

# Another power grab

The Suffolk County Legislature is considering passing a law granting the legislature power to have final approval on variances and changes in zoning. These powers currently are vested in the towns and their zoning and planning boards.

The legislators supporting this move claim they want to assume this power so they may protect the environment. If the legislature is successful in granting themselves this power, they would add just another level of bureaucracy on top of what is already an awesome and cumbersome procedure.

It has been estimated that it currently costs a land developer between \$30,000 and \$40,000 for legal, engineering and consulting fees before the land can be offered for sale to the public. Adding another layer of bureaucracy on top of that which already exists will push the cost of red tape even higher, and keep land out of the hands of people who need it.

Think about it. You are a young couple. You work here in Suffolk County. You have a good job. You want to build a home. Every lot you look at starts out with a cost of \$40,000 to \$50,000 just for red tape. Now add to this the cost of the land itself, a profit for the investor and you understand why lots are selling for \$80,000 to \$100,000. This is ludicrous and the result of needless red tape created by lamebrained politicians who don't give a damn about people or their needs.

After you have bought land, designed your dream house in compliance with the local planning and zoning regulations, you make application to the local building department. They give approval, but then, under the law the legislature wants to pass, you must additionally make application to them. Just imagine these 18 clowns debating the aspects of your dream house. What a disaster it would be. This year it took them a month alone to choose their leader

and then they only chose her because if they didn't, the county clerk would have been forced by law to make the decision for them. Do you really want to go through this nightmare?

The county legislature is famous for passing laws that have been ill thought out without consideration of the full consequences. Local town boards and their appointed zoning and planning boards know the communities that they serve, and what is best for them. Why should anybody have any faith that the 18 clowns that the legislature is comprised of know anything about the localities or the quality of life that is so different in almost every one of our communities.

Currently there are 20,000 applications a year for permits that the county legislature wants to oversee. The county legislature's staff would have to be substantially enlarged if this measure is passed and of course, the people would pay for it.

As more people become fed up with the legislature, more people are joining us in supporting the concept of a return to a weighted board of supervisors. Nassau County operates with such a board and has a fairly even and effective government. Supervisors know their communities intimately. They are accessible to the people, and most can serve effectively as a board of directors for the county. A return to a board of supervisors would stop the county's interference with towns and the gamesmanship that is wasting our hard earned tax dollars.

Those legislators who are still sane should turn this measure down cold and then direct their energies to making sense out of the legislature. If they fail to do so, we suspect there will be a new groundswell to disband the legislature and reinstitute the weighted board of supervisors as the chosen method of government in Suffolk County.

And why not?

# Give and take

It started as a suggestion at a meeting of the Supervisor's Association and spread like wildfire through a number of towns. The proposal to extend the terms of supervisors and highway superintendents to four years, from the current two year length, will face voters in a number of towns in November.

The rationale behind the move is that the extended term will give the supervisors more time to be involved in meaningful projects instead of having to campaign for re-election every two years. We have serious questions about the accuracy of that premise, since most public officials spend more time campaigning than they do on matters that serve the public. A lot of the legislation they pass is based on self-image rather than public good.

The opposing point of view about expanded terms is that it removes

the public official from accountability for a longer period of time. The public has an opportunity to pass judgement on the officials' actions every two years as the terms now stand. If the official is good, and has done good by the public, re-election is a safe bet. But if the official has done a lousy job, and has not responded to public need, he or she will be safe, under the expanded term proposal, for an extra two years.

Think about it. When is the last time the supervisor of your town seemed to care what you thought? The last time he or she ran for office, right? When is the last time that official walked through the neighborhoods, meeting the public, finding out the concerns of their constituents? The last time he or she ran for office, right? Expand the terms, and that pre-election interest will

come every four years rather than every two.

The politicians will tell you that they will be able to serve you better if they don't have to run for office so often. Actually all they want is a safe seat for an extra two years. Do they deserve it? That's the question you will have to answer in November when you cast your vote on this proposal.

We think there ought to be some give and take in this issue. If the officials want a four year term, how about adding to that proposal an opportunity for recall as a giveback to the public. A recall provision in-

cluded as a part of the expanded term provision would be the public's insurance policy against poor performance in office. It would ensure an opportunity to evict from office those officials who put personal and political benefit above the best interests of the people. It would prevent public officials from escaping from accountability during a specific term of office.

If public officials really want to run less often so they "can work more," the public should have the chance to fire them through recall if they don't deliver.

And why not?

# Your final chance

Governor Mario Cuomo and his allies continue to push for legislative approval of one of the major provisions of the Cuomo-Catacosinos Shoreham deal, authorizing the New York Power Authority to build power plants on Long Island for LILCO. Opposition to the terms of the deal, which financially favors LILCO at the expense of the ratepayers, has stalled action on this proposal. Cuomo has pulled out all stops, and has applied tremendous pressure, in an effort to force his will.

Cuomo has told the people of Long Island the deal is the deal, like it or not, take it or leave it. He raises the specter of fear, "if you don't take my deal Shoreham will open and you will be responsible."

Last week, Suffolk Life News-

papers offered the people an opportunity to express their view on the proposal, something the governor has failed to do. If he spent less time talking and more listening, he would know how the people feel. The response has been overwhelming in number and in opposition to the deal. The people are saying, sometimes with cryptic messages, that they want the governor to go back and renegotiate a better deal, one that puts more of the burden on LILCO rather than on the ratepayer.

The ballots are reprinted below for those who did not yet respond. This could be your last chance to voice your view, to let the governor know where you stand on this important issue. Stand up and be counted.

And why not?

## Ballot:

Governor Cuomo, I love you and the deal you have made with Catacosino to close Shoreham and for me to pay for it.

Name.....

Address.....

Town.....

Clip and mail to Suffolk Life Newspapers, P.O. Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y., 11901.

## Ballot:

Governor Cuomo, your deal stinks. You have sold us out. Go back to the table and act like the executive and the hard bargainer we thought you were.

Name.....

Address.....

Town.....

Clip and mail to Suffolk Life Newspapers, P.O. Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y., 11901.



## Shoreham: a very important issue

Prudent voters will say, "You can't pick a man for president on a single issue." We agree that this normally is a truism. But, if the issue is so all encompassing that it transcends philosophies and a multitude of issues, then the stand on a single issue can be grounds for a conclusion. The Shoreham debacle is such a scenario.

George Bush, in a recent press conference, announced that he feels no state nor any governor should be allowed to stand in the way of the federal licensing of a nuclear power plant. Up to this point, the only thing Bush would say in reference to the Shoreham controversy was that he was in favor of nuclear power on a national basis.

When we called a campaign spokesman, he vehemently denied that Bush was talking about Shoreham. In fact, he said he was referring specifically to Dukakis and the Seabrook situation, which is similar to the Shoreham/Long Island controversy.

Dukakis, as the governor of Massachusetts, has refused to approve the emergency evacuation plans and has stymied the federal government from opening this plant. We reminded Bush's spokesman that Bush had said "any state governor." Surely he must have known that New York governor, Mario Cuomo, has, like Dukakis, refused to give state approval to the utility's evacuation plan because state and county experts have said there cannot be a safe evacuation in case of an accident. If the vice-president's comments did not include Shoreham, we asked for a clarification directly from Bush. No clarification has come from the man who spoke the words.

An important issue in both the Shoreham and Seabrook cases is whether the federal government should have the right to give a construction permit for a nuclear power plant prior to investigating whether the site is suitable for such construction. We doubt very much the federal government, through the E.P.A., would give permission for an open air garbage incineration disposal system in the midst of a populated area. Yet, for a simple garbage dump, E.P.A. approval is needed before construction can begin. The Atomic Energy Commission, now the NRC, permitted the construction of a nuclear power plant before they gave any consideration to whether the area surrounding the power plant could be safely evacuated. They did not overlook this important consideration. They deliberately ignored it. In fact, they said that evacuation would not be considered until the plant was ready for licensing. In other words, let's build it first, then we'll worry about if it is built in the right place.

Even to the most diehard federalist, this concept is irrational and without logic. It points out the utter disregard a federal agency, the NRC, has for the life, health and welfare of the citizens. This gives you an idea about how sensitive to people the administration that is a proponent of nuclear power at any cost can be.

The federal government, through the NRC, admits that it did not do a thorough job of checking on the quality of construction at Shoreham. The NRC testified it had only inspected less than one percent of the construction at the plant. An administration that asks you to buy this kind of guarantee of quality is asking you, as a voter, to have blind faith in your elected officials even though they admit they have not done a competent job of ensuring your health, safety and welfare.

A crucial issue in the Shoreham battle is whether a profit-making corporation such as LILCO should be granted police powers in a time of emergency. LILCO claims they have such authority and went ahead and developed an emergency evacuation plan based on this assumption. The New York State Appellate Court ruled they didn't, a ruling that put LILCO's plan in jeopardy.

To overcome that obstacle, the Reagan administration, through the NRC, then changed the regulations to allow a profit-making corporation

to endanger the population with a flawed evacuation plan. They based this change of rules on what they called a "realism issue" claiming that in the case of a real emergency, the local governments, and police, would respond. The NRC has ignored testimony from police and other emergency personnel who have said their first concern would be the safety of their own family.

The federal government's willingness to put aside the real world, to accept fantasy, is again a frightening example of the lack of respect it has for human rights and welfare. The most salient lesson to be learned during this presidential election, in reference to the Shoreham issue, is the willingness of the current administration, and George Bush, the Republican presidential candidate, is to put aside concern for public safety. Their political ambitions are driven by greed rather than humanistic responsibility. It's big business all the way at the sacrifice of the lives of the citizens of the United States.

The administration is saying to the citizens of the world, our corporations, our banks and the financiers, investments must be protected before the lives of the citizens are considered. The administration is not even willing to live up to its financial responsibility to the people who would be affected. In the event of an accident, those who may survive will be wiped out financially,

their businesses ruined, and their homes and lands contaminated. The federal government has enacted a law that limits the total liability of the corporation, of the government and the industry, to a maximum of \$670 million, while their own national laboratory has predicted that the financial losses will run into the trillions.

George Bush's press secretary has said that Mr. Bush has not taken a position on Shoreham. We think his statements are pure hog wash and political rhetoric for the naive. We have made some very serious allegations in this editorial. If Mr. Bush would like to correct us and make a statement that is clear and concise, we would be more than delighted to print it. But don't hold your breath waiting for a reply. Mr. Bush is like many of the other politicians who have permeated our society. When they don't want to answer, they remain silent and you are forced to make your choice in a vacuum.

We ask every reader of Suffolk Life who intends to vote for president in November to evaluate the candidates on the issues that you can understand. On the issues most important to the welfare of your families, and the future of Suffolk County. Shoreham is such an issue, perhaps the most important issue that we, as Suffolk residents, face in this presidential campaign. It should be seriously considered.

And why not?

## More than a matter of color

Judge Marquette L. Floyd is a Republican. He is black, and has served for 18 years as a District Court judge. Like most people, he has had aspirations of moving up. For years, he approached the political leaders within the Republican party and asked their blessings to run for a higher judicial office. He has been told, wait. He has waited. Five years, perhaps acceptable. Ten years, reasonable. But 18 years of waiting is ridiculous.

Judge Floyd has earned an excellent reputation as a jurist. In his quest to become a County Court judge he was interviewed by the Suffolk County Bar Association, which normally goes along with whatever the club house boys want. But this time they did a turnabout and designated Floyd as "highly qualified" and gave the choice of the organization, a lesser "qualified" rating.

This year, Floyd is seeking the seat through a primary contest. He was denied the Republican organization's nomination not because he was black, but because of a deal that had been made by former GOP Chairman Michael Blake with Huntington Town Chairperson Juliette Kinsella. They decided that the nomination for

this county position would go to a Huntington Town resident. Qualifications were not the subject of the deal. It was just raw politics, plain and simple.

Floyd's grandmother, whose roots were in a South Carolina sharecropper's farm, told him as a boy, "You go out there, you work hard, you work smarter and the system will allow you to rise to your level of competence." Floyd followed her advice, struggling against all odds through college, through law school, to become a distinct minority, a black lawyer. He became even more of a minority when, as a lawyer and a black, he chose to become a Republican. His roots firmly planted in self achievement made this an easy choice.

Floyd did not follow the lead of other black professionals in ignoring those he had risen above. Becoming successful meant to him a responsibility to go back to his own, to put out his hand and offer himself as an example that you can rise up in this society even though you are black. He has been involved in numerous black self-help organizations, and has had strong involvements with self-help type projects.

His campaign to become the Re-

publican standard bearer for County Court has been a loosely organized, almost amateurish effort for he has not had either the funds or an organization of pros who are used to running primaries. There probably will not be any great effort made on his behalf to get out the vote on Primary Day, Thursday, September 15. If he is to become victorious and become the Republican candidate, it will be because rank and file party members, white and black Republicans, have said, "Here is a black man who has paid his dues, has earned the right and we are proud to have him as our nominee for County Court."

This is the Republican Party's opportunity to say to the black community, you can rise as high in our party as your capabilities allow. It doesn't make any difference whether you are white or black. That our judges should be selected on ability, not on geographical boundaries or political deals. That the people will have the final say, and make their choice on the basis of quality rather than political greed. If the rank and file of the Republican Party are concerned with justice, Judge Marquette Floyd will emerge victorious.

And why not?



## Deplorable welfare housing conditions

A court ruling this past week may result in drastic changes in welfare housing throughout New York State.

Under current standards, welfare recipients receive a housing grant of about \$450 to obtain housing for this amount. When they can't, the county finds housing for them, normally, in motels that cannot make it as a commercial enterprise and that have been taken over by slumlords, or in summer motels vacant during the winter.

The slumlords charge the county up to a \$1,000 per month per room for this so called emergency housing. The units generally reflect utter squalor and deprivation. Those placed in summer motels after the tourist season ends may be moved several times during the year, moved out when the new season arrives and the owner can make more money on the commercial market.

The children are the victims of this system. They are forced to live in extremely limited confines. But what is even worse is they never have roots, never establish themselves in school. Their education is constantly interrupted and they become destined to become repeat welfare recipients in later life.

Last week's court ruling was based on a suit that argues that for less money the county could supplement the rent allocation. The families could find adequate housing and the disruption of their lives would not take place. The court agreed, and has ordered the county to pay subsidies above the grant in this particular case. It is expected that this case, if not appealed, will establish a precedent that will become the norm.

Several years back, rents in the Riverhead area averaged \$250 to \$300 for a two bedroom apartment, \$300 to \$400 for a two or three bedroom home. Rates then jumped, seemingly overnight, by over 50 percent. Inflation was a culprit but, upon investigation, the real culprit turned out to be that welfare was allowing over \$400 for the rental of an apartment and this made the commercial market jump accordingly.

We suffer an acute housing shortage here on Long Island, particularly in affordable housing. Whether it be on the East End or the West End, singles and young marrieds are forced to look at house and apartment rentals that start at \$500 and can reach \$1,000 per month without any problem. If the court decision stands it will add fuel to this fire by giving needy welfare families subsidies to match the going rents on Long Island, which will do little more than push up the cost of housing even further.

Altruistically, the court's decision may seem humane, but in reality it isn't. It's time for our courts and the legislators to face the realities of the

eighties. We always will have people in need of both emergency and long range housing. Under our current system, we warehouse these people in rundown motels owned by speculators and slumlords without a conscience. The slumlords get rich, the needy of our society are warehoused in small groups, removed from needed services and in horrendous accommodations. They are out of sight and out of mind, but not really helped.

For years we have advocated taking some of our assets and utilizing them to approach the needs of those who are the needy in our society in a humane and constructive way.

The State of New York and the County of Suffolk are holders of substantial housing that is not being utilized. These buildings and facilities can be converted inexpensively to social service centers that could provide housing. And if we then approached the need and the problems with common sense, they could be turned into social service centers where all the needs of the recipients could be met in the most cost efficient manner. Prime examples of property currently held are facilities at Pilgram State Hospital and Kings Park Psychiatric Centers that have been all but abandoned because of

the state's deinstitutionalization program, turning mental patients out to live within the community.

On the East End, the county has title to the Suffolk County Airport which, until recently, had several hundred units of housing. The former airbase officer's quarters still exists there. With some courage, common sense and a rational approach to the problem, we could address the total needs of the welfare recipients. We could provide not only housing, but nutrition through communal feeding, as well as home maker units, health centers, vocational training, day care.

The big objection, we understand, to this concept is that the liberals say it would be demoralizing and inhumane to put people who are in need of welfare all together in one complex. We ask these liberals if they have ever visited a welfare motel complex? Gone into these housing units and viewed first hand the deplorable conditions people are being asked to live in? Seen the forlorn looks and the pains of hunger on the children's faces? Ride in a school bus with these kids and watch them being ridiculed by their peers who do not want them there and are, in their own juvenile way, making them as uncomfortable as they can. Have you gone into the schools and

seen the eager ones trying to keep up with a disrupted education? Giving up all hope because they know they are going to be moved in just a short while anyway.

Have you visited homes where people are desperately in need of medical services but the health center, where they can receive free medical care, is too far away to reach and there is little transportation to get there. Have you talked to women who are trapped in the welfare maze, desperate to break the chains but they don't have the training to secure a reasonable job, nor can they afford day care?

We believe a social service center is, without a doubt, not only the most economical, but also the most humane and service-oriented concept that could be instituted to meet the needs.

It's time for us as citizens to start addressing our problems realistically. It's time we stop hiding our welfare recipients out of sight in substandard housing, and start doing something to help them reconstruct their lives to be able to hold their heads up high. It's time we stopped worrying about imagined stigmas and start adequately addressing all their needs.

And why not?

## Catacosinos for governor

If the Republican Party of New York State is searching for a candidate to run for governor, we have a suggestion: a logical choice would be William Catacosinos, chairman of the Long Island Lighting Company.

Catacosinos would make an especially strong candidate if Governor Mario Cuomo entertains any thoughts of seeking re-election to the seat. Catacosinos' strengths as a negotiator, as a hard-nosed businessman, as someone who has whipped Cuomo so dramatically in recent events, would give him a lot to brag about.

Like him or hate him, and there are a lot of people on both sides of that line, Catacosinos has done a whale of a job of doing his job. His responsibility was to do what was in the best interests of his company, his stockholders. He put into place some golden parachutes which will ease him and other company officials into a very lucrative retirement. He manipulated public officials on the state level--in the state Public Service Commission, to be more specific--into giving his company all kinds of rate increases, financial stability adjustments, and other financial rewards as a reward for arrogantly pursuing an unneeded, unwanted, and, from most informed accounts, unsafe, nuclear plant. He didn't care

about the people. That wasn't his job. And he did his job well.

Caring for the people was the responsibility of Governor Cuomo. And he didn't do his job. He'll say, as he has so many times already, that he saved the public from Shoreham, and he may well have managed to do that. But the medicine he used to cure the Shoreham sickness is surely going to have side effects that will produce disaster with the financial futures of the ratepayers.

Cuomo negotiated--more accurately his chief henchman, Vincent Tese, negotiated a settlement with LILCO. Actually negotiated is not an accurate word. Negotiate means some give and take. Tese gave, and LILCO took. Just about everything they could have hoped to receive. And then some. Including: guaranteed rate increases for the next ten years. Payment of dividends for stockholders. Full reimbursement for the plan, with the exception of that disallowed for imprudency, which LILCO was not entitled to receive anyway. A profit on the plant.

Remember the fuel adjustment that used to go up and down as oil prices fluctuated? Well, they're still there. Only now they go up when prices go up. But they don't go down when prices drop.

On top of this and all the other financial goodies that LILCO dragged out of Tese during the "negotiations," Catacosinos got to keep his golden parachutes. They represent his pound of flesh. His guarantee of a total and complete victory. He outdid Tese and Cuomo.

And even now Catacosinos is doing a better job of selling the deal than Cumo and his henchmen are. Whenever it's to LILCO's advantage to keep the fear of Shoreham alive, he has them blow the evacuation sirens. He did it in August when talk about the deal was hot. He did it just last week, the day before the Public Service Commission was to meet--and approve--the Cuomo/Catacosinos deal. He had his federal allies in the Nuclear Regulatory Commission pass the LILCO evacuation drill with flying colors. And on the same day the PSC--who, by the way, were co-authors of the deal--was giving it its official blessing, the feds arranged for an announcement by the IRS that the billions in a LILCO tax write-off would be fine with them.

Make no mistake about it. Given the choice, LILCO wants the deal more than they want a license for Shoreham. And why not? They get reimbursed for its costs, make a profit, get guaranteed rate in-

Cont. on page 6



# Twelve BNL sites called hazardous...

Cont. from page 2

lawmakers. "I'm concerned about the fact that...past mistakes now turn out to be present problems," said Legislator Edward Romaine (R-Center Moriches). "Part of the problem is a lack of commitment from the federal government."

Romaine, a candidate for congress, said he would ask his opponent, Rep. George Hochbrueckner (D-Coram), and other members of congress, to move quickly and boost funding for clean-ups at the laboratory site.

Suffolk County Executive Patrick Halpin said he, too, would ask for faster action on the matter. "We're going to be writing to the (Suffolk

congressional delegation and urging that they provide emergency funding to the lab through the Department of Energy's budget."

Hochbrueckner said he would approach top DOE and BNL officials, as a member of the congressional Science, Space and Technology Committee, to urge that additional funds go to the site clean-up.

"You have to realize that this administration in Washington (D.C.) has a terrible environmental record," he cautioned, "(but) I will do my best as the congressman in the district where Brookhaven National Labs is located, to make this a higher priority."

BNL officials, meanwhile,

say they will continue to cooperate with the county site review. However, Casey said that the agency is not eligible for emergency federal superfunds that would expedite the process.

"It's a matter of planning

closely."

Funded by the federal Department of Energy, BNL is developing a multi-year clean-up program, said Casey. This year, he added, \$600,000 has been spent for sewer repairs alone.

## "Part of the problem is a lack of commitment from the federal government..."

and scheduling," said the official. "In the meantime, I don't think we are seeing any soil contamination. We have wells all around the sites, and are monitoring them

According to Casey, additional funds are designated for:

- removal of waste tanks (\$2.6 million, from 1988-90).
- groundwater monitoring

(\$400,000 in both 1988 and 1989).

- storage tank upgrades (\$700,000, from 1988-90).
- underground tank removals and upgrades (\$400,000 in 1989).

- landfill closures (\$7.4 million, from 1989-91); and
- upgrading the hazardous waste management program (\$2.4 million in 1990).

"Our plan is that if the programs are carried out by fiscal years 1994 and 1995, that we will be completely in compliance with all regulations," Casey concluded.

Suffolk Legislator Gregory Blass (R-Jamesport) is among the county officials promising to press onward with the health department investigation.

Pointing out that "a shortage of personnel has led to unduly long delays in inspecting all buildings at the lab," Blass recently asked Halpin to fill two health department staff vacancies for full-time lab inspection.

Halpin said he would not be able to do so because the county budget is in crisis and "the (staffing) problem is multiplied through every department in the county budget."

However, the executive said funds from a groundwater protection program, part of a proposed \$570 million county land preservation program that will be on November's election ballot, could be available for that purpose in the future.

# Lilco receives good news from PSC, IRS...

Cont. from page 2

'ten worst managed companies in America' according to Financial World Magazine."

According to the IRS, the company would be allowed to take the write-off beginning with the year the settlement is officially approved.

LILCO officials said the federal tax write-off was included in the deal to hold down annual rate increases to about 5 percent.

In a related development the PSC voted to approve the settlement as well. That was not much of a surprise, according to those familiar with the proposal, since staff attorneys for the PSC helped state officials negotiate the deal with the lighting com-

pany.

In voting for the settlement, Chairman Peter Bradford said, "The parties have negotiated extensively and thoroughly to produce the settlement that is before us. Our task is to decide whether the proposed settlement meets the goals set forth in our December (1987) order (to the company), namely, the assurance of an adequate power supply priced as reasonably as possible. We conclude that it does."

The strength of the settlement, Bradford said, "is that it produces certainty at a reasonable price."

The chairman added that the rate increases under the settlement "are expected to approximate inflation, so the

real price of electricity is not forecast to increase significantly over the life of the settlement (1988-1998).

"What is likely if the settlement is rejected," Bradford said, "is years of future litigation."

Commissioner Edward M. Kresky called the settlement agreement not a triumph, but "rather, it is a reflection of the imprudence over past years by LILCO management and the disjointed public policy-making at all levels of government -- state, local and federal -- on the issue of Shoreham over these long years."

Commissioner Gail Garfield Schwartz concurred with the majority opinion

saying, "While one cannot ever assert that another course of action would not yield a superior result, this settlement does require LILCO to forfeit \$396 million (including recovery of \$130 million from Bokum Resource) in underserved revenues, and the certainty of the forfeiture is itself a very valuable element of the settlement."

Commissioner James McFarland cast the single vote against the settlement, saying he would wait until the PSC's final written decision to fully explain his vote. In the past, McFarland has supported allowing LILCO to continue to attempt to license the plant

LILCO spokesman Jim Lois said, "The pending settlement provides an opportunity for cooperation between LILCO and local governments to seriously address the energy needs of Long Island."

According to Lois, the company is currently waiting for approval from the Federal Securities and Exchange Commission to hold a shareholders meeting to consider the settlement. Once

that approval is given, the company expects it will take about 30 days to hold the meeting. While the state's deadline to approve the settlement is September 22, the PSC is permitted to extend the deadline for up to 14 days after the shareholders meeting to give the legislature additional time to approve the deal. After that, Lois said, the parties to the deal are able to "walk away, if no agreement is reached."

## Tax-rate jumps...

Cont. from page 2

### Few Frills Contained

Compared to many budget proposals through the years, the package contains few frills, the executive and legislators agreed.

"...This is an honest, tight, no-nonsense budget that protects the safety, health and environment of Suffolk residents," said Halpin. "It is also a realistic and professional budget."

Working without \$65 million that a half-percent sales tax increase would have provided--the legislature recently blocked that effort by Halpin--the county executive said the 1989 tax increase was nonetheless held to a modest level because his administration saved \$19 million this year through hiring freezes and spending cutbacks.

Deputy County Executive for Finance Robert Kurtter said those efforts, plus an \$8 million 1987 fund balance, compensated for a projected \$22.1 million 1989 budget gap that prompted Halpin for months to warn of a budget "crisis."

"This is not a happy budget," Kurtter conceded. "It's clear that the agencies have more work to do than they can do, and in that sense, I'm not proud of this budget. But I've told all department heads that we've been ratcheting down and we will continue to do so."

### 'No-stick' Promises?

After hearing the 'budget crisis' claim for months, Blass, the leader of the legislature's Republican-Conservative caucus, pounced on Halpin's new projection of a \$5.8 million 1988 budget surplus, saying it was evidence of "teflon promises."

In the weeks ahead, the legislator added, the seven-member caucus will present an alternative budget plan that would contain a general fund tax rate "over \$2.00 but under \$2.40," targeting county fee and fine hikes of about 10 percent rather than such a large property tax jump.

The tentative schedule for the budget review and amendment process calls for public hearings at the October 12 and October 25 general legislature meetings; an October 19 report issued by the Legislature Budget Review Office; legislative committee reviews of the package, from October 26-28; and legislature amendment voting on November 9 and/or 10.

After that, Halpin could veto amendments, sending the budget back to the legislature for final polishing via override votes.



SIRENS SOUND AGAIN--Long Island Lighting Company officials tested the Shoreham emergency sirens again last week, reporting that 87 of 89 worked properly. The testing came shortly after a federal court ruling upheld the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's rule change on evacuation plans. Photo by Jeff Sievers. (Full V48F)

## Willmott's and why nots? Catacosinos...

Cont. from page 5

creases, low interest state IDA loans, and all the rest of the benefits they grabbed from Tese and Cuomo. If they put Shoreham on line, and ran into operating problems, it would cost them a fortune and probably drive them into bankruptcy. The deal gives them everything they could hope for. Without any risk.

Yes, when the Republicans go out looking for a candidate who would be able to beat Cuomo, they should consider Catacosinos. The Cat has shown he can do it. He just did. In election terms, it was one hell of a landslide. We, the ratepayers, will pay the price for his victory. Kind of makes you wish he was the negotiator for the people and not LILCO.

And why not?



# Ultimate arrogance

It should come as no surprise to anyone that the NRC Licensing Board hearing the Shoreham case has decided the controversial plant should receive a full power license. We have said many times that the NRC and its staff would finally license the plant, disregarding safety and other issues.

The manner in which that decision came late Friday, however, in an angry ruling which castigated Suffolk, New York State and Southampton Town intervenors, and dismissed them from further participation in the matter, is the ultimate arrogance. Angry that the intervenors did not submit to NRC demands without question or opposition, two of the three judges declared the intervenors guilty of "disobedience and disrespect for the commission's adjudicator process." Any display of disrespect or disobedience toward the commission and/or its process is to be applauded, in our view. There can be no respect for a process that lacks integrity, that changes the rules to suit the utility, that ignores the safety of the people to enhance the future of the nuclear industry.

The NRC decision, which came sooner than most of us expected, puts the people of Long Island between a rock and a hard place. Do we put our trust now in the courts, with hopes that right will triumph over wrong? Or do we accept what is a very bad deal, one that will impose severe financial consequences upon the ratepayers, while making LILCO smile all the way to the bank?

Governor Cuomo, in announcing his deal with LILCO, said this: "I believe that in the end we would stop Shoreham because we are legally

correct in our opposition, but this option could produce further long delay that could threaten a LILCO bankruptcy..." That scenario, Cuomo worried, would result in higher rates and more uncertainty. We felt then, and still do, the governor was more concerned about LILCO's health than he was of the ratepayer's future.

We believe our opposition is right, and that if integrity would be the measure of a final decision, we would win. But there is no integrity in the NRC, and we seriously wonder if we could get a fair shake in any federal court, considering the lack of concern for the people being shown by the current administration.

We have strongly opposed the governor's deal because we think it is a very bad deal, that the ratepayers could and should have been better represented. But the governor refused to budge, refused to renegotiate, and now the NRC has played its trump card.

Throughout the long Shoreham controversy, safety has been our primary concern. We have spent long hours since the NRC Licensing Board's display of ultimate arrogance worrying over this issue. We still consider safety the top issue. And if the only way we have to protect the people is to swallow the very bitter Cuomo medicine, we may well have to accept the prospect of a bankrupt future. Better that, we suppose, than the Chernobyl-type tragedy of a nuclear accident.

The shame of it is, it could have, and should have, been different if only concern for the people was the prime consideration in deciding this issue.

And why not?

# Transportation trust a must

This November, voters will be asked to approve yet another long term debt bond issue. This time it is supposed to be dedicated to transportation to cure some of the ills that confront our roads and bridges.

We, as New York State residents, currently pay special user fees, including fuel taxes, motor vehicle fees and sales taxes on fuel. In fiscal year 1986-87, almost \$1 billion in receipts was collected from motorists in the form of highway use taxes, motor fuel taxes and motor vehicle fees. Yet, our roads have not been improved and are rapidly deteriorating.

You probably are scratching your head and wondering, "Where did the billion dollars go? Why am I not seeing improvements?" The answer is quite simple. And it's revolting. The special taxes we pay in user fees goes into the General State fund. The governor and the legislature then dole out some of these revenues for roads, but use the rest elsewhere.

Of the billion dollars the state collected in 1986-87, only \$400 million was earmarked for capital projects for our highways. The balance of the funds were used for any other purpose the law makers could come up with, to finance their own pet projects and wasteful spending.

Governor Cuomo now comes to us with pictures of deteriorating bridges, of roads in need of repair, and tells us we should not only indebt ourselves, but our children and even their children, to pay for the repair of today's roads that should have been fixed and paid for yesterday.

We have never liked long term indebtedness unless it is an absolute necessity. Our roads may be in bad shape, but putting our grandchildren into hock to fix them is not the solution. What is, is a truly dedicated trust fund. As the special user fees and fuel taxes are collected, they must be channeled into this fund and not used for any other purpose. This is what most of us thought was going

on all along. That's not what has been happening, and as a result, we have the condition we must bear now.

Voters will be faced with a deluge of propaganda between now and November. State officials are right now preparing to launch a major campaign to sell their new bond issue proposal. We urge you to listen and read carefully, but consider the promises with a jaundiced eye. If these same lawmakers have failed in the past to use the special taxes and fees raised under the guise of transportation tax, what guarantee do we have that they won't find a way around spending bonded indebtedness for transportation on other projects?

The bond issue proposal is a request by the governor and state officials to reward them for their lack of concern for our highways in the

past with a huge chunk of money to correct that lack of action. Give them those bucks, and they'll simply have more of the user fees we already pay to squander in other ways.

When the state legislators appear at the voter information meetings and during their campaign swings, approach them, tell them of your concern. Ask why the special taxes you have paid for transportation have not been used to repair our highways and our bridges in the past. Ask them where the dollars from the last bond issue went. Ask them for a full accounting. If they don't give you satisfactory answers, they haven't done their job. They haven't been the watchdogs they should have been, and you should voice your displeasure in no uncertain terms.

And why not?

# You cannot vote

An elite group here in Suffolk County, using the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the State of New York, have certain privileges that are denied to you if you are not among their ranks. If you are not a member of this elite group, you cannot vote this year.

- .. If you are Jewish, you cannot vote.
- .. If you are Catholic, you cannot vote.
- .. If you are Protestant, you cannot vote.
- .. If you are an atheist, you cannot vote.
- .. If you are black, you cannot vote.
- .. If you are Hispanic, you cannot vote.
- .. If you are an Oriental, you cannot vote.
- .. If you are Irish, you cannot vote.
- .. If you are a Wasp, you cannot vote.

There are others who may not vote as well. If you are in the above named groups, and you have not

registered, you are hereby forbidden to vote this November.

You are not allowed to choose your president, your senators, your state legislators or county officials. We, the elite registered group, will choose who will be your representatives. We will tell them what laws to pass and those not to approve. These laws may well affect the freedoms you used to enjoy. We will determine what type of schools you go to, what form of work you may pursue. We will decide who may own land and under what conditions. We will decide how much of your earnings and your wealth we will confiscate through taxes. We will tell you when and how you will give us your children so we may use them as soldiers or for other purposes.

You will not have a say in anything we do for we are the elitists. Our Constitution gives us the right, the privilege and the power and there is nothing that you can do to change

Cont. on next page

## SUFFOLK LIFE NEWSPAPERS

and Suffolk County Life

Offices and Plant Located at Willmott Plaza  
1461 Old Country Rd. (Rt. 58), Riverhead 369-0800 Classified Ads 369-0820  
Mail Address P.O. Box 167, Riverhead, N.Y. 11901-0102

Suffolk Life is published in 27 market zone editions every Wednesday

Huntington Str./Melville	Coram/Middle Island	Mid Hampton	Lindenhurst
Brentwood/Central Islip	Bay Shore/West Islip	Huntington	Arnthville
Ronkonkoma/Holbrook	Centereach/Selden	Rocky Point	East Islip
Haluppauge/Nesconset	Mastic/Moriches	North Fork	Medford
Three Village/Port Jeff	Sayville/Oakdale	Patchogue	Babylon
Cornmack/Kings Park	Hampton West	Riverhead	
Smithtown/St. James	Hampton East	Northport	

Total Circulation audited and verified in excess of  
**489,466 Circulation Weekly**



Suffolk Life is an Official Newspaper of Town of Southampton, Brentwood School District, Town of Islip, Surrogate Court, County of Suffolk, Rocky Point School District, Patchogue-Medford School District, North Babylon 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

Claire B. Swanik - Assistant to Publisher	Sheryl Heather - Promotion Director	Bill Johnson - Director of Printing and Distribution
Ted Cook - General Manager	Sharman Gordon - Graphics/Production Manager	Barbara Lampasona - Data Processing Manager
Walter Hoefler - Director of Research	Lora Holdorf - Assistant Graphics/Production Manager	Hugh A. Battersby - Personnel Manager
Arlene Greene - Classified Editor	Noble Laird - Advertising/Art Director	Frank Frolke - Comptroller
Lou Grasso - Managing Editor	Tom Gandolfo - Printing Manager	William Lawton - Purchasing Director
Daniel H. Aug - News Editor	Debra Rogers - Pre-Press Manager	Duane Sundquist - Circulation Manager
Jonathan Willmott - Feature Editor		
Victor Prusinowski - Director of Sales		

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. Please include daytime phone number for verification.  
**ERRORS** - Responsibility for errors in advertisements is limited to the value of the space occupied by the error.





**REMEMBERED** -- A memorial was unveiled outside the Order of the Sons of Italy, Constantino Brumidi Lodge No. 2211 in Deer Park during a ceremony honoring the late Anthony Casamento. Casamento, who died last July after a lengthy illness, was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his 1942 heroics at Guadalcanal during World War II. The former Marine corporal fended off an entire battalion of Japanese soldiers and saved two other soldiers' lives, despite being hit by 14 rounds of machine gun fire and other ammo. Photo by Greg Valero. (G S43F-2)

# County water plan target for reform

Cont. from page 2

Brentwood and John Heilbrunn of Riverhead, said political and geographical considerations played no part in their decisions.

Although the public water main was installed on his block as part of the project, Heilbrunn said it was not extended as far as his home. The BRO report said members of the committee failed to disclose voting situations where a conflict of interest could occur, and no record of project votes was retained by the committee.

Heilbrunn said no formal vote was taken on the project near his home; if there had been, he insisted, he would have abstained. Because minutes were not taken at committee meetings and formal voting records were not kept, legislators were left to take Heilbrunn at his word.

Several lawmakers voiced support for the committee members who attended the hearing.

"I found the people to be very dedicated and interested in doing a good job," said Romaine. "But like the first time for many things, it was a learning experience."

The water main program totaled \$7 million in county funds, over two phases. Phase one, which contained \$5 million, was the major focus of BRO report criticisms. In phase two, committee members said, it became a requirement that at least 10 percent of the homes in the designated areas would show test results of impure water quality levels.

Committee members said that towns, to a large degree, determined what areas would get water mains because they were authorized to petition for the county funds after indentifying appropriate sites.

Joseph Baer, a Suffolk Health Department official, joined Heilbrunn in explaining why five of 21 projects that were not included in

phase one contained homes where water quality was below safety levels.

Each of those projects, in Brookhaven Town, was pulled from the program because town officials withdrew them, the two said. Former Brookhaven Community Development Director Geraldine Sheridan could not be reached to confirm their claim that the town had apparently run out of available matching funds and was therefore forced to withdraw the applications.

Despite their acknowledgement that the selection process needed tightening, all involved in the discussion

agreed that the program should continue in the future.

Legislator Steven Englebright (D-Setauket) said that program funds should not be limited to use for water main installation. The lawmaker said a revolving fund could be set up by imposing a resale surcharge on homes that received the public water mains.

Englebright said the fund could pay for the maintenance of existing districts or the establishment of special use districts, especially on the East End's north fork where public water is not available.

## Senate okays \$5.5 mill. for high tech incubator

Legislation providing for a loan of \$5.5 million from the Urban Development Corporation (UDC) to be applied toward the construction cost of a high technology incubator facility at SUNY Stony Brook has passed in the New York Senate, announced Senator Ken LaValle, the sponsor of this legislation.

According to Senator LaValle, this loan of \$5.5 million from the UDC will cover approximately one half of the construction cost of the incubator, a facility which would provide the necessary space and resources for startup companies in the high technology field.

LaValle said that the senate had previously passed another measure which would provide for both a loan component and a direct grant for the construction cost of the incubator. Unfortunately, the assembly did not act on the legislation. Realizing the importance of the incubator for Long Island, Senator LaValle took this new funding approach in an effort to allow the project to move forward. "It is my sincerest hope that both the assembly and the governor will be able to support this modest initiative since it is of major importance to maintaining Long Island's economy," said LaValle.

LaValle said that the approval of this legislation coupled with other actions taken in 1985 and earlier this session are major steps in the development process of the incubator. In 1985, \$700,000 was appropriated by the state legislature for a development plan feasibility study addressing the issues of cost, space, equipment, marketability, operation and financing. In addition, legislation also sponsored by Senator LaValle which was chaptered in late July, permits the state university to contract or lease certain lands to be used as a building site for the incubator facility.

The future promises increased growth in high tech-

nology businesses and services. The incubator facility will not only work to ensure the continued success of Long Island's economy but will also create a great many new jobs for local residents," said Senator LaValle.

LaValle, who has continued to stress the importance of cooperation between business and higher education, sees this facility as an excellent opportunity for the university to combine forces with the business community to benefit the whole of Long Island as well as the rest of the state.

This legislation will be forwarded to the assembly for their consideration and approval.

## Rico suit...

Cont. from page 2

for comment before press time.

A spokesperson for the Long Island Lighting Co., Joan Reinhart, said the utility had no comment on the settlement due to the pending status of the litigation.

Although the trial was ex-

pected to begin last week, LILCO this week continued its effort to stay the proceedings in the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in Manhattan.

Attorneys for Suffolk County said they were hopeful that the trial would begin late this week or early next week, however.

## Stage band seeks talent

The Town of Islip Community Stage Band is looking for a few good musicians to complement their band.

The Town of Islip Community Stage Band is sponsored in part by Islip's Division of Cultural Affairs and is made up of musicians of all age groups. Currently the band is looking for musicians who play saxophone, trumpet, trombone, and bass.

If interested in joining, call Peter Maitland at 581-6492. The band rehearses every Tuesday, at 8 p.m. at Town Hall West, 401 Main Street, Islip.

## Editorial

# You cannot vote...

Cont. from previous page

this, except to register to vote yourself and exercise the same powers that we have been granted under our Constitution.

You may register to vote at the Board of Elections. The telephone number is 924-4300. Or you may register at your local polling place

October 13 or October 15. If you don't, accept the fact that whatever you are, where ever you come from, whatever religion you choose to practice, you will be disfranchised by your own apathy and refusal to be involved.

And why not?