimed in the lower steps. But the final impact of what is decided should first stand the test of the taxpayer's ability to shoulder the burden. With the county executive just this week voicing fears of a \$7,000,000 deficit in 1983 - '84, because of cutbacks in state aid, fiscal sanity demands moderation be the key of any agreement.

The elimination of the exempt employees out of the contract sounds good, but it is dangerous rhetoric. The number of exempt employees, according to the county labor negotiator's office, is currently about 150, just a fraction of the 6,690 county employees. Total raises for the exempts under the proposed agreement rejected by the legislators, would amount to only about 2 per cent of the estimated \$51 million projected increase resulting from the proposal. Those who are hanging their hat on the elimination of these exempt employees as a way to control the future cost are either very naive, or are deliberately trying to mislead the public.

Unfortunately, this whole process of reaching a settlement has taken far too long. Too much politics has reared its ugly head, which proves once again that bad politics makes bad government.

Let all of us hope that good, sensible politics can prevail, and a reasonable settlement that county employees can live with, and county residents can afford, can be reached, and that fairness and justice can be achieved.

And why not?

Readers' Opinion

Dear Mr. Willmott:

It seems hypocritical of our government and population that we restrict prayer or a moment of silence in the classrooms of our children.

First, if we look on the back of our legal tender, the words "In God We Trust" are stamped.

Secondly, when we pledge our allegiance to the loyalty of our country we assert "One

nation, under God."

There are other examples, I am sure.

I suggest that if we don't consider allowing prayer in the classroom, we have no need to waste the ink on our tender, and should delete it from the Pledge of Allegiance. It's only fair.

And why not?

Richard Domencello
Mastic Beach

SUFFOLK LIFE

Vol. 22 No. 26

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Brookhaven N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published at 11:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. every Wednesday.
North Fork Patchogue Centereach Rocky Point
Riverhead Medford Selden Port Jefferson
Hampton East Holbrook Hollisville Cutchogue Three Village
Madisonville Sayville Middlebrook
Westhampton Oyster Bay
Montauk



Total Circulation audited and verified in excess of 194,000 Circulation Weekly
Suffolk Life is an official newspaper of the Town of Southampton, Town of East Hampton, County of Suffolk, Rocky Point, Sayville, Patchogue, Medford, Cutchogue, Suffolk County, and the Village of Port Jefferson.

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher
John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Martin J. Cann - Director of Sales
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator
Claire Swanik - National Sales Director
Ted Conlon - Retail Sales Manager

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughty - Adv. Art Director
Sherman Gordon - News Art Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County: \$4.99 per year Outside Suffolk County: \$17.00 per year. Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue. Suffolk County Life: In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year; outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year; newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue.

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the Letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume.
NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason.
ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.

Willmotts and Why-Not's

David J. Willmott, Editor

The REAL Shoreham Culprit

The curtain is about to go up on what could well be the final act in the continuing saga of the Shoreham nuclear power plant. With evacuation of Suffolk's residents deemed "impossible" by the Suffolk County Legislature and County Executive Peter F. Cohalan last week, and Governor Cuomo's decision not to impose a plan upon the county, it would seem the death knell for the Shoreham plant has been sounded. But we doubt it!

Both the proponents and opponents of the LILCO nuclear facility are now in the process of jockeying for position, devising new strategies, planning their next course of action. The rhetoric has already begun. LILCO's Chairman of the Board Charles R. Pierce fired off a rebuttal to the action by the Legislature and Cohalan last week, insisting Shoreham will be safe and reliable. Pierce declares that "Over the last 10 years, Shoreham has been submitted to more than 2,000 separate safety inspections. Their conclusions have proven beyond doubt that the plant is built to the highest standards of the nuclear industry."

If such is the case, why not another inspection? Open the doors, Mr. Pierce, for an independent, outside firm to probe every inch of Shoreham. Very apparently the 2,000 separate safety inspections cited by Pierce missed a few things. Such as the 19 problems which will cost about a million dollars to repair according to the inspection by LILCO's hired firm, Torrey Pines. And some other problems missed by Torrey Pines, but caught by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in a more recent inspection. Open the doors, Mr. Pierce, and let the full truth come out.

Pierce points to some 80 operating nuclear plants throughout the nation, and points out emergency preparedness plans have been formulated and implemented for these plants. Perhaps, Mr. Pierce, but how many of those plants are on an island which depends on limited highways to flee the area?

Pierce insists evacuation is possible from Long Island. Mr. Pierce, how many times have you sat stilled on the Long Island Expressway, or other east-west roadways, while traffic

backed up for miles, sometimes for no other reason than people "rubbernecking" at a disabled motorist? Those conditions prevail when only a small percentage of area residents and — in summer — visitors, are exiting the island. Can you really — honestly — tell us you don't believe that problem will be so greatly magnified in the event of an emergency at Shoreham that evacuation will not work?

Pierce tries to put the entire blame of the new mood toward Shoreham on Cohalan. But that's simply not true, and he should know it. Pierce and other LILCO spokesmen wonder "Where was everybody back in the days when LILCO was first seeking its construction permit for Shoreham?" Pierce knows full well there were many voices raised in opposition to Shoreham when it was first proposed, and through the years since. But LILCO appeared to be successful in labeling these opponents as "emotional kooks" and continued on their merry way.

Then came Three Mile Island — the accident nuclear experts declared could never happen — and a new awareness that nuclear energy was not without risk, as we had been told time and again. And then came the evacuation sirens. Those sirens, more than anything else in Suffolk, brought home the full realization that Shoreham could well force people to flee their homes one day. And the public began to become more and more concerned.

While Pierce is fond of saying many LILCO employees live close to the plant, it is also a fact of life that its top officials and its more vocal spokesmen live far to the west. We have said before the best way LILCO could prove its confidence in the plant is to move all its top executives to a housing complex at Shoreham, where they would be forced to endure the threat and the problems of evacuation. They still live far to the west, and somehow we get the impression they would be first notified and first off the island in the event of a problem.

If there is fault in the fiasco of Shoreham, it lies firmly on the shoulders of LILCO and its executives. They have built, and

propose to open, a facility that could well spread death across this county. And they arrogantly say to the county, "No, you can't come in here to check us over to insure this plant is safe." If a member of the public builds a house and refuses to permit its inspection, all hell would break loose. The resident would be subject to court action, would not receive a certificate of occupancy, and therefore would not be permitted, legally, to live in that house. Why should it be different for a nuclear plant that threatens the lives of people?

The fate of the Shoreham nuclear plant is, to say the least, uncertain at this point of time. We certainly don't think the saga of Shoreham is over, by any means. What we do know, however, is that LILCO, if it harbors any hope at all of putting Shoreham on line, must put aside its past arrogance and yield to the need for a full inspection. An independent, outside firm, and the NRC, must go over every inch of that plant with a

fine toothed comb — despite the cost — before any consideration can be given to the thought that Shoreham is not dead.

Despite Pierce's rhetoric that evacuation is possible, the consensus of officials and the public alike — and common sense as well — declares otherwise. Therefore, it must be proven beyond a shadow of a doubt that Shoreham, if permitted to operate one day, is the safest nuclear plant ever designed and built. All we have in assurances of that now is the "trust us" attitude expressed by LILCO.

From where we sit, LILCO has only one course of action left: Open the doors or, indeed, shut the plant! If LILCO fails to do so, all the rhetoric in the world will not change one inescapable fact, Shoreham will die not because of unwarranted fears or political ambition. It will die because of the arrogance of the Long Island Lighting Company.

And why not?



Brookhaven's "Smoking Cat"

The first reaction by many to the reports of last week concerning a night-time raid by Brookhaven Town officials on the office of the town's dog warden was one of humor. More than one chuckle greeted the image of Brookhaven Town Councilman Steve Burke putting his shoulder to the door to break his way in, while other officials huddled around a telephone trying to coax the dog warden to the scene, which, incidentally, was shortly before midnight.

When humor turned to anger in the light of day, Burke tried to explain away his door busting activity by declaring he "smelled smoke and heard a cat cry." While they were in the office searching for the smoking cat, they also carted out a couple of file cabinets with the files they sought.

Since this is not the first time Burke has put his shoulder to a door in Brookhaven Town to gain entry — he reportedly battered down a door at the Bald Hill Ski Bowl to gain entrance to an office there — the "smoking cat" excuse is an insult to the intelligence of the people of this town. Also not humorous is the fact that some high ranking town officials were a part of Burke's raiding party, even though they did not help break through the locked office door.

Even more troubling is the lack of any comment from the town administration and town board members, in a strong public statement,

that declares the affairs of Brookhaven Town will not be operated in such a childish manner.

Those town officials involved claim they acted on the basis of rumor that files were reportedly going to be altered, thus the need to act in such a fashion, and in haste. Poppycock! An official visit during normal working hours by the commissioner of the department could have secured any files that may have been needed. Of, if this supposed rumor came to light after the end of the working day, a guard at the door might have been more appropriate, however less dramatic.

If there is any reason to suspect the need to fully explore what goes on at the dog pound, a full scale investigation, done in a proper fashion, is the way to go about it. There should be no need to break down doors. No councilman, or any other public official for that matter, should have the right to participate in such a folly without being made to suffer the consequences which, in our view, should be more than a weak comment about the "stupidity" of such actions.

Former President Nixon and Watergate had their "smoking gun." and now Brookhaven has its "smoking cat"! Unless Brookhaven Town officials begin to show a lot more regard for good, sane government, the end result may well be the same!

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 22 NO. 27

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
Mailing address: Box 282, Westhampton, N.Y. 11777 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 11 market zone editions every Wednesday.
North Fork Pittsford Cuthbertsville Rocky Point
Riverhead Medford Sweden Port Jefferson
Hampton East Hobbick Hollisville Coram Three Village
Mid Hampton Sayville Mastic Shrubbs
Westhampton Oyster Bay
Moriches Ronkonkoma



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of
194,000 Circulation Weekly
Circulation is an average representation of a week of publication.
Count of paid circulation is based on a survey of paid circulation.
Circulation figures are published weekly, except on Wednesdays, in an official
bulletin of the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic
Analysis, Office of Business Economics.

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Martin J. Cann - Director of Sales
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator
Clare Swank - National Sales Director
Ted Conlon - Retail Sales Manager

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughy - Adv. Art Director
Sharmar Gordon - News Art Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County: \$4.99 per year Outside Suffolk County: \$17.00 per year Newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue Suffolk County Life: In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year; outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year, newsstand single copy sales: 25¢ per issue.

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: We encourage our readers to express their views regardless of opinion through the Letters to the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address. We will withhold names on request and assign a nom de plume.

NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS: Readers are welcome to submit ideas of interest and photographs for consideration of publication. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon submittal and cannot be returned for any reason.

ERRORS: Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.