

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**  
**OF THE**  
**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**  
**MINUTES**

A meeting of the Economic Development Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on October 1, 2014.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Leg. William J. Lindsay III, Chairperson  
Leg. Steven H. Stern, Vice Chair  
Leg. Kara Hahn  
Leg. John M. Kennedy, Jr.  
Leg. Kevin J. McCaffrey  
D.P.O. Jay H. Schneiderman

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory  
Leg. Thomas Cilmi, 10th Legislative District  
George M. Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature  
Lora Gellerstein, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
Jason Richberg, Aide to Leg. Gregory  
Joanne Minieri, Commissioner/Economic Development  
Brian Sapp, Aide to Leg. Lindsay  
Sean Rogan, Aide to Leg. McCaffrey  
Deborah Harris, Aide to Leg. Stern  
Michael Cavanagh, Aide to Leg. Lindsay  
Laura Halloran, Budget Review Office  
Tullio Bertoli, Town of Brookhaven  
Jonathan Keyes, Director of Downtown Revitalization/Town of Babylon  
Carolyn Fahey, Economic Development  
And all other interested parties

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

**MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:**

Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:06 PM)

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Good afternoon. Welcome to the Economic Development Committee. If we could all please rise and Legislator Schneiderman will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**SALUTATION**

Thank you for being here this afternoon. We do not have any cards filled out for the Public Portion. If anybody is interested in speaking before the Legislature, you just have to fill out a card. Seeing nobody we will move onto the agenda.

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS**

We don't have any presentations this afternoon so we'll start with Tabled Resolutions and we'll start with **Resolution 1329, Establishing a new policy for appointments to the Board of the Suffolk County Industrial Development Agency. (Kennedy)** Any comments or motions on this bill?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair, it appears that the IDA still has unresolved replacing the Executive appointment with Mr. Manetta having left and now being in a transition stage. So I think the concerns that we've talked about here are still poignant and I'd like to see the resolution pass. I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I'll second it.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Any other comment? Do we have a second? I'm going to make a motion to table it again. I need a second.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll second.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator Schneiderman. Seeing no more comment, we'll call the vote starting with the tabling motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Opposed.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

So four to two. Okay, so motion to table carries. **TABLED (VOTE: 4-2-0-0 (OPPOSED: LEG. KENNEDY and LEG. McCAFFREY))**

Okay. Moving onto new legislation.

**INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS**

**1810 - Allocating and appropriating funds for Phase XII in connection with the Suffolk**

**County Downtown Revitalization Programs, Economic Development (CP 6412) (Co. Exec.)**

Any comments on this motion? Legislator McCaffrey.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, these funds, I believe in downtown revitalization and that the County has a role in this. I'm only concerned about the amount of money that we are spending and the money that we have spent on, I think, at least one of the projects, the Wyandanch Rising project. It's been significant. And the Ronkonkoma Hub is also substantial. Do we have a breakdown in terms of what these costs are for each of those projects?

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Carolyn, if you could step to the mike.

**MS. FAHEY:**

Good afternoon. Legislator, there's two resolutions on the table today. This one is a downtown revitalization program. This isn't the Ronkonkoma Hub and the Wyandanch Rising funding. All right? So I can answer your questions with regards to the 500,000 that this resolution is awarding. This is the money that is -- applications are accepted and reviewed by the Downtown Revitalization Panel.

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Carolyn, is the exhibit that we have here?

**MS. FAHEY:**

Correct, yes.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Kevin, you have this?

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

No, I don't have it.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

I can pass it down to you. Yeah, it's not, it's all spread out --

**LEG. McCAFFREY:**

I'm good.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Carolyn, I have the list and am well aware of the process that the board goes through to make these selections. And in large part we rely on our board and those that we've appointed to help us in making the determination as to what the priority should be and how expenditures should go.

Could you just comment on -- I don't need to go through every single item that's on the list, but could you speak to the role that town participation plays in how these decisions are made by the board that ultimately come before us for approval. This is downtown revitalization. The towns play

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

a big role in what goes on in the towns and much of what the service is and the materials that are provided for here. As the -- as our representatives to the board go through the process in taking a look at what the proposals are, I mean, there's funding that we are providing. But to what extent do the towns get involved and what role does it play in helping our appointees to the board make these -- these decisions?

**MS. FAHEY:**

When the program was first created back, gosh, 1999, it was an application from a local community group that had as part of its mission a downtown goal, whether it be beautification or downtown revitalization. Probably about two years after that, what we decided to do was to include the towns as a partner in that application. And the purpose being that one, we wanted to ensure that the project the community group wanted to see come to fruition wasn't anything in conflict with the town's capital program and their long-range plans. We found in the first one or two rounds that what the community group wanted to see, whether it be sidewalks or lighting, would have been ripped out within three or four years based upon the town's capital program.

So probably around 2003, 2004 we required that the town actually review the applications before they're submitted. And the town has to submit a supporting resolution. And that supporting resolution supports the project in its theory in that the town would be the -- responsible for seeing that project through to fruition. Being a municipality, we're required that any contract that we let out also adheres to general municipal law with regards to purchasing and contracts and so on. And the local community groups didn't have that ability to do that function.

So we now contract with the town who has already supported an application to see the contract through fruition. So a local beautification or chamber group has a project that they want to see period lighting on their downtown street. They go to the town and they say to the town *this is a project we would like to see*. And if the town concurs, they do a resolution supporting the application, agreeing to go into the agreement with the County and agreeing to carry through on that funding in that project if the grant is awarded. So the town actually becomes a partner in getting that project done at the end.

**LEG. STERN:**

So they agree in theory, they're supportive. And then to what extent, if any, do they provide the funding?

**MS. FAHEY:**

They actually bring a lot --- the towns are bringing the leverage in funding to the table.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yeah.

**MS. FAHEY:**

The community groups do not have the wherewithal to bring 20, 30, \$40,000 of leverage funds to the table. So the towns end up being that resource for that community project. Whether it be through community development block grant money -- or even if it's a capital program that the town has always wanted to do but never had the funding, the full funding to do, if they bring some of it to the table, we end up leveraging.

**LEG. STERN:**

And is there a guiding principle in terms of dollar amount or percentages? And if there's no -- say it's not a 50/50, does the percentage or dollar amount that the town is willing to contribute in its participatory role here, is that part of the score when the members are going through their analysis? For example, does a potential project score higher if it's a 50% match by a town as opposed to a

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

20% match?

**MS. FAHEY:**

Exactly, it does. There's six criteria that we -- I'm just trying to see if -- no, five criteria -- that we score every application on. One of them is the leverage funds. And there's a sliding scale based upon the percentage of leverage that they bring to the table. They get assigned that amount of points for that leveraging. So a project that has 15% leveraging gets three points; and a project that has 50% leveraging gets 20 points. So it's a sliding scale based upon the amount leveraged.

**LEG. STERN:**

In looking at the list here that we've been provided, it doesn't specifically talk about the towns participation, percentages, anything like that. But it is safe to say that if these were the chosen projects, that there is some level of appropriate town participation because that was meaningful in the overall score.

**MS. FAHEY:**

Each project is different. One might get scored higher because of its location to a downtown or its economic activity. It might have scored a little lower on leveraging or vice-a-versa. But leveraging is one of the major components.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you.

**MS. FAHEY:**

And to your point, we are awarding \$500,000, or you are awarding \$500,000 through this resolution and we're leveraging almost \$500,000 in town and municipal and community money also. Chambers bring money to the table and so on.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thanks.

**MS. FAHEY:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Legislator Hahn.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Remind me how you define downtown.

**MS. FAHEY:**

I'm sorry, I didn't hear.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Remind me how you define downtown.

**MS. FAHEY:**

The application talks about a community that -- and it's not just strictly a downtown. It is a community that is, was or strives to be a downtown. We have a lot of communities who at one time were really strong economic hubs and downtowns that have kind of dissipated over the years. So we will fund that community. We will fund a community that doesn't have a central location. And it needs to be walkable; it needs to have, you know, one-stop parking where you can walk from store to store to store; maybe have a library, a post office, community assets there that we take a look at.

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

It's not just downtowns. It's central business districts as well. We have some communities that have two or three little central business nodes but only one will be the one that we try and fund so as not to compete with each other.

So it's a community that is, was or strives to be a downtown. And that gives the panel the ability to look at communities like a Centereach or a Selden that never really had that traditional downtown like a Patchogue or a Huntington.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Yeah, no, I just -- I know Port Jeff Station, Terryville has been, you know, trying to apply for some of these grants. And I think they keep getting stuck in this. They think they're someone striving to be a downtown but they -- you keep rejecting them. So, you know, I want to understand what the vision has to be or -- I don't quite understand that distinction, but I'm very supportive of all the communities that got the grants and just hope that we're fairly rating them when they want to be -- when they want to help create a downtown atmosphere and improve their business areas that are really truly struggling.

**MS. FAHEY:**

One -- if I could, one of the criteria that we look at when we look at applications is that there's some sort of written plan that the town has adopted that says *this is where commercial district and this type of development really should go*. And it proves to the panel that the town is supportive of that development and that they're going to move forward whether it needs to be zoning changes or anything -- you know, and the town's going to help with that development also.

I don't want to get into specific projects but, you know, that's a criteria that we have. Some projects fell short -- very short on that. Some projects sent in plans that were not adopted by the town that they wrote themselves, which really isn't what the panel's looking for. So there's a lot of things that go into the panel's discretion.

**LEG. HAHN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Carolyn, to the leverage component or matching funds component, I don't recall that being a part of previous rounds. And I know Nesconset has been successful multiple times. This is round 12. And so, you know, previously there's been a number of things that we've done. But when did the matching concept or the town contribution piece kind of emerge? Because that's somewhat new to me.

**MS. FAHEY:**

That's not new, Legislator Kennedy. I want to say at least four or five years ago. At least. When we created -- when the panel revamped the downtown program, you might recall they won a -- the County won a NACO award for taking this program --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**MS. FAHEY:**

-- very competitive.

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yup.

**MS. FAHEY:**

And evenhanded program. We created the criteria and the scoring to it. Leveraging was part of that, I believe, I want to say from '05, '06.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MS. FAHEY:**

A long time.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

The other piece that occurs to me is having had a series of previous grants that have worked out very well, as a matter of fact, with lighting and walkway improvements and a variety of other things that we've utilized, my recollection was that there was, I don't want to call it stacking, but we had like two or three successive rounds where we had approval but then we had quite a bit of work we had to do with planning, Smithtown Planning, to ultimately get to implementation of what had previously been envisioned and approved or awarded.

**MS. FAHEY:**

So if we're talking about the two rounds that Smithtown had been awarded for downtown Main Street --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, my question doesn't go so much to Smithtown as it does to these recipients. Are there prior awards that are in the pipeline? Or is that something that factors in? It occurs to me that we should have prior awards completed before we make subsequent awards.

**MS. FAHEY:**

Actually one of the criteria that we use when we score the projects is -- I just want to get the wording right -- *reasonable expectation of completion of project within the contract term*. And you're right, past years, a good eight, ten years ago we've had awards that were lingering for years and years and years. And this Legislature and the County Executives and the department were very concerned that we made awards and nothing was happening.

So what the panel does now is when we go to sit and score each project, we look at the municipal partner that Legislator Stern was referring to. So we have the township or the village. And we look at their history and their ability to complete the projects in a reasonable amount of time. There are some towns that tend to linger. And the projects that are submitted by those towns for future funding are scored accordingly. Underneath that category we have one town that has had difficulty moving along. And, two, last round one of their projects was not voted on at all because the town -- it was voted on but it scored low because the town just wasn't getting the past projects done. That has been implemented, I want to say, in the last two rounds and has had a tremendous effect.

We have one town that had rounds that were open for eight, ten years. Wow, look at this, all of a sudden they're closed, they're moving along, they're getting done. If there's the fear of not being able to get funded in the future because they haven't completed past projects, they tend to get those projects done.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

What I would ask you -- and I agree with you 110%. I'm glad that you're utilizing that. But, again, if that's something that's a factor, and I don't know whether it is or not and quite frankly I don't

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

want to know it right now, but offline I would like to know if applications coming out of, you know, the Brookhaven area or in western Brookhaven or Smithtown, you know, are in that area. Personnel change all the time at the town levels. And what may have been, you know, some not such great work ethic previously now may be a department under a whole different, you know, leader with, you know, a different ability to go ahead and take on and complete. So I --

**MS. FAHEY:**

We can talk about those towns offline if you'd like --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**MS. FAHEY:**

But we know when there's a change in the planning staff or we know when there's a change in the administration of a town. We reach out, we meet with them, we start from scratch, we educate them on the whole program.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MS. FAHEY:**

So we make an attempt to bring that new administration up to speed --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MS. FAHEY:**

-- to get those projects moving so we make it -- we're very active in making sure that they're up to speed on it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, good. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Lora, do we have -- do we have a motion on this yet? Okay. I'd like to make a motion to approve.

**LEG. McCaffrey:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Second by Legislator McCaffrey. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? The motion carries.

**APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-1 - LEG. HAHN NOT PRESENT)**

**MS. FAHEY:**

Mr. Chair, if I could, I just want to give a shout-out, and I'll do this again at the full Leg: Your Committee members are very dedicated. They show up, they're active, they participate. They follow through with their municipalities. Each one of them that's on the panel is a very strong advocate, not only for their community, but for the communities throughout the County that really do need help. We have had Committee members talk about and advocate for communities outside of your districts knowing that those communities need help. So you should be very proud of who you appointed and they're great members and I want to thank you for that.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

Thank you, Carolyn, we appreciate that.

Moving onto **1825 - Extending the life of Master Plan for Francis S. Gabreski Airport (CP 5735). (Co. Exec.)** This resolution authorizes the extension of the period of probable usefulness for master plan for Gabreski Airport. The current PPU for this program expires in October of 2014. This resolution extends the life of these bonds an additional five years. Any comments? Legislator Schneiderman.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Maybe Carolyn, or -- so this is the current master plan, right, not the new master plan? How does this work?

**MS. FAHEY:**

It's the master plan update.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Oh, it is the master plan?

**MS. FAHEY:**

Yes.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What is this actually doing? It's extending the life of the bonds?

**MS. FAHEY:**

Right. But when you adopted the resolution back in 2009, the bonding resolution for the master plan update, it only had a five-year life span. And as you know, Legislator, we're now trying to do a financial component for that master plan. And if we don't extend the PPU on these bonds, it expires this October. So we need that extra life in order to utilize that money for the financial component and the update to the plan.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How much money was authorized for that master plan update?

**MS. FAHEY:**

I think -- I want to say 75 or 100. I don't know off the top of my head.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. And where are we with the master plan update? Are we close to finished?

**MS. FAHEY:**

We're getting there.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

This was going on, I think, when I first took office just over a decade ago.

**MS. FAHEY:**

And you recall that the data became old so we had to redo it. So we're in the process of reviewing that.

And one of the things we want to do now is to include in that master plan update a financial plan for the airport. And that financial plan takes a look at our leases, the capital, the debting, all of that. So the contractor that we've just brought on, as you know, that we brought on a financial consultant

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

to help us with negotiating and everything else at the airport, is going to help us create a financial plan that becomes part and parcel of the master plan update that we submit.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you have a target date for completing all of this?

**MS. FAHEY:**

Not in stone. I would say within six, eight months.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Six, eight months. And it comes back here for approval?

**MS. FAHEY:**

Master plan would have to be approved by the Legislature, yes, as a final document after the FAA.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do we have to do an EIS on it or no, just an EAF?

**MS. FAHEY:**

The EIS, I think, is going to be decided by CEQ when we present it to them. They're going to have to determine whether or not a full EIS is necessary. It is an expensive venture, as you know, that's anywhere from 80 to \$100,000, you know, 70 to \$100,000 to do a full-blown EIS --

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And another year at least. Yeah.

**MS. FAHEY:**

Yeah. And whether or not we need that, we're going to rely on the experts to tell us.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, all right. It's the only questions I have.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay. I'd like to make a motion to approve.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So, George, this came up recently on a Vanderbilt, I think, bill. So if you don't renew after five years, the money is no longer available. Right, that's how that works?

**MR. NOLAN:**

I believe that is correct. I'm going to actually talk to bond counsel about this resolution in the interim between now and Tuesday just to discuss the issue with the PPU.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Okay.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay, thanks. Should we discharge it without recommendation then?

**MR. NOLAN:**

10/1/14 Economic Development

I think it's okay.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. I'll second.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Mr. Vaughn.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

Legislator Schneiderman, just to clarify, when we came forward with the resolution for Vanderbilt, at that point in time that was a bill that never had a bond attached to it, so it is a slightly different thing. This is talking about extending the life of a bond that had already been adopted by this full -- by this full body. When we went forward with Vanderbilt, at no point in time had a bond been attached to that resolution.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah, but this had the bond.

**MR. VAUGHN:**

This had a bond.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The useable lifespan --

**MR. VAUGHN:**

They've been drawing down off the bond and they need to extend it so they continue to have those funds available.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Thank you for distinguishing that. Okay, call the vote.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? The motion carries. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)**

**IR 1835 - Reappointing member to the Suffolk County Landbank Corporation Board of Directors. (Kennedy)**

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll make a motion to approve.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

I'll second.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Who are we appointing? Has he appeared before the Committee? (Laughter)

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Any debate on this motion?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Maybe from me.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

You sure you want to do this, Tom? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion carries.  
**APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)** Congratulations or condolences.

### **LEG. CILMI:**

Both.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

#### **IR 1850 - Appropriating funds in connection with Jumpstart Suffolk (CP 6424) (Co. Exec)**

Joanne, I don't know if you had anything you wanted to speak to about this before we go into it. If you could come to the mike.

This resolution will award and appropriate \$5 million in funds from the Jumpstart Suffolk Program to assist with infrastructure components of the following projects: Wyandanch Rising, the Ronkonkoma Hub, Huntington Station and the Smithtown Central.

### **MR. VAUGHN:**

Mr. Chairman, before we get into the debate on that just for the sake of clarity, we did remove Huntington and Smithtown from this initial resolution. However, prior to today's filing deadline, we have now filed a second resolution that will include the Huntington and Smithtown projects. They needed to be taken out simply because of a concern with the CEQ that the towns needed to do. It was only a technical matter as to why they were taken out, not a lack of support on behalf of the administration. So I just wanted to make that clear, that we will be coming back to you guys at the next -- during the next committee cycle to get those projects approved as well.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

So today we're just considering it without those two projects. We don't need to table the whole thing.

### **MR. VAUGHN:**

Correct, sir. We've removed them so that way the two projects that had the CEQ that could go, so that way they would go -- and at this round the projects that we had concerns about the CEQ findings or had not gotten yet the CEQ findings on, we -- we removed them from this legislation so that way they would not impede the adoption of this legislation.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay. Perhaps, Joanne, maybe you could talk a little bit about the Wyandanch Rising and the Ronkonkoma Hub, what the funds are going to be used for.

### **COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Okay.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Thank you.

### **COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

All right, thank you. Just to refresh everyone's memory of what Jumpstart is, it's an economic development initiative to really promote and encourage the development of these master communities -- master development communities in and around transportation hubs; multi-family, commercial and retail use with the appropriate amount of open space and amenities to have a sense of place.

So with this, Legislators, the guidance and approval of this program was created last year. And last year the amount in the budget for the program was 2.5 million. And we recommended and were approved to appropriate that to the Wyandanch Village project. This year, we had a budget

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

approved for 5 million. And today I'm requesting support to award 2.3 million to the Ronkonkoma Hub and 2 point 250,000 to Wyandanch Village.

First, I would like to just recognize the fact that both of these projects are long-term projects. And they are regionally significant and transformative in accordance with the economic -- Regional Economic Development Council for the State of New York. They both are public/private partnerships where the towns have entered into developments with master developers, private developers for the long-term development of these transit oriented programs.

Wyandanch Village is in the Town of Babylon. This will be, as I mentioned, the second award. It is -- in terms of the entire project, it is a master plan when it's completed that would have over 850 residential units, approximately 160,000 square feet of retail, 50,000 square feet of civic space and 100 plus or minus square feet of office or commercial space. We are currently working closely with the town and the private developer to complete phase I of Wyandanch Rising, which consists of two residential buildings over retail, one commercial office building, a one-acre station plaza and a train station as well as a 900 plus or minus space garage built by the MTA.

I had the opportunity to bring over a rendering of this particular development because I think it would be helpful to see what's really happening here at Wyandanch and how this type of investment by the County will ultimately return a significant amount of economic benefit. Just for this phase I, which I'll walk you through the rendering, but just so you all are aware, the return on this type of investment at this juncture, and this was determined based upon my economist in Planning, that approximately 6,000 jobs will be created. The sales -- the annual sales tax for Suffolk County alone upon the completion and leasing of this particular phase of the project annually will be almost approximately two-and-a-half million dollars and property taxes will be approximately a half-a-million with some of that obviously going to school districts and other County agencies.

What we have here -- and the importance of this also, and what I would like to -- make a very distinguishing factor here, is that the money that's being invested right now that I'm requesting for the second round of Jumpstart is for this project that is under construction and is for building A, months away from opening; for building B, we'll be opening middle of next year; and hopefully we'll be breaking ground on building C within the next 12 months. So everyone gets a sense of what's here. And I have the Director of Downtown Revitalization for the Town of Babylon, Jonathan Keyes here with me also, who's spearheading this effort for the town. I'm stealing his thunder by the way.

This is building A. Can everyone hear me? Which will have 91 units of residential, about 17,000 square feet of retail at the base and is slated to open toward the end of this year. It just currently had a lotto for the residential units. We, at the County for the Workforce Housing, supported this residential development to the tune of 1.7 million and we have 60 of the 91 units for affordable housing.

The second building over here **[Indicating]** building B, is currently under construction, will be 86 units of which 61 will be affordable with retail at the base of about 18,000 square feet. We also supported that through our Workforce Housing Development Program for 2.2 million.

The one-acre area, the open space that is critical for a town to have a quality of life aspect to it and amenities for the people to enjoy -- for the people to enjoy is being developed by the town. And it is currently about to break ground. They did the bidding on it and hopefully they'll be awarding it shortly and it will be under construction. The goal here is to open this up all together so that you can begin to create the sense of place and town.

The town is also currently designing a train station. This picture doesn't do it any justice. **[Indicating]** You'll just see the top it, but it's a train station because in connection with the

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

public/private partnership working with the MTA, they have and are currently in the process of developing a garage, which is here, which will provide for approximately 900 parking spaces. **[Indicating]** The MTA is investing \$20 million in connection with that development.

And the final piece of this phase I, which is currently in discussion with the town and the developer for a -- about a 100,000 square foot office building at the head of the plaza. And we're working with them to assist them in potentially getting certain designations and opportunities to attract the new businesses to the Wyandanch Village community.

This money will -- again, this money is being awarded to the Town of Babylon to help them pay for the utility infrastructure, pedestrian walkways, curbs, lighting and addition in the development of the open space. It is part of a public/private opportunity where the State, the Federal government, the MTA and local -- local government have spent tens of millions of dollars as well as private investment of close to 80 million.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Joanne, are there any strings attached to the funding to the towns where they have to -- the project has a certain timeline it has to -- where the funds have to be utilized in a certain timeline?

### **COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

There's no time attached. The money, I think working closely with the town, I believe we know that this money will be needed within the next two years, similar to the initial Jumpstart. These are capital dollars that they need to spend and then show us, you know, substantiate the spending before we would reimburse them.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

What about on the Hub project?

### **COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Same thing.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Same thing.

### **COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

It's all under the Jumpstart Program.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

You know the timeline that they have associated with it -- because obviously they haven't broken any ground yet there, there's a lot of questions --

### **COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

The Ronkonkoma Hub and -- and I have the Director of Planning -- they are -- they just finished all their approval processes. And the developer is expected to file a site plan for phase I of that development, which would be about 380 residential units the beginning of next year and looking to potentially get approval and break ground mid -- mid-2015.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

### **LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not a member of this Committee but just, Joanne -- Commissioner, hi, how are you? Pleasure working with you on Landbank, by the way. And thanks -- thanks to the

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

Committee for your support.

Just to question with respect to -- if you could reiterate where we're at with Wyandanch, hold that thing back up again. Thank you. If you could reiterate where we're at presently with Wyandanch Rising.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

In terms of buildings, what's built if anything, what is --

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Oh, okay, sure.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And I'm particularly interested in -- you said there was a lottery for rentals or ownership or whatever, where are we at with the capacity of it?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

The lottery was for -- these are rental units. Some market, some affordable.

**LEG. CILMI:**

For the whole development are they all rentals?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Yes, for this phase I.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Just phase I.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

One hundred and seventy-seven units. Ninety-one and eighty-six are all rental.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Market and affordable.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yup.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

There was a lottery -- on the affordable, you know, the affordable rentals have to meet certain AMI limits. And I think the initial demand was like 1200 -- 1200 applicants. They did a lottery. It came down to 600 that qualify and now they'll go through the 600. Some are actually -- that aren't qualifying are choosing to rent the market units. So the demand was --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So there's a total of roughly a 100 and, what did you say, 180 or so?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

One hundred and seventy-seven units.

**LEG. CILMI:**

One hundred and seventy-seven units. And at this point based on initial appearances, you have far more applicants than we have units available.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Oh yeah, at this juncture, yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. And what's the timeframe on phase II then?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Well, the town needs to determine -- basically phase II now needs to be defined and determined. And the town is in the process of doing that and putting together the next phase. And that'll all be a function of, you know, the land, where it is and the type of assemblage that they could put together to proceed on phase II. Creating a new community, 177 residential units is nice, but you need more. That's why when you see in this master plan there's future development behind this building, you don't see it here on Straight Path, down here, across the track also. **[Indicating]** It's a larger master plan.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And what about -- you said -- is there retail in the first phase as well?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Oh, yes. There are -- at the base of each building, there's about 17,000 square feet. So 17 under building A, 17,18 under building B.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And do we have commitments for any of that retail space as of yet?

**MR. KEYES:**

Yeah, there are five notices of intent between the developer, yeah, I apologize. Yeah, sure, Jonathan Keyes, Director of Downtown Revitalization for the Town of Babylon. Good Afternoon.

To date we have been informed by the developer that they have at least five notices of intent between tenants and themselves for the retail prospects in addition to other opportunities that we're both pursuing.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Five. And how many units are there?

**MR. KEYES:**

It's flexible space. It's demised based on the individual needs of the tenants. I don't have the total number of rental storefronts.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Do you know how much as a percentage space those five commitments will occupy?

**MR. KEYES:**

Maybe 33%. Approximately 33% we would estimate.

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. And --

**MR. KEYES:**

Two buildings I should note -- that's both -- both retail buildings so that's a percentage of the first building. Building A, that's over 50%.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. And how critical is the success of that retail space to the success of the overall project?

**MR. KEYES:**

I mean every component of this is important. The residential, which as we've seen is five to one demand for the units that are out there. The retail is certainly important for place making. And I think as we begin to work with them on the development of the office and commercial space, we'll realize that that's also important and the ability to get a tenant for the office use. There's many different components. It's a large development, so --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay, thank you. Mr. Chairman, I may have some questions when -- I assume you're going to do a similar presentation for Ronkonkoma Hub, Commissioner, or no?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Not as detailed as Wyandanch because this is much further along.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

But if I could answer, I obviously will.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Well, I'll defer to whatever presentation you have or whatever details you're here to share on Ronkonkoma before I ask questions on that.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Legislator Stern has a question.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. The -- so our participation here is for various parts of infrastructure that's necessary for the community. Here we're talking about phase I and the various buildings that are involved. The money that is being allocated here, is this -- are these dollars that would be specifically geared to infrastructure just towards the needs for phase I? Or do you see that these monies here are being part of an overall infrastructure plan that may incorporate parts of phase II as they come down the line?

**MR. KEYES:**

It's the latter. So the nature of the development, particularly with this site, is such that the

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

infrastructure is very much an upfront cost and that we have to lay a lot of the framework out right now. So that would include the roadway network, which extends north of this building and throughout an entire site, approximately 20 acres that we call site A, not to be confused with building A. So a lot of those initial infrastructure costs are upfront for the plaza and the roadways whereas phase I just focuses around the plaza area. Subsequent phases could be the development at north for the infrastructure that's being built right now.

**LEG. STERN:**

Well, would it be safe to say, and I guess, you know, nobody has a crystal ball, but would it be safe to say that at this point the County participation in terms of dollars that we're allocating towards helping with the infrastructure, that this would be -- this would be our participation for what we see as being the entire project phase I and phase II.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I would generally say probably no, because the balance of this project will still require the build-out of roads and curbs and walkways and continue the -- continue for it to be a pedestrian walking community. I can't -- I don't have a crystal ball. I will tell you, though, that to the extent the town is in need of money to further this master plan, I would -- if I had the authority to do so, I would continue to be investing in the Wyandanch Village Master Plan until it's complete. That will take several years from now as they proceed to design phase II and phase III.

So, again, each time any kind of proposal's being -- that will be made will come to this Legislature for approval. But this is the beginning of a larger master plan.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, Commissioner. How are you?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Fine, thank you.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good, good. I don't want to jump the gun, but I do want to commend you, you've done great work, I think, with Wyandanch Rising. And we've seen it now for over the better part of four or five years from the waiving of sewer connection fees to some of the land acquisitions, the assemblage of all the parcels, the selection of a contractor and importantly having a Project Labor Agreement in place with the Albanese Organization. That is correct, right?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I believe it --

**MR. KEYES:**

There's a first source agreement.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

There's a first source, right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'm sorry, say again.

**MR. KEYES:**

Yeah, I believe you're referring to the First Source Direct Entry Program, whereby community residents are actively engaged on the construction of the buildings, yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, that's a subset actually what's called Community Benefit. But, in fact, the general contractor, the Albanese Organization did, in fact, enter into a Project Labor Agreement with the Nassau/Suffolk Building Trades Council as far as a commitment to utilize union labor for construction of the project.

I was going to ask you if that was a PLA that extended to all three phases. We're talking about here this phase I and the funding. Commissioner, we spoke about the 2.5 million committed in 2013, which clearly was going to phase I. And, again, let me just make sure in my head, this 2.3 or 2.4 is in addition to phase I? Or is that going forward to future phases?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Included in phase I.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It is included in phase I. And so we know that the PLA is in place. The only question, I guess, is as to whether or not it covers the full gamut of the project or if it's only phase I. But, in any event, we have that in place.

I'm going to want to have that same conversation about Ronkonkoma Hub, which I know the answer to already, but I guess I'll allow you to put that presentation on.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Joanne, if you could go ahead, go forward with the Ronkonkoma Hub presentation.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Legislator Schneiderman.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Just one question. Excuse me, Joanne. Since you have a mixed affordable and market rate, when we do infrastructure like this, and this is now, I guess, around \$5 million between this grant and the prior grant toward infrastructure, is there a way that we distinguish that we're not contributing taxpayer money toward the market rate? Only toward the affordable?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Oh, yeah. There are very --

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How do we do that with the -- because obviously the roadways, everybody uses road --

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

No, the roadways -- the roadways are separate and apart from the affordable housing infrastructure that is -- this award goes to the town for the infrastructure that they will own and we will have a lien on. The workforce housing is a contribution to the developer in exchange for the affordable units, which are below market. And the dollars that are spent to develop the actual vertical development of the building and the infrastructure around that the developer is responsible for is what that -- that money goes to. It's a different -- different --

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Where's our 5 million?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Our 5 million right now for Jumpstart is going to the Town of Babylon for all of the municipal-owned property which includes the station, plaza, this one-acre park, **[Indicating]** the train station and all of the roads and curbs around that is owned by the Town of Babylon.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. All right, thank you.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Okay. I'll move onto the Ronkonkoma Hub now. The Ronkonkoma Hub is in a very different stage of development. They just completed a series of approvals and are now going to begin their first phase, as I mentioned earlier, which is a residential 380-unit development.

In order for the Ronkonkoma Hub to proceed, the Town of Brookhaven will have to also be involved with a number of different infrastructure improvements that are necessary to further the master plan. This Jumpstart award today of 2.3 million is to assist the Town of Brookhaven in connection with the development of the road, engineering and construction including the design of the grading, the drainage, the water distribution systems, the road widening, the curbs. They're at a very preliminary stage of this development working closely with the master developer -- master developer, TRITEC, that was awarded this master plan. This is the beginning of significant infrastructure requirements that will be needed for this master plan. I do not have a rendering of the Ronkonkoma Hub proposal though -- I'm sure the -- I've seen one and I know TRITEC has it. And they're in the process of completing the design on some of the components of the project. I didn't print it out.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

I know Legislator Kennedy had some questions about the Hub project.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay, Legislator Cilmi, we'll defer to you before him.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Oh, let me just add one thing. Just so we can get a general understanding, the Ronkonkoma Hub, their master plan development provides for 1450 units of residential; about 195,000 square feet of retail; 360,000 square feet of office; and about 60,000 square feet of some hospitality use. That is the master plan in its entirety.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Joanne, could you just review that again not so quickly.

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Okay. I apologize. Fourteen hundred and fifty units of residential; 195,000 square feet of retail; 360,000 square feet of commercial; and about 60,000 square feet of a hospitality use.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay, thank you. So \$2.3 million, what are we paying for?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Okay. We're -- The Town of -- the Town of Brookhaven -- the Town of Brookhaven would be paying for the roadway, engineering and design.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So our payee is the Town of Brookhaven.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Yeah, we're awarding this --

**LEG. CILMI:**

We're awarding the Town of Brookhaven 2.3 million.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

That's correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. And what are they?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Roadway, engineering and construction including the design of grading and drainage. Water distribution systems, road widening, curbs, utility relocations.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So you and I have spoken previously about the impacts that will -- that will occur to infrastructure and residents on the Islip side of this development. It's very close proximity to County Road 93, I think --

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Ocean Avenue.

**LEG. CILMI:**

-- Ocean Avenue. And I'm wondering if we're going to take \$2.3 million and spend it on the various things that you said we're going to spend it on, why is it all being spent in Brookhaven?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

This is -- the Ronkonkoma Hub Master Plan right now is on the north side in Brookhaven. As we've spoken, we are looking -- we at the County level are looking forward to working very closely with the Town of Islip to discuss the potential opportunities that may exist south in their town, south of the -- of the town line in the Ronkonkoma Hub.

This award is -- we're recommending it directly in response to this master plan opportunity that has gone through all the approval processes and a master plan developer has been awarded the project. So we're focusing this award specifically on this north side development opportunity. The Town of Islip is -- is in the process, I'm sure, of reviewing the location as well as, as you know, the airport. And we are looking forward to working closely with them because I would like -- it would be

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

wonderful if we could get them in the queue for an award going forward.

This award is -- again, it's really to promote the development of these master plan communities. And really what we're trying to do is to award these dollars, make this capital investment in the locations that have a -- an organized group working closely to promote the development. And I think that at this juncture the Town of Brookhaven with the, you know, master -- with its master developer as well as the County and, you know, the State who's -- obviously recognizes development as a regional transformative development meet those general criteria.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So aside from future plans and, you know, I certainly appreciate your anticipation of working with Islip in terms of their -- some of their development on the south side of this, but clearly because there's -- there's such a close proximity between the Ronkonkoma Hub Project area and the Town of Islip and the border between Brookhaven and Islip and, therefore, Town of Islip infrastructure, it seems to me to the extent that that infrastructure will be impacted, which, I suppose, is debatable but in my mind there's no question that there will be significant impact to that infrastructure, it seems to me that if we're dedicating infrastructure money at this juncture that's specific to the impacts associated with the Ronkonkoma Hub in its current design and scope, then some of that money should be -- should be allocated to infrastructure within the Town of Islip.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I don't see how we would be able to do that at this juncture.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Why?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Because I think right now the way that the plan is designed, it all resides in the Town of Brookhaven. All of the roads and all of the planning and all of the studies, the infrastructure resides physically in the Town of Brookhaven.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes, except that -- except that -- let's -- we'll exaggerate to prove a point. If the only roadway heading into the Ronkonkoma Hub was within the Town of Islip and there was a gate, let's say, and you entered into the Ronkonkoma Hub and that was the Town of Brookhaven, it would be silly not to consider and to invest money in the infrastructure leading up to that entry point. So my -- my point is that because of the close proximity of the two, necessarily you would want to spend some money on that infrastructure, I would imagine. And certainly the folks on the Islip side of the development who stand to be impacted by additional traffic as a result of the Hub project, deserve to have some infrastructure money spent on, you know, the roadways that they utilize day in and day out.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Yes, but we haven't really been in much conversation at this juncture with the Town of Islip. And there hasn't been any really formal design or request made of the County through this program at this juncture.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well --

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I mean, that's the only --

**LEG. CILMI:**

I understand what you're saying.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

You're saying --

**LEG. CILMI:**

And Islip can't have any impact on the project, legally, at least, on the project itself because it's all in the Town of Brookhaven. But the impacts associated with the project will extend into Islip. And to the extent that the County is investing in town infrastructure to support the Hub project, I believe that the County should then consider making an investment in infrastructure in the Town of Islip, particularly when that infrastructure is, in the case of Ocean Avenue, at least, County infrastructure.

I mean, here we are, you know, we're constantly talking about the fiscal challenges that -- the fiscal challenges that we're facing and we want to support some affordable housing. We want to support transit-oriented developments, but we know that there are impacts associated with those developments. So why wouldn't we be committing some of this money to those areas? I mean, I know I keep asking the same question and you sort of keep giving me the same answer.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I know we've discussed this briefly offline. Right now there is no master plan to allocate any -- there is no master plan on the Islip side of this juncture that would -- that we would be able to target any funding at this point. But we did discuss another program that might be available to respond to some of your concerns, which I would -- you know, we'd -- obviously we've discussed this and we will continue to discuss it. We are -- I am in agreement. I think the County is in agreement, that the -- we would really encourage the Town of Islip to begin to look at a potential master plan opportunity on the south side of the Ronkonkoma Hub in conjunction with their studies of MacArthur Airport and the whole surrounding area. And we will continue to, you know, encourage and work to facilitate some form or fashion of a design plan for the south side with the Town of Islip. At this point there is no plan to award the funds to.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay, thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Commissioner, if they were to come to you in the future with a plan, you know, wouldn't you expect to support that with infrastructure?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Yes. Yes, absolutely.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Mr. Chairman, if I may, what I'm talking -- and I would expect that as well, if there's a future plan to develop property on the Islip side but that's -- that would be a -- it would certainly be complementary, if you will, to this development. But that's not planned yet. It hasn't been proposed yet. But yet there will be impacts in Islip as a result of this, which is already proposed and designed and, you know, for all intents and purposes ready to go. So to the extent that this proposal will impact infrastructure within the Town of Islip, I just think there should be some commitment now today out of these funds for infrastructure improvements in that area. That's my only point.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Yeah, I agree with you in theory. And as someone who lives just south on Lakeland Avenue off of this -- of this project, obviously I'm going to be personally impacted. But I think it's hard for us to allocate any funding without the town having a plan. I think it points to a greater issue here between the two towns. The two towns really never got together and discussed this project on a global basis. And maybe whatever we can do to encourage that to happen, I think, will be beneficial to everybody involved.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Right. And we're working on that.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Okay, Commissioner, here we go, here's round two. So let's talk a little bit about the project because I have had -- actually prior to redistricting the 12th Legislative district went right down to the railroad tracks on the north side, as you know. So I probably been at meetings regarding Ronkonkoma Hub for the better part of the last five to six years. And Tullio has been excellent at kind of shepherding the project, but, in fact, the concept even predates him coming to the Town of Brookhaven.

So let's go through the basics. I mean, we know it already. TRITEC is the master developer, I believe. They were selected through an RFP process through the Town of Brookhaven. And as of today we do not have a PLA in place with TRITEC. Do we?

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I'm not aware.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm Tullio Bertoli. I'm the Planning Commissioner of the Town of Brookhaven.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Good afternoon. How are you, Tullio?

**MR. BERTOLI:**

By the way, you're absolutely correct it was five years ago. I was with Lee Koppelman having lunch one day. And I was frustrated at one point in the project saying that that I worked on something in the mid-80s on the Ronkonkoma Hub. And he said, "well, I beat you, I worked in the mid-50s on Ronkonkoma Hub."

**(LAUGHTER)**

To my knowledge there has been discussions with the unions. The first phase that TRITEC is working on now, as Joanne said, is about 400 units. And I'm not sure that a PLA agreement is in place because construction obviously hasn't started. They did have something in place when they were doing New Village down in Patchogue. And I assume that the same thing would continue over.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, I confirmed today, as a matter of fact, with a conversation earlier that from the Nassau/Suffolk Building Trades perspective, there is no PLA in place.

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

**MR. BERTOLI:**

Something that will have to be addressed by TRITEC (inaudible) --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes, but the issue becomes we have a project that is a quasi private/public project. And when it comes to the commitment of public funds, this Legislature has always been very clear that in order to go ahead and make that commitment, there has to be a PLA in place. Sometimes contractors talk about a representation or maybe a best effort --

**MR. BERTOLI:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

-- or we'll talk about a certain percentage. But this is one of those bright line areas where either you have a commitment on the part of a general contractor to utilize union labor or not.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

A little bit of difference between this project and Wyandanch is this is, I guess, more public than -- more private than it is public. We did not acquire land. The developer has gone to contract on the first phase and is working with the owners and the others. So, you're correct, Legislator Kennedy, that's something that'll have to be addressed.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, you touch on another factor that's important, Tullio. There's two other factors that I want to stay on here and so let me not downplay the PLA. For me the PLA is a deciding factor. But, in addition, there are a number of privately held properties that ultimately must be acquired by TRITEC in order to move forward with the project. And, to date, that has not been completed. There are still many privately-held properties that there's discussion going on about acquiring title; correct?

**MR. BERTOLI:**

I believe that the first phase, which are three large parcels, have been secured. There's ongoing discussions with the others. But, then again, this project was not approved until June 24th of this year.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

It's still ongoing and it's still -- I think TRITEC was hesitant about making really strong moves until the five resolutions passed.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well -- but so, see, that's another reason, then, that I guess I would kind of question the request from the administration about the commitment of the funding at this point. We have really two very different projects, if you will, combined in one resolution.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

How so?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We have Wyandanch Rising, which is bricks and mortar underway with a completion date anticipated. And in many ways with the Ronkonkoma Hub we're still talking about multiple renditions on paper.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

No, that is not true. In fact, the design of the first phase is being worked on at the moment. They'll be submitting for a building permit and through the normal process. It's anticipated that they'll secure those approvals in the early part of the year; January, February. And the monies that we're requesting are for the sections, a lot of it having to do with that area on Mill Street to the east of the train station. And that is the first phase that needs to work in conjunction with TRITEC's work. That's critical.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Well, listen, you're the design professional. I'll -- how about we agree to disagree on that one.

Lastly -- lastly, with this aspect, and I kind of touched on it a little bit with the land acquisition, I know I've heard Supervisor Romaine say that there will be no overt effort on the part of the town to actually engage in an eminent domain process. Some of the property owners there are very concerned that, in fact, that is something that's going to go underway. But I take Supervisor Romaine at his word. And if he said that's the case, then that's the case.

Lastly, let me say I personally question the decision to make the radical shift of electing to build a 10 or 12 mile force main from this project over to -- what's the connection point? Is it CI or is it Pilgrim?

**MR. BERTOLI:**

It's Bergen Point.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, ultimately destination is Bergen Point down on the South Shore, as Legislator McCaffrey has reminded me over and over again. But for the longest time we had a million dollar -- a million gallon STP that was quite a ways progressed through initial evaluation.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

That's correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Some design evaluation and ultimately something that, in my opinion, would have gone much further towards addressing not only the sanitary concerns for Ronkonkoma Hub, but the needs of the surrounding areas as well. At one point there was an envision to have Main Street in Holbrook tapped in. And my own -- I was very, very, very shocked to see that essentially abandoned and now this concept of a long-range main.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

Legislator Kennedy, I just want to let you know that the change was a recommendation coming out of Suffolk County DPW in connection with trying to determine the best location for the sewer treatment plant. Upon the completion of the evaluation, Suffolk County DPW came up with these alternative to connect.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, Commissioner, I would suggest to you that DPW is in the business of evaluating, I guess, how to provide for waste needs. But at no point through the earlier process did they ever say that there were underlying issues associated with sufficient acreage. There's 12 acres there. There's excellent percolation. It is strategically located as far as the ability to serve not only the station but the other areas and, in essence, we are aband -- well, not abandoning, but we are shifting what had been a significant capacity commitment down in Southwest now to this project. Quite frankly, I don't even

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

understand how this project comes in. Are they a contractee or are we expanding Southwest Sewer District into the Town of Brookhaven? So many questions.

### **MR. VAUGHN:**

Thank you, Legislator Kennedy. So this was an issue that Commissioner Anderson kind of spoke -- addressed during the Public Works Committee on Monday. And he obviously will also be available on Tuesday as we hopefully pursue this a little bit further as well. So if we have questions as to why DPW is recommending what they were recommending and the change in the plans, I think that he would be best to address this at that time.

### **LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, I'll be happy to take that up with him, Tom. And in particular, I think we're looking at a range of things as far as -- as I said, I need to look at what the mechanism is, the legal mechanism. You know, I know firsthand what it takes to create a sewer district, we've been at it for the ten years of my career as a Legislator and we still don't quite have it yet, but we're real close and that plant's already built.

But I'll go back to, I guess, my first concern. Commissioner, I can't support commitment of County funding where we do not have a PLA in place. I would suggest to my colleagues that this is something that I think is critical to have answered, I'm not saying that we should not move the resolution. Perhaps the Committee wants to entertain a discharge without recommendation. But I have multiple significant underlying concerns with where we're at right now with this. So I probably will not be supporting where it goes.

### **MR. BERTOLI:**

I wonder if I could address Legislator Cilmi's question since, I guess, he and I have been at numerous meetings over the last four or five years.

### **CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Sure.

### **MR. BERTOLI:**

Over those past four or five years, I think I've gone through three different Islip Planning Commissioners and two different Supervisors. And all that entire time I've always wanted these two townships working together in a joint effort. And it's not through a lack of trying, at least on my part, but I think it makes a lot of sense, Legislator, in looking at those two composites in a combined fashion. And, as you know, we had a final FEIS that was accepted that looked at a number of the issues that you raised in your questions. So I look forward to working with the Islip side at any point in time.

### **LEG. CILMI:**

May I? As a planner, do you understand my point about allocating some funding presently due to this particular project for infrastructure on that side of the border?

### **MR. BERTOLI:**

Well, I think that -- I think Joanne's concern, I guess, is there's no full master plan in place and there's certain criteria. But I do understand that Islip and Brookhaven need to sit down and see what the Islip portion is and how that merges with the Brookhaven side. Good planning deserves that attention.

### **LEG. CILMI:**

And don't you think that good planning on the County's part would entail the recognition and consequent investment in infrastructure when you have impacts associated with a project in

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

Brookhaven that will -- that will --

**MR. BERTOLI:**

Also recognize, though, for this project to get off the ground, it needs this level of investment in that first phase, in that section to the east in order to make the project begin.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'm not arguing that point but I'm saying that --

**MR. BERTOLI:**

I think that's what we we're looking for the funds to --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, I recognize. I understand that. But if I'm not mistaken, the phase I that we're talking about in terms of its proximity to the border is the closest phase? Or am I wrong in that?

**MR. BERTOLI:**

No, it's all the way to the east.

**LEG. CILMI:**

It's all the way to the east.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

Going towards the hotel.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. But still not far away.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

It's really to bring the -- the critical mass, the 400-unit project in place to buttress the commercial that occurs in railroad -- so it really works itself east to west.

**LEG. CILMI:**

In terms of distance, how far is it, would you -- do you think from the border?

**MR. BERTOLI:**

The border's so severe. It's the train station. But, again, I think before --

**LEG. CILMI:**

So how -- I mean, if you had to hazard a guess, how far do you think it is?

**MR. BERTOLI:**

What would you guess, Joanne? I'd have to get back to you.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Is it a mile away?

**MR. BERTOLI:**

No, no, no. No. It's walking distance.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right, so.

## 10/1/14 Economic Development

**MR. BERTOLI:**

But we don't have an Islip plan in place for us to really --

**LEG. CILMI:**

I understand that, but you -- this is a huge development. You're talking about 1450 residential units.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You know, I don't need to -- it's the largest development in the area, in the region. Right? In the northeast possibly.

**MR. BERTOLI:**

Built over a 10 to 12 year timeframe.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right, so -- so to the extent that the first phase of this project is going to involve 380 units of development, which I -- which I think probably rivals some other developments that we've done in terms of -- in and of itself, just phase I, in terms of its -- in terms of its capacity and, therefore, in terms of its impact, I would think that we would want to consider the impacts to our neighboring roadways, whether they be in the Town of Brookhaven or the Town of Smithtown or the Town Babylon, wherever they may be; in this case Islip.

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

I think there's been an effort, as indicated earlier, to work closely with the Town of Islip, and having not -- that hasn't occurred yet. And to sort of stall one -- one master development that has -- is underway right now. Waiting on the other is sort -- is something that we're trying to avoid.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I'm not --

**COMMISSIONER MINIERI:**

That's why we're encouraging --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Commissioner, I'm not suggesting that we stall anything. All I'm suggesting is that you have a huge proposal here that's coming to fruition imminently. And there are going to be impacts, significant impacts, to the town immediately to the west, less than a mile away. And we haven't considered those impacts and we're not allocating any money for improvements to infrastructure to account for those impacts. That's all I'm saying. And whether -- I'm not placing blame here but I'm saying that there should be a conversation ongoing with the Town of Islip presently because this project is about to be built.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Okay. If we could move on to a vote here. Although I agree with Legislator Kennedy about the Project Labor Agreement being in place, I do think we need to move forward with this. And I would like to put forth a motion to discharge this without recommendation.

**D.P.O. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll second.

10/1/14 Economic Development

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

Seconded by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRPERSON LINDSAY:**

So we'll discharge this without recommendation. **DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION (6-1-0-0 OPPOSED: LEG. KENNEDY - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

Seeing no other business here, that will conclude our meeting -- our Committee meeting for today. Thank you.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 3:22 PM  
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**