

Planning For Personal Reasons

Last Tuesday, the County Legislature passed a resolution amending the original one that authorizes the county to plan for a multi million dollar centralized court complex in the west end of the county. The amendment directed the planners not to remove the current parts of the Supreme Court from Riverhead.

The centralized court complex scheme was the brain child of Chief Administrative Judge Arthur Cromarty, who formerly was up to his neck in the South West Sewer District and Lee Koppelman, who also had substantial input into this disgraceful example of scandalous planning.

Koppelman we understand, is pressuring County Executive Cohalan to veto the Legislature's resolution. We find this ironic, for Koppelman has often described the East End's economy as a fragile mix between agriculture, resort and government. He has maintained that the disruption of any one of the three would upset the balance and ruin the pristine quality of life on the East End. His support for pulling the courts out of Riverhead is a diametric contradiction of his own planning efforts, a deliberate sabotage of the economical balance on the East End.

The complex that these two so-called public officials advocate, originally was estimated to cost \$30 million. Currently, the estimates are over \$100 million plus bonding costs which would bring the total price tag of the project to \$300 million, a first cousin to the ruination of the taxpayers caused by the lack of planning in the South West Sewer District.

Riverhead was chosen by the founding fathers of Suffolk County as the County Seat, because

geographically, it is located midpoint in the county. Koppelman and Cromarty want a center close to the Nassau County Border because they claim that the population centers are located there now. They seem to forget the vast tracts of underdeveloped land which will someday house people in Brookhaven and the five East End towns. The East End is going to grow, and so is Brookhaven, Hopefully in a compatible fashion with what is already there, and not as hodge-podge as the West end.

The Court Complex - if there is a genuine need for one, which we doubt - should be located in Riverhead, the County Seat. It is a heck of a lot easier to go east in the morning and west in the afternoon. The trip is substantially quicker than going in the reverse directions.

The economical impact of the courts on the East End's economy is very real and genuine as Koppelman has often mentioned. If the courts go, much of the East End economy would be seriously impacted. Tradition tells us when this happens, slip-shod types of businesses and undesirable industries all of a sudden become acceptable, out of the need to create jobs and an economic base. Any beginning planner knows this as a fact. Therefore, we find Koppelman's part in the planning of a west end court complex ripe with suspicion.

County Executive Cohalan should tell Lee Koppelman to go fly a kite, that he is going to sustain the will of the Legislature and live up to his commitment to the East End, that under no circumstances will the courts, the County Clerk's or the County Treasurer's offices be moved out of the East End.

And why not?

Reflection On The Election Past

By this morning, Election 1982 will be a bit of history, and will be recorded probably as a start of a new era, an era we are not particularly happy or proud about.

In our 20 some years of covering and taking part in the election process, we have seldom found the degree of dishonesty and ruthlessness we observed this year. You had to be a pretty strong person who was very knowledgeable to have voted intelligently.

If you listened to the bombardment of commercials on radio and television, many of which were based upon comments taken out of context, you had to be misled and confused. It seemed to be the prevailing thought of the 1982 politicians and their staffs, to win at any cost, whether it was honest, true and fair to all concerned. This is deplorable.

Probably the worst bit of political

chicanery took place in the disgraceful cross endorsement of judges, whereby the Bar Association was the sole determiner of the qualification of candidates. One of the candidates, a Republican who was cross endorsed, had been turned down by the Bar Association on two occasions as being "unqualified." This candidate, a sitting judge, had a horrendous reputation amongst lawyers, police, probation officers and court attendants. He was booted upstairs and a deal was cut between the leadership of the Democrats and Republicans.

The Bar Association in a highly questionable and possibly unethical move, reconvened on short notice suddenly found him "qualified." The electorate was left without an alternative and now will have to suffer under the man's alleged incompetence.

Most of the other judges whose candidacies were not controversial never had their credentials examined by the public. They had the political luxury of not having to face campaigns, or the public. Who knows how many of these are saints or sinners. Yet, they will be sitting in judgement over our lives when we are called to appear in court.

The system of cross endorsements, particularly when it applies to judges,

is sick. The public is robbed of the right to choose. There are no revelations about these people. They are faceless and of unknown quality.

The whole political system is badly in need of a complete revamping. Unfortunately, the elected officials responsible for these changes are incumbents and are comfortable with the system as it is for they are in and the people are out.

And why not?

So Sue Us

Suffolk County jails, according to state standards, are over-crowded, with more prisoners than there are accommodations. The State Correctional Commission has cited the County for this condition on numerous occasions in the past.

The County, in an effort to correct this condition, made arrangements with an upstate county that had vacancies in its jail to house some of the Suffolk prisoners. In addition, county officials have contracted for the construction of modular prison facilities at Yaphank. These constitute tangible evidence of attempts by the county to comply with the State's mandates.

The good old state announced this past week that this was not enough so, therefore, Suffolk County, its government, and its residents shall become defendants in a law suit brought by the State. Apparently the state feels that suit will somehow, mystically solve this very real problem. That "we'll sue them" philosophy is a prime example of bureaucratic logic perpetuated by assinine people.

To continue this lunacy, the State itself is partially responsible for the over-crowding of county jails and refuses to do anything about it. When defendants are convicted and sentenced to state prisons, they are supposed to be transferred immediately. Because there is over-crowding in state jails, state officials refuse to accept these prisoners, leaving them in the county facilities.

According to Jack Finnerty, sheriff of Suffolk County, they can have as many as 50 to 60 of these prisoners at any given time. If they could get rid of them within a day or two of their conviction, his statistics on over-crowding in Suffolk County jails would look a heck of a lot better. Instead, there are delays of up to six weeks.

Logic will tell you if the state was concerned about cleaning up the

problem, they would clean up their own problems before they attempt to sue the people of Suffolk County for a condition they are partially responsible for. But then, who said bureaucrats are logical.

The problem is money and too many people who got caught taking the law into their own hands. To provide the accommodations that meet the luxury standards as set forth by the Correction Commission, the County is supposed to build new prisons. To build these new prisons, the County must raise the money from the taxpayers. The State Correctional Commission, who is quick with the mandates and the law suits, neglected to send any money to meet his demands.

These mandates also are the ones that demand prisoners be housed in private accommodations, with amenities beyond the scope of the average person's imagination.

This same Correctional Commission is allowing an upstate community to double bunk their prisoners because that community does not have the room for their prisoners nor the tax base to build new prisons. Of course, this is a double standard that is neither fair nor right. Is double bunking upstate more humane than double bunking in Suffolk?

Further, the bureaucrats who run the State Correction Commission fail to realize the residents of Suffolk County and Long Island are the highest taxed in the nation. We just plain don't have any more money to give. We believe Sheriff Finnerty, who will probably be served personally, and Peter Cohalan, the County Executive, should say, "so sue us already," and meet fire with fire by suing the State Correction Commission to allow double bunking in Suffolk, and for the funds to meet this regulatory agency's mandates.

And why not?

USPS 098-300

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 22 NO. 12

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
Mailing address: Box 252 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	Centerach	Rocky Point
Riverhead	Medford	Selden	Port Jefferson
Hampton East	Holbrook	Hottsville	Three Village
Med Hampton	Sayville	Coram	
Westhampton	Gardes	Mastic	Shirley
Monroes	Rantonomas		



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of 194,000 Circulation Weekly

Suffolk Life is an official newspaper of: Town of Southampten, Town of West Suffolk County, County of Suffolk, Middle Pines School District, Patchogue-Medford School District, Suffolk County Life published weekly each Wednesday, is an Official Newspaper of: 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 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.

Willmotts and Why-Nots

David J. Willmott, Editor

Suffolk Comes Through

In a New York Post editorial on November 5, the Post asked if there was a Republican leader who did not sit on his hands during this past elections. They went on to comment that many of the old guard Republican leaders throughout the state resented Lew Lehrman's emergence as a candidate, and to show their displeasure, even though he was the standardbearer, sat out the campaign.

We would like to bring to the Post's attention Suffolk County Republican Leader Anthony Prudenti, who had been at the forefront of the Lehrman campaign. He was instrumental in opening up the nominating procedure by stopping a runaway by Ned Reagan in January. He led the fight for Lehrman at the convention and actively worked throughout the summer, until the wee hours of the morning of election night.

This work proved fruitful. Prudenti produced the 30,000 vote plurality he had promised, and, in doing so, re-elected all sitting Assemblymen and Senators and picked up two new Assemblymen for the Republican side, whose districts had been deliberately and disgracefully gerrymandered so as to be favorable to Democratic candidates.

The Post editorial, we think, was unfair as they spoke out about the state which delivered 56 out of 62 counties for Lehrman. Unquestionably, Republicans were out-manuevered, out-gunned and beaten badly in New York City, where the Republican party is self-delegated to the depths of political obscurity.

We were sickened by the number of Congressional races in the City that were run unopposed. It's one thing for judges to be selected without opposition, it's another for the Congress of the United States.

We congratulate Mario Cuomo on putting together and unifying the Liberal-Democratic forces. He played his cards and his politics right, winning a hard-fought victory.

Before the Democratic primary, we suggested the Democrats support him as he truly represents the Democratic

Party. He is a true liberal Democrat. His philosophies do not blend with mainstream Republicans, and as a result, the voters had a clear cut choice on who to support in this election. This is the way it should be. It was a good campaign, hard fought and well run, and the voters rightfully had the final say.

Cuomo's slim margin of victory is anything but a mandate, particularly when you consider he lost the majority of the State and only won in the city. He will be in a very uncomfortable position as those who backed him, the Liberal Party; labor unions, and a coalition of the minorities, will be demanding their pounds of flesh.

If he is to be a good Governor, he is going to have to learn something fast. He has never before had to face saying "no" to unreasonable demands. As he takes office January 1, he becomes the Governor of all the people of the State. His alliance and his loyalty shall be challenged, for he will no longer enjoy the luxury of being a politician without responsibility. The unions will make brutal attacks upon the labor laws of this State; the municipal unions will demand the elimination of the anti-strike portion of the Taylor Law. They will insist that Tier 3 be abolished. Both of these measures would cost the taxpayers billions.

In the private sector, unions will be screaming they have to bring back to their members more from the State because of their support. Passage of new pro-labor laws will only cause more firms to move from the State. This has been a big factor in the past.

Cuomo avoided taking a stand on many issues during the campaign, issues he now will have to face as Governor. We pray he is up to the task and can put partisan politics aside to become a Governor to all the people. If he fails in this task and his paybacks are too great, the State will be left in absolute economical chaos that nothing short of bankruptcy, or an absolute recession, can straighten out. No one wants this, and hopefully, Cuomo least of all.

And why not?

99% Uninspected

The recently completed LILCO-financed study of the construction of the Shoreham nuclear plant declares that plant "is judged to be satisfactory for the nuclear industry." That finding is not unexpected. But the findings are most certainly suspect, to put it mildly.

Consider this: The study - conducted by Torrey-Pines Technology, which was hired by LILCO for the project - covers only one per cent of the plant's 37 safety systems. In the inspection of that one per cent, the firm found 19 "findings" which will cost an estimated \$1 million. How many more "findings" are there lurking in the other 99 per cent of

those safety systems? How many more flaws will go unchecked, and uncorrected?

LILCO spokesmen continue to insist that Shoreham "is the most inspected plant in the world" and claim that the myriad of Nuclear Regulatory Commission tests, and those done by LILCO and Torrey-Pines, should provide a basis for certainty about the plant's safety. In our view, the discovery of 19 flaws in just one per cent of the plant's safety systems does just the opposite. If this is, indeed, the most inspected plant in the world, why weren't these flaws discovered long before this? Why didn't the NRC inspections find them? Or LILCO's

inspections find them and correct them long before this?

Is it money that causes LILCO spokesmen to continue to insist there will be no further inspections? If 19 flaws will cost \$1 million to correct, how much would be needed to repair those flaws that continue to remain hidden at Shoreham, hidden by LILCO's insistence there will be no outside, independent inspection, one they cannot control?

The cost of Shoreham has continued to escalate through the years because of mismanagement, pure and simple. Now, in what we can only assume is an attempt by the utility to keep costs down, and to prevent the total fiasco of Shoreham to become public knowledge through an outside, independent inspection, LILCO is perfectly willing to gamble that there are no serious defects in the 99 per cent of the plant which remains uninspected.

But the stakes in LILCO's gamble

are terribly high: the health and welfare of the residents of Suffolk County. One accident could be devastating for Suffolk County, as we know it, and for the people who live here.

County officials vow to continue pushing for an outside, independent inspection, and we applaud them for that determination. The residents of Suffolk County, our public officials - and that includes our congressmen who should be in the forefront of this effort by pressuring the NRC to put safety at the top of their priority list in dealing with Shoreham - need to stand shoulder to shoulder against LILCO in this fight.

Shoreham must be proven safe, without a shadow of a doubt. With only one per cent of the plant's safety systems now inspected, the safety of that plant remains 99 per cent in doubt.

And why not?

Readers' Opinion

Dear David:

Your recent editorial on the need for an Alcohol Detoxification Program here in Suffolk County was right on target. Elimination of this essential service would be a grave disservice to the residents of this county.

As the county legislator who first broke this story to the media, I appreciate your alertness in responding to and sensing the critical nature of the funding problem before us.

Sincerely yours,
John J. Foley
County Legislator

To the Editor:

With mixed emotions I ponder the results of the Nick Poulos defense fund—\$40,000 plus—raised for a person indicted on 40 counts by the District Attorney. Just suppose by some stretch of the imagination, Nick is found guilty, who is going to pay for his prosecution? We, the taxpayers!

We should demand equal rights. I wish some group would start a fund to raise money for the prosecution of "Nick."
Annoyed Honest Taxpayer,
Donald F. Rimmelin
Mastic Beach

To the Editor:

I missed the friendly encounter sponsored by the Medford Taxpayers and Civic Association between Supervisor Henrietta Acampora and Assemblyman George Hochbrueckner on Councilmatic Districts in Brookhaven on Sept. 13. I am not in favor of them.

The present system puts the responsibility for decisions on all the elected officials equally. A case in point is the shredder in Medford. With six councilmen aware of the problems facing the community the wheels of government are turning slowly, with only one representative they wouldn't even move.

I do favor two year terms over four year terms for the council people only because it would make them more accountable to the people.

No system is perfect, but if given the choice I would vote to retain the one we have!

Ann Follmer
Medford

To the Editor:

Along with my check for subscription let me voice my appreciation for your active concern for community problems. Your coverage of Shoreham has been excellent.

Regards,
Sophia Adler
Southold

Dear David:

I refer to your April 28 editorial of this year entitled "H.E.A.P. of Abuse." I wish to commend you for your astute observations concerning the misdirection of a portion of the Home Energy Assistance Program monies.

As Chairman of the Aging Committee, I was particularly critical of the Department of Social Services' use of H.E.A.P. funds to finance public assistance recipients who reside in public housing. Such a practice denied benefits to the neediest and the elderly. I stated my displeasure with this practice in a letter to Commissioner Barbara Blum on March 3, 1982, a copy of which I have enclosed.

Please be assured that I shall work with the new Commissioner of Social Services to seek a correction of this outrageous policy, but there is very stiff resistance in that Department as well as in the Legislature to such change.

Very truly yours,
Paul Harenberg
Member of Assembly

USPS 098-300

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 22 NO. 13

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 11 market zone editions every Wednesday

North Fork	Patchogue	Centerport	Rocky Point
Riverhead	Medford	Selden	Port Jefferson
Hampton East	Holbrook	Coram	Three Valleys
Mad Hampton	Sayville	Mastic	Shirley
Westhampton	Quaker		
Moncks	Rancocas		



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of 194,000 Circulation Weekly

Suffolk Life is an official newspaper of Town of Southampton, Town of East Hampton, County of Suffolk, Rocky Point, Southold, Patchogue, Medford, Sayville, Riverhead, and Westhampton. It is published weekly except Wednesdays, is an official newspaper of Town of East Hampton, Town of Riverhead, Town of Brookhaven, and Town 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 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 \$1.00 per copy
25¢ per issue Suffolk County Life. In Suffolk County \$4.99 per year, outside Suffolk County \$7.99 per year
copy sales: 25¢ per issue

General Information

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR - We encourage our readers to express their views in the Editor Column. All letters must be signed with author's signature and address.

NEWS AND PHOTOGRAPHS Readers are welcome to submit ideas and photographs. All news and photographs become the property of Suffolk Life upon publication. ERRORS - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the advertiser.

(516) 633-1111

Wednesday, November 10, 1982

SUFFOLK LIFE

PAPER

PAGE 3

Willmotts and Why-Not's

David J. Willmott, Editor

Separating Fact From Fiction

A few weeks ago, we ran an editorial stating that the County was offering its civil service employees what amounted to an average pay increase of 25 per cent over three years.

We were accused of not having our facts, and doing irreparable harm to the County workers. We followed up this editorial with another, explaining what we had hoped to accomplish was to get both sides to put the facts on the table so that union members and the public could decide who was demanding what.

We also ran a page of angry letters from County workers who criticized us highly for this editorial, claiming that the content was purely a figment of our imagination. One of the writers wrote condemning Suffolk Life, the County's labor commissioner and the County government itself.

We requested that the County run us, in black and white, what this man would be earning under the new contract compared to what he is earning now.

The union has been telling its members that all the County is offering is 2½ per cent over a three year period. Let's look at the facts as they pertain to this individual and see if it is 2½ per cent, the 25 per cent we alleged in our editorial, or more. This individual's title is Communication Tech I. He was hired on May 2, 1977. According to his job description, he installs and services radios. Under the present contract, he makes \$825 bi-weekly, or \$21,533 annually. This, in itself, is above what many private companies pay and substantially more than is paid by other county governments throughout the State of New York.

Let's look at what happens over the three years of the proposed contract. In 1982 under the proposed County contract, his salary would go to \$882 bi-weekly, \$23,020 annually for a 7 per cent increase. As of January 1, 1983, his salary would be increased to \$1,050 bi-weekly, or \$27,405 annually, a 19 per cent increase. On January 1, 1984, the third year of the proposed contract, his salary would go to \$1,123 bi-weekly, or \$29,310 annually, a 7 per cent increase. This is a compounded total of 36 per cent over three years,

11 per cent higher than the average we published and were criticized for alleging.

What is happening is the union leaders have refused to divulge to County is offering. Instead of giving them the facts, they have given them rhetoric. The union has maintained the increase in steps is automatic, when in fact, the contract states steps are a negotiable item.

Most people do not understand steps, and for the sake of clarity should be eliminated as they do nothing more than confuse the issue and provide a very unfair system of secondary longevity increases. The County is proposing an accelerated move through the step system, combined with percentage increases in salaries which works out to better than 25 per cent over a three year period.

In addition, they have offered other additional sweetness to the pot in improved benefits. These benefits, right now, are far and above what private enterprise offers their employees, and should be reduced rather than increased.

We feel for the union employees who have been working without a contract since January 1. They have been denied the increases in their weekly pay they would have received on a bi-weekly basis if the union negotiators had been honest with their members all along. Annual increases of over 7 per cent per year in today's economy are much more lucrative than should be hoped for under normal circumstances.

Considering the economy, and the unemployment that appears to be growing, the union may have outplayed its hand. The County is in a better bargaining position at this time and could reduce its offer, as economic conditions have changed substantially since negotiations first started. The percentage of increases proposed in our example of the individual who did the complaining are similar across the board for all County employees, except those at the top level cannot make more than County Executive by law.

The membership of the union should demand its negotiators give to each member a chart so they can

figure out exactly what would happen to their pay under the County's offer. Let them understand, firsthand, how generous the offer is.

In our view, they should be clamoring for an immediate settlement before the opportunity is lost. And why not?

A Lack of Leadership

Suffolk County residents who seek assurances that the Shoreham Nuclear Plant is safe before it goes on line, and that a workable evacuation plan will insure the safety of the public, got a double dose of bad news last week.

First, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which is holding to its being licensed, announced that those hearings will continue to be held in Bethesda, Maryland, far away from the local area which would be impacted by problems at the Shoreham plant. The NRC had originally said those hearings would return to Long Island, where they were first held, on November 19. It now says the hearings will not be returned here until January 1, and, of course, with the November 19 promise now broken there are no assurances the hearings will be returned to Long Island at all. Keeping the hearings in Bethesda effectively eliminates local participation. As an excuse, an NRC spokesman said: "They were having a hard time finding a place to hold the proceedings up on Long Island." Hogwash!

The second bit of bad news came in what is conceded to be a proposed departure from standard procedure: normal procedures be discarded in litigation of emergency planning issues, and written depositions be substituted for testimony by witnesses in those areas. That means no cross-examination of witnesses. According to Deputy County Executive Frank Jones, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board for the NRC will review the written depositions privately and decide what to accept as testimony. That means no public hearings on a matter of vital concern—a workable evacuation plan.

Suffolk County Executive Peter Cohalan has declared the proposal an "insult" that cheapens the role of both the board and the parties." And we quite agree. The NRC's action in this regard leads to heighten the often expressed concern that the licensing hearings are nothing more than a sham, and the NRC is rushing to give LILCO a license to operate the plant.

We applaud the leadership of county officials in battling to prevent the NRC in this matter, and the cooperative support vowed by officials at virtually every level of county government, except one: Congressman William Carney was noticeably absent at the gathering of public officials in Hauppauge to plan a cooperative effort concerning Shoreham. And he has been definitely

lacking in offering a leadership position in insuring that safety is given the top priority, and evacuation is possible.

Carney maintained in interviews at Suffolk Life during the election campaign that he was satisfied with sitting back and waiting for the NRC to act in the matter and expressed the sad part of that attitude is that Carney is the key official in this matter: he is the federal representative from the immediate area of the plant. He is in a position to exert pressure upon the Reagan administration and upon the NRC itself.

He should be insisting that the licensing hearings for Shoreham be returned to Long Island so that local residents may witness the proceedings. And he should be insisting that the emergency planning issues be fully discussed at open hearings, not behind closed doors. And he should speak out against the notion the licensing board will decide what should be considered and what should not.

Fortunately for the residents of Suffolk, Congressman Tom Downey has been a fighter on this issue on their behalf. While we have often been critical of Downey, he has excelled in this matter and has provided some of the leadership that has been sorely lacking on Carney's part. We applaud Downey for that concern and sincerely hope he will continue to provide a strong voice at the federal level to protect the residents of Suffolk in this crucial matter.

And we would hope those who feel, as we do, that the Shoreham hearings belong here in Suffolk, and that the emergency planning issues—and that means a workable evacuation plan—be the subject of full and open hearings, contact Carney and remind him of his responsibility in this matter. There should be cross examination. There should be full discussion, and total disclosure. It could well be a matter of life and death. Remember, only one per cent of Shoreham has been double checked by an outside firm, hired by LILCO, to insure its safety. That means 99 percent of that plant is still in doubt.

Congressman Carney is admittedly pro-nuclear. We're not asking him to change that view. We're simply demanding that he stand up and be heard and that the vital issues concerning Shoreham be taken out of the back room and face public scrutiny. Now. Before it's too late!

And why not?

Readers' Opinion

Dear Mr. Grasso:

Thank you so much for your help in our fundraising efforts, and I would once again like to say what a great job you have been doing on Shoreham.

Yours sincerely,

Karen A. Wagner
Member

East End Shoreham Opponents Coalition

USPS 098-300

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 22 NO. 14

Offices and Plant Located on Montauk Highway, Westhampton 288-3900 Classified Ads 288-5000
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 Centereach Rocky Point
Riverhead Medford Selden Port Jefferson
Hampton East Holbrook Hottsville Coram Three Village
Mid Hampton Sayville Massie Shrewsbury
Westhampton Oakdale
Monticelli 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 except Wednesday, is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Islip, Town of Riverhead, Town of Westhampton, 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 Conaughy - Adv. Art Director
Sharon Gordon - News Art Director

Subscription Rate: In Suffolk County: \$4.99 per year Outside Suffolk County: \$7.00 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.

Riverhead: Another View

Enough is enough!

It is not our usual policy to utilize this space to do battle with another publication or to refute its actions. But for some time now we have watched with increased concern while Newsday has played games with the news to suit its own editorial opinions, printing and headlining articles which do a total injustice to Long Island and its people.

Newsday has continuously run front page headlines shouting out the high unemployment figures across the nation, but burying deep in the copy the good news that Long Island's unemployment picture is far brighter. It editorialized via photo selection and dramatic headlines prior to the recent elections, shouting out just before balloting that the job outlook was dim, dim, dim. Of course that was the theme of their candidate's campaign, and Newsday utilized news space to bolster the election hopes of Mario Cuomo, cloaking those efforts under the guise of news.

But Newsday hit the bottom of the barrel last week in their story about the "two county centers"-- Hauppauge and Riverhead. What Newsday did to Riverhead was tragic, and deserves rebuttal here.

Hauppauge, said Newsday, is simply a marvelous place, seemingly without any problems, filled with "All-American" families, with a taste of prosperity.

Hauppauge's many wonderful attributes, based on Newsday's version of this glorious community, is based on a development plan which a young landscape architect helped the community to develop back in the 1950's. Who was that architect? Why, none other than H. Lee Koppelman is, today, "the Island's chief planner," Newsday proudly reports.

Riverhead, on the other hand, in Newsday's mind is a lowly community with a multitude of problems, so many in fact Newsday couldn't find one good thing to say about the County Center of Suffolk. "The most visible sign of Riverhead's anemia are the street people, men and women, young and old...who walk along holding conversations with the wind and who sleep in abandoned cars, in shacks, in chicken coops." Look elsewhere, Newsday, there are many more

"street people" in even larger numbers in many communities.

Koppelman's deputy, Arthur Kunz, declares "The schlock along (Route) 58 is an eyesore," and county officials (Koppelman and Kunz?) cite a lack of proper planning as a source of problems.

We could go on with the examples of this hatchet job on the Riverhead community, but we won't. It's tragic. It's sickening. And it is totally dishonest, because the five pages of editorializing were done with but one purpose in mind: the centralization of Suffolk courts in Hauppauge where Koppelman, Judge Arthur Cromarty and Newsday want them to be!

Are there problems in Riverhead? Of course there are, just as there are problems in Patchogue, Bay Shore, Coram, Port Jefferson, and Hauppauge. No community in Suffolk County is without problems. But do the problems in Riverhead far outweigh the good that exists, so much so that Newsday could not find one good thing to say? Very definitely not!

Riverhead in recent times has seen a rebirth of community pride, fostered by many community improvements that have been accomplished. Newsday's choice of photos to illustrate their hatchet job focused on traffic, deteriorated housing, and a man who has had very little good to say about the community or the community about him, in recent times. They could have used photos of the beautiful riverfront area, with its shrubs, new bulkheading, floating dock. They could have shown the revitalized 821 East Main Street housing complex, but they focused on a problem complex caused by a county department's indiscriminate dumping in the community.

They could have filled a full page, and more, with photos of the Riverhead County Fair, or the Polish Town Fair, which draw thousands upon thousands of people to the community each year. But they weren't even mentioned!

They could have run photos, or perhaps just mentioned, the undergrounding of utility lines and the new decorative lamps along one portion of Main Street, but that would



Scenic Riverhead, views Newsday didn't present



have spoiled the illusion they were striving to create. They're good things, and Newsday was concentrating on bad.

How about the beautiful sight of rolling pastures, with horse farms growing in number, or the sloping lands of a farm field? Too scenic for Newsday! How about the marinas, and the beaches? Where was the photo of the East End Arts Center, a beautiful old-fashioned complex in the heart of the Main Street community. Too much beauty. It would spoil the image Newsday wanted to create.

There's anger in the Riverhead community because of the injustice heaped upon them by a daily newspaper with a vested interest, and ambitious politicians who will stop at nothing, certainly not honest reporting or honest facts, to get what they want. There's too much at stake: a multi-million dollar court complex that even now in its planning stages threatens to compete with the Southwest Sewer District for the title of Boondoggle of the Century.

And there should be anger in the minds of fair minded people of any community who believe in honesty. Any community in Suffolk that gets in the way of plans devised by ambitious politicians and their cohorts is a prime target for similar treatment.

Now that Newsday has done its best to tarnish the image of a community filled with good people, watch for future editorials that will try to steer the court complex proposal back to

Hauppauge where Cromarty, Koppelman and Newsday want it.

Things were going great for this trio until the County Legislature threw a monkey wrench into their plans by approving a resolution directing the Special Courts Facility Committee, created to push with western Suffolk Court complex idea, to seek an architectural plan for a centralized court facility in Riverhead. That resolution virtually assured the retention of Supreme Court parts in Riverhead, killing the Cromarty attempt to snare them for his court complex dream in Hauppauge.

Koppelman was very angry about the approved resolution, as was, it would be safe to say, Cromarty. Although there's still talk about a smaller court complex to house current west end courts, that's simply not enough. They want the whole pie. And the hatchet job on Riverhead was, in our view, the opening gun in a new battle to get what they want.

But there's a good side to this story. You don't cut apart a community with pride, or insult its people without retaliation. There's a new determination now in Riverhead to unite against the ruthless ambitions of determined politicians. In any way that's necessary, Riverhead, and many other east end communities that will suffer the impact of losing Riverhead's courts, will fight. In the political arena, in the courts. In any way that's necessary!

And why not?

USPS 098-300

SUFFOLK LIFE

NEWSPAPERS

VOL. 22 No. 15

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 stations every Wednesday

North Fork	Patchogue	Centersbach	Rocky Point
Riverhead	Medford	Selden	Port Jefferson
Hampton East	Holbrook	Holtsville	Coram
Mad Hampton	Sayville	Three Village	
Westhampton	Oakdale		
Monticue	Romankin		



Total circulation audited and verified in excess of

194,000 Circulation Weekly

Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of: Town of Southamptown, Town of Highville, County of Suffolk, Rocky Point, Port Jefferson, Patchogue, Medford, Sayville, Coram, Three Village, Westhampton, Sayville, Oakdale, Romankin, Monticue, Westhampton, N.Y. 11977 or Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901

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.