

Is Brookhaven Town Board in LILCO's Pocket?

In the wake of the Long Island Lighting Company's decision to withhold the taxes due on its Shoreham nuclear power plant, the Brookhaven Town Board has decided that the shortfall caused by this arrogant action will impact all of the school districts in the town rather than the school district that has gained all the tax benefits of the past. The decision, in our view, is as arrogant as was LILCO's action to withhold the taxes.

The Shoreham - Wading River School District, which is virtually supported by the plant, has lived high on the hog in past years, free of budget problems faced by other districts. The average district surrounding Shoreham - Wading River spends under \$4,500 per year to educate a student. Shoreham - Wading River spends over \$11,000 per year per student.

Never has that district offered to share in some fashion the bounty it has enjoyed, even though it has been the residents of the other districts who, through their LILCO bills, have helped Shoreham - Wading River thrive in its educational plushness. Now, however, as a result of LILCO's tax withholding actions, officials of that district are only too happy to have the other districts in the town suffer the financial impact.

Assemblyman George Hochbrueckner has charged the town with violating the Suffolk County Tax Act in coming up with the distribution plan which will "deprive the 22 school districts in the town of the funds to which they are entitled." Hochbrueckner claims the school districts are entitled by law to 76.3 per cent of any tax revenues distributed after January 12. However, he notes, the town, on January 16, gave \$43 million of the taxes it has received to fire districts and to the town highway department. If Hochbrueckner is correct, and the town illegally distributed funds to the fire districts and the highway department after January 12, the town will find itself facing a series of Article 78 proceedings forcing it to reverse its actions, recalling some of the monies distributed and distributing them,

instead, to the school districts.

Town officials claim their actions are legal. But we think they had better do a bit more research to be sure of their legal standing. The last thing the town, or the affected school districts, need at this point is the added costs of legal expenses to fight the battle over this point.

One town official, Councilman Eugene Dooley, reacted to Hochbrueckner's charge by saying "I didn't know Hochbrueckner had a law degree." He charged that Hochbrueckner's claim is motivated by politics. But the key question is this: Is Hochbrueckner right? Did the town miss its own deadline? If it did, will it correct its own error?

Brookhaven Town officials have noticeably been without comment in the controversy over Shoreham. They insist they can say nothing because of the litigation between the town and LILCO over the assessment of the Shoreham plant. But there's cause for wonder. That cause includes the secret meeting held by Supervisor Henrietta Acampora with top LILCO officials in her home, and Dooley's personal stance on nuclear power. As a former steamfitter at the plant, he has personally voiced support for the plant and nuclear power. And the windfall the Shoreham plant has given town officials to squander is another reason for question.

LILCO's withholding action was designed to prove a point, although that point is clouded by the lack of credibility of the utility. LILCO officials declare that if Shoreham doesn't open, there will be no taxes. Thus the withholding action is designed to give a taste of what will happen if the plant dies. What is not said, however, is the fact that LILCO is merely a conduit for the taxes which are paid through the ratepayers in their electric bills.

LILCO claims the Shoreham taxes are paid from borrowed money, and have not been included in current rates. But it would take a full audit by the state controller to convince us there is truth in that claim. What, we wonder, has LILCO done with the \$374 million (as of last October) it has collected in Construction Work In Progress funds from the ratepayers?

Has that been used to pay any of LILCO's indebtedness? Who pays back the money LILCO claims it borrows for the taxes?

By spreading the financial impact of LILCO's action on school districts throughout the town, Brookhaven officials are, in a sense, playing the game LILCO wants them to. Instead of having the one school district that has enjoyed all the benefit feel all of the impact, town officials have gone beyond their scope of moral responsibility, in our view.

We think its time for the town officials to stop hiding behind lawsuits, and state their position on Shoreham and LILCO very clearly. What has the

town done, and what will it do, to solve the problem. If the town board is in LILCO's corner, let it be known. If it is as angry as the public about LILCO's arrogance, let it stand up and take action.

Hiding behind "this is the way we have always done it" statements, and cloaking itself in silence, is not the kind of leadership the people of the Town of Brookhaven deserve. Officials of the Town of Brookhaven should stand up and fight for their residents, or go sit in the corner with LILCO. At the very least, town officials should be honest about where they stand.

And why not?

LILCO And Bankruptcy

Rumors persist that the Long Island Lighting Company is on the brink of bankruptcy. If credibility was the criteria for solvency, LILCO would have had to declare bankruptcy a long time ago. Time and again, most recently just last week, it becomes painfully clear that LILCO and its officials do not have a working relationship with the truth.

The most recent example involves the matter of an escrow account which LILCO officials have continually insisted had been established to hold the \$26.2 million in taxes its board of directors decided to withhold. LILCO's public relations staff said again and again that the escrow account — which would have restricted the use of the \$26.2 million for the payment of the taxes if LILCO's action is declared illegal — was established. They would not say where because the county had said if its efforts to challenge LILCO's withholding action in the courts prove successful, the county would confiscate those funds. "We don't want to give them a roadmap to where those funds are located," said one LILCO spokesman.

Now it turns out that no escrow account has been created despite the many claims by LILCO and its officials. In short, they lied. The admission came from LILCO Controller Michael Czumack in testimony before the Public Service Commission. Czumack said the money has been placed into an interest bearing account, and that no escrow agreement with any bank has been signed. Thus LILCO can grab those funds if the oft-repeated rumors of LILCO's pending bankruptcy become fact.

Is it or isn't it? That question is raised by LILCO's belated announcement that the Shoreham nuclear facility was finished back in November. To prove that point, LILCO took members of the media through the plant, through areas freshly spruced up, we suspect, for the "just finished" claim. But is it really finished? Are the diesels up and running? Will they work this time, or will the crankshafts shatter again? When the diesels are tested, will LILCO run proper tests? Or will they fudge the tests by running less than the load-time limit specified, and then report that "everything is fine" as they did before. LILCO got caught for fudging the tests and the results the last time and paid a \$40,000 fine for that action. Will they try it again?

The fact of the matter is, and LILCO has shown it time and time again, the utility and its officials simply cannot be trusted. That doesn't mean only the top

management — rumored to be on its way out — which has been the target of criticism for a long time. That also means the Board of Directors who until the recent tax action have been charged only with omissions of their duties, of not overseeing the actions of the top management as they put LILCO closer and closer to financial doom. In voting to withhold the taxes, the members of the Board of Directors became full participants in problems of mismanagement, of attempting to thrust upon the people of Suffolk County a nuclear plant of dubious safety which will produce electricity — if it ever opens — far too expensive for the people to pay for.

LILCO's directors are supposedly considering the replacement of top management in an effort to push their Shoreham plant into operation. But will that action help the utility to regain its credibility? We think not. It'll take a housecleaning the likes of which has been seldom seen, and one which includes the ousting of the board members themselves, to give LILCO any hope of ever being believed again.

The saga of Shoreham may soon come to an end. The Public Service Commission report on the prudence of LILCO's management actions in the construction of the plant is due out soon. There are persistent rumors that LILCO will get hit by a finding of imprudent actions to the tune of \$500 million to \$1 billion. The higher figure would be more accurate, we believe, and may bring the end to LILCO as it is presently constituted.

LILCO can, and undoubtedly will, survive bankruptcy. New management and new directors could go a long way toward restoring the credibility that will sorely be needed to work out the financial mess LILCO has created for itself, and for the people of Long Island. If lies are replaced by truth, and concern replaces arrogance, there can be hope that the utility could survive in the private sector, and the stockholders can be spared the financial loss they surely face under the present leadership.

Rather than the doom and gloom being projected by LILCO and its allies, we think the bankruptcy that hovers above LILCO's corporate head could have a beneficial impact for the ratepayers. The big money LILCO's management pays to itself, at the expense of the ratepayers, must cease. LILCO's self servicing attitude must change. The public must become the top priority for a change.

And why not?

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

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 Centrearch Rocky Point
Riverhead Medford Selden Port Jefferson
Hampton East Hotbrook Holtsville Coram Three Village
Mad Hampton Sayville Mastic Shirely
Westhampton Oakdale
Moriches Ronkonkoma



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of 210,000 Circulation Weekly
Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton; Town of Islip; Surrogate Court, 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 - Regional Accts. Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator
Claire Swank - National Sales Director
Ted Conlon - 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.

Mom

My Mom, Mary Catherine Willmott, went home last Tuesday to join my Dad and her God. Her passing was marked both by joy and sadness. Joy in the fact that her suffering had come to an end and her desire to go home had been fulfilled. Sadness in that we no longer would have her to talk to, or seek guidance from. We would no longer be able to offer her aid or comfort, to share our sorrows and our joys.

Mom was a beautiful woman not only in appearance, stature and pride, but more importantly in compassion and feeling. I loved her dearly for she represented to me everything a mother, a woman, should be. I will miss her terribly.

I take comfort in knowing that during her lifetime she made many friends. Nearly everyone who had the pleasure of her acquaintance came away with deep feelings for this woman. She was a lady, regal in stature but with tremendous feelings for and understanding of other people. She never was too busy to stop and listen to someone else. Never were her problems too great that she wouldn't be aware of others. She was a gracious person who opened her home to young and old.

We well remember Dad and her inviting the G.I.'s about to debark for overseas duty during the war into their home for Saturday night parties and Sunday dinners. This was not done out of a sense of patriotism, but more out of a sense of compassion, for, as Mom used to say, our G.I.'s are away from home, their loved ones; about to leave on a frightening experience, in need of a little warmth, love and laughter.

Growing up as a teenager, our home was open to all. It didn't make any difference the color or the creed. Anybody who needed an older person to talk to, to seek guidance from knew my Mom.

Mom was very much a part of Suffolk Life. In the beginning, when I announced that I was going to start a newspaper, she supported me, not only through encouragement but through participation. She was fond of recalling the nights we stayed up until

3 or 4 a.m. preparing copy for the typesetters. We often laughed about the two of us tying bundles of mailings in the wee hours of the morning. She loved Suffolk Life and was proud of it for it represented the accomplishment of her son.

After we were out of the house, she started her second career as an executive secretary at Little Flower. True to form she was not only a darn good secretary, but addressed the human problems there with kindness and compassion, feeling and love. Some of the long term residents sought her out on a regular basis.

My Mom and Dad were married close to 50 years. They had their good times and their bad times. They fought together, played together and loved together as a team, providing us children with a warm foundation for life.

There are so many things I remember about Mom. As a youngster, the joy on her face one day when she was ill and I brought her home some wild violets and a half-eaten Babe Ruth bar. The proding and pushing when I felt down and depressed as a young man facing manhood, not wanting to face the responsibilities or leave the warm clutches of home.

Mom was a salesman to the nth degree, always making everything seem crystal clear and within reach, encouraging us to go the extra step, take that extra chance. While she encouraged growth and development, she, by her own example and words, instilled a strong sense of community and responsibility in others. A responsibility to act privately but with compassion and desire.

I wish all kids could have a Mom like I had.

The last few years were tough on Mom. She was lonely and wanted to go home. She spoke often of Dad, feeling his presence.

She is gone now. I feel sad, but I'm joyful in the knowledge that because of the way she lived her life in Christ's image she is enjoying all the benefits of being with God.

Goodbye Mom, we love you.

usurp zoning powers from local municipalities.

County officials give little credence to the concerns voiced by the towns, declaring the quality of the groundwater supply is far more important than the question of home rule. But, as has been the case so many times in the past, the county is being shortsighted in analyzing the reasoning behind the towns' opposition. County officials choose to view the opposition as a power struggle. Town officials see it as a matter of economic survival.

Zoning powers on the local level — if used properly — are more meaningful than a sense of power for local officials. The ability to control zoning is the means by which towns can encourage controlled growth to bolster that town's tax base. That tax base is

needed to support the governmental services expected by the public, and is vital for the education of our children. In those areas where industrial growth has been more apparent — many sectors of western Suffolk are prime examples — the taxes paid by the industrial firms help ease the burden of educational financing for the school districts within those areas. In other sectors, however, and Riverhead is a prime example, tax exemptions — because of governmental use, the purchase of farm development rights, veterans' and senior citizen exemptions — diminish the tax base, putting more of the burden on the shoulders of the residents.

If, as county officials suggest, industrial development in West End areas is permissible, but should be restricted in the East End, they are saying, in effect, the tax base of the West End will continue to grow, but become stagnant in the eastern sectors. An industry spokesman said at a recent public hearing that under the restrictions proposed in Article 7, about 70 per cent of the firms in an industrial area in the Hauppauge area would have been excluded. That means, of course, that 70 per cent of the assessments — and the tax yield that area currently enjoys — would be lost as well.

If West End officials consider water under the Pine Barrens in the East End as a regional asset, then surely — if they are fair minded folks — they must agree the financial impact of preserving those waters must also be a regional responsibility. If the West End wants to insure future water supplies, they must pay the premium. If they want to get, they've got to be willing to give.

Simply put, if the West End wants to share in the waters under the East End, and that includes Brookhaven Town, they must share in the assessment loss the East End will suffer because of restrictions imposed to protect that water.

Officials of both Riverhead and Brookhaven are adamant about this point. And they are absolutely correct in their position. Much of what the

county has done in recent years has been self-serving, Riverhead Supervisor Joseph Janoski declares. A case in point: for years one of the largest non-polluting forms of industry in the Riverhead area has been the court system, which has provided jobs and economic benefits to the eastern area. Yet in recent years the county has worked diligently to move governmental operations from Riverhead, and much of the court system, to the West End. If the county now wishes to impose restrictions to curtail the industrial growth that will help offset the economic loss caused by these actions, the economic future of the East End will severely suffer.

The financial impact of the proposed Article 7 MUST be considered before that proposal is approved by the board of health. A formula must be established through which the West End areas that continue to enjoy industrial growth will share the tax benefits of that growth with those towns and school districts that will lose such taxes because of restrictive regulations imposed by the county.

Whether that formula consists of the purchase of development rights based on potential tax loss, or the creation of a county industrial taxing system, is immaterial. What is important is the fairness of having everyone sharing the burden of protecting the water supply.

If the county — and the West End officials who support Article 7 — are purely dedicated in their announced goal of preserving the water supply, they will see the wisdom of such action. If the quality of their water in years to come is important to them, they should be willing to pay the price.

It is time, we think, for the county to come to grips with one important fact: cooperation between all levels of government is a far better way to resolve many of the problems we face than is legislative or administrative edict. Many more solutions could become reality much quicker if the county would communicate rather than dictate.

And why not?

\$2 Billion In Mismanagement

The State Consumer Protection Board and Suffolk County have released a report on an investigation into the imprudence of LILCO's management at the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant. It is devastating for the corporation for it charges that the mismanagement of LILCO was responsible for over \$2 billion in improper decisions related to this construction project.

The report was not the work of outside agitators, or bumbling state bureaucrats. It was the conclusion of a heavyweight three-man panel comprised of Robert J. Aillo, a former senior manager for the Atomic Energy Commission, dean of management school at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, and director of planning for a

broch. on page 4.

Want Benefits? Share Costs!

Suffolk County officials are pushing for a revision of the county's sanitary code which seeks to protect the quality of the water supply under the Pine Barrens. Few have argued with the intent of that proposal, but the means by which it would be accomplished has come under protest.

Article 7 — the controversial proposal — would give the Suffolk County Health Department regulatory powers over the siting of specific industrial operations within boundaries established in the revision. Industrial spokesmen predict grave economic conditions would result from the restrictions proposed. Town officials in both Riverhead and Brookhaven, where the majority of the land is located, argue the county is attempting, through this provision, to

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

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

Total circulation audited and verified in excess of
210,000 Circulation Weekly

Suffolk Life is published in 19 market zone editions every Wednesday
North Fork Patchogue Centereach Rocky Point
Riverhead Medford Seiden Port Jefferson
Hampden East Holbrook Hottsville Coram Three Village
Mad Riverham Sayville
Westhampton Oakdale Mastic Shirley
Moriches Ronkonkoma



Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton; Town of Islip; Surrogate Court; 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 Bill Johnson - Circulation Director Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Martin J. Cann - Regional Accts. Director Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator Linda Conaughy - Adv. Art Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager Claire Swank - National Sales Director Sharman Gordon - News Art Director
Ted Conlon - Sales Manager

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.

Good Man, Bad Choice

The Nuclear Regulatory Agency is about to sign a contract with Brookhaven National Lab to inspect and test the diesels at Shoreham.

The man who will head Brookhaven National Lab's team is Herb Kouts, a member of Governor Cuomo's Shoreham Commission and head of the Nuclear Physicist Department of Brookhaven National Lab. Kouts is an honorable gentleman. While serving on the Commission with him we learned to respect him. We also realized how pro-nuclear he was. Kouts unlike many other Commissioners who started with a bias, found it extremely difficult to recognize the facts as they were revealed. He could not agree there might be something wrong with atomic energy, with the construction of the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant, or the management of LILCO.

Although we may not agree with a man's stand, we admire a man who stands up four square and defends his beliefs. Kouts is such a man, but we seriously question the objectivity of such a man and his ability to make a sound, honest and accurate appraisal of an industry he so strongly supports.

We must remember Herb Kouts was one of the three so-called renowned

experts of the Blass Ad-Hoc Blue Ribbon Panel that purportedly reviewed the Torrey-Pines inspection and gave it a 100 per cent clean bill of health. Torrey-Pines was hired by LILCO to review the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant, including the diesels and said, in their opinion, everything was a-okay.

It has now been brought to the public's attention that LILCO's troubles with the diesels started eight years ago and have been ongoing ever since. Suffolk County had suggested that LILCO bought and paid for a favorable report from Torrey-Pines. Kouts, a feverish supporter of atomic energy, put his seal and reputation on the quality of this report.

At best, any report issued by the Brookhaven National Lab and a team headed by Herb Kouts concerning the Shoreham Nuclear Power Plant would be suspect and do little to enhance the credibility of Shoreham, LILCO or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Herb Kouts is a good man, but, because of his bias, it is a bad idea to have him head up such an inspection team. What we need now is undisputable truth, not more suspicion.

And why not?

ratepayers should not be saddled with any costs above \$2.3 billion, which would leave LILCO and its stockholders responsible for the rest. This would wipe out the value of the corporation. Even before the PSC staff report was released, LILCO officials said the utility could face insolvency as early as May because of its current financial condition.

You are probably wondering what does this mean to you as a Long Island user of electricity and gas from LILCO? If the corporation goes bankrupt, you will still receive electricity. According to state sources, there will be no interruption in service.

The rate you pay for electricity would be determined in part by the form of bankruptcy the courts might order. Under Chapter 11, Voluntary Bankruptcy, the courts could allow current management to continue as operators of the corporation. The utility would have protection from its creditors while they develop a financial rescue plan. This plan could conceivably include the retention of Shoreham.

Under Chapter 13, Involuntary Bankruptcy, the courts would appoint trustees who would appoint new

management. Under this scenario the new management would be able to eliminate any liabilities that could interfere with the corporation's future financial health. They could sell off Shoreham as scrap, recovering for the corporation whatever the market would pay for the components. The new corporation would concern itself with the distribution and marketing of electricity within its service area. In doing so, it would free the ratepayers from the construction work charges built into the current rate base. It would free the ratepayers from having to pay for the Shoreham fiasco.

It is conceivable that, under Chapter 13, a new corporation could be formed to replace LILCO that would reduce current electrical rates by as much as 20 per cent, instead of raising rates 100 per cent to pay for Shoreham.

What is bad for LILCO is not necessarily bad for the public. Time will only tell which scenario will be played out. We hope that the state officials think of the public first, rather than the management and the investors of LILCO who willfully got themselves into this jam through arrogance which led to imprudence. And why not?

Unshackle the Yoke

Years ago, a number of East End residents became interested in the idea of a separate county for the East End of Long Island. "Peconic County Now," became the rallying cry.

The idea was doomed from the start by political subterfuge. The supporters' group was influenced by forces who were opposed to the idea. Who, for political expediency, chose to work through the back door rather than be out front with their opposition to the proposition. They knew if they could have the initial structure of the proposed new county limited, population requirements would not be met and, as a result, time would wear down the proponents. Thus Peconic County would never become a reality.

The original proposal for Peconic County included only the five East End towns, which would have to have 119,000 population or a constitutional amendment for approval. It did not have a 119,000 population, and a constitutional amendment, without major media and upstate support, was doomed to defeat.

The primary factor that motivated the cry for Peconic County was concern about West End domination, the stripping of the East End of financial assets and control over its environment and quality of life by outsiders. These fears have been coming to fulfillment in a rapid fire barrage over the past few months.

Lee Koppelman, we can only assume with the county executive staffs' approval, has, with others, made a raid on the Riverhead court structure, a major employer and ingredient of the East End. Koppelman wants to take the courts out of Riverhead, moving them to Hauppauge, leaving Riverhead with the jails.

Just recently, the new county clerk, going back on a campaign pledge, announced she was opening a satellite office of the county clerk's in Hauppauge. How soon will it be before she proposes to move this entire branch of government to Hauppauge?

Using the county's 208 study as a

basis the county health department is trying to take over the powers of our local planning and zoning boards. They want to forbid most industrial development down the spine of the island that planners had long concluded is the proper place for industry. The West End power brokers who control the county health department want these large tracts of industrial land placed off limits for industrial development, denying the East End the necessary tax revenues from industrial development needed to sustain government and services. They want the industrial development concentrated in West End towns and, if they have to use the law and environmental arguments to achieve this goal, they will do so.

Of a less important note, but indicative of the rape of the East End, last week the county received from the federal government \$100,000 to aid the county's ten townships in bolstering policing of the waterways. The five East End towns have many more miles of waterfront than the five West End towns. Their ability to patrol their waterfronts is limited by their tax base. The West End power brokers in the county, in their wisdom, allocated the entire \$100,000 to the five West End towns, not giving a penny to the East End for marine police. Obviously the East End is not considered part of Suffolk by those who made this decision.

In plain English, the East End is getting shafted and it's about time its citizens stood up, declaring "no more!" Let us move the lines of Peconic County to the William Floyd Parkway and form a new county. The William Floyd Parkway separates the eastern third of Brookhaven Town. It is more East End in nature, attuned to the East End, than it is urbanized. Using the William Floyd Parkway as a boundary line, population requirements are met and the possibility of a "Peconic County" is within the realm of possibility.

We would like to see the five East cont. on page 4

Not Necessarily Bad News for Long Islanders


The news this past week has been devastating for the Long Island Lighting Company, its management and stockholders. For the public, however, what was bad for LILCO could well be happy tidings.

The state Consumer Protection Board issued a report indicating that up to \$2 billion of the Shoreham nuclear power plant's costs were imprudent and should not impact on the ratepayers. On Friday, the Public Service Commission's staff — after a long and exhaustive investigation — released a report indicating virtually the same conclusions. Both reports charged LILCO with seriously flawed management which led to imprudent costs.

The Public Service Commission's

report alleged that the project was in trouble from its conception because of mismanagement, bad decisions by management and a lack of knowledge. The report indicated that the board of directors had paid little attention to this major construction project, leaving the entire operation in the hands of management. The report paints a devastating picture for the corporation. If accepted by the full Public Service Commission, stockholders and the investors in LILCO will be forced to absorb all costs of the project that go over \$2.3 billion.


Current estimates predict the final costs of Shoreham will be between \$4 billion and \$5 billion, and could well exceed the \$5 billion mark. The PSC staff emphasizes, however, the



SUFFOLK COUNTY LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

USPS 991-120



Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-8000
Mailing address: Box 262, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 187, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

Suffolk Life is published in 19 market zone editions every Wednesday.

North Fork	Patchogue	Centerarch	Rocky Point
Riverhead	Medford	Selden	Port Jefferson
Hampton East	Holbrook	Holtsville	Coram
Mid Hampton	Sayville	Mastic	Shirley
Westhampton	Oakdale		Three Village
Monticue	Ronkonkoma		

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

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor	Bill Johnson - Circulation Director	Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Martin J. Cann - Regional Accts. Director	Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator	Linda Conaughly - Adv. Art Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager	Clare Swanik - National Sales Director	Sharmar Gordon - News Art Director
	Ted Conlon - Sales Manager	

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 submission 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.

letters to the editor

"What possible benefit?"

Dear Mr. Grasso:

Enclosed is a letter which I have today sent to the Honorable Edward V. Regan, Comptroller of the State of New York. The subject of my letter is Suffolk County Sewer District No. 10.

I request that a copy of the enclosed correspondence be published in your newspaper.

Sincerely yours,
Charles K. Stein

Dear Mr. Regan:

I am writing this letter to you regarding the proposed Capital Improvement Program with respect to the Strathmore Sewer District No. 10 in Suffolk County. I am aware that your Legal Services Division is currently reviewing this capital project as called for in Section 268 of the County Law.

I am asking that you utilize your authority under Section 268 to deny this project.

I would like to provide you with a little background regarding this project, after which, I believe you will see that the taxpayers in Sewer District No. 10 are being used and unfairly treated.

Sewer District No. 10 involves, primarily the Strathmore Development. This sewer system has been in operation for over fifteen years, during which time those living in the district have been paying sewer taxes. Much of the surrounding area remains unsewered. The New York State DEC is calling for the upgrading of the Sewer District No. 10 treatment plant because the agency believes the nitrates entering our ground water are too high. I ask one simple question; if all of the surrounding community remains unsewered, what possible benefit would be derived out of upgrading Sewer District No. 10? It should also be pointed out that the tremendous cost of this upgrading, while having no potential environmental

benefit, will result in the doubling of Sewer District taxes. This, truly, represents pouring money down the drain.

I have already spoken to your Deputy for Municipal Affairs, Mr. Healy, on this subject. I have been advised that your current review process is examining whether this improvement is in the public's interest and whether the costs associated with the project may be an undue financial burden upon the district's taxpayers. Believe me, I do not believe this project to be in the public's interest because it does not solve the problem. Additionally, a doubling of our sewer taxes would, obviously, be an undue financial burden.

I realize that there are very complex issues surrounding this project. In essence, the real problem for the entire area rests with the sewerage needs of the State University of New York at Stony Brook. I truly believe that the New York State DEC is utilizing this undue burden approach on the taxpayers of Sewer District No. 10, in order to formulate a more grandiose sewer system for the entire region. However, if the DEC was truly concerned about the environmental conditions, it would be mandatory for the DEC to consider those surrounding areas which are currently unsewered. Since these areas are not being considered, I question the true motives behind the DEC's insistence that Sewer District No. 10 undertake a very expensive upgrading of its treatment plant.

Obviously, this is an intricate problem. However, I do not believe that the problem can be solved by holding the taxpayers of Sewer District No. 10 as hostages, in a financial sense. I implore you to deny the approval of this project under your authority of Section 268 of the County Law. The taxpayers of Sewer District No. 10 will be forever grateful.

Sincerely yours,
Charles K. Stein
Stony Brook

"Salaries far in excess"

An open letter to the public

Dear Sir:

Since the county workers have received their pay increase, we constantly see the vituperation directed at them for so burdening the county.

Why is it now that the butchers are on strike, nothing is being said that they are receiving \$32,000 a year and \$6,000 in benefits?

My friends are ranchers who complained about the little income they receive for their beef and now it is evident why.

Here are butchers, probably with or without decent educations, drawing salaries far in excess of the county workers who in many instances have had the enormous expense of college. Many hold two degrees and continued additional study is necessary.

Before the county workers are blasted, you all better think what the butcher's salary is doing to your meat bill; LILCO workers are doing to your utility bills; LIRR personnel are doing to your transportation expense. With far less education they are being rewarded for being drop-outs, manglers of the English language and malingerers.

Sincerely,
Mary Regnideir

Ed. Note: The difference is the type of employment. Butchers work for private companies, patronized by choice by consumers. If the supermarket gives away the store, and then tries to raise the prices to make up for it, the customers can shop elsewhere. This is not true with government labor contracts! Taxpayers must foot the bill without a choice.

"An integrated approach"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

The concept of emergency planning necessarily implies mutually-supportive emergency planning and preparedness arrangements by several levels of government; federal, state, and local governments, including counties, townships, and even villages.

Suffolk County, the only local governmental agency that has jurisdiction capacity for the total area represented by the Shoreham Nuclear Power Station Emergency Planning Zone, has stopped emergency planning.

LILCO has developed an emergency response plan that requires emergency planning and preparedness activities by state and other governmental agencies.

An integrated approach to the development of any emergency response plan is most likely to provide the best protection of the health and safety of the public.

The establishment of an emergency preparedness/evacuation zone district, whose boundaries are compatible with N.R.C. requirements, would provide the organization for integrated emergency planning.

Development of emergency plans should not be used as the means to halt the utilization of nuclear energy to provide electrical power.

Very truly yours,
Carl Franz
Wading River



CENTENARIAN - Paying tribute to a century of living, Brookhaven Town Supervisor Henrietta Acampora, left, presents a Town of Brookhaven Certificate of Appreciation to Daniel Weissman, center, father of Suffolk County Court Judge Morton Weissman, on the occasion of his 100th birthday. Family and friends gathered at the home of Judge Weissman, right, and his wife Helene, center, to celebrate the event. (S-9)

"Thank you for your contribution"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Thank you very much on behalf of all of us involved in the Three Village Meals on Wheels, Inc. for your excellent coverage of our recent release "Report to the Community". You have been very generous in promoting the ideals and goals of the voluntary home delivered meals effort initiated by this office.

As you know, a successful project is the best way to sell similar projects throughout the county. Good press coverage contributes greatly to the suc-

cess of the community based projects such as this one.

I am happy to report to you that the Office for the Aging is currently engaged in two more such efforts in other parts of our county. I am totally confident that they will also be successful.

Thank you once again for your contribution in what is a heart warming and worthwhile activity.

Cordially,
Alelaide F. Silkworth
Director

"I applaud the increase in sales tax"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

Regarding your editorial of Jan. 5, "Sales Tax Charade," I for one, in contrast to you, applaud the increase in sales tax. Unlike the home tax, which penalizes stability, and good values, the income tax, which penalizes initiative, savings, and growth, the sales tax (which does not hit necessities) does hit the foolish spenders, the big wheels, and all the volitile, show-off, and wasteful activities in this culture: "And, why not?"
Stanley Poole
East Marion

Ed. Note: Our concern about a sales tax increase has nothing to do with "the foolish spenders, the big wheels, etc...". Our concern targets on the impact on those who just manage to make it each week - the low income, the senior citizens - who would have to pay extra in taxes for the many necessities of life, that are, indeed taxed. We suggest you check the list of taxable items again.

"Overlooking the many opportunities"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

At the last meeting of the Flanders-Norhampton Alliance, the members re-elected Dan Beauvais as their Chairman.

The Alliance, comprised of six civic groups, has taken a stand against indiscriminate zoning. We feel that this zoning inhibits encouragement of new

business to the area. The members of the Alliance feel that Southampton Town officials are overlooking the many opportunities to develop the Northwest Quarter of the Town.

Sincerely,
Evelyn Froehlich
Alliance Secretary

And Why Not?

Unshackle the Yoke. . .

cont. from page 3

End supervisors and their councils meet in joint session to discuss the problems and the opportunities that are before them.

The supervisor of Brookhaven should be at this meeting to explore the possibility of linking part of her town with a new county. She should also be exploring an alternative which would bring about the creation of county status for the Town of

Brookhaven, which would better serve the public more economically and more realistically.

Let's make it Peconic County AND Brookhaven County now! Let's make it known to the West End power brokers that they will not create havoc with these areas as they have with their own.

And why not?

Shoreham's Scare Tactics

With the recent release of reports by the state Consumer Protection Board and the Public Service Commission staff, each charging that over half the costs of Shoreham resulted from mismanagement and were, therefore, imprudent, there should be little question in anyone's mind about the quality of construction and the dire safety consequences of this nuclear power station.

Although the final impact of both reports was in financial terms, each and repeated instances of mismanagement involving planning and construction of the facility. Each cited numerous problems of alcohol and drug abuse among workers at the plant, and questioned quality control procedures. If a drunk or drug impaired driver is considered dangerous on our roadways, are we any safer if such conditions prevail while a worker is involved in critical safety systems of a nuclear plant?

Combine the reports of these state agencies with the findings of the Cuomo Commission, which exhaustively explored most aspects of the plant, and there is no reason for any Long Island resident to bet his life on the operation of this facility.

The proponents of this plant, LILCO, Newsday, Long Island Commercial Review, the big business interests, and others, are attempting a scare campaign on the economic issues to make Long Islanders change their minds about holding fast on safety issues for the sake of economics. Their reasoning is as flawed as the plant itself.

The crux of their argument is the loss of taxes from the Shoreham plant if it does not operate. Let's look at these taxes realistically and honestly for a change. Taxes paid by LILCO, whether they be for Shoreham or any one of its facilities, are part of its operational cost. These taxes are built into the rate base, they are paid directly by the consumers of electricity and gas as part of their charges for this product. LILCO merely passes them through the taxing municipality where the facility is located. The taxes are taken from all Long Island Lighting Company ratepayers.

In the case of Shoreham, approximately 65 per cent to 70 per cent of these taxes go to the Shoreham-Wading River School District. Approximately 20 per cent of the taxes go to the Town of Brookhaven, less than

10 per cent goes to the County of Suffolk.

The Shoreham-Wading River School District, because of this tax windfall, is currently spending close to \$12,000 per student for their education. Surrounding districts spend close to \$4,000 per student. Shoreham-Wading River homeowners, even though their school district is spending close to three times what surrounding districts are spending for education, are paying substantially less in taxes than the surrounding districts for comparative homes. In other words, because all ratepayers throughout Long Island pay these taxes, all of us on Long Island are subsidizing the taxes of the Shoreham-Wading River School District.

Why the hell should we? If the plant does not go on line, Shoreham-Wading River would be forced to cut its expenditures to those of the surrounding districts, and the homeowners who live in the Shoreham-Wading River School District would be required to pay their fair share of taxes, which have been for too long subsidized by all the ratepayers throughout Long Island.

Windfalls breed waste

The same holds true for the Town of Brookhaven, where 20 per cent of the taxes come from Shoreham. But what does it do with them. Start at the top, Brookhaven pays its part-time councilmen over \$30,000 per year in salary, gives them cars for their personal use. One councilman, Eugene Dooley, has the audacity to use the car supplied by the town for commuting back and forth to O.T.B., where he works full-time and, by sticking his head in the trough twice, collects an additional \$40,000 from the government.

Brookhaven has a huge patronage system, paid for in part because Shoreham is in that town. The wealth is spread amongst the Republican hierarchy which ranges from near no-show jobs to the leasing of millions of dollars worth of equipment through the highway department. One Brookhaven official, in confidence, confided that Brookhaven could easily cut back its budget by 20 per cent. As he said, "We may no longer be eating caviar, but it won't mean we will have to give up our prime steaks."

The finances of the county are in an

atrocious mess. Shoreham produced about \$8,000,000 in tax revenues, a drop in the bucket when you consider the county disburses close to \$1 billion each year. The lavish contract Cohalan and Company saddled the taxpayers with, giving 35 per cent to 70 per cent raises to county workers, is the real problem with county finances. Shoreham may be the best thing that ever happened to the county, for it may make those in the county executive's office and the county legislature, realistically look at the damage their wanton spending has done to the county's financial stability.

The \$8,000,000 the county may lose from Shoreham is a small price to pay for safety. It could easily be made up in a host of other cutbacks that do not provide services for the public, but which are overly generous perks for the employees. For example, a good place to start would be to compound the county sheriff department's cars at their base rather than to allow the sheriffs to take them home and collect an hour overtime everyday for this privilege.

No matter how you look at it, taxes paid by LILCO are nothing more than transfer payments. These tax payments are paid by the ratepayers through our electricity and gas rates.

Even if everything was kept status quo, would it make any difference to us whether we paid these taxes through our rates, or through district taxes to the municipalities? They're still the same bucks coming out of our pockets, no matter how you cut it. The only difference, and it's a big one, is that if the municipalities — Shoreham-Wading River, Brookhaven Town, Suffolk County — wish to continue spending these windfall taxes, the residents of those tax districts will have to pay them rather than all Long Island ratepayers.

Who will owe whom?

Newsday made the argument recently in an editorial that if the plant does not go on line, the municipalities which have collected taxes on the plant while work was in progress, based on the value of the plant as it was being built, might be subject to the repayment of these taxes. We doubt any court would agree with Newsday.

But even if they did, there is a balancing factor which Newsday forgot to mention. LILCO has been collecting, through its rates, charges for Shoreham called Construction Work In

Progress (CWIP) funds. We believe the court would look more favorably upon returning these to the ratepayers than they would look upon returning taxes paid by LILCO on the value of the plant as it was being constructed. These CWIP charges already paid by ratepayers amounted to \$376,000,000 as of October, and probably total over \$400,000,000 today.

Speaking of courts, what Newsday and LILCO and some members of the Public Service Commission choose to ignore are the "used and useful" principles of law which very clearly state that before the ratepayers can be charged for a facility built by a utility, the facility must be "usable and useful." If Shoreham is not opened, it is not usable and, therefore, could not be charged to the ratepayers.

If Shoreham is opened, only the power absolutely needed by the service area can be charged in the rate base, according to an official of the state attorney general's office. The excess power created by the utility may be sold, but the cost of the plant for excess electricity cannot be built into the rates paid by the service area.

Shoreham was created out of greed, not need. It was conceived long before the effects of OPEC came into existence or were hinted at, and there was a shortage of oil. The management of LILCO developed projections that indicated the island would be out of electrical sources by the mid-70's. It wasn't true. Governor Mario Cuomo's Shoreham Commission concurred with the contentions of the county and the State Energy Office that new sources of power will not necessarily be needed until almost the year 2000. So why was Shoreham started if greed was not the underlying reason? When the proposed new transmission lines are built, more economic electricity will be brought down from upstate hydro systems as well as imported from the Canadian-Quebec hydro projects. This precludes the need for Shoreham even in the future.

We warn readers not to panic now! Don't let LILCO or its mouthpiece, Newsday, scare you with projections of dire financial consequences.

The law is on your side. What we must do at this point is convince our elected leaders that their obligation is to the ratepayers rather than to the investors who, at this point, are speculators in the Long Island Lighting Company.

And why not?

It's Nice To Be Right, But...

We might like to be writing, "We told you so." But now that the damage is done, there is no pleasure in doing so.

Last year, while the county negotiated with police, sheriffs and the county workers, we did an exhaustive analysis of the ramifications of these pay raises. Working with data supplied by the financial people in the County Executive's office, and the Legislative Budget Office, we concluded there would be a horrendous shortfall in taxes in 1985 and 1986.

Much of the information on which this conclusion was based came from the county government itself. In fact, our initial involvement was based on strong statements of concern voiced about the financial future of the county from County Executive Peter Cohalan. We were very dismayed, therefore, to

hear county officials argue when they signed the police and Civil Service Employees Association contracts, that there would be no shortfall, and that the county could well afford the huge raises being given.

Those early conversations with Cohalan concerned the demands being made by the labor negotiators for the employees, and Cohalan's predictions of what the county could afford to give. His financial experts had projected, he told us, the maximum the county could afford to absorb without raising taxes was 27 to 28 per cent over a three year period. Based on the information presented to us, we took a firm stand against the proposed contracts and fully disclosed the pitfalls that lay ahead.

Then Cohalan did a flip-flop, ap-
Cont. on page 4

SUFFOLK LIFE

VOL. 23 No. 26

NEWSPAPERS

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. 11951

Suffolk Life is published in 19 market zone editions every Wednesday
North Fork Patchogue Centereach Rocky Point
Hampton East Medford Selden Suffolk County Life
Med Hampton Holbrook Hotville Coram Suffolk County Life
Westhampton Sayville Mastic Shirely Suffolk County Life
Moriches Ronkonkoma

David J. Willmott - Editor and Publisher

John McKay - General Manager

Lou Grasso - Managing Editor
Martin J. Cann - Regional Accts. Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

Bill Johnson - Circulation Director
Angela Gingo - Co-op Coordinator
Claire Swank - National Sales Director
Ted Conlon - 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.

letters to the editor

"Basic considerations that guide us"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

On behalf of the people of Long Island and all of New York State, I wish to convey my personal appreciation for your contributions as a member of the fact-finding panel on the Shoreham Nuclear Power Facility. Out of the democratic give-and-take of the panel meetings and hearings has come a sharper image and understanding of the diverse and impassioned issues that surround not only the Shoreham plant but nuclear facilities throughout our state and nation. These will be

the basic considerations that guide us as we who are elected guardians of public welfare and safety seek an answer to this complex and compelling problem.

Few state advisory bodies have undertaken a more difficult challenge than the one faced by you and your fellow panel members. I thank you for the knowledge, skill and dedication that you brought to this vitally important task.

Sincerely,
Mario M. Cuomo

"There are honest people"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

We thank God for a newspaper that prints the truth. Also we enjoyed your Merry Christmas article so much. On Jan. 24th we purchased an antique hutch on Main Street in Hampton Bays and three weeks later we bumped into the owner in town and she gave us \$20 that we overpaid.

There are honest people.

Respectfully,
Mr. and Mrs. Charles Thoesen
Hampton Bays

We are enclosing a check for a subscription to Suffolk Life, "The Honest Paper".

"Decries the revival of patriotic fervor"

Dear Mr. Willmott:

It would be good if you or some other paper in the area would print the following for Mr. Van Howell's benefit:

"Breathes there the man, with soul so dead
Who never to himself hath said,
'This is my own, my native land!
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burn'd
As home his footsteps he hath turn'd,
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim,
Despite these titles, power and pelf,
The wretch, concentred all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile grave from whence he sprung,
Unwept, unhonour'd and unsung."

Mr. Howell refers to the negative aspects of our country's history, such as the way the Indians were treated by the early settlers, and the fact that slavery existed in the South for a number of years. He fails to speak of the many people who co-existed peacefully with the Indians, and he does not mention those who risked their homes, their very lives and the safety of their families in the underground effort by which many slaves were brought to freedom. He forgets, or chooses to ignore, the Civil War. He compares Germany's inroads into countries where they had no business with our rescue of American citizens from an almost certain hostage situation in Grenada. He links the Grenada rescue with the reorganization of the Civil Rights Commission, although most observers would fail to see the connection, or why either action should be considered detrimental to our national honor.

He decries the revival of patriotic fervor, and compares the present resurgence of American determination with the time when Germany beat, starved, raped, tortured, gassed or burned six million people whose main sin was that they did not have coursing in their veins the pure Aryan blood of their persecutors.

Carl Sandburg has this to say of those who would tear down their own country:

"... we know when a nation goes down and never comes back, when a society and a civilization perishes, one condition may always be found. They forgot where they came from. They lost sight of what brought them along. The hard beginnings were forgotten and the struggles farther along. They became satisfied with themselves.

Unity and understanding there had been, enough to overcome rot and dissolution, enough to break through their obstacles. But the mockers came. And the deniers were heard. And vision and hope faded. And the custom of greeting became 'What's the use?' And men whose forefathers would go anywhere, holding nothing impossible in the genius of man, joined the mockers and deniers. They forgot where they came from. They lost sight of what brought them along."

(From Carl Sandburg's "Remembrance Rock." Justice Orville Brand Wendom's radio speech. May be restricted material.)

Mr. Howell's comparisons are very far-fetched. The comeback the United States is making under the present administration should not be likened to Germany's eventual build up after World War I, nor should the American tendency to come to the relief of the oppressed be compared with the tramp of German boots across the face of Europe 45 years ago.

An illustration of the difference between our country at any time, and Germany in the Hitler years can be found in the words of a woman who was on her way from San Diego to Washington in the spring of 1983. She and a few others were going to attend a national meeting of Holocaust survivors. Asked by a reporter about their plans for the visit, she said among other things they were going to do was their projected trip to Arlington National Cemetery to place a wreath in honor of World War II American dead. "After all," she said simply, "they saved us." And that has been the custom of Americans always. We try to help the oppressed. We go in and beat down the oppressor. We failed in Vietnam because people, "deniers and mockers," encouraged our youth to burn and trample the flag and JFK's first 60,000, plus the rest that LBJ sent over to Vietnam became discouraged because of lack of support, even moral support. A terrible toll was taken there, in more ways than one, and it may well be that writings such as Mr. Howell's may have contributed to the defeat. The "mockers came." The "deniers were heard." "And the custom of greeting became 'What's the use?'"

Mr. Howell has a good talent. It is the gift of God. His freedom to use this gift is a courtesy extended to him by the greatest country in the world. Let him not forget where he came from. Let him not lose sight of what brought him along.

Irene Dalmus
Chula Vista, Calif.

"Keep up the good work"

Dear Sir:

Enclose \$10.00, \$5.00 for subscription and \$5.00 for what ever expenses you have trying to help us.

The taxes are so high and electricty and everything else. I'm a widow 78 years old,

so it's hard to live on Long Island. So keep up the good work.

Sincerely,
Stella Zdyb
Jamesport



SCHOOL COMPUTERS — On February 2 and February 3, students from the Hampton Bays elementary school and high school demonstrated their computer expertise to patrons of the Suffolk County National Bank and the Bank of New York. Student participants in the display included first graders who received the public's attention as they demonstrated their skill and ease of handling the sophisticated equipment. At the high school level, the greatest interest was generated by the S.A.T. preparation software utilized in the district's S.A.T. classes. More than one passerby was heard to remark, "I wish they had that available when I was in school." Shown, left to right are third graders Becky Perlow, Cathy Shelton, Kerry Wilenski, Melanie McClain, and Theodore Jankowski. (T-2)

And Why Not:

It's Nice To Be Right, But...

Cont. from page 3

proving a contract that gave the union far more than they had originally asked for. And the majority of county legislators succumbed to pressure brought by the unions, and voted their approval as well. Cohalan's office, and the legislators, stated that with the forecasts of additional revenues from a good economy and new construction in Suffolk, which would increase income, the package could be paid for without additional taxes or cutbacks in staff.

Our analysis at the time indicated, for the CSEA contract alone, a shortfall of over \$20 million in the year 1985. This could mandate a reduction of up to half the county work force; a 22 per cent increase in real estate taxes; a 1 per cent increase in sales taxes, or a combination of all three measures.

A year has gone by, the economy is a lot better than anyone had hoped for. Construction starts are more than respectable. On the other side of the coin, Shoreham may not go on line, and the Southwest Sewer District financing did not come about. Now both are being used as an argument for an increase in taxes, but the real culprit is being deliberately ignored.

Shoreham produced approximately \$8,000,000 in taxes for the county, a drop in the bucket when you consider the county disburses almost \$1 billion per year. This \$8,000,000, which is less than 1 per cent of the total county budget, could have easily been absorbed by normal economies.

The Southwest Sewer District is a problem of the residents of the Southwest Sewer District. John Klein promised the residents of this district they would not have to pay any more than \$350 on an average home in sewer taxes. This was a political statement made for political reasons. It was an artificial promise not based on fact, just politics. We understand there are a number of small sewer districts throughout the county which charge the users more than \$350 on an average piece of property for sewer service, but nobody cries about their plight. It is not fair for the taxpayers of

Suffolk County to subsidize the people of the Southwest Sewer District, unless, such a subsidy is county-wide, both for municipal sewer districts and aid to the landowners who have septic tanks and must pay for their emptying and cartage fees.

A knowledgeable source in the county recently said that a good portion of the impact in the sewer district will be spread through volume, particularly as the sewer district hooks up those along the 110 corridor. These are heavy industrial users, the fees they pay will soften the blow to the individual homeowners.

The real crux of Suffolk's financial dilemma is the lack of management by the County Executive and the County Legislature. They have spent money, your money, in an unconscionable fashion. The County Executive has loaded his office with patronage employees, as have many of the other agencies throughout the county.

The County Legislature has followed suit. Some of the aides have had their salaries doubled in a period of two years, making more than county legislators themselves, while receiving the same perks and more, including cars.

The county government is like a bloated pig. The bigger it gets, the more it wants to eat. Instead of expanding its meat content, it fills with hot air.

The dropping of the county's credit rating should be the point that breaks the bubble and makes our elected officials face their responsibilities to act as prudent, fiscal managers. Biting the bullet is hard, but we must cut back the size of the county government and realign its finances.

People are going to have to be cut from the payroll. Productivity must be increased. The taxpayers in the county cannot afford more taxes. Suffolk already pays more in taxes than most counties in the United States. We just can't continue to add to the taxpayers' burden.

Sacrificing this time must come from the government itself. How about it Cohalan, Howard and Co?

And why not?

Cohalan's ~~Last~~ Second Chance

Rarely does a man receive a second chance in political life. The county executive received such a chance from the courts last week when they threw out the county contract. The court ruled that the county contract was illegal because it had been negotiated by people who would benefit from its provisions.

Refer Cohalan initially stated during negotiations that the maximum the county could afford to settle with its employees were raises in the 27 per cent to 28 per cent category without increasing taxes.

Maybe because of gross incompetence, or perhaps it was just plain exhaustion, the representatives of the county agreed to a contract covering a four year span that gave county employees 40 per cent to 70 per cent increases in salary, plus benefits.

Suffolk Life's extensive analysis on this contract predicted that even with an improved economy and new building starts, a shortfall of up to \$40 million would result by the year 1985. Cohalan and the legislature, contrary to their own earlier predictions, denied that there would be a shortfall when they approved this contract.

This past January, both the county executive and the legislature again reversed themselves and indicated there would be a shortfall. They spoke of raising the sales tax from 7 1/4 per cent to 8 1/4 per cent, and, in addition, increasing real estate taxes by as much as \$20 million annually.

Cohalan said that the culprit was LILCO for not paying its Shoreham taxes. The county would have received, from LILCO's taxes, approximately \$8 million. He also blamed the financial problems of the Southwest Sewer District for the shortfall. This is a self-financing special use district. When his rhetoric was all said and done, the real problem was the contract with the county employees. Cohalan was fooling no one but himself.

The court's findings, which invalidated the contract, have given Cohalan a second chance, a chance to act like a man. A man of leadership and with management attributes. Cohalan knows, as does everyone else, where the problem with the contract lies. It wasn't 1983, it wasn't 1984, it is 1985. This is the year the piper is going to have to be paid and the county could go broke.

If everything is allowed to stand in the year 1985, sales tax may well have

to be raised to 8 1/4 per cent. The county portion of real estate taxes may have to be increased substantially, and massive layoffs of the county work force may be the only things that can keep the county whole. But the residents of the county, the people who pay the taxes, will be losers.

Those who have come into the county work force during the past five years could lose their jobs. They should remember last in, first out.

Cohalan and the Republican organization, as well as the Democratic legislators that supported the initial contract, will be losers as they earn the wrath of the voters when they realize how badly conned they have been.

The rejection by the courts of this contract has given Cohalan a second chance. The contract, by law, must be renegotiated. It must be negotiated not only from the county employees' viewpoint, but with concern for the residents who must pay for it. No one wants to see the county employees give up everything that they have received to date, but the provisions and the schedule called for in 1985 must be rescinded. The provisions of the contract must be frozen at the 1984 level.

Increases for 1985 and 1986 can be achieved for the county workers by changing the work week from a contracted 35 hours to a normal 40 hours. Going from 35 to 40 hours would give a 12 per cent increase in productivity, which could result in a 12 per cent increase in wages. This trade-off would give the county workers increases in their paychecks, which is what they want, and the people of the county increased work for the taxes paid.

The work force, to compensate for the increased hours, would have to be reduced by a like amount. This could come about through attrition, saving layoffs of the younger, less highly paid workers who most need their jobs and income.

The county contract was a mistake, a mistake that needs correcting.

Rarely do you have a real opportunity to correct a mistake. The courts have given Cohalan the opportunity. Will he be man enough to take advantage of it? Is he a good enough politician and a manager? Does he care about our future and his own? That's all up to him.

And why not?

to be the little guy fighting big government and its insensitivity.

Against all odds, D'Amato snatched the nomination away from the establishment, ran a vigorous campaign and was elected Senator from New York. A Senator who gave promise of being for the people, not the establishment and not the world as his predecessor, Jacob Javits, had been.

D'Amato, during his first couple of years in the Senate, amazed even his critics as he seemed to have an ability to be in tune with people, his constituents, at all levels. He actually seemed to remember there were little people, there was a Long Island, and it had needs to be addressed on the federal level. This refreshing representation gave the people hope. But, unfortunately, time seems to have worn out D'Amato's understanding of the people.

We are sad and very upset to see him blindly become a LILCO flunky. Just a few weeks ago, D'Amato accused Governor Mario Cuomo of playing partisan politics over Shoreham. This ill-founded remark, we felt then, had to be a slip of the tongue that was partisan in nature rather than based on knowledge.

Cuomo has been in the hot seat over Shoreham and although we did not support him for Governor, we have found his handling of the Shoreham situation admirable. Cuomo did his research. His opinions are based on fact, not rhetoric. He has properly taken much pains to cut through the rhetoric and find the facts. He has withstood the pressures from LILCO, the financial community, and all those who have callously disregarded legitimate concerns for people, both from a safety and an economic standpoint, and are solely motivated by their own personal greed.

Cuomo has reached out to the public, asking hard questions of the pro-safety forces as well as the pro-LILCO supporters. The more educated and vocal the supporter, the harder the questions he proposed to them. The decisions he has made were not easy decisions to reach. They have earned him the wrath of big business and big labor. They have placed him alongside Peter Cohalan, a Republican of opposite political persuasion.

D'Amato, in contrast, has done everything in his power to put himself

out of the reach of the public. During the Shoreham Commission hearings, he failed to have a representative present. During the public hearings, again, D'Amato was not represented. Personal letters to him concerning Shoreham have gone unanswered, unacknowledged. And requests to talk with him have gone ignored.

D'Amato seems comfortable in his position of abdicating his responsibility over Shoreham. During the past year he has maintained a strange silence for a man of the people about an issue that is so people-oriented. This past week, D'Amato came out of the closet with a proposal for a federal emergency evacuation team. D'Amato voices support for legislation for a federal bail-out through tax exempt loans to LILCO. If this had happened a year ago, or six months ago, we could understand his position. Now, never!

The state Public Service Commission and the state Consumer Protection Board have released their findings concerning the prudence of LILCO. According to these two state agencies, the management of LILCO was responsible for over \$2 billion worth of mismanagement and waste. Incompetent mismanagement does not deserve the support of any United States Senator, particularly a Senator whose roots are in the people.

D'Amato's proposal at this time can only help to perpetuate the fraud that Shoreham is, can only cost his constituents unfair rate increases, and pose a potential threat to their health and safety.

We are saddened that Senator D'Amato has apparently accepted the LILCO rhetoric, untruths and propaganda at its face value without apparently having done research on his own to ascertain the real state of affairs and the truth. We are sorry to see this man of the people has become a flunky of the establishment, forsaking his roots and his sacred responsibility to the people.

Shoreham has already cost many people their careers. It's a shame that the backlash may tarnish D'Amato's reputation and, possibly, cost him reelection. We pray that D'Amato orders his staff to independently evaluate the total Shoreham situation and, based upon fact, he re-evaluate his position and act as a representative of the people.

And why not?

Letter to the Editor

Dear Mr. Willmott:

'Thank you' for your full coverage of the East End of Islip Mural Project.

I deeply appreciate your kindness and

cherish your help.

... 'Thank you.'

Respectfully,

Sharon Lippman

Forgotten His Roots?

Senator Al D'Amato, a Republican, is a maverick of sorts. He doesn't fit your stereotype image of the Republican hierarchy.

When he ran for Senator he wasn't a wasp, he wasn't identified as a flunky for big business. In fact, initially, he had little support for his bid for the Senate from the establishment or the hierarchy in the Republican party. He was dubbed the polyester

Republican."

D'Amato had a couple of things going for him: one was the former County Leader of Suffolk, Anthony Prudenti, a fellow Italian who had also come up from the streets, and who was willing to put his career and his prestige on the line early on in D'Amato's behalf.

D'Amato had the ability to reach out to the people and to identify with them. He knew what it was to be poor,

SUFFOLK LIFE

VOL. 23 NO. 27

NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3986 Classified Ads 288-5800
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 Saugerties Port Jefferson
Hampton East Holbrook Hottelville Coram Three Village
Mid Hampton Sayville Mastic Shrewsbury
Westhampton Oakdale
Mornings Ronkonkoma



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of 210,000 Circulation Weekly
Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southampton; Town of Islip; Surrogate Court, 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 - Regional Accts. Director
Lorraine Peczkowski - Office Manager

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

Peter Parpan - Production Manager
Linda Conaughly - 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 submission 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.