

**ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING COMMITTEE
of the
Suffolk County Legislature**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Environment, Land Acquisition & Planning Committee was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Auditorium at the William Rogers Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on **July 30, 2001**, at 3:15 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator David Bishop, Chairman
Legislator Michael Caracciolo, Vice Chair
Legislator Ginny Fields
Legislator Vivian Fisher
Legislator Allan Binder
Legislator Cameron Alden

EXCUSED ABSENCE:

Legislator George Guldi

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Paul Sabatino, Legislative Counsel
Jeannine Dillion, Aide to Legislator David Bishop
Bonnie Godsman, Intergovernmental Relations, County Executive's Office
Jim Spero, Assistant Director, Budget Review Office
Elizabeth Nostrand, Aide to Legislator Vivian Fisher
Allan Grecco, Direct, S. C. Department of Real Estate
Tom Isles, Director, S.C. Department of Planning
Peter Scully, Commissioner, S.C. Department of Parks
Lauretta Fischer, Suffolk County Planning Department
Gerard McCreight, Aide to Legislator Jon Cooper
Ellen Martin, Presiding Officer Paul Tonna's Office
Amy Juchatz, Community Advisory Committee
Bill Sanok, Cornell Cooperative Extension
Jillanne R. Burns, Cornell Cooperative Extension
Edward Matthews, S.C. Department of Parks
Robert Sympson
Bill Steibel
Pam Schiel
Joseph Murray
Martin Mullarkey
Hoot Sherman
James Tripp, Suffolk County Water Authority
Joyce Rodler, Cornell Cooperative Extension
All Interested Parties

Minutes taken and transcribed by Irene Kulesa, Legislative Secretary

(The meeting came to order at 3:20 P.M.)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We will start with the Pledge to the Flag to be led by Legislator Ginny Fields.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Good afternoon. This is the July 30th, meeting of the Environmental Land Acquisition and Planning Committee. Unfortunately, we do not yet have a quorum. We can take testimony. I don't want to allow people to give testimony on bills to be voted on because we don't have a quorum and it would be unfair to them. But the Citizens Advisory Council on pesticides have a presentation that they would like to make. So why don't we lead off with them, since it doesn't relate to any bill on the agenda? You can come forward, you know, as a group. That's probably the best way to do it. We're one chair shy? There you go. You didn't have to pay tens of thousands of dollars like some others have for a seat at the Legislature. Well, good afternoon. Do you have a leader?

MS. JUCHATZ:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Please?

MS. JUCHATZ:

I appreciate being here today. My name is Amy Juchatz and I work for the Division of Environmental Quality in the Suffolk County Department of Health Services. I'm here today representing the Community Advisory Committee we call CAC. That was established through Local Law 34 in 1999 and I am Doctor Bradley's designee as the Chairperson for that committee. On May 15th, the CAC voted to seek an extension to the January 2002, deadline for phasing out the use of all pesticides on County property. There were three deadlines in that law. The first two we are complying with was the third deadline that phases out all use of pesticides that we're looking for an extension of.

I'm here today joined by a few members of the CAC, as well as some members of the Department of Public Works to help answer questions. Unfortunately, none of their community members of the CAC were able to make it, though I do have written testimony that I'd like to read from Elsa Ford, who is a representative of the Brentwood, Bay Shore Breast Cancer Coalition.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

If you could just summarize, if you would? Is it long? It's usually best with us just to -- Elsa says in essence --

MS. JUCHATZ:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

That would be helpful.

MS. JUCHATZ:

I'll try to do that. I wanted to be sure because who's represented here today are mostly from County Departments, as well as Cornell Cooperative Extension. I wanted you to make sure that was represented that this is from the CAC. It's made up of community members and we all voted on this. Okay. What I would like to just briefly talk about now is the intent of why it is that we are seeking this extension. I wanted to let you know that there has been a lot of progress that has been made in finding alternatives and in implementing those alternatives, however, there's still a lot that needs to be done. There's a large number of issues that have

come across the CAC. So many that we feel we really can't handle all those issues within this timeframe. Not only to find solutions but then to process those solutions, procure equipment, staff, etc., which needs to be done before we can really fully implement those new procedures. Cockroaches eating establishments. Mosquito repellent use by jail inmates who work outside. Licensed scabies treatment in jail and other residential housing units that we have at the County. Poison Ivy at camps and parks. Stinging insects, golf courses, which Ed Matthews will address in a little bit. Field crops from the County Farm.

A lot these things we didn't even envision would really be an issue but pesticides are used there. It's County property, as well as the jail and there's a lot of unusual circumstances that make pest control in jails a difficult situation. Weeds on highways, weeds at the airport to maintain their runways clear for safety reasons, weeds need to be kept under control. Guide Rails and signs on highways, weeds need to be kept under control and there are alternatives that are coming forward. It's just the timeframe to implement those alternatives and the research should really show that those alternatives are effective. It's still just emerging. These are emerging technologies. We're kind of on the cutting edge and just need a little bit more time to address those.

But I also wanted to emphasize that even though we're seeking this eighteen months extension, we're not just going to be sitting around waiting for that deadline to come. We really -- when we find alternatives that look like they'll work and that we can implement, we have already and the departments have already implemented those. We will be doing these on an ongoing basis. We just didn't want to come to you every few months and ask for either another extension or another exemption. We wanted to do it in a concerted educated manner.

In essence, Elsa Ford's testimony which I will hand you. I think the jest of what she was saying was that she wants this program, this phase out to work. And she also didn't feel that there was enough time to implement and enough research done on these alternatives to really implement these alternatives. And she also recognized that many of these alternatives use a lot more manpower and there are -- it takes time to get that in the works and the process. I'd like to turn it over to Bill Sanok from the Cooperative Extension to talk to you a little bit about some of the trials and research that they're conducting in concert with the CAC to look into alternatives

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

May I ask a question though? You're asking for a one-year extension, is that correct?

MS. JUCHATZ:

Eighteen months.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Eighteen months.

MS. JUCHATZ:

Eighteen months.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

And at the end of eighteen months, you'll have the answers to all the questions that you don't have answers to now? Or you would at least --

MS. JUCHATZ:

We hope to have solutions. There may be some that we don't have solutions for but at least, we hope to have a good idea of what, perhaps, if we need an extension or something else, not an extension, sorry an exemption, for that particular use that we would be able to offer them.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

The reason you want the extension is so you don't run right to exemptions?

MS. JUCHATZ:

Right.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Got it.

MS. JUCHATZ:

Right.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

That makes sense, okay.

MS. JUCHATZ:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay.

MR. SANOK:

Good afternoon. As Amy mentioned, I'm Bill Sanok of Cornell Cooperative Extension and since we've been able to employ a couple of staff in our office to work on this project, we have a number of demonstrations that we started over the last couple of years and I want Jillanne Burns to just talk a little bit about it. She does have a prepared sheet to give you just a brief description of a number of these and I think that's going to be quite useful. But I think you're right. We are not looking for exemptions right now. Are we going to have a lot of -- oh, the answer is at the end of eighteen months, not all. But I think we're going to make some real good progress. A lot of progress has already been made and I think that's a critical thing. But with that, I'll turn it over to Jillanne and we'll be glad to answer any questions as we go along.

MS. BURNS:

Good afternoon. There's a lot of research that we've undertaken this year to look into alternatives to help out with compliance for this law. Some of the things that we've been working with is organic maintenance alternatives for the County Golf Courses, where we're testing alternative products and comparing those to some of the fungicide standards for disease control that have been used in the past. We're trying about fifteen different products at two different locations and we have some results on that, at this moment, but we're going to continue this until the end of this season. This was done last year on more of a limited basis. But this year, we're a little bit more extensive with that.

We're also working on the County Golf Courses with scouting for insects and diseases. We have two full time staff members who do that on the three County Golf Courses that are affected by the law. And they are looking into what the issues are, so that we can look into alternatives for some of the problems that we're dealing with. We also have some research out at the Suffolk County Farm where they're growing corn that feeds the animals that, in turn, feeds the prisoners of Suffolk County.

They are using herbicidal alternatives for weed control to grow corn using minimum and maximum cultivation practices and hopefully, reduce herbicide use.

We're also looking for herbicidal alternatives for County highways and right of ways using other types of products such as acidic acid, which is the lemon, vinegar, clove, oil, herbicidal soap and comparing that to roundup, which is the traditional use on County roadsides. Also for the airport, we had a demonstration where we used steam and hot water treatment, as well as propane flaming for the runways to control weeds there instead of using Roundup. And also a device called a Weed Seeker where it has an electric eye that senses the plants on the runway and then uses a directed application of Roundup and reduces herbicide use by about 80 percent.

In addition, my counterpart, Joyce Rodler. She works with County Office Buildings and the indoor structural pest. She was working with -- using black light, trapping and other types of sticky traps to control lady bugs in the Dennison Building, which isn't your traditional pest but has become a pest problem due to the sheer numbers that are there. And also working with stinging insect projects on outdoor County properties, where you have to worry about risk to people who are visiting these County properties and being stung by insects, as well as the people who work on them and also in the prison areas. So these are just a couple of the projects that we're doing and we are looking into the priorities and trying to look for other alternatives where they exist and that's where we stand with it at this point.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Jillanne, have we had any successors where we're saying this organic will now replace that pesticide?

MS. BURNS:

At this point, it's kind of -- a lot of these projects are like in the midst of being done right now and so it's hard to say, statistically, we know where everything stands. But there are a couple things that look like they're holding some promise but we're still waiting on those.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So we'll have our first round of alternatives probably next spring?

MS. BURNS:

Where we have some more answers to what these tests yielded and where we can go further with this? Yes, I think that by the time of the annual report is written we'll have some more data for that. There's another thing that we're dealing with and the situation is that there's a lot of areas where we could probably make recommendations as to processes that will work. But then, it's difficult for the County to implement those without additional funding or staff members. And so we know of some things that would probably be helpful, especially when it comes to structural repairs for structural pests and things like that. But it's going to take some additional resources.

MR. SANOK:

I'd just like to comment on that. Joyce who is at the end of the table here was able to get a DEC Grant for about fifty thousand dollars working with Bob {Frebally} and others and they're looking at structural methods of pest management, putting on screens, covers for garbage things. Things that are very practical common sense but are not always in place.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right.

MR. SANOK:

Thermal curtains other things. So there are some real successes there and I think that's something that -- and Joyce is passing out one of the brochures that's coming out of this project and that is a whole list of alternatives to pesticide. So some of them are rather cute and if you really want to see something interesting, look at our Web Site at Cornell Cooperative Extension. She has a nice thing on ants and ladybugs and a few other things and so we're making a lot of progress and if you're looking at positive progress, I think it's certainly there.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Ladybugs are certainly taking a beating today. Right, I never heard of them in the pest category.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Can I just say --?

MS. RODLER:

I mean, those are the projects we're doing right now. We have a couple more projects that we haven't started yet for the season working with controlling powdery mildew on pumpkins using biological controls and also {enteropathogenic} nematodes, which are like little worms that control grubs on the fairways that we're going to try. So if anybody ever has any questions, you know feel free to contact us to find out more about this and hopefully that synopsis will be helpful to give a general overview. But I'll turn this over to Ed Matthews now because I think he has some things to say about the golf courses.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Does anyone else have any questions for Jillanne?

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

What kind of a grant was it? It was Joyce.

MS. RODLER:

It was a New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. They offered fifty thousand-dollar allots fifty thousand-dollar grants for non-toxic alternatives to pesticides in both the structural repair category and educational category and once you have it in your hand, it's just a portion. I've got a video that's being worked up right now that's going to coincide with this and magnets and this is going to be a big educational push. It's going to be distributed to the libraries, to the schools. I'd like to even come up with a yellow page ad to go along with this sort of thing and also the repairs, there are three major repairs made in the County in accordance to this grant. There was an {aircrim} that was installed over at the minimum security in Yaphank. We did, let's see I think, there were screen doors purchased for the Yaphank County Farm and the third one was the Police Headquarters. There's a bird exclusion project going on there because they have a problem at the entrances with nesting and problems associated with bird infestation. So all of these issues have been addressed through this grant and like I said, this is in the works now and by October the video should be finished and out and I'll be glad to get you a copy.

MR. MATTHEWS:

My name is Ed Matthews. I'm with Suffolk County Parks. As you can see, we've been making a lot of progress on many fronts. The most important change, I think, in terms of progress with the way we're operating the golf

courses, in light of this legislation is for the first time we're making data driven decisions. That data is being generated in large part through the help of Cornell University, the scouts they have in the field and the research they are doing out there. It's a non-advocacy approach that they're taking, so they're not suggesting names of products but they're identifying, you know physical changes and the kinds of things that we should be trying.

There are several areas where we've made progress over the last two years. One is physical changes to the golf course. These physical changes are to improve for the most part, the permeability of the soil. Water is probably the worst thing on the golf course because it promotes disease, both the lack of water and too much water. So we have a new irrigation systems, almost complete at all three of the golf courses. Timber Point is the one that's not totally complete yet because of the ongoing construction. But that has helped tremendously in our control of water on the course. To help with drainage, we've incorporated some of the suggestions made by the United States Golf Association. We contracted with them last year to do research or one-day studies on each of our courses. And we've implemented some changes in changing the soil characteristics by doing core aeration and top dressing with pure sand and doing a lot of things to the soil to improve the water's ability to drain through.

We've done a lot of tree removal this year to improve the light penetration to the greens and air circulation. It's another physical change, which is part of the organic approach rather than just treating disease, we're trying to change the conditions to keep disease at a minimum. Over seeding is another operation. It's expensive but it's a way for us to compete with leaves and it's twice a year, we're over seeding the courses, from the greens to the fairways to the tee boxes and that's had a very beneficial effect, especially, since last year we had one disease which wiped out one variety of grass at our Indian Island Course. All of the rye grass was wiped out by a disease, so we changed the species, again, based on USGA recommendations and we have a good healthy disease resistant strain of grass out there.

Reconstruction is one thing we did on a couple of the greens where we had a drainage problem and we hired a professional company to come in and improve the structure of the green to improve the drainage and that was at Indian Island. Those were two greens that were traditionally very disease prone and required repeated pesticide applications. So those are the physical changes that we've made. We have implemented a number of alternatives on all of our golf courses. Fertilization has gone to -- from an inorganic to organic based and we have two contracts with two natural fertilizer companies and we have had very positive results. We're using organic wetting agents. We're using probably the only bio-pesticide out there that's an organic fungicide and it's actually labeled as such and we've applied that on all of our courses. It's the kind of a product where it may take two or three years before we see the results. But we've made a commitment to apply that product and see if we can colonize the root zone and make those microbial changes in the soil, which we're told are going to improve the conditions and disease resistance.

We're going to try -- we've ordered a leaf hardening material. It's potassium silicate, which is supposed to make the actual grass harder on the greens and more resistant to ball marks and wear and tear, as well as allowing the grass to be cut at the same height or maybe even a little higher and keep the ball roll at a very high speed. We're using soil amendments, which again, are organic. They're combinations of wetting

agents, bio stimulants and growth stimulators and we're going to be trying some of the products that Cornell is going to be testing this year for grub control. We've contracted with the Town of Islip through the County contract for compost. We're going to be using the compost this fall, doing a combination of compost, tilling it into our barren areas and using drought and disease resistant fescues. That will also help reduce run-off, which is a potential route for pesticides and nitrogen to get into the waterways. We've tried some {compostees} compounds. It wasn't real scientifically based last year because we weren't really on line with Cornell but we've tried {compostees} some {biostimulants} and some liquid fertilizers. This year we're really using more of an organized approach.

In terms of toxicity, we're down at the very lowest level of products allowable under the law for toxicity. We went from the danger to the warning and this year we're using the caution label products. We've had relatively good results up until a very hot period a few weeks ago and in that case, we did have to use our emergency provision to control the disease. That's the a -- and we only needed that on two golf courses. Indian Island is still relatively disease free and that's being monitored on a regular basis. Basically, I would say the reason that I see as a need for an extension at this time, is the ongoing research that Cornell is doing on our courses. The results of that are going to be very valuable.

There's another study being done at Bethpage State Park. It's a joint project between the USGA and Cornell University and New York State to test cultural practices and agronomic practices on the entire eighteen holes of the green course. That's a three-year study. At the end of that three years, we'll hopefully have some good data to make a decision based on management plans -- based on. The other reason, I guess and more critical to me is the staffing issue. If we are pushed into making a full organic program next year, even if we knew what we could use, our current staffing levels are so low, we would not be able to implement such a program. We're currently between six and seven full time employees at each golf course and the USGA has recommended between twelve and fifteen using traditional methods and other people that have tried going organic have had to double that amount. So that's one issue. The other is equipment and we're not sure what approach to take, so we don't know whether we should be buying {compostee} brewers or {hydroject} units or you know, which match up between equipment and manpower would really be most effective using taxpayer's dollars at this time. So that's where we are now.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, the golfers have questions. But first, you have to give your last three posted scores and then --

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

A hundred and ten, a hundred and fifteen and one thirty five. So I'm about a fifty handicapper right now. The staffing levels? Is that because you can't get people or they're not the authorized positions?

MR. MATTHEWS:

Those are existing titles.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

So basically, we've only authorized whatever it is, five, six, seven people at each golf course when the USGA would recommend having somewhere between twelve and fifteen?

MR. MATTHEWS:

That's correct.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Okay.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I dare not publicly speak of my scores. Question for Commissioner Scully. Since we're talking about staffing, we're at that time of the year when the department heads have presented their budget request for the County Executive who will be submitting it to the Legislature about five, six weeks. What has the department submitted, in terms, of staffing requests given the statement by Mr. Matthews?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You can use the podium.

MR. SCULLY:

Whichever you prefer.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Join us.

MR. SCULLY:

Thank you Legislator Caracciolo for your interest. And as I've said to the committee before, certainly we, in the department, we appreciate the challenge that the Legislature and the County Executive are facing, in terms, of the need for long term fiscal stability. The County Executive in an all department head memorandum to the Commissioners directed that two budget scenarios be submitted for a review by the Budget Office. One of which would essentially be a no growth budget and the second of which would provide for a 4 percent reduction in expenditures. So that in case the financial conditions were such that they needed to consider those types of reductions, they would be able to do that. So our budget submittal itself did not propose any significant or any real addition. In terms, of golf course staffing.

The one thing that you should know that I think is important is that we do have an application pending. We were solicited along with the other departments, which have any related projects by the Planning Department, which suggested that we submit an application for funding under the Water Protection Fund, which is a component of the new Quarter Percent Sales Tax Program, which is specifically aimed at funding projects, which will protect surface waters. And after discussing the possibility with the Planning Department, we determined that the organic maintenance practices at the golf courses on Peconic Bay and the Great South Bay would, in fact, lead to a reduction in nitrogen loading and pesticide loading into those bays and we have an application for funding pending now. I'm not certain if any department would know better precisely where in the process that is. But if the application were approved in whole or in part, it would provide funding for us to undertake some of these organic maintenance practices both in terms of supplies, equipment and some additional staff.

But in direct response to your question about what we requested and what we submitted to the County Executive, we didn't request any additional staff. Although we were provided with additional positions in the 2001 Operating Budget as compared to the year prior. There have been some delays in hiring as a result of fiscal concerns. But the other issue that we face, quite frankly, is the difficulty in finding individuals who are interested in employment at that level.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Entry level.

MR. SCULLY:

Right, at the starting salary. So that's an honest -- maybe that's too much information for you in one shot but I think that's a complete answer to your question. I'm sorry if I went on too long.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That's quite all right. But this is an important issue and as Mr. Matthews points out, based on recommendations of others, the experts, we would need to staff each course with probably, given our current levels, four times the amount of people that we presently have. So instead of having five to seven, we would need somewhere in the area of twenty to twenty four. That's a significant increase and one that not only we but the Executive has to be cognizant of, if we really want to move forward with this program. To say that's one of the reasons by Mr. Matthews, of why this committee is requesting an extension and I picked up on the Chairman's remarks early on, it's an extension. We're not looking to repeal or eliminate and it sounds like a reasonable request. If we don't provide staff, how long of an extension would the golf courses need to meet compliance?

MR. SCULLY:

Let me answer in general terms and if Mr. Matthews has anything to add, I'm certain that he'll feel comfortable to chime in. We've been at the front lines of this battle, as you well know and we appreciate your continued interest in that. But we do -- one thing we want more than anything else is for this program to work. The key ingredient we see a need for right now is time. We have appreciated the attention of Legislators who understand that additional equipment and staff and supplies are necessary and we're hopeful that will lead to a situation where those needs are met. For me to attempt, at this time, to make some sort of estimate as, in terms, of how much more time would be needed in the absence of those resources, it would not be a reasoned, a reasoned estimate on my part and I don't think I'd be doing the question justice by trying to answer it. But for those of Legislators, who are less familiar, it's -- what it means, in terms, of supplies and equipment and people is just more. And a good example that we use may be over simplified but it's a good one nonetheless is the organic fertilizer that we're utilizing.

As Mr. Matthews indicates, we're doing pretty well with that material. Last year we learned that it's not an instant effect material as compared to the chemical fertilizers. It's somewhat weather dependent and that took a little bit getting used to but the most striking thing about it is that a single application of the chemical fertilizer that we utilize for an eighteen hole course will require about fifty bags of material. That means enough personnel and equipment to spread fifty bags of material, enough space in your storage facility to store fifty bags of material and transportation from your storage facility in Riverhead to the other courses for fifty bags. The same treatment, the same treatment of an inorganic fertilizer requires two hundred bags. So you need four times as much storage space, four times as much transportation, four times as much equipment and that much more staff time. So it's just an issue of it taking more time.

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

Overall though, you're talking about a budget somewhat or may be significantly higher than the department has been accustomed to managing for, at least, golf course maintenance. We're not talking about grounds and facilities yet. That said, between now and the time this committee and the Budget Committee meet in October to deliberate and make recommendations for next year's Operating Budget, I would like to encourage you and the committee to put together some cost estimates, so

we have an idea, at least, from the expenditure side and the staffing side, what it is we must provide, in order to have an effective organic program. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Commissioner, I appreciate your comments with regard to the additional cost of the organic golf courses and we have understood at the outset that it would be far more expensive to run the organic golf course. So we have sat on committees now for three years where this has been an issue of discussion and we need to staff the golf courses in order for this to work. And this being the state of the art project, because there aren't too many fully organic golf course nationwide. That's my understanding. It would seem to me that we would be ripe for more grant requests. Do we have someone? Joyce, congratulations on your grant but do we have someone who is actively seeking grants? I know that your staff is stretched to its limit but are we looking for grant monies to come in to help us with the staffing intern programs, more partnerships? Cornell Cooperative Extension is wonderful; they're a great partner but more partnerships?

MR. SCULLY:

I can speak to the issue from a departmental standpoint and perhaps some of the other members of the committee or Mr. Matthews may add additional information that would be of value. You may be aware that the Legislature, last year, during the budget process added a position to the department's budget for a grant writer or a grant analyst and we have been authorized to move ahead and to fill that position if we'd like in September and we may well do that. One of the problems we have, quite frankly, is that we don't have a place to put the person physically, space limitations in West Sayville being what they are for those who are familiar with Meadows Edge. It's very tight. So we have a position in the budget. We don't have a person on staff at this point who is doing that on a full time basis. And most importantly with respect to grant applications and for people who are more familiar with situations, in which this is not true, they could add the information. But most of the grants I'm aware of are usually for capital improvements or other one time expenditures and not for operating costs, per se.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Some of the work that Ed has described, right? Ed Matthews has described -- has involved some research issues as well. Is that not so? Wouldn't it be helpful to have some research people who are involved with this? I mean, more research people, I know we already do.

MR. SCULLY:

Right, I'll defer to the other folks on the panel who are much more familiar with the research people.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

We need day to day operating staff. We need the upkeep but we need -- go ahead, I'll let you answer that.

MS. RODLER:

Actually, I'd like to respond, in terms, of research partnerships. At this point, I've been working with a lot of the research for the golf courses and I've been partnered with Cornell University in doing that. Also, Cornell University has been partnered with the USGA and that's where they got the grant to try these alternative methods at Bethpage Golf Course and they've used Bethpage because they had the staff to go through with this process where they could just tell them what they need done, come down

and supervise it but they didn't have to actually do the actual work and at that moment, the County was concerned as to -- since we are the people who are going through this actual phase out period and Bethpage got the money and they don't have to do it at this moment. Why would we not be involved in having this project at the actual County courses and their response to that was that the County courses did not have the staff to follow through on such a grant request and so that's why Bethpage did it and also because it would be a focus of attention because of the Open being held in 2002. So we're working with some different groups to try and you know ferry research but sometimes that's a little bit challenging so --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

So what you're saying is that we're caught in not getting the money because we don't have the money to staff in order to attract the money to expand.

MS. RODLER:

Right, because a lot of these grants are going to require the labor to actually do the grant work and I have two staff. Those are the people who are scouting the golf courses but under seasonal. So if we want to carry something through for a whole season, we're going to need to get people who can carry through the grant money.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Wait, I'm going to -- I have to keep it moving.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Oh, all right. But our issue here is that if we don't get more staffing, it would deprive us of getting an influx of money.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You and Legislator Caracciolo brought that out very well.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mr. Bishop, I just wanted to add we have been successful working with the Metropolitan Golf Association in getting two summer students through a program called Golf Works. The County is able to hire students who have an interest in future -- you know working on golf courses but they're economically deprived and it's a two for one deal. MGA pays for, you know, half their salaries. So we do have two students, high school students.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I want to move down the line because I want to -- now we're going backwards.

MS. JUCHATZ:

Going backwards now. I just wanted sort of conclude a little bit but also make sure the focus of the staffing discrepancies has been on golf courses. But I just want to emphasize that that really pertains to not just golf courses but DPW and their work and inside buildings and Bob {Febaly} if you have any questions is here answer those as well as outdoor highways, all these alternatives, even the people who are selling these alternatives are telling us it takes more people more time, etc.,

Lorraine Hickey is here from Highways, if you have any questions, you know, regarding that as well. I also wanted to raise the question to you

that was -- that came to us at the Department of Health Services and that came about when we were discussing how to handle lice and scabies. Something that we didn't really realize that the treatment of these diseases require the use of pesticides. They're sold as drugs but they are pesticides under the definition of the law. We have a concern that we've worked with the CAC to come up with a solution for lice and scabies but we have a concern that there may be other health related problems similarly that where you just haven't identified or having come forward to us at this point and we felt that the law is a little bit vague, ambiguous, in terms, of medical treatment. It seems to exempt use of insect repellents on the person and so to us that means that it also meant to exempt the use of other pesticide products on the person. We feel that we need an exemption so that we're not interfering. The County is not interfering with the practice of medical care and we would like that to be a consideration.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. So you want eighteen months, an exemption for medical care upon a person?

MS. JUCHATZ:

Or just medical treatment, medical practices, an exemption for that.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman? That brings up an interesting question where we're going to have to involve the County Attorney's Office too, because anytime you do anything to a prisoner, you have all kinds of rights and things like that so -- to really get a full understanding of the problem that has just been outlined. We're going to need the County Attorney, plus I would think that our Chairman of the Health Department, not Chairman but the Commissioner of Health.

MS. JUCHATZ:

Yes. Just to let you know, we have been working with -- well Jenny Kahn from the Law Department has come to just about all of our CAC meetings and we have also sent a request to them for a determination of whether particular sides were covered under the law or not and it was upon her recommendation that we seek --

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

I'll make one more suggestion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Going back and doing the eighteen months. What she's saying is why don't we clarify this?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Yes, plus I would make a suggestion and involve the public defender in any discussion you have on that. Because that's who ultimately would be called in if there's a challenge to what's being applied.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Do we want to continue? Unless we have questions, is that correct? Do we have questions? I have one last question, I'm sorry. Commissioner Scully, can you join us again for a moment? Well, let me ask broadly. Is the law working in general? Since we're going back to provide the eighteen-month extension and to clarify the medical issue, is there anything else that needs to be changed in the law while we're in there tinkering?

MS. JUCHATZ:

There were a couple of recommendations that the CAC had voted on to amend the law that were given to Meagan O'Keefe from your staff.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay.

MS. JUCHATZ:

I believe that --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

And so we have them?

MS. JUCHATZ:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

And they're unanimous?

MS. JUCHATZ:

Yes, I do not believe that any -- I think all of our votes, to my recollection have been unanimous.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So then I would say that that law is working since the exemption or the emergency exemption.

MR. SANOK:

Mr. Bishop? I think of any advantages we've seen over a couple of years on this thing, it's made us all and the departments work together, whether it's Cooperative Extension with the various departments.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

And you have Elsa Ford now acting as a team player, which to me is --

MR. SANOK:

Well, we've got a couple other people too and no one is shy about it but I think --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I gave you the hardcore advocates to work with and it seems to be working well. So that's very interesting. My question Commissioner is you say that you're applying for -- the Planning Department asked you to apply for a grant from our own Quarter Cent Program?

MR. SCULLY:

Yes, because the Water Protection Fund is aimed at and forgive me, I don't believe I have the legislation here aimed at funding projects, which have as their purpose a reduction of runoff of both chemicals or --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Making the application too. I understand what you're saying.

MR. SCULLY:

The Planning Department solicited expressions of interest and then formal applications from the Operating Departments in the County and --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

To who?

MR. SCULLY:

To the planning, they're being reviewed by the Planning Department now.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I don't understand. Well, just as a preliminary manner say I would be very wary of a resolution that seeks to use the Quarter Cent Fund to fund positions in the Operating Budget. I don't think that was the intention. In other words, you're subsidizing the General Fund then, of course.

MR. SCULLY:

Well, I guess you could make that argument more --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I mean, it's supposed to be for investment, for a type of capital type investments, not to --

MR. SCULLY:

I don't think that the law itself is specific in that regard. But the only thing I would say in direct response to the subsidizing in the General Fund comment is that the positions we seek are not positions that are now funded in the Operating Budget because they don't currently exist. We're looking to add to our staff to meet this challenge. The direct result of which would be to reduce nitrogen loading or runoff of pesticides into the Peconic Bay and the Great South Bay and upon looking at the law, we felt that that was entirely consistent with the intent.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I think the equipment for that would gladly be funded out of that but the actual bodies, year to year? That should be from the Operating Budget.

MR. SCULLY:

But that's what we did and we respect where policy is made in this County. We don't have any allusions about that.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Ah, charmer you.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I want to sit with that issue for a moment. Counsel, could you perhaps address the issue as to what -- because this has come up in a number of different forums as to the water quality component and what it can and what is not permissible to use that category of funding for?

MR. SABATINO:

If you're in the water quality component, which is the eleven point two five percent component, as long as the activity fits into one of the categories, there's about twenty categories. This sounds, just from memory, like it's one of those many categories, then it would be an appropriate expenditure of money.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Including annual staff requirements?

MR. SABATINO:

Well, annual up to thirteen years. You only have thirteen years worth of --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

The legal question is not whether it's appropriate. It's a legal question.

MR. SABATINO:

It's legal, yes. The key is not that it's staffing. The key is whether or not

the category of activity to be remediated is one of the categories that is eligible for remediation. I believe this is from memory but I want to look at the exact language.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Vito Minei, did you pick that up? Talking about your baby, Water Quality Protection. Well, you may want to take a hint or two from the dialogue that just took place. Okay. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you all. I appreciate it. Good job. Keep the consensus moving. Okay, all right. Let's go back to the cards. I understand we have an elected official among us. Is Supervisor Sherman here?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Former Supervisor.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, he's former? Well, he's -- once an honorable, always honorable. Once honorable, always honorable.

MR. SHERMAN:

Thank you sir. I'm here to talk today about the acquisition of five and a half acres of property on Shelter Island. It's the Rasmussen property and the reason that this is critical; I don't if you can see this map very well or not. But this is kind of right in the middle of Town and it's surrounded by a lot of half acre, quarter acre, three quarter acre parcels and as you know, on Shelter Island, everybody has their own well and their own septic system. So it's critical that any of the open spaces we keep open. The two big green pieces are a parcel that have been protected. There's thirty-five acres that the Town purchased in the 1960's, because this whole thing sits right over the prime aquifer of the Town. This piece over here is twenty-two acres that the Town and the County just recently purchased as a fifty-fifty partnership for again, for groundwater protection. And the piece that we're trying to -- that we're recommending today for approval is a five and a half acre piece in the middle, which is a bridge between these two parcels to leave that as open space and the Town is also looking to put a trail system between these two -- these three systems. Another piece over here that they own and a larger piece to the north that they own. So that they can have a trail system through the whole thing to keep it -- always keep it open. Always keep it so it can't be built on but have it all connected.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right, it makes sense. Director Grecco, the Quarter Cent Program, Shelter Island is a non-pine barrens Town. Did they exhaust that aspect of the program? Do we still have a balance there?

MR. GRECCO:

Correct me if I'm wrong? I thought this was coming under the new Quarter Percent Program.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It probably is but if there's a balance we can change it now.

MR. GRECCO:

Oh. I'll tell you what their balance is in a moment. Probably a dollar ninety-eight but I'll --

MR. SHERMAN:

We have an appraisal on this piece that's almost a year old and it appraised at four hundred and fifty five thousand and she has agreed to sell it at four hundred thousand. So it would be two hundred and change from both the Town and the County.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, okay it's a partnership then.

MR. SHERMAN:

Yes, it's a fifty-fifty partnership. We need to do some survey work. We need to do the environmental. So it probably will be two hundred and five from the County --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Make up the five thousand from your balance.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Is there a gap in that? That's going to create a bridge but it --

MR. SHERMAN:

There's a -- it goes across the main road and then there's another lot that we're trying to buy, so that we can have a total -- there is a gap in it.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Right now, okay, good.

MR. GRECCO:

Twenty five thousand is in their account.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

This is Caracciolo's district. We'll probably want to put that twenty five thousand dollars towards it as well. Right, okay. That will leave more room for --

MR. GRECCO:

Assuming we can make an acquisition, we can always do another resolution to --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes, you're in favor of this; the administration is in favor?

MR. GRECCO:

Yes, I spoke to Mr. Sherman on this.

MR. SHERMAN:

The Town has passed a resolution saying that they'll put up their fifty percent.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Understood.

MR. SHERMAN:

They would go.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Thank you. Unless you more questions?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Actually, I have and Tom is here. I have a general question?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Not on -- okay not from Mr. Sherman?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

No. A while ago I had asked or and I didn't ask him to do this but I had some discussions with our Legislative Counsel Paul Sabatino, about establishing some criteria for all of our purchases and trying to prioritize them and things like that. Where would this fit on a priority basis? In a whole scheme of things in Suffolk County as far as purchasing property.

MR. ISLES:

Well, this one would rank pretty high up there. This was approved by this committee at the last meeting and resolution number 1499 and was then re-submitted apparently by Legislator Caracciolo, because of the lack of funding under the original program under Land Preservation Partnership. So this would be a new program and at this point much of it unspoken for. So we recommended at that time, based on many of the points that Mr. Sherman pointed out. But if you're asking a question, in terms, of Countywide? There's no simple ranking system to say of all the parcels under consideration in the County and this would be thus but I can tell you that based on the criteria of the proximity to existing County land, the piece we just bought, in terms of the importance, in terms of groundwater, this piece would rank fairly high in this location.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Okay, thanks. Just one quick question of Legislator Caracciolo. I know tomorrow and unfortunately, I'm not going to be able to be there, you're holding a hearing on some kind of priority or ranking system for acquisitions? Is that true?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

It's not a hearing, per se. What it is it's a group of environmental organizations, Mr. Isles and other interested parties in County Government. We've been meeting now for about five weeks. And we are working on putting together a resolution to continue the County's long standing commitment in environmental protection and allocate priority projects and funding under the new Quarter Percent Program, so that the Division of Real Estate would continue to be able -- would have a supply, if you will, of funding to continue the ongoing work.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Okay, so this is something different then what I was talking to Legislative Counsel about. Okay, so I might pursue that.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Just if I could Mr. Chairman, make a quick announcement regarding that meeting. It's at 11:00 a.m. We are also meeting tomorrow with the officials from New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation. They are bringing down a number of their staff at eleven. Well, the committee, the Ad Hoc Committee that's been meeting is ten and then at eleven, the EFC will join us.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Also at ten, if you want to come down we're interviewing the MTBE attorneys.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. All right, next we'll take the people who are here to talk about the Forestry Council Resolution. Mr. Murray, Mr. Mullarkey, Mr. Steibel. Mr. Sympson, are you part of that as well? Come on up at this time. Are they on opposite sides of the issue? Sympson, Murray, Mullarkey and Steibel. Bill come on up. You're all on the same side of this issue?

MR. MURRAY:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right, it makes it easy.

MR. MURRAY:

Good afternoon. My name is Joe Murray and I'm President of Forest for Tomorrow, a New York International Logging Lumber Company and I'm based in Huntington. I'm the principal proponent for this --

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Could you speak into the microphone please?

MR. MURRAY:

Sure. My company operates throughout the Mid-Atlantic and New England States as a log broker and marketing specialist. I handled nearly four million board feet of hardwood logs in the Year 2000. One and a half million board feet of that timber came from Long Island. This timber has come principally from Morganwood Tree Services, land clearers, excavators and builders. I'm a member of the Long Island Association of the Environmental and Energy Committee and the Empire State Forest Parks Association. I'm principal downstate spokesman for region one and region two and parts of region three for the Empire State Forest Parks Association.

There were three things that prompted me to become involved in this legislation. One was an article in Newsday and which back in March 3rd, 2001, in which an expert that is an arborist, consulting for a Town here on Long Island. It remarks about a three hundred-year-old tree, which was to come down and the article on the surface is fairly trivial probably to the casual reader. But, of course to me, it had a different significance altogether. And this consultant, an arborist, had been consulting with the Town for twenty years and it struck me that he was giving wrong information now for twenty years and that bothered me very substantially. He concluded this article and I won't give his name even though it's in the article, says that Elmwood is not good for anything, even though it's a hardy American tree, the wood is garbage. It will probably end up in the landfill or something like that. I think that sort of typifies to exactly where most people think of timber on Long Island.

The tree that they were referring to, as I mentioned, is a three hundred old tree; it was a ten-foot diameter. Now, this is actually very typical of lot of the timber we get from Long Island. A lot of the timber that comes from here is considered virgin old growth timber and actually for every tree that we get, we preserve between four and one hundred trees in the natural forest. And the reason for that is because of the size of them. So for every time we put a log on the truck, we are able to preserve what will be coming out of commercial operations. Just one of the other items that came to my attention was, of course, Asian longhorn beetle, which I'm sure you've heard of and the pine tree beetle, which you may have not heard of. There's already a voluntary quarantine requested for all pines coming from the entire New York State Region.

The third item, which bothered me as well, was an inquiry that I made to both the New York State, the DEC Regional Office and the County Executive's Office trying to get some simple information regarding forestry issues, where we might be able to sell wood, what's done with disposal. These were fairly routine questions, which you would be able to get through any department throughout New York State. I've yet to be able to get an answer from either one of their offices and the reason is because there's no information down here. It's really that simple. The initial inquiry to the County Executive's Office goes back to February 8th of this year.

Finally, there are two directions that are taking place in the forest industry right now in the United States. One is Green Labels, Echo Labels, Certification Systems. The other is that since the late 1970's, State Lands and Federal Lands have been closed regularly and routinely for logging. As a matter of fact, seventy percent of all the previously available lands are now closed. What this means is that timber comes from alternative and from private sources. One of the fastest growing areas for timber in the United States has now come to suburban sources. Long Island is just one of those suburban sources. But the alternative to what happens with timber on Long Island is waste. The tradition has been they cut it down, it goes to a landfill, it's left on site, it's rotten, it's chipped, serves no purpose. To me it just makes absolutely no sense. A lot of it is bad information. Some of it is no information and it seems like that that would be a terrible waste of especially these old growth virgin timbers.

The primary objective is to restructure the American derives it's -- it's potential is national and global scope, the fundamental goes to reduce deforestation by fifty percent, a significant factor in global climate change. I may also add that Legislator D'Andre was quoted in the Newsday on the CO2 bill that he thought one of the ways to reduce emissions was to plant more trees or reforestation, I believe, this is his exact words. I'm very much in favor of that.

On the Federal level, this Council would work with the Feds in seeking to obtain potential federal dollars that are out there. Create its own RC and D district. At present, we are coupled with the Hudson Valley, New York City and it is the largest populated RC and D district in the United States as a result. On the State level, the New York State DEC supports this Forestry Council. It is one aspect. Nassau County is also going to join this Regional Forestry Council. They've already prepared the bill and it's being prepared by the Presiding Officer and should be submitted and passed hopefully, by the end of August but it is moving forward. The State DEC Regional one is for this because they acknowledge that they don't have any records. They are also are hoping that by collecting data and doing the research that actually both Long Island and their departments may be eligible for additional State monies. So this would seem to make this a substantial amount of sense.

One of the things the Council will do will also make a wide variety of recommendations. It's in the legislation, I believe, in front of the resolution. One of the things that it will do will make revenue recommendations to County Legislature. Now, it's not a regulatory authority body -- your imagination that is retained in your hands. But these recommendations could potentially bring in between three and ten million dollars in new revenues for County Government. We think that that's a very substantial sum in light of recent financial considerations.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'm intrigued. How does it make three million?

MR. MURRAY:

I have several different proposals in which we listed them to the Legislature or assuming the Council is creating, which will be revenue raisers. There are several different possibilities, which we will work out. One of my proposals would be when tree companies apply for their County License. A special fee will be attached and what it will do, is it would assist them and the idea behind attaching the fee will actually be to promote conservation, provide perhaps instruction for the tree services on how they can recapture the money. Because any of these services tree services in particular, will be able to turn around and sell the timber, which they are presently not doing. So we don't see that this fee is going directly to us. We see that there's a particular recourse to this. It's also a possibility that if there are brown fields available that this industry would be very much interested in working with the County, in terms of acquiring those sites, for firewood, wood chips things of that nature. Also, we would probably be interested in working with the building industry and these various industries would be a part of the Council. So they would be adequately represented in attaching a fee to building permits as well. The particulars have not been looked at in that regard just yet but we'll take it one step at a time.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Speaking of -- or if you could elaborate on the last proposal, building permit fees? That's a function of Town Government.

MR. MURRAY:

Yes and that's why I say, the details haven't exactly been worked out just yet. There's -- one of the major problems that we've come across here on Long Island is that we have 95 Villages, several Towns, whether it's Nassau or Suffolk. They all have separate rules, regulations. Some of them have their own fee systems in here. Some of them have requirements for their own licenses. The New York State Legislature has an agreement and readership of both between the Senate and the Assembly, which will, in effect, streamline that process. They want to eliminate waste and the DEC will act as a member of this Council in looking over these various tree ordinance regulations. What we want to do is make one single license and fee uniform for everybody, so that they can work anywhere in this County or the next County under all circumstances. In regard to your specific question, I do not know the exact venue at this moment or how we will do that but I'm certain that it can be done.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Are there any existing Regional Councils in existence elsewhere?

MR. MURRAY:

Well, no this will actually be the first. But it's a critical issue. It is supported by the New York State DEC. It has been proposed by them. We believe that this is absolutely essential, in light of the battles going on now between the forest industry and the environmentalists, also when it comes to a head, as a matter of fact on August 7th, in New York City. The Forestry Council, which is a local authority, will help regulate these permits and Eco labels and so on by knowing the sources where they come from. We believe this is actually a solution to the problem rather than something aside from the problem. It would be the first one in New York State.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay, are there any in existence elsewhere in the country?

MR. MURRAY:

I could not tell you that exactly, no.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay. Thank you. Did you have --?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

I had a follow-up question to your question.

MR. MURRAY:

The questions that you do have for me and I'll be glad to answer them.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Yes, I had a follow-up question to that. Are there timber recovery projects that you know about that are in operation? What kind of mechanism would it be?

MR. MURRAY:

Well, what's happening now is I've estimated on Long Island that as much as twenty million feet of timber is, you cut on an annual basis from all these various sources. And at this moment, maybe about two million of it is recovered, which seems like an inordinately low amount. Regionally, which covers most of Southern New England and going to the Mid-Atlantic States, we estimate that as much as a hundred million more feet is cut each year. This timber is being wasted, landfill, firewood and so on. There is no mechanism to encourage getting this timber into commercial production. By the way, this amount, the amount that's cut for suburban and commercial, highway, municipal project development and so on, equals the entire amount of timber being cut in commercial operations throughout New England. So this is not an insignificant number and is a very great potential source of new timber and I might add that as a result of the Feds and the State's present forestry lands that finding new sources or keeping up with just current demand is absolutely essential. I don't have to tell you that the regional --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

But I want to just get back to my question. Are there models for timber recovery assistance?

MR. MURRAY:

No.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Where development? So this would be the first time that we're going to have the downing of trees for development or highway construction? This will be the first time that we're recovering that timber for commercial use?

MR. MURRAY:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay that would be the answer to my question. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

To follow-up on that question. Where is the market for that timber?

MR. MURRAY:

The principal market from the southern New York State area including all

of Long Island is Canada.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

So the type of wood --

MR. MURRAY:

Some of the trees, which come down here, go to Canada for processing and then are sold back to the United States.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay, so including with your estimate of twenty million board feet that's taken down on the Island that's Nassau and Suffolk County?

MR. MURRAY:

Yes but actually when you consider how the formula was calculated, it's very small amounts. There are about four hundred listed tree companies on Long Island taking a simple two trees per day, six days a week, ten months of the year, you come up to fifteen hundred of fifteen million board feet. That doesn't include any landscaping companies, which are involved, excavating projects, which are involved. It's just --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

It also doesn't calculate diseased trees that are taken down by tree companies?

MR. MURRAY:

Yes, well it doesn't calculate storm damage and a whole variety of various, so it's really an underestimate, which is the way I prefer to go on this.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

In terms of the species that are taken down? How much of that lumber is hard wood that can be used in commercial markets versus, you know, pine scrub and other types of woods that may not? I don't know --

MR. MURRAY:

I don't have an exact figure but from my own personal experience, I would say roughly half. It is also one of the objects of the Council to promote a {biomass} energy production. It's burning wood, wood chips. This is a -- it could be potentially very significant. The energy production is not what it used to be. It's now state of the art. It meets all the new CO2 standards and so on. It would help local municipalities, in that they gather a large portion of wood now for street work and storm damage and so on and a, to get rid of it. So one of our objectives would be to help and work with local government in reducing current expenditures, as well as promoting wood chips as energy. We've spoken to LIPA and to KeySpan on this subject. They have no problem with it whatsoever. So this is an initial area that we would like to keep working on. We believe that it would be very, very pro business and is part of the largest concern of the industry on Long Island.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Mr. Chairman, I have a question further to that. So what -- as I read this, I'm wondering about the actual mechanism. There is a builder who has to clear, who is clearing a piece of property. That person would be licensed or certified through the Council, the Forestry Council and then Council would connect him?

MR. MURRAY:

Long Island hasn't any licensing authority whatsoever. It would be simply with the County.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay but my question is about the mechanism?

MR. MURRAY:

Right.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay, this developer who has the licensing through the County, would then be in touch with the Council who would connect him with --

MR. MURRAY:

Right.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

A commercial entity that would purchase the trees that are being cut down?

MR. MURRAY:

Part of the program would be to educate the industry, the builders, the general public, in regard to timber recoveries. That would be one aspect of it. In terms -- to answer your specific question. What we would hope would happen, would be that on a specific building lot, if it were a new construction, perhaps and it was a densely wooded area, either a, yes it would be in contact directly with the Forestry Council or that perhaps in the way we envision it through the County as a part of a permit process, if it were heavily wooded, we would have notification of it. We might be able to assess a timber or a stumpage fee attached to that. And in order to encourage the builder to sell it rather than wasting it, we would charge a fee and then once he sells it; maybe perhaps give him a refund or a rebate of some sort. Again, these details haven't been -- it's simple to work out.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay and who would buy it from him?

MR. MURRAY:

There are good number of companies on Long Island, which --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Based on Long Island?

MR. MURRAY:

Participate with that and of course, the more we generate, the more buyers we'll get from off the island as well.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay and then those entities would ship that wood out to Canada to be processed?

MR. MURRAY:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Is that what you're saying?

MR. MURRAY:

Yes that's the principal market at this point in time, yes.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You're finished?

MR. MURRAY:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes, okay. Go ahead, please.

MR. SYMPSON:

Yes, I'm Bob Sympton. I'm here to get educated actually. I may volunteer in an organization called New York Relief and I've worked this folder because some people think I'm here selling Roloids. It's actually -- we believe in promoting trees and it's a Statewide organization and we have a Long Island Region Committee, volunteers that do hold workshops and promote efforts to plant trees and I'm not here to promote this Forestry Council. I would have great reservations or, you know concerns about it. I had thought maybe that this issue would be talked about from the committee's standpoint, not from our standpoint. But under the first resolve on page 9, what peaked my curiosity was what is a comprehensive tree-planting program for commercially {harvestable} tree street and residential trees? I don't understand that comment. Maybe you want to answer that?

MR. MURRAY:

I'd be glad to. Right now, there is to me -- a program in which -- there are several types of Tree Planting Programs. One is generated by LIPA and one is by the Towns. One of the plans with the Towns is that Town comes and plants a particular type of tree in your front yard and I can speak from this personal experience. The tree grows up. LIPA comes, cuts the tree, gives it center rot. The Town has to come and cut it down. So now, as taxpayers, we pay for the tree twice. Then as a ratepayer, we pay for the tree once. What we're recommending is that they use better trees, perhaps, different, slightly different location off the original spot and perhaps something that is usable that whenever that point in time is, if it's a hundred years from now that when it is cut down, each Town, County, Municipality would have the option to be able to use that and recover a certain amount of funds from when they do cut it. We're not advocating, so that you understand, cutting down any tree in any circumstance whatsoever. We're simply saying that if a tree comes down, let's use it. That's our approach.

MR. SYMPSON:

Well, I think, perhaps some of you know that we have lists of proper trees to plant in proper places and that's what our committee really is. One of our objectives to make sure that we're not planting Pin Oaks and Ginkou and things like that under wires, which several counties have done. And it's now costing a fortune to have to take them down.

MR. MURRAY:

So we would agree with that.

MR. SYMPSON:

And I would also agree that we need to move them off of those string

pieces and onto private property and clarify that issue. But there are very specific recommended trees for the County and for Towns to use and that's out there for everyone.

MR. MURRAY:

Can I interrupt? Apparently --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Actually, let's try to --

MR. MURRAY:

Okay.

MR. SYMPSON:

The other issue, of course, is wood chips and I'm totally in favor of recycling wood chips. I think the Counties and the Towns need to do a better effort at that. Whether it's selling or giving them away. You know, I think, we need -- our communities need to become more aware of the importance of really keeping them and not shipping them to Pennsylvania, whatever we are doing with them. And I just, as an aside, one of the issues that now seems to be prevalent throughout New York but certainly on Long Island and that is that the landscapers that are caring for trees, especially in the malls, have this thing about using mulch, which we call a volcano mulch. So I'm just sort of sending the message out here to this organization that you really better tell and license these people to mulch the trees properly, otherwise, you're going to have all kinds of disease problems and problems with your trees. They have these shapes now like this that are totally inappropriate.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Why wouldn't this Forestry Council help do things like you're talking about like get the word out to the tree trimming industry?

MR. SYMPSON:

I don't know whether you need a whole Forestry Council to do that.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We see a weary of it. What are we weary of?

MR. SYMPSON:

What am I weary of what? Of the Council?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes, what about this legislation gives you pause for concern?

MR. SYMPSON:

That's a good question. The Tree Planting Program, I would have questions of concern over that all right? There are a number of organizations including the local Forestry, there's only one Forestry on Long Island and he's part of this volunteer effort to promote the right tree. So if you were to call him, he would send you a list of the proper trees to plant. You know, I didn't understand the commercially {harvestable} street tree thing.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Your concern that there is a -- that the organization would be promoting the cutting down of trees for commercial purposes? Is that, in essence, why you're here?

MR. SYMPSON:

Yes, that's part of the problem. I just don't quite understand this Council.

That's why I came here to try to understand what this proposal is.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right, okay.

MR. SYMPSON:

I think it's far too nebulous for me to buy into, all right? And I'm a proponent of planting --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You're too nebulous and you're concerned that it's -- okay.

MR. SYMPSON:

All right? And the last thing, it was in the resolution in number 8, the second resolve of number 8. I guess it's number 8. There is only one Forester in DEC in this DEC One Region, Long Island and the last thing I would say is that if you eventually do have a New York -- you know a Regional Forestry Council that you would include some of the volunteers from New York ReLeaf, in the efforts for proper tree planting and education.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Have you met with Legislator Cooper or his staff?

MR. SYMPSON:

I have not.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay.

MR. SYMPSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you.

MR. STEIBEL:

I'm Bill Steibel from the Sierra Club and I represent the Atlantic Chapter. And when Gill Murray got into contact with me and started describing the situation, it seemed to me the sort of thing that is virgin territory for improvement. My purpose in coming here is twofold. One is to state that the Sierra Club is behind him 100 percent. We want to see him encouraged to bring order out of the chaos. The second thing I was interested in hearing the Legislators reaction to what Joe was saying. But essentially, I'm here only to support him. I cannot speak with the knowledge that he has but he sure as hell can teach me a few things and I'm tickled silly to listen to him. And I'm glad the Legislature is giving him this opportunity and I thank you.

MR. MULLARKEY:

My name is Martin Mullarkey. Marty Mullarky and like Bob Sympson next to me, I'm on the Board of Directors for the New York State Urban and Community Forestry Council. It's a relatively new Council. It's not an official body of New York State. It is -- works mainly with the DEC and the other regions throughout New York State. We are -- Bob and I are active in ReLeaf, New York State ReLeaf, Region One with the Long Island Council, we're both on the Planning Committee. I'm also on the Board of Directors for the Long Island Arboricultural Association and I'm a ISA International Society of Arboricultural, Certified Arborists.

I've been working with trees now for probably around five to ten, maybe around eight years and I'm aghast at the lack of knowledge out there. I support forming a Council. I'll say it right up front. I think it's too narrow. I think it's important that you got it this far. Whatever it took to get it this far is important. I see trees all over Long Island. Well meaning people planted Pin Oaks, Norway Maples, Bradford Pears and they planted them near wires, which is ridiculous. I happen to work for utility, have for close to thirty years. Recently, I found my way into the arboricultural field and well meaning people are causing two billion dollars to be spent every single year cutting down trees and throwing them away in landfills.

I attended a conference in Pennsylvania when somebody was talking about nationally; the type of problems you're talking about locally and it's something you don't even want to think about. All I can say is that we should be talking about planting the right tree in the right place. Bob alluded to a list that New York State ReLeaf has put together. We met with everybody who is anybody in horticulture on Long Island, including Cornell Cooperative Extension from Nassau and Suffolk, the local Arborists, the Long Island Gardener's Association, the Planting Fields Arboretum, Bayard Cutting and on and on and on. And we came up with this list okay? And we sent it around. LIPA has a Wire Friendly Tree Program to correct some of the things that were done wrong for many years. We try to encourage people to plant smaller trees, so that they will not grow up into the wires.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Mr. Mullarkey, on this bill?

MR. MULLARKEY:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You're for it but you have reservations? It's too narrow? Is that essentially --?

MR. MULLARKEY:

I believe the scope should be expanded.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Have you called Legislator Cooper? Have you met with him?

MR. MULLARKEY:

I've met with him, not on this issue. I only found out about this today.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

On this issue, okay. Fine that's --

MR. MULLARKEY:

And I have spoken to him on other issues. I have spoken to his Legislative Assistant and I'd be glad to do anything I can to help out to bringing this about. I don't want to see it drop.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Why don't we do this? We'll probably -- I'm going to ask that it be tabled and during the time that it's tabled between now and the next meeting, three weeks, you'll meet with Legislator Cooper. He'll hear your concerns and perhaps he'll change the bill to reflect them.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We're not going to not do a Forestry Council. I'm sure we're going to do a Forestry Council in the next, you know, few months. This particular bill might have to be adjusted to reflect some of the concerns. I thought this was a definite non-controversial issue. I'm proved wrong. So we'll table it. You'll meet with him and we'll take it from there. Thank you.

MR. MULLARKEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? It's tabled.

I.R. NO. 1667 Creating Regional Forestry Council for Suffolk County. (Legislator Jon Cooper)

VOTE: 5-0-0-2

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1667.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Oh, we should have taken it out of order. Okay. Imagine?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We'll do it again formally when it comes up on the agenda. That was just a test vote. All right, we have another speaker.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

You're kidding.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right, Mr. Tripp is here and Miss -- they may not be on the same issue. I think you're the last one in though. All right.

MR. TRIPP:

Thank you. My name is James Tripp. I'm here just to speak very briefly in support of 1599, which is the acquisition of a piece of land that I know of as the Novak property. It's about 25 acres. It borders on the West Side of the Carman's River. It's immediately north of the Camp Subago, the Girl Scouts Camp. It's a beautiful piece of land. I've been out there recently with Peter Scully. It's rich Pine Barrens, robust Pine Barrens. It's important not only for the protection of the Pine Barrens but the Carman's River. The Carman's River is a spectacular river. One of the four major rivers on Long Island. It was designated in 1972 as the State's first scenic and recreation river. The Town, the County and the State and the Federal Government have done a lot to protect the Carman's River and the Carman's River corridor starting, of course, with the work on natural wildlife refuge and the north of that Southaven County Park. And there are other pieces of land as you go up and down the eastern and west sides of the Carman's River that are in public ownership that are protected. But there are many parcels that are not and this is one of them.

Fortunately, we have a willing seller who contacted the Town; Annette Eaderesto had the good sense to ask the owner if he was willing to sell. The answer is yes. I am a member of the Town of Brookhaven Open Space Advisory Committee, which has recommended to the Town to

support the acquisition of this piece of property as a partnership acquisition with the Town putting up half of the money. I think it's worth noting that the Town through the Open Space Committee and the Planning Department and the County through the Parks Department are beginning -- are trying to look systematically at this river corridor to find out what parcels of land are out there that are not protected that should be.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Do you know what the appraised value roughly is?

MR. TRIPP:

For the Novak property? I think it's around five hundred thousand dollars but I may be wrong.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

There's no development on it?

MR. TRIPP:

There's no development on it. That's right. It's a beautiful piece of land and it will do a lot to protect the upper reaches of the Carman's River, which is a spectacular river. I'd recommend any of you to get out in a canoe in the upper river. So I hope that you approve the resolution. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you. Okay. Pam Schiel here? Pamela Schiel, are you outside waiting? Okay. To the agenda. Let's begin with CEQ. Run through that.

MR. BAGG:

All right, the first CEQ Resolution Number 46 is their recommendation on the legislative packet that went out on June 5th and June 26th, of 2001.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to approve by Legislator Fisher, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Approved.

CEQ RESOLUTIONS:

NO. 46-01 Proposed SEQRA Classifications of Legislative Resolutions laid on the table June 5, 2001 and June 26, 2001.

VOTE: 5-0-0-2 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

47.

MR. BAGG:

The next one 47-01 is a number of Type II Actions all relating to Parks. The first one is proposed installation of a playground at Indian Island County Park, Town of Riverhead. Counsel recommends the Type 11 Action because it's less than four thousand square feet.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is that it? Motion by Legislator Fisher, second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed? 47 is approved.

NO. 47-01 Proposed Installation of a Playground at Indian Island County Park, Town of Riverhead, Type 11 Action.

VOTE: 5-0-0-2 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is a proposed development of a master plan for Cedar Point County Park, Town of East Hampton.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

They're all 47?

MR. BAGG:

Well, CEQ put them all in one resolution; however, they're all separate projects. They're all Type Two's though.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Well, let's keep track of these. So the first one was --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Also, we shouldn't make a motion until you're finished.

MR. SABATINO:

They have to be treated separately. I don't know why CEQ does it this way but SEQRA has to have individual -- in fact, these will be converted into individual stand-alone resolutions.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I think the first one that was moved and seconded was about the playground.

MR. BAGG:

Right.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right, so that's number two actually. So you got to go back to number one, which is various proposed planning and improvements to County Park Facilities. That's the Omnibus title for all of them? Let's strike that one. Right, Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:

Right. The Chairman has it right. Strike what appears as item number two on that list and then your first vote was on Riverhead.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right, which we approved. Now we're at the third one, which is proposed development of Master Plan for Cedar Point. It's just a Master Plan?

MR. BAGG:

This is a plan to address campground design utilities, capital improvements and an inspection of existing structures. Counsel recommends that it's a Type 11 action since it involves conducting concurrent environmental engineering economic feasibility on the studies and preliminary planning of budgetary processes for the park. Approval of a Master Plan, they want to have monies to proceed with a Master Plan process.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, it's the money to study it?

MR. BAGG:

That's right.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It's not the plan itself?

MR. BAGG:

No, it's not the plan itself.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Got you. Motion by myself, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor?

Opposed?

NO. 47-01 Proposed Development of a Master Plan for Cedar Point County Park, Town of East Hampton, Type II Action.

VOTE: 5-0-0-2 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is a proposed installation of a Playground at Southaven County Park, Town of Brookhaven.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Fisher, second by Legislator Fields. All in favor?

Opposed?

NO. 47-01 Proposed Installation of a Playground at Southaven County Park, Town of Brookhaven, Type II Action.

VOTE: 5-0-0-2 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is the proposed development of a Master Plan to address Spillways, Culverts, Dams and similar Water-Control Structures in Waterways throughout the County again. It's a study to prepare such a plan.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Binder, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor?

Opposed?

NO. 47-01 Proposed Development of a Master Plan to address Spillways, Culverts, Dams and similar Water-Control Structures in Waterways throughout Parklands, Type II Action.

VOTE: 5-0-0-2 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is a proposed development of a Traffic Study for Cupsogue County Park.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

There's a lot of traffic at Cupsogue County Park?

MR. BAGG:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Well, we'll soon find out.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Caracciolo, second by Legislator Fisher. All in favor?

Opposed?

NO. 47-01 Proposed Development of a Traffic Study for Cupsogue County Parks, Town of Westhampton, Type II Action.

VOTE: 5-0-0-2 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is a proposed development of a Master Plan for Meschutt County Park in Hampton Bays, Town of Southampton.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Where's all this money coming from to do all these next -- motion by Legislator Fisher, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed?

NO. 47-01 Proposed Development of a Master Plan for Meschutt County Park, Hampton Bays, Town of Southampton, Type II Action.

VOTE: 5-0-0-2 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is proposed construction of a Sanitary Facility at Southaven County Park, Town of Brookhaven. This is a twenty-three by thirty-foot structure. It will replace an existing building that is no longer adequate to serve the family picnic area. Counsel recommends it a Type 11 Action because it's less than four thousand square foot floor area.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Binder, second by Legislator Alden.

47-01 Proposed Construction of a Sanitary Facility at Southaven County Park, Town of Brookhaven, Type II Action.

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

On the motion? I just want to ask the Commissioner a question.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Go ahead.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Well, I'm waiting for him to --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'm sorry.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

I remember these project names from a budget of a couple of years ago and these were the out year projects for these. Am I correct?

MR. SCULLY:

That might well be, in the instance of the Southaven Project. That is probably true.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Right, I remember that.

MR. SCULLY:

These bathroom projects have been in the departmental Capital Program since the mid 1990's and only now for a variety of reasons are now coming into fruition.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay, I thought they looked familiar. They didn't seem new to me. So I thought that they had gone back to that time. All right, thank you.

MR. SCULLY:

And again the funding would come before you separately. It hasn't yet been appropriated.

MR. BAGG:

The next is the proposed construction of a Sanitary Facility at Indian Island County Park, Town of Riverhead.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Jim, would you suffer an interruption? Commissioner, where is the funding coming from for these various studies?

MR. SCULLY:

We'll probably be coming before the Parks Committee with proposals to appropriate Capital Funding, authorized Capital Funding for the various purposes listed. The SEQRA Resolutions as you know are handled by CEQ.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Right, I understood that. Are these existing Capital Projects that would just need to be approved or would you be looking to offset Capital Program expenditures for the purposes of undertaking these studies?

MR. SCULLY:

In some cases, we would be looking to use offsets and we'd be coming back to the Legislature for authorization to do that.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

But the sanitary facilities were Capital Projects, which had been in the Capital Budget, had it not?

MR. SCULLY:

Yes, Legislator Fisher. That particular project is an approved project.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I would just add a little commentary with respect to that approach. One should consider when we undertake studies and Master Plans that we're going to come back and look for funding that part of the funding request is going to have to identify staffing needs and a commitment to provide and meet those staffing requests.

MR. SCULLY:

I think that point is very well taken and something that's been driven home to me over the past few months. So thank you for that.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Do you want to do the bridge?

MR. BAGG:

Did you cover the sanitary facility in Indian Island County Park?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All in favor? Opposed if we didn't. It's approved.

NO. 47-01 Proposed Construction of a Sanitary Facility at Indian Island County Park, Town of Riverhead, Type II Action.

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is a proposed replacement of existing bridge at Blydenburgh County Park, Hauppauge. Counsel feels this is a Type 11 Action because there's a replacement of a facility in kind on the same site.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Same size?

MR. BAGG:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by myself, second by Legislator Caracciolo.

NO. 47-01 Proposed Replacement of a Bridge at Blydenburgh County Park, Hauppauge, Town of Smithtown, Type II Action.

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is proposed construction of an extension to a Horse Shelter at Theodore Roosevelt County Park, Town of East Hampton. The purpose of this project is to provide a two hundred square foot extension for food service to park patrons who come to the existing facility for barbecues and evening programs during the summer months. Counsel feels again this is a Type 11 Action because it's less than four thousand square feet.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Question?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Commissioner isn't that a concessionaire setup there?

MR. SCULLY:

Yes, Legislator Fisher. The resolution would authorize -- I guess, this is a SEQRA declaration on the part of the Legislature in conjunction with a proposal by the licensee Deep Hollow Ranch to provide barbecue meals in conjunction with the --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

So they would pay for the construction?

MR. SCULLY:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

The County is not carrying that burden?

MR. SCULLY:

No, ma'am.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay, thank you. Motion.

NO. 47-01 Proposed Construction of an Extension to a Horse Shelter at Theodore Roosevelt County Park, Montauk, Town of East Hampton - Type II Action.

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is a proposed maintenance and repair to the Caretaker's House on the Chandler Estate, Mt. Sinai. Counsel feels this is a Type 11 Action since it involves maintenance and repair involving no substantial changes to an existing structure or facility.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Question? Commissioner, we had before us a resolution several months ago regarding the Chandler Estate for an expenditure of about, I think, ten thousand dollars? Is this in reference to that? Those monies that had been set-aside for the Chandler Estate?

MR. SCULLY:

No, I'm not familiar with that specific resolution. I think what we're probably going to do is coming back to the Legislature looking to appropriate certain money to make the Caretaker's House on this property livable, so that we can have a presence on that site where we currently don't.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay.

MR. SCULLY:

So no.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

What I recall was a management expenditure for Chandler Estate.

MR. SCULLY:

Creating an Advisory Committee and the original draft of that resolution, I think, included some funding for that committee. It was later amended by the sponsor, I think, to delete any appropriation but that Advisory Committee has been meeting, I think, they've had --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay, so they --

MR. SCULLY:

They're working on an overall plan for the property.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

It was just management. There was no construction expenditure involved in that resolution?

MR. SCULLY:

No, there wasn't.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay, I see, thank you.

MR. BAGG:

And then the last one again, deals with the Chandler --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Did we vote that one? I'm sorry.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

No, we hadn't.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'm sorry. I apologize. Motion by Legislator Fisher, second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed? It's approved.

NO. 47-01 Proposed Maintenance or Repair to the Caretaker's House on the Chandler Estate, Mt. Sinai, Town of Brookhaven, Type II Action.

VOTE: 6-0-0-0 APPROVED

MR. BAGG:

The next one is a proposed preliminary planning and budgetary process for the Chandler Estate, Mt. Sinai, Town of Brookhaven. Counsel feels that it's a Type II Action, since it involves conducting concurrent environmental engineering economic feasibility and other studies and preliminary planning and budgetary processes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Fisher, do you agree?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

I'm just reading it. It seems like a lot of -- this is just for Chandler Estate in general? Are we talking about the mansion Peter?

MR. SCULLY:

My assumption is I don't have the benefit of the resolution before me but, I guess, that this is a SEQRA declaration having to do with the planning work that the Advisory Committee is doing. They are going to get a SEQRA declaration in conjunction with that work because we --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I just want to understand. If we approve this, no work actually occurs other than the study. Is that correct?

MR. BAGG:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by myself, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed?

MR. BAGG:

If you read the rest, it says provided those activities do not commit the agency to commence, engage in or approve such action. It's simply a study.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay. Thank you Jim.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right and then that concludes 47.

MR. BAGG:

Right.

NO. 47-01 Proposed Preliminary Planning and Budgetary Processes for the Chandler Estate, Mt. Sinai, Town of Brookhaven, Type II Action.

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Number 48.

MR. BAGG:

The next project is the -- it involves a consent order issued by New York State DEC that requires a payment of a twelve thousand five hundred civil penalty with an additional twelve thousand five hundred being suspended with respect to Sewer District Number 18 in the Hauppauge Industrial Park. Counsel feels this is a Type II Action since it involves a consent order, which is a judicial requirement.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. We're paying a fine for what? Is there any --

MR. BAGG:

I believe that the sewer district is not up to standards and the Department of Environmental Conservation has issued a fine on the sewage treatment plant and this is to pay that fine, as far as the consent order.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Are we rectifying the problem?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Why don't we -- we'll table this and we'll have the Commissioner of Public Works, Jeannine, would you send a letter asking him to discuss that in any other fines that the DPW has received on our sewage operations in the last year? Just to understand what, you know, do we get fined regularly? Is it an expensive proposition? You get the jest of it?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

I think an answer is coming down the aisle.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes.

MR. KNAPPE:

Ken Knappe from the Budget Office. On that resolution involving Sewer District 18, I am aware that the County Executive's Office laid a resolution on the table at the August 7th, meeting for a payment. The twelve thousand five hundred-dollar fine is restitution and the other twelve

thousand five hundred is a condition if the Department of Public Works doesn't clean up and rectify the situation.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So we're paying twelve and a half and we'll pay twelve and a half more if we don't get it right?

MR. KNAPPE:

Correct. So we are rectifying the situation now.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay. That answers the question.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

But we still want to understand if we're incurring large fines on a regular basis for our sewage operation.

MR. KNAPPE:

I believe the Commissioner is or somebody from DPW will speak on this during the committee week before the next general meeting.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right, so it will be very appropriate at that time. Excellent, thank you Ken. So that's a motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? Well, it's concurrent. We'll do them both together, you know, at the next cycle.

NO. 48-01 Proposed NYSDEC Consent Order for Sewer District 18 - Hauppauge Industrial, Town of Smithtown, Type II Action.

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

MR. BAGG:

The next proposal, the project involves the installation of two ocean grounding beds comprising approximately one thousand seven hundred square feet, which will be a pertinent to the existing fiber optic cables in the area. The Park Trustees have approved the project and the New York State DEC has issued a tidal wetlands permit because it's not near tidal wetlands. No significant habitats will be affected and the area will be protected with straw bales or silk fence and will be re-vegetated. Counsel recommends that it is a Type II Action since it involves less than four thousand --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is this going up William Floyd Parkway like the other one that we had?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Michael?

MR. SCULLY:

This matter is before Ways & Means, which is dealing with the more substitutive issue of authorizing a license for the installation of these grounding beds, which would ground an existing cable installation and I think that the members of the Ways & Means Committee are --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

This is what I don't understand. I'm sorry to cut you off. How could laying cable in the ocean not be an action that requires study?

MR. BAGG:

Basically that was previously reviewed. All those cables are currently in place. There are three cables that go on the East Side of William Floyd Parkway through Smith's Point Park. There are three cables that go on the West Side, Fiber Optics Cables and I believe they have a license for the County that pays the County a certain amount of revenue.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right.

MR. BAGG:

The cable companies have decided that they need this grounding bed, in order to improve that existing facilities and that they were going to put it up at one of the intersections --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right but you understand my broader point? Isn't this like the essence, of why you have a SEQRA Study or an Environmental Study if you're going to disturb the ocean bottom and you're going --

MR. BAGG:

Well, this is going upland. This is going in the part of the park that is actually previously been disturbed and they're going to dig two trenches, approximately a foot apart and put these anodes in the ground.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'm not opposed to the underlying project. I just don't understand why it's not a Type I?

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Can I just say that --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Maybe I'm ignorant. I'm sure many people would agree that I am ignorant. But particularly on this question?

MR. SCULLY:

If I might?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes, you might.

MR. SCULLY:

I asked the same question upon being briefed on the SEQRA piece of it and the way CEQ approaches it. I think there are two threshold criteria. Mr. Bagg can correct if I'm wrong on which this was declared Type II. Number one, the grounding rods are an impertinence to an existing facility that's already in place and number two, the affected area is less than four thousand square feet. On both of those tests, the proposed action is such that it's declared Type II.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

If we were digging a new hole, it would be a Type I.

MR. SCULLY:

For a new project.

MR. BAGG:

Right.

MR. SCULLY:

But as I indicated -- but as it was explained to me, those are the two

criteria that were cited. But as I indicated earlier, you know, not to take more of your time than we need to. Ways & Means Committee has some significant questions about the project itself. So the SEQRA Resolution is really secondary to those concerns.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

There was some valid questions that were asked by the Chairman this morning and he had to leave and they weren't answered to his satisfaction yet. So we tabled it for another three weeks and I think that we should probably do the same thing on this one until his answer -- his questions are answered.

MR. SABATINO:

To take it a step further, it was tabled in Ways & Means in June, because there was no SEQRA review and the committee insisted that it go through this process. The reason you've got number 50 in front of you is because of the June action at the Ways & Means Committee took. Otherwise, you wouldn't even had the SEQRA.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

But honestly, it wouldn't be a bad idea if we were going to get, say, half a percent of whatever traffic came across these new lines, because of this action. But I don't think that's part of the deal.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is it the general consensus to table this?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Table the cable? Okay.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Table the cable.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table by Legislator Fields, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? 49 is tabled until the next meeting.

NO. 49-01 Proposed Ocean Grounding Beds at Smith Point County Park, Fire Island, Town of Brookhaven. Type II Action.

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

50 proposed restoration and renovation plans for Timber Point Clubhouse.

MR. BAGG:

This project involves the restoration, renovation planning monies for the Clubhouse and Golf Course only. Counsel feels it's a Type II Action.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Fields, second by myself. All in favor? Opposed? It's approved.

NO. 50-01 Proposed Restoration and Renovation Plans for the Timber Point Clubhouse and Golf Course, Town of Islip, Type II Action.

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. That concludes SEQRA's, CEQ. To the agenda. 1596 the Executive's Office informs me that we need to table this. There are concerns on the way it's written from the Department of Law. Motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? 1596 is tabled.

INTRODUCTORY PRIME:

I.R. NO. 1596 To modify procedures for purchase of Pump-out Vessels. (Legislator Angie Carpenter)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1599.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

This is the --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Counsel, do we have a --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

A planned property with the willing seller.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

On the motion, Mr. Chairman? Do we have a Town Board Resolution?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We have a Town Board Resolution.

MR. SABATINO:

The Town Board Resolution from December 19th, of 2000.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Has the administration reviewed this and support it?

MR. ISLES:

Yes, the Planning Department reviewed it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Enough, yes.

MR. ISLES:

The only issue we'd point out, the Parks Trustees has also recommended it. This is coming in at Preservation Partnership, which at the moment is oversubscribed. But pending availability of funding.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right. Well, we approve it and then when you get the money, you can make a move on it.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Caracciolo, second by Legislator Fisher. All in favor?
Opposed? 1599 is approved.

I.R. NO. 1599 Approving acquisition under Suffolk County Land Preservation Partnership Program. (Wagner Road Property in Yaphank) Town of Brookhaven. (Legislator Fred Towle)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1600 is approving acquisition under Suffolk County Land Partnership Preservation Program. Town of Brookhaven property, Middle Island.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Where is this property?

MR. ISLES:

This is Artist Lake in Middle Island.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Do we have a resolution on this?

MR. ISLES:

Yes, we do have a resolution.

MR. SABATINO:

A Town Board Resolution from August 15th, of 2000.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Artist Lake?

MR. ISLES:

Yes. Right, the lake itself, this is adjacent to other property owned by the Town of Brookhaven by about 32 acres. This would add on about 7 acres that consist of some underwater land and some upland directly adjacent to Middle County Road at that point.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Middle Country and County Road 21?

MR. ISLES:

It's directly adjacent to -- basically, across the street from where the K-Mart is and opposite that is the --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That's my district.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Aren't there condominiums there?

MR. ISLES:

Yes. That's the condominiums --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Yes that's Fairfield. Yes that's my district.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table by Legislator Caracciolo, speaks with Legislator Towle. Out of courtesy, if nothing else.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Who is the property owner? Do we know who the principals are?

MR. ISLES:

No.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

All right, check that out.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

A motion and a tabling.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Table.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All in favor? Opposed? 1600 is tabled.

I.R. NO. 1600 Approving acquisition under Suffolk County Land Preservation Partnership Program. (Property in Middle Island) Town of Brookhaven. (Legislator Fred Towle)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1605 making a SEQRA determination in connection with proposed demolition of concrete arch bridge over County Road 4, the Town of Huntington. Sponsored by the Presiding Officer in Legislator Binder's district. What do you want?

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

And I would like to make a motion.

MR. SABATINO:

Just so you know, the way SEQRA works is the Presiding Officer sponsors all the SEQRA bills. Not because of the County Executive, because of the Charter.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

He's making trouble.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Just one question on this? Tom, isn't this that bridge that -- did you have to make a determination whether it had historical significance or not? This is the one that goes over Commack Road, right?

MR. ISLES:

Right. It's no longer being used. It's a -- it would go to CEQ and it was heavily discussed there. It was discussed at a prior committee meeting and this committee tabled it and now it's back for a decision at this point.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Make your point.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

So we realize that -- you know, in days of old this was used to provide access for farm equipment across Commack Road because that whole area in there. And it's adjacent to Pilgrim State Hospital and Edgewood Properties and things like that so --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Allan, is that true?

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Yes, it is true. But there are no farms. There's no museum. We're putting this bridge in. It is full of graffiti, pretty nasty stuff, often pretty unsightly and needs to go. This is a -- you know, this is a community concern. Now if Legislator from Islip or others would like us to cut the bridge and create a museum around somewhere in their district, we can probably have that transported.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Actually, I was thinking maybe, you know, if you need any roadwork near your house we'll put it over there but --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

No, no, no. I just would like to see the whole thing gone, to be honest with you. It just has to be demolished and I don't think there's anything historic about it. It's pretty ugly.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

That's why I brought it up.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

It's pretty ugly.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

But the Commissioner made the determination that there is no historical significance to it.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I was thinking of graffiti on the bridge, I thought those Bishop for Congress signs were a great addition to it but I guess, it may have historical significance. No relevance. All right. Motion to approve by Legislator Binder, second. Is there a second?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Second by Legislator Alden. He's withdrawn his concern. All in favor? Opposed? Approved.

I.R. NO. 1605 Making a SERA determination in connection with the proposed demolition of concrete arch bridge over C.R. 4, Commack, Town of Huntington. (Presiding Officer Paul Tonna)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. 1654 is creating a Suffolk County Smart Growth Committee, County Executive.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Did Legislator Fields do that?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I thought we had a Suffolk County Smart Growth Committee.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Motion to table. This bill has some questionable language in the third whereas, it says that the Smart Growth Committee would review recommendations and then two lines after that it talks about implementing. So on the second page, it also says that it shall provide their recommendations. So, I think, it needs to just have a little bit of --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Can I ask? Don't we have a Smart Growth Committee?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

I thought we did.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

We have a Smart Growth Master Plan Policy that really hasn't --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Wasn't there something that was going around the County's hearings?

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Yes, we had three hearings. It was my bill and we had three hearings.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Who was those folks?

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

There's no -- it was the Planning Commission that worked on it, prior to Mr. Isles coming to the County and it kind of stayed on hold until he --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

But my question is weren't there recommendations made? I saw the recommendations. I saw the outcome. So what would happen with these recommendations that would be the outcome of this committee visavis those recommendations that have already been made?

MR. ISLES:

The report was prepared at the direction of the Legislature as indicated by Legislator Fields. It was submitted to the Legislature and the County Executive. One of the recommendations was that a committee be set up to kind of go through the forty nine or fifty recommendations that were in the report and sort them out and identify where the priorities should be, where the major effort of the County should be. So the purpose of it was to review and digest the recommendations of the plan. The plan was prepared by the Planning Department after conducting the public hearings in question. So there really has been no review of the plan from that point on. We get input and so forth.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

I see and to prioritize --

MR. ISLES:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

The recommendations that are listed in that report.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Legislator Binder?

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Can you speak to the legislation and some of the concerns that are raised about questions of implementation versus recommendation? And the language, I assume that you had something to do with creating the legislation? So maybe you can mount a defense, so I can hear a back and forth? So I can understand your view?

MR. ISLES:

Yes, here in the primary intent of this resolution is to form a committee an Ad Hoc Committee to exist for a relatively short period of time. I think the duration of the committee's charge was eight months and the idea being is that there were a multitude of recommendations in the Master Plan and that, in order to sort out where the County's effort should be focused, a committee could go through that and identify that for the Legislature. Now, in this case, in terms of the language, the purpose of the committee, as I understood it, was to review the recommendations and report and the County's strategy for implementing Smart Growth. So that was my interpretation of it. In terms of the -- it certainly wasn't the charge or the intent to charge the committee with implementation powers.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

So you're saying the wording of it does not give implementation powers, at least, from your view. It's not a question and so maybe I can ask Counsel. Is it your opinion that from the wording, they have implementation power? Or are they talking about implementation, in a generic sense, based on the recommendation but that they're not going to be implementing?

MR. SABATINO:

It's a problem with the resolution. I identified it when it first came over. The problem with the resolution is that it doesn't state the mission of the committee. I think what happened was the draftsman got tangled up in the wording because the original Smart Growth report that came forward said that yes, one of the recommendations was to have a committee to review recommendations. The problem with this bill is that, I think, somebody got tangled up with the wording. When it got to -- the critical resolve clause is really the second to the last one, which is that the Smart Growth Committee shall provide recommendations to the County Executive and the Legislature within 180 days but it doesn't say recommendations regarding what. See, the recommendations have already been made. They are in the report. What that clause has to do is that clause has to specify what it is that the committee is going to review and evaluate and make recommendations on. Otherwise, it's just a Carte blanche. They can make recommendations on what's going on in the world. The other thing is the sunset provision that Mr. Isles referred to is not there. I just think that what you described is closer to my understanding of what the original report intended. But the resolution

doesn't reflect that.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Okay, so let me ask about the sunset provision? Can you read from your copy that we have a --

MR. ISLES:

Yes, in the next to last resolve clause, it says the Smart Growth Committee shall provide their recommendations to the County Executive and the Legislature within 180 days of the effective date of the resolution.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Okay, so the 180 days is the --

MR. ISLES:

Effective date of the resolution.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

From the effective date. So the question then may come -- it doesn't say anything about terminating though? It says shall provide it but it doesn't say anything about what happens when he says -- when Counsel talks about sunset, what he's saying is the existence of the committee itself.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

So you have to decide, do you exist beyond the recommendations? Does it keep functioning? So that's something, I think, you're going to have to zero in on and the second thing you're going to have to zero in on is specificity of mission. In other words, rather than giving it a broad power to recommend in all areas --

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

To be more specific about what? Give an analogy focus and at that point, we'll probably be --

MR. ISLES:

That's fine.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

That will probably sail through you.

MR. ISLES:

Sure. That's something we'll be pleased to transmit back to the County Executive and make adjustments and hopefully, iron it out to the satisfaction of the committee.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

And that's why we have committee meetings.

MR. ISLES:

There we go.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Feels good.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Mr. Chairman?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

If I may?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Yes. Legislator Fisher.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

I agree with what Legislator Binder just said. We need to fine tune it and I think, the word prioritization is very important because then you're talking about how you would word visavis the report that has already -- which quite a bit of time was spent on that and public hearings were held. So that it is making a reference to the report and validates what came out of that Smart Growth initiative and I think, the word prioritization is very important there.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Motion to table by Legislator Fields, second by Legislator Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Unanimous.

I.R. NO. 1654 Creating a Suffolk County Smart Growth Committee. (County Executive)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

That brings us 1661. Allan?

MR. GRECCO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

On this resolution, we changed the funding source to the new Quarter Percent Program. I understand that there was some reference made to using some Town revenue sharing monies also for this acquisition?

MR. GRECCO:

It was suggested that we consider utilizing the balance in the old drinking water account that Shelter Island --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

It was 25-5-5?

MR. GRECCO:

Twenty five thousand dollars.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Do we need to embody that in this resolution or is that something -- ?

MR. GRECCO:

Yes, it should be. In order to fund it in that fashion, if you wish, then the resolution should be amended in some fashion.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Do we not have other Shelter Island acquisitions coming forward?

MR. GRECCO:

We do.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Well, my preference would be rather than to hold this back any longer, because this was already delayed one cycle because we changed funding sources. It would have been helpful if I knew before I filed the corrected copy. So I'd like to move it today and keep in mind the twenty five thousand for those other resolutions.

MR. GRECCO:

It doesn't buy a lot in Shelter Island.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I know. So I'd like to make a motion to approve 1661.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Second.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Seconded by the Chair and I revert back to the Chair.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All in favor? Opposed?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

On the motion?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It must be me Mike. Running a smooth meeting until I walk back here.
Legislator Alden.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

This is a new Quarter Cent Taxpayer Protection Program, right?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Okay. There's a number of resolutions on today under that and there's been a few passed just in the last couple of meetings. I'm going to make a suggestion and I don't know how the rest of the committee feels about it but I think we ought to prioritize the same way we did with the Greenways Fund rather than just -- this is a grab for money. It seems to be almost like the first guy that gets his resolution in, takes all the money. Because how much money is left in this?

MR. GRECCO:

Well, on that thought. If there was one fund that seemed to work with any level of sanity and order, it was the Greenway's Open Space Fund where we had a prioritization and we were able to work our way right through from the top down to the bottom in an orderly fashion. And I would be very supportive of some sort of prioritization rather than just have resolutions coming in.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Do we have more resolution requests than funds right now? No, we're not even close.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Wait a minute. We've already spent -- we've already spent the projected revenue from this Quarter Cent, is that correct?

MR. GRECCO:

However, yes, but we may. We may be bonding and front loading that fund in any event, so that's why prioritization is even more important.

MR. ISLES:

I think that's what's been ongoing.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That's what's been ongoing for the last five weeks. We're attempting to do that.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You have a lot of western projects in your --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

One of the criteria we used --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Meeting really --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

No, no, no. Legislator Fisher has been at some and her representative Legislator Fields, Legislator Carpenter. So there's been West End legislative representation and support. But let me just ask the obvious question, in terms of criteria? Where would this fit using the existing criteria, in terms of a ranking?

MR. ISLES:

Well actually, we have reviewed this on a criteria bases we presented the Parks Trustees. And the criteria we used is essentially from the Greenways Program. And this actually ranked at thirty where twenty five is a so called passing grade based upon proximity to existing County land, the piece we just bought recently, as well as groundwater protection. So it ranked fairly well and it was ranked. It wasn't as if it was done with no ranking whatsoever. We're hoping, however, in the new Quarter Percent Program to update the system, the guidelines, the ranking and to be able to present to you, as Legislator Alden is suggesting, something a little bit more systematic in plan rather than haphazard, in terms of the acquisitions.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That's one of the charges we gave you. One of the charges we gave you in that Ad Hoc Group to do. So that it wasn't in a haphazard nilly willy fashion, there was some rationale and some logic and justification to put in these parcels on the list.

MR. ISLES:

And we've also contacted every Town to including the Western Towns.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That was my suggestion that you do that.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We gave their list. We've had them for years.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Well, Mr. Chairman further to that, when we decided to have a prioritization list in Greenways, we also set a deadline. So that we requested that everyone who wanted to acquire a parcel under Open Space, under Greenways Acquisition, have those requests in by, I believe, at that time, the end of February. And we asked everyone for that deadline because you can get a clearer picture if you're setting up a priority list. If everyone's parcels are in rather than setting up a list and then having an acquisition bumped, bumped down because a more desirable piece enters the mix later on. That's not to say that it would preclude anyone from suggesting an acquisition after such date. But if you set a date and try to get acquisition requests in by that time, that's just the part of the process. If you're going to set up a list that all acquisitions -- everyone's request attempt to be in by a certain time.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Director Grecco?

MR. GRECCO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

That priority.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

This is a point.

MR. GRECCO:

Along the same line, the Greenways Open Space list was a finite list and that's how we were able to do a ranking. Now, if we have a moving target here where we have a certain number of acquisitions and we have a list, a listing, a ranking and if we may and then a new resolution comes in, it could be problematic, in terms of, I may have something ready to go to contract at a thirty and something comes in at a forty five and I'm going to have a funding problem. So prioritizations are a good idea. I think also a cut off is a good idea as well. Let us work with a finite number of properties. It will work --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is it that you're --

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

At your Ad Hoc Committee. You're doing the ranking for every parcel in the County for the new Quarter Cent Program?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

We are not doing that. The Planning Department is doing that. They -- we are submitting a list of properties for acquisition under one of the three components, Farmland, Water Quality and Open Space. The Planning Department has been charged with reaching out to the Towns to make sure that the list we have from environmental organizations and others in the field, who know of properties that should be acquired and preserved is an all inclusive list and we don't leave anyone out. We are always going to have a situation. A year from now. Two years from now where something comes on the market that's not on the market today. And that's your point, Mr. Grecco and I don't know how you know can address that unless and I don't think the resolution I'm considering, which I will be seeking legislative support for is going to be a mound of funding that's

going to exhaust the program. There will be fund balances well into the future under what I envision. That said, I think, the door will always be open for properties that may not be on the market today that do come on the market later for consideration, ranking, etc., The environmental community has made it very clear. The East End, in particular and other parts of the County are under siege, in terms, of development pressures. If you wait any longer, some of these properties will not be available for acquisition. That's a policy question that the Legislature has to address.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What is this? Just help me? What is it that you and Legislator Fisher and Fields are -- You're having a meeting ranking parcels for purchase under different programs? One program?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

All programs and the new Quarter Percent -- any three -- any one of the three components, Farmland the --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Ranking every parcel in the County?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

No, not every parcel. No, I mean, we are accepting a list from environmental organizations. Once they're presented and they are embodied in the resolution, they will have to -- they don't make muster in the resolution unless they meet the criteria of one of those three programs and rank very high, in terms, of those three programs and the criteria we're using is for the Open Space component. We're using the existing Greenways Open Space criteria. For Farmland, we're using the Farmland Select Committee criteria. And for the Water Quality Protection, Tom, I'll throw that over to you with -- and to you as far as that criteria.

MR. ISLES:

The Water Quality Protection, we have spoken to this committee on that and we're looking for on that one is to just define some criteria in how the program would best be administered, as the Legislature wants and then we will feed that back to the departments that are seeking to do those projects. So, I think, that one is a little bit less of a concern, in a sense that that's not as time sensitive as the diminishing Open Space you were speaking of. In terms of this effort at planning though, many of the programs we know are running out of money, as we can see. The opportunity, in terms, of future monies for acquisitions is coming primarily from the new Quarter Percent Sales Tax Program. And the effort over the past few weeks is what Legislator Caracciolo is referring to is an effort to -- we've been asked to join, as an effort to consolidate the outstanding parcels that are pending for acquisition. That are suggested for acquisition from different sources, the Towns and the environmental groups and whomever. And what we've been attempting to do is to provide a useful yardstick for that committee and ultimately for this committee and the Legislature to use, in terms of assessing where should acquisitions occur, in terms of priorities and in terms of a rational method where we buy what's most important and most seeking, remediating the objectives of the program. So that's what we're working on. Here again, this is only a few weeks of effort at this point though that we've been asked to participate in.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Right.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Let me get this straight. You're having meetings where you're ranking parcels.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

We are not ranking parcels. That's where your confusion is. We are soliciting from environmental organizations and others. Town Governments, the County Planning Department, properties that would qualify under the criteria of the new Quarter Percent Extension Program in one of three categories. That's all we're doing at this point. At a later date, the Planning Department will identify using criteria that's in existence, which of those properties should be considered, in terms of their environmental value and what scores we can assign to those. So that when a resolution comes forward to the Legislature, we will have a program list of projects that meet all of the existing criteria and ranking very highly, using that criteria. It's really just an extension of what we did with Greenways. That's really all it is. Am I right, Mr. Grecco?

MR. GRECCO:

I believe that's correct.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Nothing new.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

If you go forward through this process and then there's going to be a resolution prepared?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That's my intent.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So then it comes back to this committee.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

And then everybody has that? Is that --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Well, everyone's had an opportunity for the last five weeks. Every week that we had meetings, I've extended that invitation to every Legislator.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Some have participated. Most have not. You have a committee system, once a resolution is prepared to consider what's in a resolution.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I'm open and willing to consider other Legislator's priorities or considerations.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Forgive me. I thought what you were doing was attempting to rank the

parcels in the already authorized Pine Barrens that have not yet been acquired. Because I know we need to do that.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

No. That's not what that effort has been about. No, this effort --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

On request, we had table those resolutions and I thought that's what you were working on. I didn't realize that you were working on the new Quarter Cent Program.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Right. That's what we are doing. The latter not the former.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Open Space but the Water Quality aspect as well as the Farmland.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Right. That's what we're doing.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You don't lack for ambition, I'll tell you that.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay. Well, the reason for that Mr. Chairman is clear. I think, we're all aware of the fact that a number of projects that we presently do not have funding for needs some type of funding source. We have a new funding source. This Legislature, in early May, approved unanimously a whole new resolution requesting from the State of New York authority to go out and bond for the continuation of the Quarter Percent Program. Once that was in place, at the end of May, that's when this effort was organized and initiated. It is ongoing. I would hope by early September to have something in draft form, which I will distribute to my colleagues and request co-sponsorship and hopefully, get the ball rolling using the FC Funding. We're meeting with them, as I said earlier, tomorrow. And I've extended everyone an invitation to attend that meeting, so that we could go into the bonding market and take advantage of very favorable low interest rates that are prevalent today and move forward, rather than let it languish and lose opportunities, which we certainly will lose if we don't act and act in the near future.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Alden.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

I don't believe it was unanimous because when I actually drafted the resolution that extended that Quarter Cent, I had really no envision -- I had not envisioned, at that time, bonding anything. It was a pay as you go type of legislation because what it did was, it replaced bonding. It would have actually pushed out our debt and cost the people in the Southwest Sewer District somewhere around two hundred and fifty to three hundred million dollars. So it was to get rid of some bonded indebtedness and the accompanying debt service that would go with it. I think what we need to do though is we really need to take a look at all the acquisitions that maybe Planning would suggest to us that have to be made. Even if it's just area by area. Something along those lines.

We need a Master Plan though because what we're doing here is like a helter skelter type of thing where a resolution goes in and then it gets

passed and then work is done and monies expended on it and we have no idea how that fits into the whole piece of things. Also, more important than that, maybe not more important but equally as important, is how to pay for that. Because if we were to buy every piece that everybody wanted us to buy, every piece of property, I don't know if we have enough money to do that. I'm not sure. I haven't done an in-depth study on that but you know, we're running out of parcels. We're running out of Open Space but the bill to take all those parcels off the market, I don't know if that would be acceptable. I know it's not acceptable to me but I am not sure how acceptable it would be to the taxpayers in Suffolk County. Because that's who ultimately has to pay for those acquisitions. So, I think, that we need a more comprehensive plan that's integrated on all the different levels. Because we're talking about Farmland, we're talking about Quarter Cent, we're talking about Drinking Water Protection type of things. And right now, as I said just a minute ago, I think we're proceeding in a helter skelter type of fashion with no comments actually in that just the --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Well, I'll be happy to yield until you finish.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

No, go ahead. You weren't done?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Mr. Isles?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Wait a minute?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

As a planner --

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mike, you weren't done?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Would you consider the approach that's underway helter skelter?

MR. ISLES:

No, I wouldn't consider it helter skelter.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Thank you.

MR. ISLES:

I do think I understand.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I did not care for the characterization particularly from someone who has not participated in the process. This was an open process.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You appoint yourself?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Just as you did, Dave.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

But this is a committee that's formed by the Legislature.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Actually, now I'm going to --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

This committee --

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

You talk over me.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Greenways Program.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN

Mr. Chairman? To a --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Mr. Chairman?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

In order --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

This committee did not put the Greenways Program together. You, I and Nora Bredes did. Not as a committee. As three individual Legislators. Okay, so let's not try to set a precedent because there is no model. Legislators over the years, going back to the '80's, have initiated as individuals and as groups of individuals and I don't ever recall in ten years as a committee, an Environmental Program.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

But my question, I had the floor. I mean, he had the floor, I asked him if he was finished.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

One would think it got away from you, because you asked the question. You're getting everybody upset because we're --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

I don't know why people are getting upset.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Well, I don't know why --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Because this has been an open process.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Everyone is speaking so --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Well? Go ahead Allan. I'm done.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

I don't know if Legislator Alden -- because to be honest, Legislator Alden had the floor and he was waiting for the tape to be flipping that's what

was happening so -- I have a number of concerns also. I think Legislators around here are going to have concerns about a couple of Legislators just putting together their process the way they want to do it and I guess, we'll have to see how that plays out. One of the questions, when you talk about criteria, is what are the criteria and are they balanced throughout the County? In Western Suffolk, we may not have a lot of places where you'd say the Open Space is good for groundwater protection because other than West Hills, most of it is you know, scatter shot, small parcels. So if that's the criteria and we go to the environmental groups, basically we're buying on the East End and that's it. I mean, that's it. You're not going to find high criteria for a parcel that might have just come up and it did just come up in my district that just came under developmental pressure now. And that's my concern about putting on these timelines. Well, if you don't have it by February, forget it, well excuse me but in July, all of a sudden, a parcel that was asleep no one is really looking at, no one is caring, all of a sudden comes under developmental pressure and it's an important piece of Open Space for a larger community. So now how do you fit this all in? Well, I'm sure even if I put it to this new committee or whatever we're calling this Task Force Committee or self appointed group that they're going to look at, well I don't know what kind of ranking it gets but I can tell you that the ranking in the area where this is happening in this community is very important.

Now in the whole scheme of Suffolk County Groundwater, it may not rank high. I can tell you this that the groundwater you're protecting out East will never, not one drop of it will be tasted by the people in Western Suffolk, Huntington, Smithtown, Babylon, Islip. We're not drinking that water that's being protected because you can't carry it out of Eastern Suffolk. So we're all yelling about protecting groundwater. We're protecting tons of groundwater out East. A lot more than they'll be people there to drink it. But out West, we're not going to have that. So, I think, the criteria has to be balanced and that's what's been missing, an East, West balance when we're talking about buying land. And frankly, I'm getting really tired of the balance being so tipped in the East End of Suffolk because we can create criteria that makes it all environmentally and water wise and whatever where else, we can create that. The more you buy out there, the more opportunities you buy for other land. Why? Because it's more adjacent to it. Right? I mean, if you buy in the East End, then you say well but what are the criteria is it has to be adjacent to something we bought. Well, you're not buying in the West, so you can't have much adjacent to it that we're buying over there. But in the East, you buy so much; everything becomes adjacent to it. So now there again, not a criteria. Not a criteria for water unless you're -- like I say in West Hills.

There's a lot of criteria that are missed. Maybe the most important criteria, quality of life, open space and the ability to preserve land in -- how about that criteria that says density. Density, pure density and saving open space where there's dense area. Now I understand that means it's more expensive per acre. What about that kind of -- maybe you could talk about that kind of question?

MR. GRECCO:

Sure.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Why don't we talk about that? That would maybe tilt it a little bit back towards the West.

MR. GRECCO:

All right. Well, did you ever hear of the Benjamin property?

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Yes.

MR. GRECCO:

We spent -- 88 acres, we spent what? The total for eight million dollars. We reduced density by quite a few homes, okay! We've done a number of initiatives in the West End. I think --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Not too many. They're just -- I -- Benjamin, I mean you know --

MR. GRECCO:

Okay, yes we could --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Chandler.

MR. GRECCO:

We're not doing East versus West. But I think one of the things you have to remember is supply and demand. The supply is in the East, all right! If the --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

It's more precious in the West. Because of the fact that supply is less. That's my point.

MR. GRECCO:

I -- you know --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

So it's more expensive but if it's more precious.

MR. GRECCO:

Understood.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Diamonds are more precious than quartz. Well sorry, you know, it's just harder to get and maybe more people want it. That's what makes it more expensive. It's more precious.

MR. GRECCO:

I agree there should be a balance.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

There's less of it.

MR. GRECCO:

There should be a balance. I don't suggest what the balance is acre for acre. I'm not even suggesting it's dollar for dollar.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

I'm not either. But I --

MR. GRECCO:

And you have a point that there should be West acquisitions and I say to you that there are.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Not many.

MR. GRECCO:

We have West acquisitions.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. I'm going to try to get back on this because we're on some sort of tangent from hell here. It's been going on for twenty-five minutes.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I just want you to know Legislator Caracciolo; I appreciate that you're trying to bring order to a process that you think is not orderly. I just want to gently remind you that ultimately, prioritization and criteria, those are issues for this committee to determine and present to the Legislature and I hope that that's ultimately the path that you plan on taking.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Well, let me say, in terms of criteria, we're using existing criteria. So that's consistent with this committee and the entire Legislature. We're not breaking any new ground. People are not listening, if they haven't heard me say for four times now that we're using existing legislative generated driven criteria. Am I right Mr. Isles?

MR. ISLES:

The criteria is in the legislation. It's five criteria that's actually in the law.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

On water quality, what criteria are you using that's legislative driven?

MR. ISLES:

Water Quality has a series of projects that can be --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Actually identified in the resolution.

MR. ISLES:

And just not to belabor this either, Mr. Chairman but when I was asked the question, is this the helter skelter process? I think no, it's not. I've been asked to participate in it and I want to do so to the best of my ability. In terms of what's been happening with the Pay As You Go Program, in terms of what Cameron indicated, yes, it has been helter skelter because every single project is just kind of thrown in our lap. So to the extent that the department helped this committee or any Ad Hoc Committee that said to try to come up with something that's more rational and in terms of Mr. Binder, the point about we can all sit here and identify parcels that we all agree are first worthwhile and then next year, something or next month something rolls along. I've lived in Western Suffolk for many years and I've been in dense communities where I've advocated parcels like we were for parcels in East Islip where it may not rank up with East Hampton like that but I know in that community, that's a sacred place. It's very important. It has a lot of value. So that has to be factored in. The discussions that I participated in this Ad Hoc Group have weighed all these things back and forth. It has not been when I can observe everything must go out on the East End.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Has not been, you said?

MR. ISLES:

It hasn't gotten to that point.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Has not been.

MR. ISLES:

But I know that it has not been. I know that these are legislative questions. They're important questions. Sounds like they've been around a long time before I got here too. But all I'm saying is that we're prepared to help you as best we can to --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

And what I'm concerned about is that in the Greenways Program, which is being held up as a model. We did it rationally. We did it as a committee.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Greenways?

CHAIRMAN BSIHOP:

Yes, the Greenways Open Space.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

You, I and Nora didn't meet in her office on a couple of occasions?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

The list of parcels was done -- what we meant was --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What we meant was twenty million -- twenty million -- two million for a center that's the meetings we had.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Right, okay, okay. And that's our intent. That's my intent. I mean, I don't intend to propose a list and say to the Legislature, this is the only thing we're going to consider. It's going to be a list that's submitted by all of the interested parties that's going to be ranked by the Planning Department based on existing criteria, okay? We're not breaking any new ground and if Legislators want to deviate from existing criteria, then explain to me and everybody else why we're going to start deviating? Okay, this is a balanced approach that we're undertaking.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You're taking lists. I'm sorry, I don't --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Well, why doesn't everybody wait until we have --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All have discussion or try to follow it.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I think we're putting the cart before the horse. We don't know what the Planning Department is coming back. This isn't my list. This isn't the environmental group's list. The final list that's going to be proposed in a resolution will be from the Planning Department using existing criteria, period.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So what's the point of your meetings?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

It's to get that information to the Planning Department, so they could rank it. To get the universe of properties that are out there that someone has identified, either at the Town level, the County level.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

And the interest groups?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

And the interest groups. Because they're on the ground Dave. You know and I know they have a better handle on what's out there and needs to be preserved then we do in many cases.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Well, all roads lead through Rome except in Suffolk County. They're going to leave through the Environment Committee ultimately.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay. I look forward to that.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Good, very good.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Alden.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

I just have a -- maybe it's more a procedural question. How is this committee being run? Is this just --?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Which committee?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

This committee. When you recognized by the Chair and then somebody else starts talking over you, is that just -- and that person's recognition or is that how it's run?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

That's a failure of the Chair to run the meeting correctly when that happens.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Then just -- I'd like to make a record of my very big disappointment today in the way this debate went and I definitely was not done with my comments. And I was definitely not done with some points that I was trying to make with the Commissioner, as well as other people. And I'm very, very unhappy with the way this went and very disappointed.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We've had a bad day today, I apologize. Do you have anything more

Legislator Alden? Do you want to reclaim your time?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

No, not now.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Back to the agenda. 1662 authorizing planning steps for acquisition of land under Pay As You Go Quarter Cent --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

What happened to 1661?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, the Shelter Island one. I thought we had --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I made a motion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to approve. On the motion, twenty five thousand dollars remains in the Shelter Island 125E account. Are we going to be able to access that for this?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Well, you were temporarily out of the room.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What did we decide?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

There are other Shelter Island Resolutions in draft and a variety of forms that I proposed to you is the twenty five thousand dollars for. This one was held up one cycle because it was previously identified under Land Partnership. We didn't have funding because we were oversubscribed.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

A motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Opposed.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

This process of trying to decide on the priorities in this Ad Hoc Group.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

It's got nothing to do with it Allan.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Is this being ranked with that group, in terms of -- I don't know, if this is part of the process doing that?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

The answer is no. It's on that list. Because it's before us and it's been here for a month.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Why does it just become part of the process in -- since we have an Ad Hoc Group out there putting together a process, doing criteria and putting together a list, why wouldn't this also become part of that list? And why don't we wait to see what's recommended and we'll wait with this one to

see where it ranks and so at this point, I'd make a motion to table.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Move the motion to table.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Anybody else wish to be heard? Okay. We have a motion.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

No, no, no. I'm sorry. On the motion, yes, I would like to be heard.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Alden wishes to be heard.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

This is a question, I guess to the Commissioner. How much money is actually in that Quarter Cent and how are we running as far as revenues, projected revenues and actual collected revenues and how many authorized purchases under this and I'd like a little bit of understanding of how we are.

MR. ISLES:

Okay. I don't have an up to the moment reconciliation of that. We had done that recently within the past month or two months, where we had identified several parcels including Spring Brook, which is known as Wading Brook as being one. That's been approved. That was approved under the new Quarter Percent Program. Forsyth Meadow phase two, even though apparently, we don't have a willing seller there. There was another one and then Deager, which is in the town of Huntington and is in contract at this point. So those are the three off the top of my head that are tapped in, approved by legislative resolution for the new Quarter Percent Program. I'd have to do -- just verify that to give you the latest but that's -- that might be off at one or two parcels.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Just a ballpark figure and I need numbers?

MR. ISLES:

Ballpark figure dollar wise?

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Yes. Dollar wise.

MR. ISLES:

Four and a half million for those.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Approximately?

MR. GRECCO:

Where those three acquisitions, I'm going to estimate, will be between six and six point five million total. Now again, one is in contract for about a million and a half. Another one is out to appraisal again and the third one we don't have a willing seller. So you have to work with the assumption assuming they all come back. Where we think they're going to come back and we have a willing seller, we would have six point five approximately spent. What we have in that fund on the Open Space Fund was about six point six estimate for the Year 2000, plus six hundred fifty thousand for just the last month of December 2000, according to the --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That's the old program.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Spero?

MR. GRECCO:

The new program.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Spero, could you tell me where we're running as far as sales tax? Because that's directly -- the revenue from sales tax, directly plugged into this.

MR. SPERO:

We haven't checked the revenues and Robert hasn't completed all his tax analysis but the second quarter was rather poor.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Behind what projected revenues would be?

MR. SPERO:

That's correct. Because there's been no growth in the second quarter of this year. So signaling that the economy is, in fact, flattening out.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

How much behind projected revenues? Approximately?

MR. SPERO:

Robert hasn't crunched all the numbers yet on where we may be visavis this year's budget. But like I said, the second quarter was rather weak.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

And you don't really have the numbers on the second quarter even? Like how far behind the revenue projections?

MR. SPERO:

Well, Robert's still doing it.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

No, no, I'm sorry.

MR. SPERO:

To find out what that amount is.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I'd just like to add, Mr. Chairman that -- oh I'm sorry, I didn't know you had --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Fields.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

I just want to ask Mr. Grecco, you just said something about an unwilling seller?

MR. GRECCO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Who is that?

MR. GRECCO:

That was the Ward Melville Heritage Foundation. They had sent us a rather strong lengthy letter indicating that they had plans to do some sort of development with the property.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Bud we did apparently pass a resolution for planning steps to acquire that without a willing seller?

MR. GRECCO:

That -- the letter came in after this.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Okay, thank you. That was all I wanted to know.

MR. GRECCO:

Yes, the point is it came in after the resolution was passed. The seller's letter came in after.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I think they been wrong on record.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

You have his motion to table. Move it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. Motion to table the Quarter Cent Resolution, Town of Shelter Island, 1661. Motion to table Legislator Binder, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Anybody else opposed?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

How many opposed?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Three, four, okay.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Bishop, Fields, Bishop and Caracciolo opposed. Motion to approve by Legislator Caracciolo, second by Legislator Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

Four to two. Four, zero, two.

I.R. NO. 1661 Authorizing land acquisition under pay as you go 1/4 % Taxpayer Program (Rasmussen property at 68 North Ferry Road) Town of Shelter Island. (Tax Map No. 0700-015.00-03.00-004.000) (Legislator Michael Caracciolo)

VOTE: 4-0-2-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1662 authorizing planning steps for acquisition of land under pay as you

go 1/4 % Protection Program. It's actually four in favor, nobody opposed, two abstentions, one missing. Legislator Guldi asked for an excused absence for medical reasons. 1666 implementing pay as you go Quarter Cent Program.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

What happened with 1662?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1662 authorizing planning steps for acquisition of land under Pay As You Go Quarter Cent Taxpayer Protection Program. Land at Unitarian Universalist Church, Town of Brookhaven.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Willing seller?

MR. ISLES:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

How much is this one?

MR. ISLES:

Well, we don't have an appraisal. Do you want an estimate?

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Range.

MR. ISLES:

It's about 30 acres. It's restrictive in its zoning, however, to an institutional use and my understanding is and don't quote me on this. It might be one point five to two million dollars in that range.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Would this be considered the East End of the County?

MR. ISLES:

Located in the Town of Brookhaven.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I can see in the future, we're going to have to go through every one of these and go through these semantics.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I don't think it's just --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Well, no.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I don't think Michael, it's just the East, West thing. I think it's the whole notion of going off and prioritizing. It invites that kind of --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I'm not prioritizing anything. The Planning Department is the same people you and every other Legislator --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You should be doing that here, not elsewhere.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

And that's --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

That's where --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Okay. So we can --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

I think the Chair --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

So we can think --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

I think the Chairman can always figure on --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It invites that kind of --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

The concern.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

That's something I'm open obviously to.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Now, what are we doing with this? I have a motion.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Planning steps?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Planning steps only. Motion to approve by myself, second by Legislator Fisher.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Just on the motion, so that this committee is consistent. Does this meet criteria that you advocate and what criteria are we using, if we authorize planning steps?

MR. ISLES:

Well this would -- of the five criteria in the law, this satisfies two. One, it's -- part of it is wetlands. Secondly, a large part of this side is watershed to a coastal stream and so -- but the two criteria of the five indicated in the law, this meets two of those criteria.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

You recommend its acquisition?

MR. ISLES:

Yes. As a matter of fact this is part of that mud creek report we presented to this committee back in May.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Okay.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. ISLES:

This is the former Gallo Duck Farm area. This parcel was not the Duck Farm but it's directly downstream from the Duck Farm and is a pristine parcel.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Binder.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

When I heard the numbers before and if we passed the one what we just talked about passing, we are probably way out of money here. So we can start planning steps but we're just basically out of the ballpark at this point, in terms, of having the cash because you're not talking two million, maybe two. It could even be more than two. Because we don't know. It could be, let's say -- right from one and half, two and a half, somewhere in that range but you're getting one and a half at the low end. We're way over.

MR. GRECCO:

Correct. As of today, that is correct, however, we may be doing some bonding on this, in which case we would be able to purchase this acquisition. Or this may take place in the Year 2002 when we have additional funding. The fact that now we're almost in August and we're doing planning steps, I would not anticipate that we would be able to close it this year in any event. So we have a willing seller. We're only doing planning steps. It may not be a bad idea to just give it a try and see where it comes in and then make the decision.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Alden.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Just on that point. We may be doing bonding but from the looks of things, we're not going to have the revenue stream to do any debt service on that bonding. So in effect, what we've done is we're eliminated any bonding for this year anyway. Just that's a point I'd like to make.

MR. GRECCO:

Well, I think the revenue stream as projected in the model may have to be --

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Right, right.

MR. GRECCO:

Right and that may have an impact on the bonding.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

But not just an impact. You've already stated that we're up to almost 100 percent of whatever the projected revenue stream was with authorized purchases.

MR. GRECCO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Okay. We don't have enough money according to Budget Review. Our sales tax is not coming in at that projected revenue stream. So, therefore, we're going to have a shortfall even if we just go and try to do

the purchases that we've authorized. We're going to have a shortfall there. Let alone do any bonding and have a revenue stream to pay back any of the indebtedness. That's my point on that.

MR. GRECCO:

No, it's a good point and I think we have to possibly revise the model as we get more data, so that we can figure out what kind of cash flow we will have to cover the debt service and I think that's what's going to you know -- it's a good point.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Mr. Chairman, if I might? Just mention that at the last committee meeting of this Ad Hoc Group, we did request that information. We do have a printout from Budget Review, Kevin Duffy was there and presented that information. They are downward revisions. They are realistic and they are current.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

16 let's see, where are we? 1666 is my resolution. Oh, 1662. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Planning steps are approved.

I.R. NO. 1662 Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under pay as you go 1/4 % Taxpayer Protection Program (Land at Unitarian Universalist Church, Town of Brookhaven. (Legislator Brian Foley)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN CARACCILO:

1666 is a motion to table. We're waiting for a plan from the Village of Lindenhurst. Motion by myself, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? It's tabled.

I.R. NO. 1666 Implementing pay as you go 1/4 % Taxpayer Protection Plan for Water Quality Protection and Restoration Program to acquire Lindenhurst property bordering Great South Bay. (Legislator David Bishop)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1667 creating the Forestry Council. Motion to table. We did this with a straw vote before, by Legislator Fields, second by Legislator Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? 1667 is tabled until the next meeting.

I.R. NO. 1667 Creating Regional Forestry Council for Suffolk County. (Legislator Jon Cooper)

VOTE: 5-0-0-2 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1668 implementing Greenways Program in connection with the acquisition of Active Parklands at the Three Village Swim and Racquet club. Well, it sounds like it's already in Active Greenways.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

It sure is but they're considering selling it to a developer and the community members have come to me and see if we could save it in some way. But I'm making a motion to table because we're looking at it more carefully.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table by Legislator Fisher, second by myself. All in favor?
Opposed? 1668 is tabled.

I.R. NO. 1668 Implementing Greenways Program in connection with acquisition of Active Parklands at Three Village Swim and Racquet Club. (Town of Brookhaven) (Legislator Vivian Fisher)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1669 is implementing the Greenways Program. There is cross conversation and the Chairman can't conduct the meeting.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

You just have to get this meeting under control here. A motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1669 implementing Greenways Program in connection with acquisition of Farmland Development Rights at the Sherwood-Jayne Residence.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

This is a willing seller. It is the Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities. They have the Sherwood-Jayne House and the farm. It's historic. It's Farmland and the Town of Brookhaven actually came to us regarding this piece of property. But I don't think that the Town of Brookhaven has prepared their part of it yet. Have they Paul?

MR. SABATINO:

No, they haven't done a Town Board Resolution yet, which we need for 69. We don't need it for 70, but we need it for 69.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

All right for 69 we need it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So you want to take them together or you want to table just this one?

MR. ISLES:

69 requires the Farmland Select Committee to review it.

MR. SABATINO:

Right, we need that and we need the Town to commit to --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

So I'll table both of them for now, so that we can work with them. Allan, would you rather have a --

MR. GRECCO:

If they're --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Eight move forward, rather 69 go forward?

MR. GRECCO:

If --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

69 is tabled.

MR. GRECCO:

If you table 69 and you approve 70, we can at least go forward with the appraisal process.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay, so we'll table 69 and then go ahead.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So we should table 1669 by Legislator Fisher, second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed? 1669 is tabled.

**I.R. NO. 1669 Implementing Greenways Program in connection with acquisition of Farmland Development Rights at Sherwood-Jayne residence, East Setauket. (Town of Brookhaven)
(Legislator Vivian Fisher)**

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1670 is planning steps.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

To acquire the property.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Explain to me why we're both preserving it as Farmland and acquiring it?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Because it's in --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

The parcels, I assume?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Go ahead Paul.

MR. SABATINO:

Forty-six acres altogether. This is the 36 acres, which you can acquire under Land Preservation. The other 10 is for Farmland.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

The forested area of the parcel and there's Farmland and there's also the footprint of where the Sherwood-Jayne House the historic house actually is. So we're treating it in a separate part with the Chestnut and Oak Forest, which is extensive and that's the preservation part of it and land preservation and the other part is Farmland. So because they have different characteristics, we're treating them differently.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. This is planning steps for the acquisition. Motion to approve by Legislator Fisher, second by Legislator Bishop. All in favor? Opposed?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

On the motion? From Planning Department's perspective, you mentioned

that one of the pieces was Farmland requested. That active Parkland is also close to --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes but this is not active Parkland.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

This is not active Parkland. This is 1670 we're looking at.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Well I'm one ahead of you, I'm sorry.

MR. GRECCO:

Land Pres.?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay, so let's call the vote on this one. This is if you approved the planning steps. All in favor? Opposed?

MR. GRECCO:

I thought --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

No.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Because he said they can't do the appraisal.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Allan Grecco asked if we could go ahead with 1670, so he can begin the process of appraisal.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. So that one is approved.

I.R. NO. 1670 Authorizing planning steps for acquisition under Suffolk County Land Preservation Partnerships Program. (Sherwood-Jayne Property, East Setauket) Town of Brookhaven. (Legislator Vivian Fisher)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Allan, question? I thought that Brookhaven Town had done an appraisal on this and of Sherwood-Jayne and it's actually on our list of appraisers, of approved appraisers. There is already an appraisal.

MR. ISLES:

We don't have a Town Reso on it.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

But we don't have a Town Resolution.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

On our own.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

No, that's on 1669. But it's saving us some money on the appraisal because they did use an appraiser from our list.

MR. GRECCO:

We can open a file and find out really how willing a seller we have.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

They're very willing. They just took me for a tour earlier this week, late last week rather.

MR. GRECCO:

You know assuming that's the case -- we could --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Tour.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Oh with the Harmonds?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

A little junket.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'm sorry. No jocularly. Especially from you.

MR. GRECCO:

You know what we could do is under these circumstances, assuming we have all these components, we could go to contract subject to funding, subject to resolution.

MR. ISLES:

But we still need Parks Trustees and a Town Resolution.

MR. GRECCO:

You know if you give us the authority --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It's time to call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Okay, it's approved.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1671 authorizing planning steps for implementing Greenways Program in connection with acquisition of active Parklands at the intersection of 25A. West Broadway and Barnum Avenue in Port Jefferson Village.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

And again, Port Jefferson Village came to me regarding this property. The Mayor is very interested and the Town of Brookhaven is on board but not on paper yet. Oh, we do have the resolution. Thank you Elizabeth.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

How many acres?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Oh, that's from the Village. I don't believe we have it from the Town yet and we need it from the Town.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You need it from the Town.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Don't we Paul?

MR. SABATINO:

Yes, we need a Town Resolution.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

We need a Town Resolution as well. Okay, so I will make a motion to approve. It's small.

MR. ISLES:

A quarter of an acre.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

It's a small lot, a quarter acre.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What kind of Greenways are going to be on a quarter of an acre?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

They want to have an active -- a little active park. It's right by the water as you enter Port Jefferson.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

A little playground?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Like a little, yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Well, I guess it --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

It's the gateway into Port Jefferson Village and so a little park.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right, motion.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

A quarter acre of sod.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

A quarter acre of sod. Okay, well listen, it's a Western Town.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It's very precious. Motion by Legislator Fisher, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? Proceed with planning steps.

I.R. NO. 1671 Authorizing planning steps for implementing Greenways Program in connection with acquisition of active parklands at intersection of Route 25A (West Broadway and Barnum Avenue) Port Jefferson Village. (Legislator Vivian Fisher)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Mr. Chairman? Can Mr. Isles just address the question on active parklands? Where we stand, in terms, of fund balances?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Why? I would say Mr. Grecco is the one to ask.

MR. ISLES:

Yes. Where we stand right now is that we have available right now as of the beginning of July, five and a half million dollars. But in terms of -- pardon me, it's four point seven million.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Out of the twenty that's left? Four point seven is available?

MR. ISLES:

In terms of what we have in negotiation, we have about five million and in terms of -- recently accepted is five million, in negotiations two million, so the projected expenditure is seven point six million. So of the four point seven million to start off with, we have commitment to our negotiation about seven point six million. So we're short by a little less than three million dollars.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

But not from the twenty.

MR. ISLES:

We're oversubscribed.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

That's just from available. How much of the twenty he wants to know?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Right, what's available?

MR. ISLES:

Just the ten or the --?

MR. GRECCO:

Okay in the available, that's just the first ten. I believe we've still got another ten coming in.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

So just so we have a sense of where we are.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So where are we?

MR. GRECCO:

Okay. Let us say we might have another seven left.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Seven.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. That's what you wanted to know.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

And this is only a quarter acre.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right. 1667 is amending resolution 1148 for construction of a building for Wildlife Rescue, an Education Program. It's at the Marine Science Center, Town of Southold.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

This is just simply taking money that was approved and set aside for the Marine Aquaculture Program, which unfortunately is not going to happen. It's supposed to be a public private partnership. That entity is not going to be able to follow through. So all I'm doing is taking that funding to establish a Program at the same Marine Sciences Center for a Bird Rescue Program.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is that what they asked for? I mean, did somebody ask?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Yes, Cornell came to me with this plan.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, I understand.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Yes, yes.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman, I have a question?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

How are we going to prioritize which bird? Motion by Legislator Caracciolo.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Quick question?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Alden wishes to be heard.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Just -- and maybe the sponsor knows or maybe Paul Sabatino? This is for construction? The other was for a program?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Same thing. We're constructing classroom facilities. This is a Training Program that's run by Cornell and volunteers from Maryland called Tri-State Bird Rescue who will come to Suffolk County and train Cornell staff who will then, in turn, will train volunteers. So that when there's an offshore spill that affects the coastline and shore birds, these volunteers would go into action with Cornell supervision. Bring them back to the facility and clean the birds, essentially and try to save as many as possible.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

This is the one you just said the research was on. But also, this was a Capital?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

This is a Year 2000 or 2001 Capital Program?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Jim could you a -- Jim prepared the --

MR. SPERO:

These were funds two hundred and fifty thousand dollars that was previously appropriated for the Acquaculture Project, which was pointed out is not moving ahead. But now -- let the resolution will change the purpose for the use of the money.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Okay but that's 2001 or 2000?

MR. SPERO:

The funds were appropriated last year.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

So we're going back to the -- and that's all the funding we're going to provide for them on this? This is two fifty? All right, thanks.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Motion to approve.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

On the motion, I just have another question. The Marine Science Center. That's at Cornell Cooperative?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That's the one we took that wonderful boat ride out from the aquarium last year.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay, all right. It is the Cornell Cooperative Marine Sciences?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Yes, it's run by Cornell.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Caracciolo, second by Legislator Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? 1677 is approved.

I.R. NO. 1677 Amending Resolution No. 1148-2000 for construction of a building for Wildlife Rescue and Education Programs at the Marine Science Center, Town of Southold. (Legislator Michael Caracciolo)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1678 is an authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under Pay As You Go Quarter Cent Taxpayer Protection Program. Land of Jeffrey Rimland. What can you tell me about this one?

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Where is this? Well, no it's not going to make it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What can you tell me about this one?

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Right it shouldn't make -- it probably doesn't meet any of the criteria, does it?

MR. ISLES:

This is a parcel located in the Town of Islip at the intersection of Sunrise Highway and Broadway Avenue. The southeast corner. It's a parcel that's

currently undeveloped. It's adjacent to a small farm and then beyond that, it's adjacent to Sans Soucci County Park, which consists of several hundred acres. This parcel is very definitely fits the criteria of the program, in a sense that it is definitely within watershed of a coastal stream, that being Sans Soucci Lake System and Brown's River. This is basically, in the dividing line between Sayville and Bayport across from the Sun Vet Mall. So we find interesting about this parcel is that it is adjacent to a very large County holding of a fairly pristine watershed that's largely protected through the County's prior acquisitions. So it would qualify under the new Quarter Percent Program in the specified criteria.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That intersection because I didn't live far from there back in the '70's but it's opposite the old Billy Blake. It's south of what's now Sun Vet Mall, right? And what else is on the South Side there? I know as you go down Broadway, you have the Town of Islip Restoration Center on the West Side. This is on the East Side.

MR. ISLES:

Right. It goes right immediately south of this as what's known as the Fusco Farm, which is about 9 acres, a very small operation and then directly south of that is several thousand feet of County land approaching an ancillary facility of the Sayville Fire Department on Broadway Avenue. We do have an Aerial if you want to look at that. But eventually south of the fire station, substation is then residential development along the East Side of Broadway Avenue.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is the plan to acquire the farm?

MR. ISLES:

No, but I did contact Legislator Lindsay's Office and suggested that he consider that because that would square off all of the County holdings. So we think that's worthy of consideration.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Would you still consider that piecemeal approach, in the absence of the farm? With this acquisition on its own merit, you know favorable consideration?

MR. ISLES:

I think it would because there are two sides to this property that adjoin land other than roads. To the south is the farm parcel, a very small farm. To the west is County Farm. So it does directly adjoin County Farm. The parcel itself has a pretty severe topographic feature where it does dip down towards the Sans Soucci Lake System, Brown's River Tributary System. So the parcels are very definitely part of the watershed.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

How many acres?

MR. ISLES:

This parcel, I believe, is 7 acres. I'll get my facts. Two and a half. Yes, 2 1/2 acres. Two point five acres.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Quick question? A willing seller?

MR. ISLES:

My understanding from Legislator Lindsay's staff is that there is a willing seller. I haven't personally spoken to anyone on this one other than Legislator Lindsay's Office. But he apparently has been approached. He approached the owner who indicates that he wants to get rid of the property. That's all I know.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

It should be under the new Quarter Percent Program.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to approve. It's planning steps. Motion to approve by myself, no by Legislator Fields, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? 1678 is approved.

I.R. NO. 1678 Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under pay as you go 1/4 % Taxpayer Protection Program (Land of Jeffrey Rimland, Town of Islip) (Legislator William Lindsay)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1679 amending Open Space Program in connection with acquisition of waterfront property at Lake Ronkonkoma.

MR. ISLES:

This is a very small parcel.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

How small?

MR. ISLES:

In the vicinity of -- how small? I think about a half of an acre or so, yes. But it's a parcel that is directly adjacent to County land. It's in Western Suffolk County obviously. It's a parcel that provides access from Beach Street to the lake itself. So that's probably the most important aspect of this is that where the County owns significant holdings along the shoreline of Lake Ronkonkoma, this would provide another opportunity for public access for that neighborhood and the public at large. Parks Trustees has reviewed this and has recommended it to the --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

This is under the Open Space Program. Can I -- Counsel or Allan? Where is this? This is the property tax funded Open Space Program?

MR. SABATINO:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

In the Capital Budget?

MR. SABATINO:

Correct.

MR. GRECCO:

The old Capital. It's the old Capital Open Space Program. There is some money in it. There is some money in it. It's minimal. It's a minimal acquisition.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is there enough money to cover the acquisition?

MR. GRECCO:

Yes, I put some money aside for a sizeable acquisition in Setauket.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Oh, slush fund.

MR. GRECCO:

But no, actually we're in contract.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Can I just ask --?

MR. GRECCO:

With the contract vendee and assuming that contract vendee can prevail in court, we have a real gem of an acquisition. This one, while it's not going to give us -- cost us much money, I'm looking at having maybe two hundred thousand dollars over what I need for the other acquisition. So if it's -- I assume -- I should have enough money for this.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Can I just ask where is this in relation to the Trailer Park?

MR. ISLES:

Probably half a mile.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay, thank you.

MR. ALDEN:

Isn't this the one where the house burned down, so there's a foundation on there?

MR. GRECCO:

I'm not familiar with that either.

MR. ISLES:

It's directly adjacent to the catering hall, bar to the north of it.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

All right. Well we do that with -- we go out and appraise property. So we're doing an environmental study and all that too. All right.

MR. GRECCO:

Right.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay, motion to approve by Legislator Alden, second by Legislator Fields. 1679 is approved.

I.R. NO. 1679 Amending Open Space Program in connection with acquisition of waterfront property at Lake Ronkonkoma, Town of Islip. (CP 7144) (Legislator William Lindsay)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We did CEQ. Introductory non-prime sense 56, memorializing resolution

requesting New York State to require labeling of chemicals known to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity. I think we can handle this one. Motion to approve by Legislator Fields second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? Sense 56 is approved.

INTRODUCTORY NON-PRIME:

Sense 56 Memorializing resolution requesting State of New York to require labeling of chemicals known to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity. (Legislator Ginny Fields)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Tabled prime.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1024 Charter Law to authorize payments in lieu of taxes. Motion to table Legislator Caracciolo, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? 1024 is tabled.

TABLED PRIME:

I.R. NO. 1024 Adopting Local Law No. -2001, A Charter Law to authorize payments in lieu of taxes (pilots) for Suffolk County Community Greenways Fund. (Legislator Michael Caracciolo)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1185 approving acquisition under the Suffolk County Land Partnership Preservation Program, Ridgehaven Estates. Motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Alden. Hold on. Withdrawn, withdrawn. Go ahead, I'm sorry. No, I'm withdrawing my tabling.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Was it tabled because we didn't have the Town Resolution? Is that where we -- are we still the same -- at the same place?

MR. SABATINO:

We need the Town Board Resolution. That's why it was tabled then and again.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table by Legislator Binder, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? 1185 is tabled.

I.R. NO. 1185 Approving acquisition under Suffolk County Land Preservation Partnership Program (Ridgehaven Estates LLC Property) Town of Brookhaven. (Legislator Martin Haley)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1198 implementing Greenways Program in connection with acquisition of

active Parklands, Village of Amityville. I believe we have all our resolutions.

MR. SABATINO:

We were waiting.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It's a tug of war.

MR. SABATINO:

We were waiting for a Town Board Resolution. Oh, it finally came in. The Town Board Resolution finally came in, yes, yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

This is about -- it's four parcels. We will never purchase the four. It's at a point along the Bay. So hopefully, we can negotiate the parcel right at the point, at least. It's Legislator Postal's but it's in my district. I'm going along. It's a strip right on the Nassau County line. It juts out at the Bay, never developed. Right and you can actually, on a clear day, you can see the Twin Towers and --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Counsel? Okay, because mine has a lot of blanks on it so --

MR. SABATINO:

The Town Board resolution came last week and we just --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Quiet. Motion to approve by Legislator Bishop, second by Legislator Binder who is the Town of Babylon Legislator. All in favor? Opposed? The resolution is approved.

I.R. NO. 1198 Implementing Greenways Program in connection with acquisition of active parklands at Village of Amityville. (Legislator David Bishop)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 APPROVED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1230 is authorizing acquisition of environmentally sensitive lands to be acquired with current funding pursuant to Article XII of the Suffolk County Charter. What are we talking about here?

MR. GRECCO:

Pine Barrens Core.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay, Pine Barrens Core. The committee's got to make a decision at some point. The committee has continually tabled this despite my objection and the administration's objection on the theory that somebody is going to prioritize these parcels. I thought this is what you're actually doing?

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

I think the question was more New York State's contribution.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Right.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

I thought we were going to have someone here from the department --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

There is no update on that. We invited the DEC, Commissioner Cowan, Director Cowan, whatever, Regional Director. He declined because he says that there are lawsuits regarding what we want to ask them about. However, he would be willing to answer our written questions. I have --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Did you offer an Executive Session?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I didn't. I didn't offer an Executive Session.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Why don't you offer an Executive Session because, at least, we can understand in a closed-door meeting.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Because that's something we really could do.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I should have offered an Executive Session. You're exactly right.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

And as Counsel says. No, no, let's not put that on the record. But Executive Session is --

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman? Which is the approximate cost if we implemented this? Or what we would be authorizing the County Executive to spend, if we implemented this?

MR. GRECCO:

I think, I went through that. My guess is you have about three thousand acres left to acquire in the Core. At ten thousand dollars an acre, it would be thirty million. At twenty thousand an acre, it would be sixty million. So my guess it's around fifty million.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Thanks.

MR. GRECCO:

If we were to acquire every single piece?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Real quick though?

MR. GRECCO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

The 1994 Pine Barrens Act, the State Legislation to acquire -- preserve and acquire fifty thousand Core acres of Pine Barrens in Central Suffolk.

MR. GRECCO:

Well, if you have a number of mechanisms. County acquisitions, State

acquisition and transfer of developments.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

How much has the State contributed? What amount of acreage did the State acquire?

MR. GRECCO:

The State? Well, the State acquired thirteen thousand acres, approximately twenty eight hundred, I guess, was a transfer from the Federal Government of the Otis Pike Preserve and they started out with ten thousand and they ended up with thirteen thousand. We did some {stats} here. We are up to almost twenty thousand acres. What we have acquired since -- just for what it's worth. It's been a long day. Since February of '98, we went from seventeen thousand three hundred acres to now, nineteen thousand six hundred acres.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Is there a formula when the act was passed as to -- would it be a Partnership Program, fifty-fifty?

MR. GRECCO:

My knowledge -- I wasn't here then. But what I understand is that there was a goal of acquiring 75 percent of the Pine Barrens Core.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

At the County?

MR. GRECCO:

By overall. Overall, Federal, State, Town, County, Village, whatever of public acquisition. By all estimates, including the most radical, we have done so.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'm going to end it there because we have members who have to leave and I have to get through this agenda. Anyway, my point is to the committee that somebody has got to make a decision what we want to do.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Well, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table. I guess that is the decision.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

But you advocate approving the resolution? You do?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes, these are parcels that were all previously approved.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Mr. Grecco just said that we had met our goal of acquiring -- wait a minute but let's clear the air once and for all. Have we met our goal Mr. Grecco?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Let me fold up your tent?

MR. GRECCO:

No, no. The goal was for public ownership of all the property within the Core by one vehicle or another. The game plan was for 75 percent

acquisition and 25 percent transfer development rights. We have reached that 75 percent acquisition figure. But we still have an obligation to the balance of the people there to do something.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

That's what this resolution seeks to do.

MR. GRECCO:

Yes, what we're looking to do was --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Authorization?

MR. GRECCO:

Was authorize my department to continue negotiating on small and large lots. I cannot offer anything, at this point, to any of these parties. We've run out of money and I have parties coming to us looking for us to purchase their properties.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Mike, would you yield?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

The concern is -- are the 25 percent that the TDR has just happened to happen the way we envision it.

MR. GRECCO:

That's correct.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

The State has not pitched in their share. So since they haven't, the question for the committee is, though we want to provide relief, it's not right these people are holding onto land that they can't sell. Should we jump in with our money again, when the State hasn't done, at minimum 50 percent, when they have the buying power for more than 50 percent and they should have.

MR. GRECCO:

I want to read --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

That's the question we have to hit the State with before, I think, we jump in and we buy.

MR. GRECCO:

Just so you get a clear picture. In the plan, it states, it is universally -- I'll try that again. It is universally recognized that sufficient public funding does not exist for the acquisition of all remaining privately held lands in the Core area of the Central Pine Barrens. Thus, the establishment and viability of a TDR Bank is absolutely essential to the ultimate conservation of the Core area as a broad continuous source of pure recharged to the underlying aquifer system.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

What is that document you just read from?

MR. GRECCO:

It's a portion of the Northville settlement that created the Pine Barrens Transfer Development Rights Program. So it was clear that they understood that we were not going to have sufficient --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Final question? Where did the money come from if this committee and the Legislature approved the resolution?

MR. GRECCO:

If you approve the resolution, it would come from presumably the new Drinking Water Program so --

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

New indebtedness.

MR. GRECCO:

New in -- well, yes, which is attached to it.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

It would?

MR. GRECCO:

You're absolutely right.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It would.

MR. GRECCO:

And what you're saying is for every dollar I spend in the Core, I can spend a dollar on the East or West End.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Move it along.

MR. GRECCO:

That's what I'm saying, however --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table, or having been made and having been seconded, the tabling motion by Legislator Caracciolo, second by Legislator Binder. All in favor? Opposed? It's tabled.

I.R. NO. 1230 Authorizing acquisition of Environmentally Sensitive Lands to be acquired with current funding pursuant to Article XII of the Suffolk County Charter. (County Executive)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. Help me, where am I?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

1265

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Approving acquisition under the Suffolk County Land Partnership Preservation, Portion Road, Lake Ronkonkoma.

MR. ISLES:

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1265 resolution.

MR. ISLES:

This went to Parks Trustees. They turned it down.

MR. SABATINO:

There's no Town Resolution.

MR. ISLES:

Legislator Caracappa is requesting an opportunity to go before the Trustees.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table.

MR. ISLES:

It will happen in August.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Binder. All in favor? Opposed? 1265 is tabled.

I.R. NO. 1265 Approving acquisition under Suffolk County Land Preservation Partnership Program at Portion Road in Lake Ronkonkoma, Town of Brookhaven. (Legislator Joseph Caracappa)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1337 is dedicating certain lands now owned by Suffolk County to the County Nature Preserve.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table by Legislator Binder, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? It is tabled.

I.R. NO. 1337 Dedicating certain lands now owned by the County of Suffolk to the County Nature Preserve pursuant to Article I of the Suffolk County Charter and Section 406 of the New York Real Property Tax Law. (Woodlands in Hauppauge) (Legislator Andrew Crecca)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1359 is requiring adherence to federal standards for mercury testing in Suffolk County. Explanation? Why do we -- what's going on?

MR. SABATINO:

What happened the last time, the reason it was tabled was there was -- the Chairman was going to request Public Works to come down and make a presentation to see if it was --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

A whole presentation? I think I just wanted a letter.

MR. SABATINO:

No, a presentation as to whether or not they could comply with the standards. That's why it was tabled.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. Motion to table. But what are we doing in the interim period?

MR. SABATINO:

My notes say that Public Works was going to be asked for their comments, because the committee wanted to know what their position was on this.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

They haven't come down yet.

LEGISLATOR BINDER:

You didn't ask them.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. I will ask for their comments. Motion to table by Legislator Binder, second by Legislator Alden. All in favor? Opposed? 1359 is tabled.

I.R. NO. 1359 Requiring adherence to federal standards for mercury testing in Suffolk County. (Legislator Jon Cooper)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1493 is implementing Greenways Program in connection with active acquisition of active Parklands in Lindenhurst. We need resolutions on that, correct? Motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Binder. All in favor? Opposed? 1493 is tabled.

I.R. NO. 1493 Implementing Greenways Program in connection with acquisition of active Parklands in Lindenhurst. (Town of Babylon) (Legislator David Bishop)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1494 adopting Local Law, a Charter Law to promote Smart Growth by diversifying composition of Suffolk County Planning Commission.

MR. SABATINO:

The Public Hearing was recessed.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So we have another --

MR. SABATINO:

The Public Hearing was recessed.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to table by Legislator Fields, seconded by Legislator Alden. All in favor of 1494 is tabled.

I.R. NO. 1494 Adopting Local Law No. -2001, A Charter Law to promote Smart Growth by diversifying composition of County Planning Commission. (Legislator Ginny Fields)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1499 is approving --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Motion to withdraw the resolution.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Withdrawn. 1502 directing Suffolk County Planning Department RFP. Motion to table Legislator Fields, second by myself. All in favor? Opposed? 1502 is tabled.

I.R. NO. 1502 Directing County Planning Department to establish RFP Policy for securing grants for Soil and Water Conservation District. (Legislator Ginny Fields)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1523 is a resolution approving appointment Suffolk County Panel on Groundwater Protection.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Make a motion to table because none of those people are here.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1523 motion to table by Fields, second by Bishop. Tabled.

I.R. NO. 1523 Resolution approving appointment of member to Suffolk County Panel on Groundwater Protection. (Dr. Robert Turner) (Legislator George Guldi)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1524 a motion by Fields, second by Bishop to table. Approved.

I.R. NO. 1524 Resolution approving appointment of member to Suffolk County Panel on Groundwater Protection. (Richard Amper) (Legislator George Guldi)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1525 motion by Fields, second by Bishop to table. It's tabled.

I.R. NO. 1525 Resolution approving appointment of member of Suffolk County Panel on Groundwater Protection. (Sara Meynard) (Legislator George Guldi)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1526 same motion, same second, same vote.

I.R. NO. 1526 Resolution approving appointment of member of Suffolk County Panel on Groundwater Protection. (Julie Penny) (Legislator George Guldi)

VOTE: 6-0-0-1 TABLED

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to adjourn by Legislator Caracciolo.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

I just have a quick question before we adjourn.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Second by myself. On the motion?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Yes, I just needed to ask Jim Spero to put this on the record very quickly. It's about a study, a Brown Tide Study that has been ongoing at SUNY Stony Brook Marine Sciences. They're concerned about the rest of the research being completed because they are not certain of the status of their grant. Can you please just tell us the status of that grant, quickly Jim? I just want that on the record.

MR. SPERO:

Well, funding for the Brown Tide Studies has become a Pay As You Go Project and while there's funding in the Pay As You Go Account, there's about five million dollars remaining in that account. The department and the County Executive so far have not come across with a resolution to appropriate any additional funds for this program.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Can we do that?

MR. SPERO:

You can do that if you like?

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Introduce the resolution?

MR. SPERO:

Sure.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

For that program? Okay, this is the Brown Tide at Peconic Bay that's been ongoing.

MR. SPERO:

I'm not sure that it would be a need for the rest of this year.

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Well, I think they were expecting ninety nine thousand per year. I think that's what it is. I'm not certain. But I'll work with you Paul, then on putting a resolution together for that.

MR. SPERO:

Just let me know the exact amount and we'll --

LEGISLATOR FISHER:

Okay. Thank you Jim. I'll call them back.

(The meeting was adjourned at 6:25 P.M.)

{ } Denotes spelled phonetically