

**ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Environment, Land Acquisition and Planning Committee was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, NY 11787 on Monday, **December 8, 2003** at 1:30 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator David Bishop - Chairman
Legislator Michael Caracciolo - Vice Chairman
Legislator Ginny Fields
Legislator Vivian Vioria-Fisher
Legislator George Guldi
Legislator Daniel Losquadro

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Paul Sabatino - Counsel to the Legislature
Legislator Crecca - District # 12
Alexandra Sullivan - Chief Deputy Clerk - Legislature
Tom Carroll - Aide to Legislator Bishop
Frank Tassone - Aide to Legislator Crecca
Nanette Essell - Aide to Presiding Officer Postal
Catherine Stark - IR/County Executive's Office
Lauretta Fischer - Suffolk County Planning
Vito Minei - Dir. of the Div. of Environmental Quality w/ Health Department
Judith Gordon - Commissioner of Suffolk County Parks
Enrico Nardone - Seatuck Organization
Arlene Handel - Northport Town Village
Jean Freeman - Historical Society of Islip Hamlet
Peter Rettaliata - Seatuck
Charla Bolton - Society for the Preservation of L. I. Antiquities.
Ed Davis - Self
Peter Freeman - Historical Society of Islip Hamlet
Job Hunter - Amsterdam Beach/E. H. Town
Tom Dillon - Self
Kay Dillon - neighborhood
Charles Schlesinger - School Bd. Admin. Islip Schools
Lenny Lampel - Seatuck Environmental Association
Ray Erwood - Seatuck
Walter Erwood - Seatuck
Charles A. Hersh - Self
Tracy Worth - Self
Martha Pinnola - Self/Community
Nick Gibbons - Environment Analyst S. C. Parks
Sally Garrett - Seatuck
Sean Clancy - BRO

Kathleen O'Connor - Great South Bay/Audubon/Scully
Betty Cochrane - Seatuck
Jack Finkenberg - Great South Bay Audubon
Bill Akin - Concerned Citizens of Montauk
Nancy Porta Libert - OSICA - HSIH
Brian Gargano - Presiding Officer's Office
Kevin LaValle - Aide to Leg. Losquadro
Jim Burke - Suffolk County Real Estate Department
Christine Costigan - Suffolk County Real Estate Department
Legislator Alden - District #10
Vito Minei - Dir. of the Div. of Environmental Quality w/ Health Department
Alpa Pandya - Nature Conservancy
All other interested parties.

Minutes taken by:
Eileen Schmidt, Secretary

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:35 P.M.)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Please rise for the pledge of allegiance to be led by Counsel to the Legislature Paul Sabatino.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

As is always the case we have a lengthy agenda, many speakers who want to bring business before us so we will dive right into it. And we will begin with a presentation by Enrico Nardone of the Seatuck Organization about a proposed purchase in resolution 2085.

MR. NARDONE:

(inaudible)

MS. SCHMIDT:

You have to speak into the microphone.

MR. NARDONE:

How's that?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

That's one.

MR. NARDONE:

Enrico Nardone, Director of the Seatuck Environmental Association. I'm joined today by Peter Rettaliata a member of our Board of Directors who's going to add a few comments when I'm finished. And we are here of course to urge the committee to approve resolution 2085 and seize a one of a kind opportunity to acquire a spectacular 70 acre property in Islip and a magnificent

historic mansion that's on it. We're also here to present our proposal to help the County in making this acquisition feasible.

SPEAKER:

(inaudible)

MR. NARDONE:

We are proposing essentially to shoulder the primary managerial and financial responsibilities of this acquisition in exchange for the opportunity to establish a nature center on this site. Before I turn to the details of our proposal I wanted to just quickly give you a little bit of background about our organization.

We are a member based not for profit 501c3 organization dedicated to promoting the conservation of Long Island's wildlife and environment. We were found more than 20 years ago and have been endowed by the Peters Webster family of Islip. Although our roots are in scientific research we have transitioned over the years to a focus on environmental education and we currently offer a diverse collection of environmental education and natural history programs at locations across Long Island. In fact, a great majority of our programs are currently held on various Suffolk County Parks and Preserves and we are happy to say we have a great working relationship with Suffolk County Parks Department.

We currently offer a collection of weekly adult and family nature walks at various locations around the Island. We have a monthly lecture series at the Islip Public Library that often draws as many as a hundred people. We offer programs for schools and libraries around the Island. And we have a very popular pre-school program for three to five year olds that you may have recognized this guy in the picture Lenny Lampel from yesterday's Newsday one of our programs was featured. And I have included copies of this article with the proposals. It's in the back of the proposal. In fact, these pre-school programs have been so popular that we've been struggling to keep up with the demand. We started offering these programs a year ago, once a month; we're now offering them twice a week. And the success of these programs and our other programs highlights our essential handicap.

And the final bit of information that you need to know about us is that we don't have a facility of our own. We have been offering the programs we do offer and having the success we have without our own building and we recognize that if we had our own facility we could do a great number of more programs and have a lot more success. We were historically based on the Peters Webster property in Islip and we had proposed to operate -- to establish a nature center on that facility which is owned by the federal government. Unfortunately, that proposal was denied because the federal government was trying to minimize human activity on that property. And then we eventually lost our office space on the refuge and have been working from temporary offices for the past year and a half which is why we were so excited to learn earlier this year that the National Audubon Society was interested in selling the -- their Scully estate. And why we were so excited to hear that the County through Legislator Alden and Legislator Fields was interested in at least exploring the possibility of acquiring this property and was looking for potential partners.

When we learned that we of course submitted this proposal to the County and in it as I mentioned we are essentially offering to shoulder the primary financial and managerial responsibility for this property in exchange for the opportunity to establish a nature center there. Our proposal has essentially three major components. The first is relying on our own

staff expertise and board expertise in working with the County Parks Department with the state D.E.P. we would try to develop a management plan for the property that's safe guarded the property's open space and wildlife habitat resources.

The open space value of this property is illustrated by this satellite photograph you get a sense of just how rare a large 70 acre track of land is in this part of Suffolk County. This is the parcel identified by the yellow arrow here and for those of you that need a little help this is the intersection of Southern State and Sunrise. This is Heckscher Park down here in the right hand corner and that's the approximate location of the Islip Town Hall. The open space value is obvious. The ecological space is not only based on the property size and relative rarity, but also on the diversity of this property; it's got extensive salt marsh, mature upland forest, freshwater wetlands, a large saltwater pond. And for those of you who haven't seen this property I just have a few quick video clips and I don't know how well you can see it, but to give you a sense of what this property looks like. This is overlooking the marshland with the forest in the background; you get more of an idea of what the salt marsh looks like. And then the final clip after this one is actually taken from the north of the property panning back on South Bay Avenue and the striking thing about it is you get a sense of how much forested land there is to the north of these salt marsh areas. This is a long property that's approximately a mile from head to toe and contains lots of great habitat. The ecological value of this property is further heightened by its' proximity to the National Wildlife Refuge which is just across that street you were just looking at. And you know the well-documented value of large contiguous tracks of open space.

The second aspect of our component -- of our proposal is public access. These properties both have been essentially closed off to the public. And we're proposing to, you know, keeping in mind that the priority of the wildlife and open space habitat to develop some trails actually to improve the existing trails on the property to develop some new trails. And eventually add some boardwalks, which would open this property up, open the beauty and diversity of the property up to the people of Suffolk County.

And then finally the third aspect of our proposal involves the building that is tucked away in the middle of this property at about where that yellow arrow is. We propose to turn this building into a nature center with all of the things that you would expect from a nature center. All of the programs we're currently offering plus all the programs that we're asked to do and there's certainly a demand for that we can't do without a facility. The after school programs, the full day workshops, the summer camps, the holiday camps there's clearly a demand for. This is a spectacular building with almost no renovations. It's well suited to serve as a nature center. It's got this great property surrounding it of course. It has this large terrace in the back. It has lots of large open rooms that could accommodate educational programs and it's, you know, I had hoped to get the committee down there to see this because it's a spectacular building that sells itself. It's worth noting that the building was designed by Grosvenor Atterbury whose a world renowned architect and we've been told by the folks at the Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities and the local historical chapter that this building would certainly qualify for historic recognition. And most likely would be able to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It's got lots of neat architectural feature, winding staircases and these sorts of turrets on all four of the corners. So it's a great place; it would make a great nature center. There's lots of details about our proposal about the types of programs we'd like to offer about the building contained in that document in front of you. I hope you have a chance to look through it, but I want to turn I think to what the key question is, is you're asking yourself is how do we afford to pay for this and maintain this building. We've been told the building is in great shape; we've had engineers and architects look at it, but despite that we recognize that there would

need to be some capital expenditures undertaken to prepare this building to accommodate the public. And we've contemplated these expenditures and they include a parking lot with improved restroom facilities and things like that. We've secured two large pledges totaling \$300,000 that we have contemplated would cover the cost of these expenditures. Not only the start up improvements, but also the things we'd like to do down the road including the upgrade to the main entrance and the insulation of boardwalks and perhaps an observation deck and things. So that money we have ready to go ready to spend on improving this property and making it ready for the public.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Could you suffer an interruption, please?

MR. NARDONE:

Absolutely.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

I'm concerned about the -- that your capital program and renovation project is done backwards; you have \$300,000 in pledges and you've scoped out \$300,000 in work. How many square feet is this building roughly? It's an older mansion and residence.

MR. NARDONE:

It's an old building and I know it has 27 rooms and seven or eight bathrooms. I don't know the square footage.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

So it's probably six or seven thousand lets call it 10,000 square feet.

MR. NARDONE:

Sure.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Okay. It was build as a residence sometime ago.

MR. NARDONE:

Right.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Industry standards tell you if you're going to renovate it for residential purposes figure a \$100 a square foot. If you're going to renovate a residence and use it to commercial purposes adding the fire protection sprinkling and the other code requirements for that conversion figure \$200 a square foot. Your budget --

MR. NARDONE:

(inaudible)

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Excuse me. Your budget is at \$300,000 is about a million seven short.

MR. NARDONE:

Well, I mean, the property has been used as an office space. It was designed as a residence, but

it has been used as an office. The Audubon, you know, they have made some improvements to this building. I mean, certainly it's perhaps more ready to accommodate a nature center than you might think.

MR. RETTALIATA:

If I could add --

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

You have to use the microphone.

MR. RETTALIATA:

My name is Peter Rettaliata as Enrico mentioned before. I think our assessment is it doesn't require a complete renovation. It, in fact, is a center today for Audubon and requires some improvement and the building in fact is in pretty good shape. Things like handicap access and some better access and things like that, but in fact the physical plant is in pretty good shape as it is including things like the roof and the public spaces and so on.

MR. NARDONE:

The other issue is, you know, how do we pay for the annual maintenance and operation of this facility and I turn your attention to page 13 of that proposal if you have in front of you. It's sort of hard to see this and I don't want to dwell on these details, but I just wanted to illustrate a few points with this chart. And the first is that, you know, we have worked really hard and crunch a lot of numbers in trying to answer these questions. And I think it's natural to have some doubts, but we have talked to lots of nature centers across the northeast. We've reviewed budgets from lots of nature centers; we've consulted with lots of business and financial leaders from Long Island and even with conservative estimates we're pretty confident that we can handle this. The other important thing about this chart is that we're contemplating lots of revenue sources including membership and fundraising obviously, grants. Income from our invested assets which we can rely on every year and the final thing is that eventually this facility with the programs that we know we could offer, the people that we know we can attract we're confident that we can get to a point of offering establishing essentially a fee for service facility. In phase one perhaps in the first couple of years we think almost right away we can attract enough people and raise enough revenue from programs fee to cover a third of our budgetary needs from program revenue. By the time we're up and running I think within five years we can reach a level of maybe covering 2/3 of our budgetary needs from program fees.

So to summarize that's what we're interested in doing here is protecting this property, protecting the open space the ecological value. Making it accessible to the people of Suffolk County and establishing a premier educational and recreational facility for the people of the County. And in sum I would in conclusion I would just urge the committee to approve this resolution and seize this one of a kind opportunity to partner with Seatuck in acquiring this property.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you. I have a number of questions. First, who is going to own the house?

MR. NARDONE:

Well, I think under the proposal the County would own the house and we would enter into some sort of lease agreement, some cooperative agreement or something like that for sort of a long term use of the building. The other scenario that had been discussed is that, you know, we would somehow take title to the building and those are options that we're certainly open to.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

But you're not going to pay for the building. You want the County to purchase the land and the building.

MR. NARDONE:

Right.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Then provide the land to you as your office and your center and is that in the budget what you're going to pay the County for it's newly purchased mansion there?

MR. NARDONE:

Well, we're saying that we don't have the resources to acquire this property ourselves, but we do have the resources is to help the County make this deal feasible. We feel that this is a once in a lifetime opportunity for Suffolk County to acquire 70-acre parcel and an historic mansion at a price that seems to be discounted.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman, would you suffer an interruption for just one-second?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You're interrupting him.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Well, both of you actually. Would you suffer an interruption?

MR. NARDONE:

Absolutely.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Just to set this --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Welcome to the Environment Committee.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Thank you. I use to sit on this actually. Just to set it in perspective the resolution calls for the purchase by the County of the entire parcel. What we've done in the past when we purchase property we've ended up letting it sit there. Now as you know we don't have enough Park Police to patrol these properties and some of that are actually used then abused where people are getting injured on there's ATV's, there's other type of abuse that occurs on these other properties. This is a situation where when we purchase this property we have a tenant that can go in and provide all these type of benefits and pluses to the people of Suffolk County. Also they're going to provide security and there will be somebody on property at all times so that the property cannot be abused as some of the other properties that we have acquired in the past. So this presentation is secondary to, you know, like the question of whether we purchase the property or not. This provides, you know, a nice situation where the building is secure, the property secure and we have somebody going forward that the County is going to be off the hook as far as for upgrades on the building itself or maintenance and things of that nature.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I appreciate the perspective, but this is the question period and we're going to debate the bill later on and that perspective --

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

(inaudible) Seatuck.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. All right. Seatuck is going to operate now and you gave us a chart with your funding sources and you're not looking to the County for any of the funding sources. Are you going to be funded by the Audubon Society at all? Are they --

MR. NARDONE:

As far as I know, no. I would expect not, but if they want to contribute some money that would be great, but I would expect not.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I should hope so.

MR. NARDONE:

Since the beginning when we first started talking with the County about this it has been clear to us that the County while there maybe funds available to acquire this property we should expect no help in maintaining and operating this facility. So we have been operating on that premise since the beginning and all of our analysis of this has been based on that, that we would be shouldering the burden completely.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Are you joined by anybody from the Audubon Society today?

MR. NARDONE:

There's not anyone from the National Audubon Society here, but there are members of the local Audubon Chapter.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, oh. I'll reserve my questions for them. Are there other members of the committee -- Legislator Alden have questions? Okay, thank you very much.

MR. NARDONE:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I hope these are in the order that I received them, Charlotte Bolton.

MS. BOLTON:

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. I'm representing the Society for the Preservation of Long Island Antiquities. Our director Robert Mackay wanted to be here today, but was not able to attend. We're appearing to lend our support to the efforts to acquire the Scully property and in particular to acquire the property with the Grosvenor Atterbury designed house included in the purchase. We would like to just say a little bit about the house. Grosvenor Atterbury was a

designer who had many Long Island country house commissions, but was also noted for several New York City commissions, which included the American wing of the Metropolitan Museum. What's distinctive about the Scully house which was, in fact, his last commission was the features that incorporated from the experimental work he was doing at Forest Hills Gardens. I have a copy of the information from our book Long Island Country Houses and their architect, which is the definitive book on the subject, and I would be happy to leave that with you so that you could include it in the file. We'd like to say that SPLIA is a organization with a regional presence which whose mission is to preserve historic environments. As such we offer our expertise and the expertise of network organizations to help the Seatuck organization work out the restoration and maintenance questions at the Scully property.

I would like to say also, in closing, that the adaptive reuse of the house would make this a question that would not be a problem for Suffolk County in that it's not going to be a derelict building on a park property as some of them have been in the past, but rather an ongoing organization with a presence throughout Long Island. And, in fact, a distinctive building could help build identity for the organization and, in fact, sell the programs that are being conducted from that headquarter site. And we fully support this effort and hope that it will be positively concluded. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you. Any questions? No. Charles Hersh. Kay Dillon is next.

MR. HERSH:

Hi, I'm Charles Hersh and I live in Amityville. I've been a member of Seatuck for years. I've always enjoyed their nature programs and so I remember when they had the Webster's Day that they would typical have -- well, sometimes they would do it at Webster's Day sometimes they would do it at other locations depending upon, you know, what they're studying. I know the Osprey Program they had a big Osprey nest, well, several nests, but one was very big and they would first give a little lecture and talk about, you know, the bird its habits and all. And then they would train, you know, a telescope on the bird, you know, the nest show the young and all and we'd know their habits an all in their nature program. And they've been doing things like that for years, you know, covered all kinds of animals. Obviously, the Piping Plover had to been done at the beach and they've been doing a good job now, but I think they'll do an even better job if they had their own nature center where they could be established locally. And they'd probably continue doing the same things that they've done when they had the Webster Estates. Some of their programs were beyond the Webster Estate when, you know, they would have speeches there probably again it would probably be Osprey's in that area and other creatures and all. And so I think it would be very beneficial. They have excellent nature programs now. So I just hope that they're able to continue and get the use the new Scully Estate. Okay, that's all I had to say.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you Mr. Hersh. Kay Dillion, Martha Pinnola is next.

MS. DILLION:

I'm fortunate enough to live right in the neighborhood of the Scully Estates. I live on Maple Street and over the years I've been in there. The Audubon has had programs there occasionally and I have had the use of the Webster Peter Estate until recently. And I just want to encourage you to access this land so that my children, my grandchildren and all the people of Suffolk

County can enjoy this beautiful piece of property because it's very, very special. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you. Martha Pinnola, Charles Schlesinger is next.

MS. PINNOLA:

Hello. I would like to add too that, that if -- I also live in the community my name is Martha Pinnola and I'm an artist. And we had an idea to join with the Seatuck environmental group and have some small quite art programs there music has a way to bring the community into the area and respect the environment. And at the same time provide Suffolk County residents with all kinds of interesting musical and cultural artistic possibilities in connection with the environment. And I too wanted to say that most importantly, this morning my daughter is six years old asked me what I was going to this meeting for and I said, you know that ride that we take on the bicycles or we walk sometimes. Or we've taken the wagon down and there's all that land all the way down to Islip Beach and there's trees and there's all kinds of beautiful foliage and she said, yeah. And I said I'm going to make sure it stays just like that and nothing gets knocked down and nothing gets put up and we just preserve the land for our children and our grandchildren and so on.

So if you haven't seen it please do before you vote no and take that away from us because this is just something that is so important. I really would encourage you to go down and take a look yourself and enjoy it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Charles Schlesinger and Walter Erwood is next.

MR. SCHLESINGER:

Good afternoon. It's an honor to be here. I'm representing the Islip Public Schools. I'm a school business official and on behalf of Alan Van Cott the Superintendent of Schools and the Board of Education of the Islip School District we encourage to pass resolution 2085. We feel this acreage abutting the Sherwood Elementary School would best serve the Islip community by continuing and preserving in its present rustic condition all the things it can offer the school district. The Islip School District envisions real educational opportunities in the curriculum area of nature and science for all of our students. We would encourage the County to purchase this great acreage from the Scully property and to preserve the reserve. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Walter Erwood and Kay Erwood is next.

MS. ERWOOD:

Walter Erwood said he'd pay us.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay, thank you.

MS. ERWOOD:

I would just like to quickly say I'm Kay Erwood, I'm the Commissioner of Keep Islip Clean that is part of Keep America Beautiful and that this wonder piece, this wonderful track of land is for the good of all of Suffolk County. We are so -- the land is so easy to get to. It's not in a remote area -- whatever goes on there that the County and Seatuck would provide it is very easy for

everyone in Suffolk County to get there. Very accessible -- it's a wonderland and I hope that you'll preserve it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Kathleen O'Connor is it?

MS. O'CONNOR:

Good afternoon. Kathleen O'Connor and I'm afraid to say I'm a member of the Great South Bay Audubon and Director and also the Director of Brookside County Park in Sayville. And this was a cooperative venture with the County that has worked out extremely well for the public. We have tours twice a week and the Seatuck organization is a well-established educational conservation organization and they're now homeless. And I think this venture with the County is an ideal situation for them and for the County because the building as you've heard from the community and historic division is gorgeous. I've been in it many times and I would like to see this venture completed proposition 2085. And you're going to get me now.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Are you the Audubon representative here today?

MS. O'CONNOR:

The president is also here from our chapter. It's not National Audubon there's a difference. I'm also representing Long Island Audubon the seven chapters that have -- we've written letters I've written letters to you in February and in June. The Living Oceans Program was in the Scully property and they've disbanded that and National for whatever reason and we were very dismayed about this -- mostly financial. And the National organization has also cut funds for all the local chapters. So they're in certain straits and they want to cut their budget and it is our understanding that they said they would not put it up for development, they would leave it to one person, but we would like this person to be the County if we could.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Who do I ask the questions I have to Audubon, to you, or to the president?

MS. O'CONNOR:

Well, you can ask me or you can ask the president.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

How did Audubon come to acquire this?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Excuse me. There is a National representative here. He just stepped out to his car for a moment, but he's on deck when we make the presentation or whenever you want.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. I'd rather growl at the National first and then the local.

MS. O'CONNOR:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you very much. Nancy Porta Libert and Peter Freeman is on deck.

MS. PORTA LIBERT:

Good afternoon. First of all I'd like to applaud the Legislature for its rededication to land acquisition. Many of the points I wished to make have already been covered, but they're a few things I should like to say. Unless we start printing our own money I know we all realize that it comes down always does to matter of choices. And in this particular case of land acquisition the Scully property in my estimation is just a perfectly excellent choice for the very reasons that your tenant most assuredly would be able to assume responsibility for that house and its maintenance. And I'd just like to say, I hope that the Legislature won't get bogged down in that I'm sure that that can be worked out financially to your satisfaction so you don't feel that this is going to be just another open pit that the County's going to have to throw money into as far as that building is concerned.

Just the other few points, this I do believe is one of the last remaining pristine roadways in western Suffolk that lead down to our Great South Bay and that is a very important point I think. Down at the end of South Bay Avenue is a 70 year old Islip Township public bathing beach and thousands of people each year travel down this road to enjoy the Great South Bay and they are treated to this very unique experience of woodlands and wetlands. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife who has acquired the almost 200 acres on the eastside of the roadway will be keeping that land in its natural state. And if the County does the right thing here under the circumstances that we will for much of the time then we will have both sides. And I think we need to remember that the wisest of men cannot create what we have down there, but the wisest of men can preserve it. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Peter Freeman, Betty Cochrane is on deck.

MR. FREEMAN:

Good afternoon ladies and gentlemen. I'm Peter Freeman, Vice President of the Islip Historical Society or Historical Society of Islip Hamlet. And with a membership of over 250 households we as an organization support the proposal of Suffolk County to purchase the Scully sanctuary. The 70-acre property that we've been discussing with the 27 room Normandy style mansion now owned by the Audubon. Some people may be upset with the Audubon for divesting themselves of this property, but the fact is they're going to sell the property. The question is will the property become a wildlife sanctuary, a nature center available for public use, which Mrs. Scully originally intended, which was never fulfilled by the Audubon Society or an upscale development of 39 houses.

We has a historical society are afraid that this property -- if this property falls into the hands of developers Suffolk County will lose an historical link to the Great South Bays gilded age. The chateausque style mansion was built in 1917 by famed Long Island architect Grosvenor Atterbury as was mentioned before. We are aware that the County is leery of buying improved property because of the cost involved. But the Seatuck association is willing to enter into a partnership with Suffolk County whereby they would accept the managerial and financial responsibilities for the property and maintain the chateau. Seatuck's current assets would make the partnership possible and future revenue would be raised through fee for service educational programming supplemented by income from office leases, gift shops sales, facility rentals, membership dues and fundraising.

We see this as a winning proposition for all parties involved. One, Suffolk County would be conserving more open space. Two, an historical home of South Shores gilded age would be saved. Seatuck would have a home for its excellent educational programs that serve people of all ages. And the people of Suffolk County would have an opportunity to visit a chateau and wildlife sanctuary that only the wealthy had access to at one time.

The Historical Society of Islip Hamlet strongly urges you to support the acquisition of the Scully sanctuary for the people of Suffolk County. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you. Betty Cochrane and Jack Finkenberg is on deck. Jack Finkenberg?

MR. HAMILTON:

I'm the president of the Local Chapter of the National Audubon Society, the Great South Bay Audubon Society. We represent members in the Town of Babylon and the Town of Islip and we're here to encourage you to purchase this property so that it can be saved and provide a nature center for the citizens of Suffolk County. I'd be glad to entertain any questions.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I think it's clear that I need to direct my questions to the National Audubon Society.

MR. FINKENBERG:

Yeah, it looks that way. I wanted to make another statement that we were fortunate to occupy a building in one of the County nature preserves in Sayville. It's the Brookside property on Greene Street in Sayville and I think you could kind of compare our stewardship of that property with what we anticipate Seatuck would also do at the Scully site and we've really improved the property. Enhanced the natural qualities, provided great nature ties for the local community and we anticipate that Seatuck would be doing that also. Now we'd like to work with them in their attempts to do that.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Jack, does Audubon have any other holdings in Suffolk County?

MR. FINKENBERG:

Any other what?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Holding, assets that they're going to --

MR. FINKENBERG:

Well, each -- the chapters get involved in local things. I know Moriches Bay Audubon Society has a nature center out in East Moriches.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Now is that owned by the local chapter or can the National come in put that one up for sale also?

MR. FINKENBERG:

No, no. I'm pretty sure that property was owned by the town.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, okay.

MR. FINKENBERG:

And they the North Fork Audubon Society has a center up on the North Fork just by Greenport a beautiful little site there. The chapter gets involved in different arrangements, but I think National, I can't speak for National, but they have large nature holdings, natural holdings, and very active centers.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Knowing you I know that you probably are active in the dialogue within the Audubon Society at large. Is there a controversy about a policy of selling off assets like this?

MR. FINKENBERG:

Well, I don't think it's as controversial as you think. The property doesn't really fit the needs of the Audubon Center. They had a Living Ocean program there; there were some small offices and a small staff there, but that was very expensive for them to maintain that building for that small staff. Their staff changed and I understand Living Ocean has moved to another location. So it doesn't really fit their needs.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You mean Audubon looks at 70 acres on the Great South Bay and says, ehh, you know, I guess that would make a good parking lot if somebody else doesn't want to come and save it.

MR. FINKENBERG:

Well, I hope you'll address that question to the National people.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Well, I guess I'll have to. Okay.

MR. FINKENBERG:

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is that representative here?

MS. COSTIGAN:

This is -- this gentleman is from the National Audubon Associations. He had come if you had questions during the presentation, which is why he didn't file a card.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you for coming.

MR. HAMILTON:

Thank you. I'm Ken Hamilton I'm the Director of Facilities and Services for the National Audubon Society.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Do you just want to take questions or --

MR. HAMILTON:

If you'd like, sure.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. I'd appreciate that. How did Audubon come to acquire this property?

MR. HAMILTON:

I believe it was left to us in the late 70's early 80's by Mrs. Scully with no restrictions on the land or our use of it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. My information it was in the 60's and that she always intended it for it to be a wildlife preserve at least --

MR. HAMILTON:

There's no restrict -- as I understand it --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

There's no legal restrictions.

MR. HAMILTON:

I was a young child and I don't know when it was left to us, but as I had looked at it I'm really more responsible for the maintenance and upkeep of that property as it stands now. But as I understand it and as we've researched it there are no restrictions on our use of that land at this point.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Are there any other properties that you own in Suffolk County?

MR. HAMILTON:

I don't believe we own any others. We operate the Roosevelt Sanctuary in Oyster Bay; I think that's a cooperative arrangement.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So this is the only asset that you own in the region?

MR. HAMILTON:

I think so I'm not exactly sure; it's really now my (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You're not a policy --

MR. HAMILTON:

No, I'm not, no.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. So I'm frustrated because I want to get to some of these policy questions. This -- I

guess I'll save it for debate then if you're not in a position to answer it. I just want --

MR. HAMILTON:

Well, you were raising the issue about our looking at the land as just something that we're going to give away. Audubon is really not in the business of preserving land; that's more of the Nature Conservancy kind of thing. We hope that we could find a conservation buyer for this land should the County choose not to purchase it, but we could do with it what we will and I don't mean to sound like that's an implied threat.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

A conservation buyer would be swell. I'm just -- I went to the web page for Audubon Society and it says, "Audubon's mission is to conserve and restore nature ecosystems" that's the first phrase. And if we have a natural ecosystem that Audubon was given for free then I would expect Audubon not to do something to extort the local government and to say that they're going to allow it to be developed. I'm sure your position, I'm sure everybody in this room's position, is if we have a pie of money to preserve property that we don't want to spend we want to use that pie, that fund, to preserve as much land as possible. And my analysis of this is that in the end we will take a sanctuary and keep it a sanctuary, but have millions less to preserve other properties and that's deeply troubling to me. It's not -- antiquities did this earlier in the year and at that time I muse that this could be opening a door that we don't want to step through and here we are again stepping through that door.

What other assets do you have next time there's a cash crunch? Just, you know, keep diminishing the rest of the pie for other purchases that we have and that's what I'm deeply concerned about.

MR. HAMILTON:

You know we're looking to keep our education and other programs alive. This particular property was used by our Living Oceans Program and funding for that program quite frankly dried up. And that program has not been relocated it's been eliminated and farmed out to the various states.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Who funded Living Oceans?

MR. HAMILTON:

Private donors, some grants from (inaudible), etc.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right.

MR. HAMILTON:

Giving is down and our core mission is not to preserve parcels of land. Now we're not looking to extort money in this case. We thought this was the ideal solution.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Well, the rhetoric that everybody comes up with is that if we don't preserve this, if the County doesn't do the right thing quote unquote then this land is going to be lost forever.

MR. HAMILTON:

Well, that's not -- you know that's it could be more accurate.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right.

MR. HAMILTON:

And I disagree with your characterization of extortion or threat and I'm -- I don't mean to imply that certainly.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You could disagree that's fair.

MR. HAMILTON:

But we would certainly do anything we could to see the land preserved and we looked at this as being the ideal solution. You know Audubon is not a land trust and as I understand it and I never seen the original documents and didn't work for Audubon at the time where our use of this property is unrestricted.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, I sure it must be. I mean, I'm assuming that that is the case. When you say a conservation buyer what kind of effort has Audubon made to find one?

MR. HAMILTON:

We've done some effort -- this proposal came up pretty early on and we thought this was the ideal solution that would benefit the most people. Certainly, the people of Suffolk County a conservation buyer is going live in the house close the land. This would give people access and the use of the property and the sanctuary.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

But we would have millions of dollars then to preserve other properties throughout the County and that's one of the issues that we need to consider. Here's another thing that troubles me. The mission of Audubon is to, you know, as I said is to conserve and restore natural ecosystems. You're getting all this money if this goes through from the local tax base yet I don't see you as partnership in the magnificent proposal that Seatuck is coming forward with. So the money is leaving, you know it comes from the local taxpayers. They get to keep what they already have, but the money is used elsewhere probably for I don't know what. Hopefully, it's to preserve an ecosystem somewhere and not for operational expenses, but whatever it is the net effect is that it leaves the County.

MR. HAMILTON:

I know I'm not at liberty to speak to how that proposal was arrived at, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I appreciate that. Are there any other questions? Thank you very much.

MR. HAMILTON:

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'll -- I assume most people here want to see what happens with this, right? So I'll make a motion to take this out of order and then we'll have the Real Estate Division come forward. What is this 2085.

2085 Authorizing land acquisition under Water Quality Protection Component of the 1/4% Drinking Water Protection Program (National Audubon Society Property, Town of Islip) (Suffolk County Tax Map No. 0500-463.00-01.00-001.000) ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Fields)

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

2085.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to take it out of order by myself second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed? This issue is now before us.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

I have some questions.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Ms. Fischer will be handing out maps of the site.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I guess you should say who you all are.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Christine Costigan the Director of Real Estate joined by Jim Burke the Deputy Director of Real Estate and Loretta Fischer a Principle Planner of the Planning Department and on the end is Bill Moore, Bill is the General Certified Appraiser for the County. On Introductory Resolution 2085 the Audubon Society property -- you've heard considerable amounts on it in terms of the County's basis for the offer and proposal. You should be informed that in our discussions with Audubon we've approached this throughout as a two piece proposal because there's a significant amount of land and underwater and wetlands. And then there's the house, which we segregated on six acres as a separate economic unit. So the basis of our proposal to Audubon was a unit A and unit B. The total was \$4 million; we proposed to pay for parcel A which is the parcel with the house and six acres \$360,000. The balance was for the land. I think you can on the maps in front of you that the parcel is very long. The house is centrally located which in approaching this as an acquisition frankly it does make most sense to acquire both parcels. Because if the house were separately occupied then public access to the rest of the land and it is ideally suited for public access because of the road frontage and easy access. Indeed there's already publicly accessed and has been for many years by people just walking in. It would be interrupted if the center of it were privately owned.

In that so much has been covered I don't know where you want to go exactly. We are proposing the current offer was premised on its being paid out of the 125e residuary non-Pine Barrens money. This is Islip designated money so that the only place that it can be spent is in Islip. We have no other major candidates in Islip which are demanding this money.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Are we ready for questions then?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes, I think she's ready.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I just wanted you to finish your presentation. I'm happy to see that you have separated the acquisition into the two parts because I'm concerned about the type of agreement that we've come to with regards to the management and maintenance of the house. We've seen in other areas in Suffolk County where there has been a house on the property and it becomes a bottomless pit, you know, it becomes a money pit. And so I was wondering whether the agreement has already been drawn up with Seatuck. By the way that was a beautiful presentation, very nicely done, but what kind of protection does the County have?

MS. COSTIGAN:

No. The agreement has not already been drawn up. I suppose this is most analogous to the Sagtikos Manor acquisition in the sense that at the time that you acquired that there was no agreement with anyone to manage the house. But we all knew of the interest of several accomplished groups to take care of the house. In that instance, of course, the groups didn't have any money at all and they relied on local fundraising. So we'd be following that model, but it would be in the better instance where here the group that's interested does have money and does have experience having managed another large building in the past. But the agreement has not been hammered out and indeed it may be decided by Parks and I think Judy Gordon has had some discussion on this point that Seatuck was not given access to the entire building.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Another question is regarding the program. The Greenways has -- a portion of the Greenways Program has an interpretive centerpiece to it.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

As far as the six acres that has the house is 125e the best program for that or would it be -- or would that segment be better served under the Greenways Program that provides for active parkland and even interpretive center.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Well, Greenway does have that \$2 million designated for the nature center that has never been agreed on where that nature center should go so that earmarked money just sits there waiting a location. If it were decided that this should be the location of the County nature center then indeed I would suggest shifting the funding for the parcel with the house on it to be the nature center that's been anticipated all along in the Code. Absent that direction on your part we kept it in the 125e money. It does seem that this, I know Ms. Fields had suggested that be considered as the County nature center. The site is certainly adequate to the task.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

And the location is very accessible.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Oh, highly, yes.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Loretta, did you want to --

MS. FISCHER:

Thank you. Commissioner Gordon and I had spoken about this issue just recently ourselves about the \$2 million. It would have to be on an existing County parkland location. At this point it hasn't been finalized where that location is if we do buy it we can then certainly consider this to be a location for that kind of use. So it can be any parkland under any program. Obviously, there were tentative sites identified one being Southaven Park another being out in Robert Cushman Murphy Park. So it wasn't that it had to be a park acquired with Greenways money, but it just has to be parkland owned by the County. And so therefore we would have to own this to then use it as and be considered as a nature center which we could do if we do acquire it.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Christine with regards to the appraisals, how have they come in?

MS. COSTIGAN:

The appraisals had a significant spread for this parcel, but the purchase price is they range if you will from \$5.4 million to \$5.6 million.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

And that's for the whole piece or the two parcels?

MS. COSTIGAN:

That's everything.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What's the significant spread?

MS. COSTIGAN:

I'm sorry; between the purchase price and the appraisals. The appraisals were quite close. The purchase price is well discounted.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right.

MS. COSTIGAN:

The house was appraised at a million dollars. The offering price for that is 360,000. So the house is well discounted.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. Those are all my questions.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Guldi.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

With respect to our appraisal of the house my concern and let me preface my question with the instinctively I mean, to preserve land nothing has ever been a preservation project in the County I voted against. And the fact that the Audubon Society can surplus this property and it be subdivided and come back ten years from now at five times the price is something that I'm well aware of. What I'm concerned about having looked at the existing condition report that's included in the summary that's provided is the rough estimate of \$2 million to bring the structure to sustainable usable purposes is maybe grossly understated. And I'm concerned about us getting into a situation where like the Vanderbilt Museum for decades we're looking at major capital projects every year at this facility.

So I want you to give me in laborious detail the information about the condition of the house that was done in connection with the appraisal. The existing building survey that's in the presentation material does not state the square footage of the house. Do we have that from our appraiser?

MS. COSTIGAN:

We do have it from our appraiser. Next question is, did I bring it with me however? I thought I was trying to think of every detail you might ask about, but the square footage did not leap to the top of that list. No, I don't have that number.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

All right. Do you have -- did our appraisal of the structure evaluate its condition and the conversion of the residence to a nature center, a County facility?

MS. COSTIGAN:

No. In the nature of the appraisal it did comment on the condition of the house which it found to be good and in appraisal speak good is adequate. I mean, they're not there as engineers for the purpose of, you know, checking every system and that sort of thing. They're saying is it a sound building, which can be used and occupied safely, and their board gets good. We did take the building inspector who works for me to the house for an inspection and go through it from the cellar to the attic. He found it to be in remarkable good condition. He did note that some of the systems are out dated, but that the house was far more sound than he expected to find.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Well, let me sum up from what the things that jump out of this report. In section 1.0 the necessity of putting in parking areas and in section 2.0 the boiler room was flooded with an inch of water. So the equipment which is ancient couldn't be inspected. Section 5 the slate roof, and frankly the last time I knew someone who repaired a slate roof they had to import labor from Canada to find someone who could do it technically, is in good condition except that the copper flashing at the seams is leaking and aged out and needs to be replaced. The conveyor system there's an existing conveyor system, but to be used for to use the second story for either offices or for public purposes the installation of an elevator is required by code. The HVAC system it needs to be completely updated. There is no air-conditioning system; it would need to be installed including the duct work. The plumbing system "is in need of complete rehabilitation" because it's ancient steel pipe. The fire protection system doesn't exist. It would need to be added including fire alarm strobes, exit lighting, and sprinklers. The electrical system is 200

amps and is under sized. The site work, the driveways are in poor condition. So other than the roof, plumbing, electrical, ventilating and the lack of parking it's in good condition, but not for this use. My question is, how are we going to evaluate purchasing it without knowing what it's going to cost to keep the building waterproof -- water tight and usable for say even five years?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Well, again, I have to give you Sagtikos Manor as the stalking horse here in that that wasn't a problem when we bought Sagtikos. We knew the size of the building; we knew generally that it needed substantial maintenance. We knew it was worthy of preservation; we did not have a dollar figure for it's repair.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

What is the proximity of this property the Sagtikos Manor?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Five miles.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Seven miles away I would say. Sagtikos Manor is on the main road towards West Islip.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

It's in the Town of Islip that's my point.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Perhaps if Judy Gordon could join us; I have some questions for Parks and historic structures. Hi, Judy.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

How are you?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Very good, thanks. How many historic structures has the County have in its inventory?

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

Approximately 200 ranging from the size of an outhouse to Sagtikos Manor.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

And how many would be in the category of the on the scale of Sagtikos Manor or perhaps even this property?

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

Oh, I'd say maybe we ten.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Ten. And what has been our experience with this condition, the maintenance and the maintenance cost for maintaining these -- this structure in this case one that 60,70 years old or more?

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

I don't have definitive numbers for you Legislator Caracciolo, but I can tell you that it's not inexpensive. We very often has been said today very often we get buildings in the state that Deepwells for example was in or Meadowcroft in Sayville for example was in extreme states of disrepair. And what we did over a period of time was go out and get grant funding as well as County capital funding in order to restore those buildings. And again, I have to emphasize that it is not inexpensive, but having been at the Scully property myself I have to agree that in comparison to other buildings that we have in our inventory it's in fairly good condition. And I think the fact that we have a partner that can help us with it adds to the benefit.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

I would agree that having a partner certainly can add to the benefit. The question I have with respect to the partner is how deep are their pockets because when they reach the wall and they can't dig any deeper you know and I know where they're coming.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

Yes, I do.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

And the community is going to come right back here and say well, now this is a County facility you have to do the right thing and that's what we've been trying to do at Vanderbilt. Last time I lost track of what we've invested in Vanderbilt. I mean, this was a bequest the County got many, many years ago in the late 40's and we have probably invested over a \$100 million in the Vanderbilt property, a \$100 million. I don't know what the investments going to be in Normandy and Sagtikos. So the County has quite an investment in these types of properties or showcases, showcase homes of the past. I have a lot of questions, Mr. Chairman, they run along the lines that some of the other committee members have brought up. I think these estimates for renovation and repair are definitely on the low side. I don't know if --

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

I could comment on that Legislator Caracciolo.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

And Mr. Nardone and I have had several meetings to discuss this. And I think that I've impressed upon him several times that the County Parks Department is not in a position to put any money into this building given the responsibilities that we already have and I think he fully understands that. But I think their being a non-profit organization would help them in terms of getting grant funds that we may not be able to get. In addition, if the Legislature were to entertain using that Greenways money that was slated for the interpretive center that could be a pot of money in this effort also. I'm not giving an opinion one way or the other, but one of the

issues with the interpretive center is that that \$2 million may not have been enough to build something new and it doesn't have any operating cost attached to it. If we have a group like Seatuck that we could partner into help us to operate that facility that might be something to entertain also. And obviously, that would have to be all spelled out into an agreement where it's available for all Suffolk County residents and maybe we would want to include other environmental organizations in that as well.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I wish you would not have mentioned the interpretive center because as one of three sponsors of that legislation along with Legislator Bishop and Nora Bredes it was our intent long, long ago to have that facility up and operating. The voters approved that referendum in 1998.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

Yes, they did.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

And I think that's something else that people are here from the community should keep in mind the County moves very slow. We have budgetary constraints, but here we're talking about a partnership and in the absence of seeing an agreement spelling out the financial capabilities and stipulations by the Seatuck organization and a timetable with goals and objectives being met.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

Oh, absolutely.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Because, you know, my concern is this maybe in lot better condition than some of the previous purchases, but I wouldn't use it as a model Christine. Shame on us if we're going to go down that road and I'm not saying your suggesting that. Your reference to Sagtikos, you know, is where we didn't have a partner as financially capable yet that this group is really capable of undertaking the type of capital improvements. This building has to be ADA compliant right there, right there you're talking.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

Well, and its got to comply with, you know, with County codes as well.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Exactly.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

That's a big consideration.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Yeah. I'd like to see a realistic budget from County sources as to what these renovations would cost if we have to hire an outside consultant to do this. I would think we'd have somebody in-house in the Department of Public Works.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

We could impose on DPW to go in and give us some indication.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Yeah. This kind of reminds me of the record storage facility building back in 1994 that three that

I wind up getting personally sued for cause the owner didn't like the idea that I raised these issues. Well, we won that lawsuit and we're not going to go down any slippery slopes that's going to have the taxpayer footing the bill for many years to come without all the facts. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So don't sue him don't even think about it. Mr. Moore, the appraisal. 70 acres on the Great South Bay that was sub-dividable and buildable aren't they worth more than five million or what. Intuitively, I --

SPEAKER:

Some of its marshland isn't it?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yeah, well, that's what I want to get to. I mean, how much?

MR. MOORE:

I think if we take the two reports prepared by our consultant appraisers and we view them as both being representative of fair market value one being slightly higher than the other I have great confidence in these figures as being accurate. Personally, I feel that all of the consultants that we use for all of our projects are of very high quality and I'm quite surprised at the quality of the work they've submitted.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

The point of my question is, why isn't it higher? Why is it not, you know, 70 acres that -- it's been represented as sub-dividable, is it not sub-dividable?

MR. MOORE:

Well, we have a lot of wetlands on the property.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. That's what I wanted to bring out.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

A lot of wetlands.

MS. FISCHER:

(inaudible)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You have to go on the -- you know the rules Loretta.

MS. FISCHER:

I'm sorry. Approximately 75% of the land is title and fresh water wetland with some upland including where the home is, but it is surrounded by wetland. And then there is woodland north of there to the northern portion of the boundary of the property.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. So approximately 75% of it is not developable at any time?

MS. FISCHER:

Well, it's considered very highly unlikely, but it doesn't mean that it is quote unquote undevelopable because if what they would have to do is cluster up on the upland portion as best they could. That would be what DEC would probably require; so it depends on how far they can go, but it's definitely is not undevelopable, but very highly unlikely.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Let me ask the Shadmoor question, which is worst case scenario. If this audience's worst nightmare occurred, what would they be facing? How many houses; what could go there?

MS. COSTIGAN:

The appraisals had an estimated yield of 39 houses based on the zoning code. And in response to your previous question --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So wait, wait, 75% of it is not developable, but still 39 houses could.

MS. COSTIGAN:

In Islip it's different from a lot of places. If you set aside certain wetland area you can increase the yield on the upland.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Are they setting it aside or is it already set-aside? I mean, that's just by automatic you get that automatic.

MS. COSTIGAN:

If one were projecting in other words a site plan and you in that projection set-aside as a conservation area you could increase the yield to 39.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yeah, but you're getting credit for something that was already set-aside that's what I'm -- I thought it was an inducement for the developer to set something aside not to say, oh, look I have land that I can't build on. All right that's interesting.

MS. COSTIGAN:

That's the way it is in Islip. The square footage the gross living area of the house is 5,859 square feet. So make it slightly under six. It's a smaller house than it appears in some of the pictures.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Now I mean, my last question is to Real Estate. Are there any other purchases in the Town of Islip that have been approved for planning steps or are in contract at this time?

MS. COSTIGAN:

There's one other that was approved for planning steps. The owner has not accepted the offer. There are two others that you just had on last time around for planning steps. They're both I think an eighth of an acre, so they're very small.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

And the Town of Islip's master plan has calls for no more preservation of properties?

MS. COSTIGAN:

I couldn't say what the Town of Islip's master plan calls for. They're not active in preservation however.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

No, but we're active in preservation. I just want to know when you made the representation that there are no other candidates for this money --

MS. COSTIGAN:

I meant there were no pending.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It sounded to good to be true.

MS. COSTIGAN:

There are no pending candidates; there are no immediately identifiable candidates. There are no candidates on a list that I'm aware of or have ever seen that are of any significance.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Isn't there property right out in back of the Dennison Building that's in the Town of Islip? Hasn't that been approved?

MS. COSTIGAN:

That is not under 125e right now.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

No. That's my point it's not under 125e right now, but it could be.

MS. COSTIGAN:

It has to be a nature preserve to be in 125e, remember.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Are there any further questions then we can go to debate if you want to debate it? Legislator Fields I know would like get her perceptive on the record.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

I just -- I made some notes as I was listening to some of the discussion. And I think I just want to point out that Seatuck is a well-established environmental conservation organization who actually does provide services to the County already and to other residents throughout the County. They have a tremendous reputation and they are willing to come to the plate to help find themselves a home, but also to continue being able to provide those kinds of programs to residents. It's not something where we would have to hire someone to run programs that they would already be there.

They're excellent stewards already; they've proven themselves and I think you couldn't ask for much better than that. You also heard from chapter of National Audubon. I just want to try to get that straight in your mind and that is that National Audubon is a group that has chapters throughout the United States. They have salaried employees and they provide programs education and salaries to those paid employees. The chapters are individual chapters throughout

each of the states who do not pay any salaries unless that particular chapter wishes to do so, but it doesn't come from National Audubon. It is up to each chapter to put together a board and have a group of volunteers to provide programs for their members and the two are really very, very separate. They can get information from National Audubon. They can call up the main chapter and say how do we feel about Black Ducks and how do we feel about Hummingbirds, but in reality they don't get any money from National Audubon. National Audubon doesn't provide anything to the chapters except assistance.

This particular property is unusual; National doesn't really own properties. They run programs, they have education. They help step in and organize chapters to have them be stewards of properties and run programs, but this is not -- they're not the Nature Conservancy. The Nature Conservancy actually goes out and buys property to preserve it. They don't generally hold the property; they turn it around and sell it to us. This is no different than the Nature Conservancy except that National Audubon is not usually in the business of buying property and preserving it. They're in the business of --

SPEAKER:
(inaudible)

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

They don't have to give it to us for free and that's kind of silly actually. I mean, they're an organization that has gotten grants and foundations and giving and donations of people to provide the programs and provide the education. Again, they're not in the business to preserve land and I take -- well, I'm surprised that you would say that National Audubon is extorting the local government. When Mr. Flicker the president of National Audubon came here and discussed this with us in the past they gave their word that they would not hold us hostage to any land and they would agree to sell it for less than market value. They made that promise and they kept that promise. They are a willing seller and they're not selling it for top value. The 125e money only Islip can utilize. You heard Christine talk about the fact that there aren't really many other properties in Islip Town and also it has to be a nature preserve. So this is money that all four Islip Legislators agree they should be able to utilize and you know I think that that we should be able to do that. This is a significant amount of land. It's a unique wetland and woodland and building and this should be something that we as Legislators see in a visionary way that this is a beautiful holding, extremely unique. And we have the ability as a Legislature to take it and preserve it and protect it so that we can have something that we can give to our children and to our children's children. And I can give you an example, Dave. When the OBI was on the market -- are you listening Dave?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

OBI was owned -- was not a nature preserve.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

No, but I'm making --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

This is a functioning as a nature preserve.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

That has nothing to do with it, it's an acquisition.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So we're going to spend \$4 million out of the County's pot that we have to preserve land to buy a nature preserve from an organization whose mission statement says that they are in business to conserve and restore natural ecosystems. And if you can find, you know, mental gymnastics to justify that --

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

No, it's not mental gymnastics; I want to point out --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Fine.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

I do have the floor. I want to point out that OBI was a unique holding and it was a unique acquisition, but in this case we're not paying more than market value like we did with OBI we're paying less. And further more as far as working out an agreement, Legislator Caracciolo with Seatuck or with anyone else I believe that we have to first purchase the property before we can enter in any agreement with any environmental organization. So I would think that we have the opportunity; these kinds of opportunities as you all well know don't come along everyday. They never will come again and this particular property I think is absolutely worthy of acquisition and I think if you follow the lead of the four Islip Town Legislators it would be something that as County Legislature we would be very proud to be stewards of.

(Applause)

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Mr. Chairman. Dave.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes. Legislator Alden.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

I'm not a voting member of the committee, but I appreciate you recognizing me for just a brief statement. Just to point out that the size of this house is fairly small when we compare it to something like the Vanderbilt. I think we have to keep that in perspective. If this was owned by a private individual I don't think we'd be having much of a discussion. This is pretty much a no brainer for us to preserve a pristine piece of property like this where we've got a house that has historical significance on it. So I would ask my fellow Legislators to actually get pass that the fact that it is owned by the Audubon Society because legally the Audubon Society can go and do whatever they want with this property.

Mrs. Scully when she gave the property, while she intended it to be exactly what it is a nature preserve, she did not include that restriction in the deed. So they have fee simple absolute which means they can do whatever they want. We do have a partner that once we purchase this property. And again it's a small building relatively speaking if you're going to compare it to Sagtikos Manor or the Vanderbilt whereby I believe that they have shown an ability, a financial ability and also a financial plan that they've laid out us they can go forward with and actually restore the building to whatever it required and actually maintain it into the future. So we're not going to be looking to the people of Suffolk County as a drain. This can be a gem for the people of Suffolk County so I would strongly urge my fellow Legislators to vote for this acquisition.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'm just going to go down the line on this one.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

I agree wholeheartedly with my colleagues from Islip. This is certainly an acquisition, which I will support wholeheartedly. I do have a couple of questions. Commissioner Gordon, just to put it on the record with regards to the Vanderbilt. They do have an endowment and how much of their -- of the expenditures have come from that endowment?

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

I can't answer specifics about the Vanderbilt, Legislator Fisher. I apologize I really, I'm not really sure.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, because it has been represented that they have a money pit and although we do spend money on the Vanderbilt they do have an endowment and much of the expenditures do come from the endowment.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

My understanding is that pretty much all of their operating expenses are covered by the endowment, but you know beyond that I really can't give you any specifics.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. As I look at the map I noticed that the beach the access to the water is Islip Town Beach. So would County residents then be precluded from accessing the water if they're not town residents? (inaudible) I don't know where people would park, what kind of restrictions there would be?

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

Well, I believe the parking would be on the grounds probably in the vicinity of where the existing house is now and there would be trails. I can't, Mr. Nardone might know better, I'm not sure whether you can get down to the water. And obviously the property line would end at the Islip Town Beach. If you wanted to park at the Islip Town Beach you would probably have to be an Islip resident or, you know, pay whatever non-residents fee there might be.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

But County residents who parked at the preserve would be able to walk to the beach and have access to the water?

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

There's no barrier. No, there's no barrier other than maybe water, but there's no barrier.

MS. FISCHER:

There's a right of way down to the east of the Town Park that they can access to the water.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

I see. Okay. All right and as far as the Audubon being a not for profit and having as its mission the preservation of open space and the ecosystem we had this argument when the resolution the planning steps came up when the Sherwood Jane property came up. Any entity that is an organization and as an infrastructure has expenses and if they chose to sell a piece of property and in order to maintain their very valuable programs I don't believe that we should hold them hostage because of their mission. I believe that if we're able to preserve a piece of property at much below market value we should jump at the opportunity and our purchase of Sherwood Jane closed recently. I was very proud that we were able to effect that contract and I hope that we will be able to do with this. If you recall one of the first pieces of legislation that I introduced after having become a Legislator was the stewardship plan because we need management of our parklands. This seems to me to be a win, win situation and I believe we should also support it.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Several of the previous speakers have mentioned several past County acquisitions and in the example made by Legislator Fields the OBI there is no comparison between this an OBI. I would grant you that on the surface, however, this is unique from the standpoint that from this Legislator's perceptive we're talking about 69½ acres. I would not have any difficulty supporting the acquisition of the property for open space preservation and for some passive uses. However I do believe the mansion will become a money pit. I have not seen the financial capabilities of Seatuck. I don't know if they have the where with all five, ten years from now to maintain the operating cost not to mentioned making the improvements which far exceed the estimates that they included in this proposal which we just received today. So I could go on and on and on and talk about OBI and talk about Shadmoor and talk about some other bad County acquisitions that I did not support, but obviously that's going to fall on deaf ears because whatever reason the Legislature likes to think its doing the right thing for the right reason and sometimes it does not. In this case I think the Legislature would be doing the right thing if it purchased just the land and what is just the land cost, Ms. Costigan?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Again, the entire price is four million. The parcel A with the house was 3600, parcel B would be three million six hundred forty.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

So I would say to Seatuck bring back a proposal where you purchase the house and we'll purchase the property and then we'll go our separate ways. You can have all the programs you want the County shouldn't be engaged in that. We have ten large historic homes that we currently maintain and I would remind Legislator Fisher that I've been here 12 years and I can sight chapter and verse the investments we've made at the Vanderbilt. The endowment at the Vanderbilt as the Commissioner correctly stated has helped to offset it doesn't even cover the cost of the operating budget at the Vanderbilt it offsets it. I could request from Budget Review in the last three years alone what we invested, but I won't bore everybody with the details probably in excess of \$20 million in capital improvements at the Vanderbilt. I think that's the way you get the most -- the best of both worlds here both for the people in the community, the residents of

Suffolk County and for the Legislators that have put forth this proposal. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you. I'm going to let Legislator Fields have the last word, but before I do I'd like to make a statement. I've been on this Legislature a decade, over a decade now. And I can't think of anything in the area of preservation and conservation that I've opposed; this may be the first one. And the reason is because I understand that we are in a race to preserve the last remaining open spaces. It's a desperate race and we want to win that so we have a legacy to leave future generations, but I don't think I've ever been asked to pay for a sanctuary and that's what I feel that we're doing here. When Mrs. Hathaway Scully left this property to the Audubon Society she did so with the expectation that it would be a wildlife sanctuary and nature center. And maybe her lawyer erred and didn't put those restrictions on there, but it is clear from historic records what the purpose was and it has operated as such all these many years. Now along comes the Audubon Society and frankly shame on them for maybe perhaps their national fundraising isn't going well. So what do they do, they look at Long Island they see a 70 acre parcel that they are legally allowed to sell and find no moral inhibition whatsoever to putting it up for sale. And saying to the community, you know, this could be very well paved over and you can have a housing development there go to the County and have them preserve it.

Now if the County steps forward right now and preserves this property that's \$4 million less that's available to preserve other parcels. And the most best argument that the Islip delegation and they've done a very good job of promoting this purchase and it's only through their very strong efforts that we've gotten to this point and may go beyond it. The best argument that they make is look we have a segregated fund for the Town of Islip in the 125e and we're going to use that money which is only available in the Town of Islip. I'm dubious of the suggestion that there's no other parcels in the Town of Islip that we can protect and by exhausting this fund that means that the other preservation in the future in the Town of Islip will have to come from countywide funds. So there will inevitably be a crowd out effect and I don't think that's what Ms. Hathaway Scully had in mind when she left the property to the Audubon Society. She had an expectation that it would be acting as a nature preserve. I'm sure if we discussed this property a few years ago the Audubon Society would have sighted chapter and verse all the wonderful species that are on the location. So I just can't get passed that and I don't understand how the local chapters have not raised hell on this. This is outrageous what's occurring here and I will not be a part of it and I understand where the Islip delegation is coming from. They've done a great job, but I ultimately I think that paying the Audubon Society to buy a preserve is a perverse use of the open space fund. Legislator Fields gets the last word. Legislator Losquadro hasn't spoken yet.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Then I'd like to speak.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Mr. Chairman too.

LEGISLATOR LOSQUADRO:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. As the newest member of this committee I would just like to make a comment. Many people don't know where I stand on things of this nature. You will find that as a student of history that things of this interest me greatly and I've had some discussions and I've had a chance to review some of the material regarding this home. And not only do I think that the acquisition of the land is very important, but I think the home that speaks to the history of

Long Island as this home does would be a wonderful acquisition for Suffolk County and not quite the detriment that you make it out to be. So --

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Wait, who made it out to be a detriment? Where did you hear detriment?

LEGISLATOR LOSQUADRO:

As a money pit, I heard that --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, not me. Okay. I'm sorry. I thought you were directing it to me. I'm sorry.

LEGISLATOR LOSQUADRO:

No, no, as a money pit. This was a statement in general. I think it would be an asset to the County and not a detriment. The comment was not directed at you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to give my support for this on the record that was all thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Guldi and then Legislator Caracciolo.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

I think I'm probably guilty of starting the money pit discussion, but lets talk about that for a minute. The real concern I have is not the fact that it's going to be expensive to maintain an old structure. The real problem I have is the fact that we're pretending its not going to be expensive to maintain an old structure at least that's what the proposal seem to do. I think that we however have established pretty clearly on the record that your long-term maintenance obligation on this historic structures will be very much like it is on all of the 200 other historic structure that this County has preserved throughout its inventory if you will. The fact that's most compelling to me is the local support for this. The local support from all the members of the Islip delegation makes it really their call. It's their ¼% money and I'm not in a position to second-guess the Legislators from that district about how they want to spend their ¼% money in their district. The concern about the diminishing money pool of Suffolk County for preservation and if we spend it here we won't be able to spend it elsewhere is in my opinion truly a false argument. What we're losing is the open space and the preservation opportunities. We're going to have money left from our current 13-year program when there's not open space left and there's already not open space left in Islip.

(Applause)

The thing I really don't want to see and that I've seen far, far too often is the County being given an opportunity to buy bulk land on an un-subdivided basis at below appraised value like we are here. Only to say no and come back years later after the sub-division process has been completed and approved with pressure and support from the towns and broad based community organizations having us only buy the same parcel for preservation five or ten years later for four or five times as much money as we had the opportunity to in the past. And unfortunate circumstances occurred far too many times. I don't want to see it happen here that's one of the

many reasons I'll support this acquisition with the caveat that the organization that wants the use and the exclusive use and occupancy of the dwelling is to start your aggressive fundraising campaign. Your \$300,000 is going to be considered an entry fee; you're going to need a couple of million bucks to keep this structure sound over the next five years.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Ms. Costigan.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Mr. Guldi, we did determine the square footage of the house, it's 5,900.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Yes. Counsel, could you clarify and lets finally put on the record as to whose responsibility the maintenance and rehabilitation of this home mansion will be?

MR. SABATINO:

Well, in the first instance because the County is making the purchase it will be the County. If that however would be subject to whatever agreements could be worked out subsequent to the acquisition if in fact it's not going to happen simultaneous with the acquisition to allocate that responsibility.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Well, then I asked the Legislators sponsoring this resolution and Legislator Alden whose district with whom -- within this property is located is it either or both of your intentions to incorporate into this resolution language that would hold harmless the taxpayers of Suffolk County on all of the renovation and improvement costs.

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

Absolutely not.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

That's clear and that's the problem. I will not support this resolution.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Legislator Fields, before -- I just neglected to mention that I feel that this proposal could be made a lot better if the Audubon Society would become a partner in developing the Seatuck proposal and recycling some of the money back into Suffolk County. But what I feel is occurring is they're taking the money out of Suffolk County and using it for their own operational expenses which I find offensive. Legislator Fields.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

As I said before, Audubon is not in the business to preserve property. They're not in the business to pump money into Suffolk County they're in the business to promote their programs and to teach people how to enjoy the environment and wildlife and wetlands. You can say shame on National Audubon and you know you may feel that way, but this is what it is Dave, and they are going to sell the property. I mean, you're acting as though what you say is going to

alter their final decision and if you say and this body agrees not to buy it that okay well, then their going to give it to us. That's not going to happen. They're going to sell the property and this is a large holding. You will not, I challenge you to find another property in Islip Town that's 60 or 70 acres. I challenge you do that; I don't think you can come up with anything. There's really very little left in Islip as there is in Babylon and, you know, I think that most of us who have supported acquisitions in Riverhead and out in the East End, farmland and also OBI and east and west of us don't say well, what about us. If we agree to buy your farmland in Riverhead or the OBI in Babylon well, wait a minute there's not going to be any money left for us here in Islip Town. We don't do that; we do it -- excuse me.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

You don't have farms Ginny, be realistic.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

It has nothing to do with it. What I'm saying is we don't stop and say we're not going to vote for a property in your district or on the East End or the western most portion of where Islip is because we feel that it's a good thing to acquire property and preserve and protect is good for the Suffolk County resident for all of Suffolk County. No one's being, oh, I would hope no one's being selfish about this. This property also might have to be designated to the Historic Trust and that would enable them to then reach out for grant programs and money that could be incorporated into repairing or fixing or maintaining or improving that particular building.

In addition, you do have the Greenways \$2 million that could be designated to have this be a nature preserve for all of Suffolk County. And one of the most important points is that this is already off the tax rolls. Audubon does not pay taxes so we're not hurting the taxpayer by saying okay well, now we have to make up for it some other way; this is already off the tax rolls. And as far as this acquisition it would not exhaust the 125e money. There would still be money leftover and I think that we owe it to the residents of Suffolk County that's our drive here in the Legislature to promote, to protect property, to protect buildings. And I think that we would be derelict in our duties if we did not agree all of us as one unit to do something that's going to be beneficial for all taxpayers for all residents and for our grandchildren. I would like to take this out of order --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

(inaudible)

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

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

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion having been make by Legislator Fields second by Legislator Fisher. This is for approval. All those in favor? Four. Opposed? Myself, Legislator Caracciolo. The resolution is approved and it goes to the full Legislature. **(Vote: 4-2-0-0)**

(Applause)

LEGISLATOR ALDEN:

I want to thank the committee.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

May I just suggest to the people who came here today that it will come before the Suffolk County Legislature all eighteen members in this building in this room on December 16th at 9:30 in the morning if you would like to revisit. Thank you. Thanks for coming.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you all. Lets move to the other cards that we have. These people have waited patiently and have had their issue pushed to the back. Arlene Handel.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

One down and 22 to go, Dave.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Good afternoon.

MS. HANDEL:

Good afternoon. I am here to speak on Legislator Jon Cooper's memorializing resolution on anti-dumping and my name is Arlene Handel. I'm a trustee of the Village of Northport; I'm here to express my concern and that of many of my villages who support the Legislator's resolution opposing the dumping of dredge spoils into Long Island Sound. Our village grew up around our harbor as a thriving trade port in its early years, as a home port of commercial fishermen throughout its history to this very day and as a aesthetic and recreational treasure for boaters, sport fisherman and those of us who just passively appreciate its beauty.

I urge you to be skeptical, if not suspicious, of the actions of the EPA in this matter. The EPA is systematically overturning hard won standards to protect our environment. I find its reassurance that this dredge material is not terribly toxic, that it will not pollute and poison our waters and marine life, hollow and against reason.

If the material is benign, let it be used for beach replenishment and other upland uses. Please be wise stewards of this great resource that belongs to all of us. Please pass this resolution. And a neighbor of mine Captain George Doll wanted to be here and is off on his lobster boat today. The weather has been bad and he couldn't get out, but he asked me to read the following.

My name is George Doll. I'm a former Northport Senior Harbormaster for 15 years. A member of the Town of Huntington Commercial Fishing Advisory Council, Chairman of the New York State Lobster Conservation Management Team, a member of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission Lobster Advisory Panel, Treasurer of the Long Island Sound Lobstermen's Association, and local commercial fisherman for the past 40 years.

I strongly urge you to support Legislator Cooper's bill opposing the disposal of dredge spoils in Long Island Sound. As a lobsterman I have experienced first hand the affects of sludge dumping. Every winter since 1982 when the western Long Island Sound disposal site was opened we lobstermen have suffered the affects of dumping. Contrary to what proponents of dumping claim, sludge does not go directly to the bottom in a nice neat little pile. After a dumping operation lobster traps up to one mile away are covered in silt and visible debris such as leaves, plastic, etc. I stress the word "visible" because whatever else is in the sludge is also

dispersed in the surrounding water. Some former dumpsites have been closed for as much as 50 years and they're still oozing oily substances from the sediment. Lobster resource is just starting to show signs of recovering from a massive die off that occurred 1999. It would be unconscionable to allow a practice that is a strong suspect in the cause of lobster die off to continue or worse to expand. And even worse scenario would be if someone becomes ill from eating the seafood harvested in this area.

In a recent Newsday article the EPA's New York regional administrator Jane Kenny is quoted as saying, "Long Island Sound continues to need our utmost care and attention." I supposed that she doesn't know that another branch of the same agency is planning to use the Sound as a dump. Suffolk County has a proud history of protecting its marine resources and habitat. You have an opportunity to continue that history by supporting this bill. Thank you very much. Sorry I took so much time and I enjoyed being here today.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you. We would have referred to you as the Honorable if I had known. I apologize.

MS. HANDEL:

Oh, no.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

But we do have the Honorable Joe Potter from the Town of East Hampton and Bill Akin. They're here on the issue of Amsterdam Beach. Are they both --

MR. POTTER:

Mr. Akin is here.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You want to come and use the -- you're on the same side of the issue, right?

MR. POTTER:

Yes. And our Supervisor Schneiderman is here too if he's available. Very briefly I wanted to -- I see Mr. Guldi is not here because I wanted to thank all Legislators who maybe leaving this year for their public service and wish good luck to the ones that are coming in. I'm just here very briefly to speak on resolution 2040 which is to authorize planning steps for the Amsterdam Beach property out at Montauk which is along that same stretch of beach as the famous Shadmoor property and this is 122 acres. We've been talking East Hampton Town with New York State and we understand from Congressman Bishop that there's a million dollars in federal money available to go toward this parcel and we're hoping that Suffolk County will join us in a partnership on the Amsterdam Beach parcel.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

This is planning steps only?

MR. POTTER:

Planning steps only.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We usually don't attack these things until we get them back with a deal.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Could you just say the size again?

MR. POTTER:

Let me just introduce Bill Akin who's the President of CCOM which is a very prominent environmental organization in Montauk.

MR. AKIN:

It's a pleasure to be here this afternoon. I had to come this far west to find out where the snow was; we got one inch.

MS. SCHMIDT:

State your name.

MR. AKIN:

Bill Akin. Well, maybe two. 50 mile an hour winds constantly. Bill Akin, President of the Concerned Citizens of Montauk an organization founded in 1970 in order to save what is now Suffolk County Park. The Amsterdam Beach parcel is a totally unique parcel; it's 120 acres and I'll take a little bit of divergence from what Job says, yes, it's on the south side of Long Island, but it is substantially separated from the Shadmoor parcel by the Ditch Plains Housing area and several other housing areas, but it is closer to the east towards the lighthouse. It is the largest undivided property in the Town of East Hampton. It is number one on the Town of East Hampton's community preservation fund acquisition list. It is number one on the Nature Conservancy list for the acquisition for the East-End. The state has already stated that they want to participate in this and as Job just said Tim Bishop has managed to get a commitment of a million dollars in federal funds.

One of the unique things about this parcel is that it provides an access to the ocean in an area that is pretty much blocked off for a couple of miles on either side. And it also has -- it has incredible nature I won't go into the number of species, endangered species something like 15. But what I really would like to say today to this committee is that what you're doing out in Montauk is going to when you look from the perspective of several years ahead from now you're creating an area that's not only unique to Suffolk County you're creating an area through the acquisition of some of these parcels that we've been able to save over the last 30 years that's not only unique to Suffolk County it's unique to New York State. It's unique, in fact, to the whole East Coast of the United States. We're going to have, when we look back, we're going to have an area that where it is a town that is a tourist oriented town where nature is the number one attraction. Not other things which we've come to identify as attraction with nature preserves; not just a beach, not just the fishing, not just the bird watching, not just the trails the whole area have all of those things. And Shadmoor at hundred -- sorry, I fought pretty hard for Shadmoor. Amsterdam Beach is the last and largest piece to that puzzle. With that I urge to you forego ahead with the planning stages and I'm sure I will see you later down the road on this issue. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. Supervisor, did you want to speak?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good afternoon, Legislators. I guess it's my last chance to speak from this side of the ark. We're

not here asking for a commitment to buy this property today; we're asking simply for the Legislator to take -- the Legislature to take the initial planning steps so that we can appraise this property and look at it. If any property ever qualified as worthy for the County to consider this is it. It's over a 100 acres; it has oceanfront. It adjoins historic property. It's from a bio-diversity standpoint. It's a very important piece of property. So if you can agree and I'm sure that you will to move forward with appraising this property this could be somewhat historic in terms of its partnership potential. I don't like to mention Shadmoor because Mike cringes every time I do, but hopefully he'll come out there and see the property. It's a beautiful piece of property Shadmoor, but Shadmoor was -- Shadmoor had a partnership it was the first of its kind that we know of, it was State, County and Town. With this piece the Amsterdam Beach we're talking potentially about State, County, Town, Federal government and potentially some private conservation money too. So that's a unique parcel, but this is one of those pieces that's really worthy of so many people coming together, so many organizations coming together and trying to protect it. So I look forward to your positive vote which I hope to see and in working on the other side to help to preserve this property. Thank you.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Mr. Schneiderman, Supervisor.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Jay, the resolution indicates that 75% of this site contains title and freshwater wetlands. What is the zoning on the property? What could the property owners possibly do with this property?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's currently zone A5, five acre residential. It is a complex property to develop, but not undevelopable. There are extensive wetlands on the property. The yield under zoning with the wetlands excluded is probably, you know, under ten lots maybe seven, eight lots. You know we get into this question every time, you know, what if it were developed. What if it there were five or six houses and then they be on the tax rolls. And you know the problem is you lose public access so, you know, why preserve anything when you -- here's a piece of property it's contiguous to thousand of other acres of open woodland and moorland. You've got endangered species throughout these properties; it's part of a large block. I'm sure you can rationalize not spending the money on it, but what is the value of having this large protected block in, you know, a very unique place. And I would say that even if it was one or two houses it would still be worthy of preserving.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

As you well know you should never prejudge my inclinations because on the Duke property, which was in your town, I was the tie-breaking vote if you will, to make that acquisition possible.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes, you sure were.

(Applause)

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

There you go you have a fan club here today.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

So when I deem properties meet the criteria the County should have, I support them. When I don't I simply don't, you know, and I think that's what we're all called to do and unfortunately, some may disagree on approaches. I think the last acquisition in Islip would have been fine to purchase the land. To purchase the mansion I predict and I believe I'll be right will cost taxpayers millions of dollars five, ten, fifteen years from now. And nobody will be sitting here to be, you know, left holding the bag the taxpayer will, but that's another story.

As far as this property, the resolution also mentions that it's a joint effort by the state and as represented by the federal government apparently. What do we know about the state effort because again when we use Shadmoor as a template we find that in November of 1999 the County Executive Office comes into Legislative --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I just couldn't resist I heard you I was up there -- opportunity for some free shots. So all right.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Jay, as you and I discussed back in November of 1999 there was a sense of urgency that the County had to act and meet the commitment that the town at that point had made visa vie a town board resolution to purchase and preserve Shadmoor. It only took another 11 months to make that a reality. So my question in, what assurances do you have if you have any that the state will in fact be a partner.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Actually, with Shadmoor the County had before the state got involved had agreed to take the planning steps.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Oh, no. We didn't do planning steps. We did a bonded resolution that Mr. Guldi and the County Executive co-sponsored.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. Unfortunately, that was for \$3 million and later it was brought up to meet the number. The County came on board with the full it was close to \$7 million -- the state did. The state came in with around \$7 million and we came back to the County to get the number moved up from three million to five and half million because that's what it was going to take. There's no guarantee that the state is going to participate. It is on the state's open space list. We've met with Assemblyman Thiele. We've met with a representative or assistant to Senator Ken LaValle. We're certainly hopeful that the state will fully fund this acquisition. We don't have a price yet so it's going, you know, right now we're just trying to assemble the partnerships and at least to be able to get the appraisals we need to determine what a fair market price would be. And then try to figure out how we could assemble that amount of money.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I'm going to be very interested to see what the appraisal approach is on this.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Michael, the state has bought a lot of land in this area. Recently the sanctuary properties, which

actually, it was bigger than this probably five or six years ago or within, that range that property was purchased. So I think it makes sense for the state to participate in this property. They got all the holdings out by the lighthouse so this would tie into it.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

As you know, on Duke you and I well, I should say you and the town board were very accommodating in meeting certain requirements that I felt were necessary for public access. That term is used rather randomly sometimes and one does not know what that means. So let me ask you today, what does it mean in this instance?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. There is oceanfront there.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Are we going to have a County Park and beach?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

These are details that I can't speak and bind the town board on, but, you know, you'd have to be very clear that whatever the conditions of County participation are you need to lay them out on the table. I can only tell you what the environmental attributes are. There are some trails, but they're not extensive trails on this property. There is a dirt road that runs along it and there is oceanfront here. There's like a pretty little cove along the ocean. There's I don't know how you would you'd have to find a way to get vehicles down there or at least a trail down there if you wanted to use it as a beach. I can't really, again, I can't really answer for the town board. You'd have to go out there and look at this is something that falls more into a kind of environmental sanctuary or more into a recreational property. My estimation is this is more of an environmental sanctuary than it is a recreational property.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Planning steps.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Thank you.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Planning steps.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

It's planning step --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

I think the public's (inaudible) would be making a significant investment and they should get something out of it. We have a lot of environmentally sensitive property more than almost ever-other county in the country.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there a benefit to have a habitat protection --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Where is the nearest access County beach?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm sorry.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Where is the nearest County public access beach in the Town of East Hampton? Do you have one?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah, sure. Gin Beach out at the end of East Lake Drive in Montauk.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

No, no, County park.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, there's County Parkland just to the end of it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

No, no, County beach.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Gin Beach is town, but right next to it is County beach.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Called what?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Indian Field which is now Theodore Roosevelt Park and their property extends all the way north along the ocean.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

And it's a bathing area every summer where residents go to?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

You can bathe on that beach; it's a County beach.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Are there lifeguards there?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anybody know?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

(Laugh) Okay, that answers my question.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Judy, is there a lifeguard at County beach out there?

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

No.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Do you want to put lifeguards there, Mike? You could sponsor a budget amendment to do that.

SPEAKER:

(inaudible)

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:

There are 235 campers, you know, on the County beach. George, are you done?

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Yeah, I'm quite done. It's your problem now.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. That was a little less than I expected.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Oh, it's a lot less than I expected.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Last card is Alpa Pandya from the Nature Conservancy whose business is not protecting bird habitats.

MS. PANDYA:

It's all habitats; we do all habitats. My name is Alpa Pandya; I'm with the Nature Conservancy. I'm here today to speak about and in favor of IR. 1852 prohibiting the use of invasive plant species by the County of Suffolk. I spoke about it last time, but I'm going to say it again; we're asking you to pass this. Invasives are the second biggest threat to bio-diversity after habitat fragmentation from development. The Nature Conservancy is working with public and private partners in the Long Island weed management area including federal, state and county agencies and the Long Island Nursery and Landscaper's Association. We're here to ask the County to do its share in reducing the spread of invasives by not planting the most aggressive invasive plants on County lands. Please pass IR. 1852.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Thank you very much.

MS. PANDYA:

Thank you.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you Alpa.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. To the agenda unless there is anybody else who wants to speak to this committee. Nope. Excellent.

INTRODUCTORY PRIME:

2016 Allocating pay-as-you-go funding for the clean-up of former wallpaper factory site, Lake Ronkonkoma (CP 8223.310). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Lindsay)

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Motion.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

I'll second the motion for purposes of discussion.

MS. COSTIGAN:

We're doing it; my office is doing this.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right, but I know, but he's familiar with the site because this is Ronkonkoma Wallpaper. You're cleaning it up; it's a Brownfield, right?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Beige.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It's a beige field. That's what happens when you do a phase II; you learn exactly what's underneath. All right, so you want to go first, Ms. Costigan and then Mr. Minei.

MS. COSTIGAN:

This property was taken by the County and has been the subject of an ongoing sort of phased in cleanup. It's 3.3 acres improved by industrial buildings. There were some immediate matters that had to be taken care of earlier this year on an emergency basis and now due to the weather and particularly the rain over the summer the balance of the buildings have deteriorated passed --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We took the deed?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay, so we own it; it's ours?

MS. COSTIGAN:

We do own it, yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right.

MS. COSTIGAN:

At this point we have a plan; we have bids. We have a projection for concluding the cleanup of the property. It's a U-shape building and half about half of the U had some material contaminated material in it that we're proposing to remove to an off-site -- off state as a matter

of fact landfill and that's part of what's driving up the cost of this. So these numbers are real; they are based on actual bids and granted on a competitive basis and this is what it's going to take to finish the job.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. All right, and when we're done with that we'll have a parcel that is clean and we can either sell it or use it for public purposes is that the point?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes, it will be clean; it will still be improved by a large cement slab, but we have every reason to think that that slab will be attractive to bidders. All right, it's ten inches of concrete and this is going to be an industrial site.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Who isn't attracted to a large cement slab?

MS. COSTIGAN:

I mean, I never saw one I didn't like.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Mr. Minei, try to be half as witty as that, please.

MR. MINEI:

I've been called a halfwit many times.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Good, good.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Very good, nice start.

MR. MINEI:

I've been accused of being lengthy in my responses.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Never.

MR. MINEI:

Let me be brief this afternoon; we're very supportive of this. We do have a couple of concerns though. In the resolution the money is transferred to Capital Program 8223 that's our Brownfields and I would ask Counsel, the money we now have in 8223 is for planning, design and supervision. This goes directly to the remediation, but essentially we support it as long as the administrative procedure is sound. So we would ask that that opinion -- I just had time this morning to look at this so I really haven't had a chance to review it. The other point too is --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

We need an answer.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Are we going to have an answer to the first part?

MR. MINEI:

I'm sorry. Is Paul ready?

MR. SABATINO:

I think the question got truncated; you started to say the monies been put into an account. It has planning, --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

But this is the first time its ever been used for an actual cleanup.

MR. MINEI:

The existing 308,000 is in planning, design and supervision. Now we're asking -- it looks like the sponsor's asking for a transfer from the General Operating Fund which I hope, I hadn't had a chance it doesn't come from the Health Department fund.

MR. SABATINO:

You know, the monies coming from that pay-as-you-go money. The only concern I had raised I mentioned to the Chairman is that it's not clear as to where the money is going and who's responsibility it is. Normally, there's another clause, which says, and somebody is hereby authorized empowered and directed to do something; that seems to be missing from the equation. So it was unclear to me as to what mechanic were going to be after it got into the account. So that was the other concern I had.

MS. COSTIGAN:

The account that we intend to use this money from is account 4730, which is an operating account. So if that needs to be added that's where the monies have come from to clean the property that's where this money --

MR. SABATINO:

No, no, what I mean is not being clear is normally it'll say, Department of Public Works or they'll say, Division of Real Estate, Division of Environmental Health Services. I don't know --

MS. COSTIGAN:

We pay the contracts from Real Estate.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. Can you amend the resolution in time for 5 o'clock so that we can --

MR. SABATINO:

There's time today's the deadline.

MR. MINEI:

They're just demolishing buildings and hauling away the contaminated soil. I have -- I hate to

be the one impressing with you, Dave, to get these Brownfields going. This is one that has limited concern because it doesn't include industrial solvents, which migrate in the groundwater; these are heavy metals as part of a wallpaper manufacturing. The only hang up is we're in the process of preparing through the consultant through 8223 the capital program to have the consultant prepare a Brownfield application which, Mike, you want us to be more active in. And I'm hoping that with the new Brownfields legislation that we can be reimbursed for this money.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right.

MR. MINEI:

So I know it takes time to demolish the buildings and things like that so I would -- was asking my staff as I ran to this meeting to check into whether or not we would qualify for reimbursement with a Brownfields grant under the State Bond Act.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I have my calendar, before we leave we'll meet, you know, in the next week or so. Do you know your schedule?

MR. MINEI:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Good. So we'll do that afterwards.

MR. MINEI:

But other than that obviously, we've met several times at the Long Island Housing Partnership.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Right. They want to build houses. It could be a great site for a parking lot.

MR. MINEI:

Well, it's considerable good stretch of the leg to the railroad station, but I've heard affordable housing and other uses of the property. And I know I've talked to the sponsor Bill Lindsay and I've been there. I mean, it is indeed a blithe to the neighborhood. It should be cleaned up as expeditiously as possible. I'm just trying to work these different ends concurrently to make sure we get reimbursed for it. I hear and we're sensitive to your concerns.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

A relevant question; is this enough money?

MS. COSTIGAN:

These are based on actual bids.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay.

MS. COSTIGAN:

So we believe that it is enough money.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to approve by myself second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0)**

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

(inaudible)

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

(inaudible)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'm sorry. Well, you don't have it anymore.

2020 Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed improvements on CR 19, Patchogue-Holbrook Road, between Old Waverly Avenue and CR 65, Division Street, CP #5040, Town of Brookhaven. ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Pres. Off.) Motion by Legislator Viloría-Fisher, second by Legislator Guldi. All in favor? Opposed? It's approved. **(Vote: 6-0)**

2021 Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed acquisition of Patchogue River Watershed Addition – 0.25 Acres – North Patchogue, Town of Brookhaven. ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Pres. Off.) Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 6-0)**

2022 Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed donation of property from Newport Construction, Inc., to Suffolk County Parkland for Open Space Preservation, Miller Place, Town of Brookhaven. ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Pres. Off.) Motion Legislator Losquadro, second by Legislator Viloría-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0)**

2023 Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under pay-as-you-go ¼ % Taxpayer Protection Program (Land of Roe Avenue, Town of Brookhaven). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Foley) Let's discuss.

MS. FISCHER:

This property is approximately three acres on the southern portion of Mud Creek on the western side the County has acquired land as you can see on the map in blue. This is north directly north of our acquisitions and would add to our holdings. Approximately maybe 50% of the property is wetland mostly tidal wetland which we can not put on the map for you, but --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. You've got 45 points which is --

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, so we gave it 45 points.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Which is a pretty good score.

MS. FISCHER:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is that all sand that (inaudible).

MS. FISCHER:

The area down below is dredge spoil that we own.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

We own dredge spoil.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Well, we're not going to send it to Legislator Cooper's district.

MS. FISCHER:

Actually, they haven't touched the wetlands on this parcel yet.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, I see. The blue is dredge spoil.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

The blue we own.

MS. FISCHER:

The blue we own.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

The blue we own that's what we don't -- okay, I got it. What's the piece in between?

MS. FISCHER:

That's ours as well. The line is just not showing.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right. Motion by Legislator Guldi second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed? It's carried. **(Vote: 6-0)**

2039 Authorizing the acquisition of development rights to farmlands by the County of Suffolk County under the Suffolk County New Drinking Water Protection Program (Ernest/Norton Farm, Town of Southold) (SCTM # 1000-056-01-011.1 & 1000-056-03-013.3). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Motion.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion Legislator Caracciolo second by Legislator Guldi. Is this planning steps or is this the deal?

MS. COSTIGAN:

The deal.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

The deal. So what are we paying for what?

MS. COSTIGAN:

This is the deal and in this instance it's a 52 acre farm. The appraisals ranged from 2.1 million to 2.7 million. The mean is at \$43,250 an acre and that's what we're paying for the 52 acres.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Do we have a map on that, Christine?

MS. COSTIGAN:

No, apparently not.

MS. FISCHER:

We usually don't give the farmland maps.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What do they grow there?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Different things actually. It's in different sections they grow different things on different areas.

MR. SABATINO:

Just one second.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Whose farm is it?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Ernest Norton. It's Angela Norton and Ed Ernest they're married.

MR. SABATINO:

Just one technical point, Mr. Chairman, which is the monies in the second resolve clause is being taken from the open space project, but it really should becoming from the farmland preservation.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

So that should be corrected?

MR. SABATINO:

It should be corrected before I mean, before the end of the day.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Can that be corrected before the end of the day at ten to four he asked?

MR. SABATINO:

It can be. Just make sure it's taken from the right account. You can't draw open space (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You need to authorize that, Christine.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes, we'll get it done.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Are you going to do it, Counsel or they're going to do it the County Attorney's Office?

MR. SABATINO:

I can't do it. It's the County Exec's bill, but I'm -- as long as you got the authority to just advise the Clerk's Office that it's okay. I mean, I can't -- I don't have the authority to speak on behalf of the County Exec, but as long as you do that the Clerk can make the correction for you just so we get it right so we don't take the money from the wrong account.

MS. COSTIGAN:

We request the Clerk to make the correction for us as we're authorized to fix this mistake.

MR. SABATINO:

Great and the Clerk's Office can just make that change in the second resolve clause we're home free.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Home free. Next one is 20 --

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Hold on you have to do the all in favor, opposed part.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I thought we did.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

No, we didn't.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. **(Vote: 6-0)**

2040 Authorizing the acquisition of development rights to farmlands by the County of Suffolk under the Suffolk County New Drinking Water Protection Program (Young Farm, Town of Riverhead) (SCTM # 0600-067-03-017). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.)

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Motion.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Second.

MR. SABATINO:

We have the same issue, Mr. Chairman, again, if we could just repeat the authorization and the correction we can do it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Ms. Costigan, same authorization?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Same authorization as requested, sir.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Appraisals.

MS. COSTIGAN:

This is the Young Farm; the price that is in front of you is 3% above the mean. This will be an application for procedural motion and for authorization to proceed at that level. The appraisals ranged from 1.6 to 1.7 million. The mean was \$32,000 an acre; we're paying \$33,000 an acre as that is the lowest that the farmer will accept. It's a 50/50 transaction with the Town of Riverhead.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Counsel, can you prepare that procedural motion or is that a County Executive's.

MR. SABATINO:

If you wish to -- you need a sponsor if you wish to sponsor it.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

I'll co-sponsor it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. What account is the money supposed to come from?

MR. SABATINO:

Farmland not open space.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Motion having been made and seconded. All in favor? Opposed? It carries. **(Vote: 6-0)**

2042 Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (Mastic/Shirley Conservation Area-Town of Brookhaven) (SCTM # 0200-980.70-06.00-038.000). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.) This is adjacent to the William Floyd Estate?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes. It's across the creek sort of speak. This primarily tidal wetland a half an acre in the area that we concentrated on in the Mastic/Shirley area for acquisition.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What's north in the red, just north of it?

MS. FISCHER:

In the yellow you mean?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

No, in the red. Are those residential?

MS. FISCHER:

There just residential lots.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is anything south that's residential?

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Yes.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, but they're not developed nor is it north of there for about two lots. We own in yellow already in parkland so this would add to our holdings.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Is this buildable or was that ascertained as part of the appraisal process?

MS. FISCHER:

It will be ascertained because this is planning steps.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion Legislator Guldi, second by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed?

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Abstain.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Abstention by Legislator Caracciolo. **(Vote: 5-0-1-0 Abstention: Caracciolo)** 2045 --

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

You skipped 2044.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

2044 Sale of County-owned real estate pursuant to Section 72-h of the General

**Municipal Law (New York State Department of Environmental Conservation).
ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec)**

MS. COSTIGAN:

This is a small piece that the state approached us on purchasing for purposes of a canoe ramp. They own adjacent property; they're paying us our full investment for the property of \$40,000.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Where is this?

MR. BURKE:

Mill Road in Calverton. It's just north of the expressway of the exit 71.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Canoeing north of the expressway.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

This area has been commonly used as a ramp for some time; there's some steps there.

MS. FISCHER:

It's off of Edwards Avenue.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

It's in the {Pecallic} River. It's on your side, Mike. It is a primary recreational access point. If we're getting back the money we have invested and getting out of the liability we'd be nuts to not jump at the chance.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Well, lets jump.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Let's be nuts. Let's be crazy. All right.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

This is Legislator Caracciolo's district so I'll suffer him to make the motion.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Motion.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Caracciolo second by Legislator Guldi. All in favor? Opposed? It is carried.
(Vote: 6-0)

2045 Authorizing the acquisition of development rights to farmlands by the County of Suffolk under the Suffolk County New Drinking Water Protection Program (Soundview Farm, Town of Riverhead) (SCTM # 0600-018-01-005 & 006.001). ASSIGNED TO

ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.)

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Motion.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Second.

MS. COSTIGAN:

This matter is before you for acquisition. It's a 75 acres and the --

MR. BURKE:

The mean on this one is 31,000; we're purchasing it for 31,000 at the mean, the mean of the two appraisals.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

And we're purchasing it at the mean?

MR. BURKE:

At the mean, yes.

MS. COSTIGAN:

At the mean.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

At the mean. Motion having been made and second. All in favor? Opposed? It's carried.
(Vote: 6-0)

2047 Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (Amsterdam Beach-Town of East Hampton). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.)

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Motion.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Guldi second by Legislator Caracciolo. Planning steps only.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Co-sponsor.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It's 122.8 acres. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. **(Vote: 6-0)**

2048 Authorizing the acquisition of development rights to farmlands by the County of Suffolk, Phase V. ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co.

Exec.)

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Motion.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Explanation.

MS. COSTIGAN:

This matter is going to be before you for another procedural motion. The variation on the appraisals, one was 530,000 the other was 760,000.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Wait, wait. There's a farm here?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes, farm.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I thought it's, I'm sorry. There's a specific farm involved?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay.

MS. COSTIGAN:

This refers to --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Unlike the other ones it doesn't say the names though.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes, I thought it was odd myself. On the second page it does mention the farmer name, Mr. Ljungqvist.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. This is the Ljungqvist Farm, which is where?

MS. COSTIGAN:

The Ljungqvist Farm --

MR. BURKE:

Brookhaven Hamlet adjacent to an existing farm that we purchased a few years back. If you remember the {Loehmann's} Farm which property immediately to the left of this piece and both

being farmed by one farmer who's -- and now we're looking to acquire this property for the Ljungqvist family. It's also adjacent to Beaver Dam Creek, actually, on the Creek. So it's a good open space purchase.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:
Farmland and wetland?

MR. BURKE:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:
Motion by Legislator Vilorio-Fisher second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed?

MS. COSTIGAN:
This is 10% above the mean.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:
Yes. This will need a procedural motion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:
It's exactly 10% of the mean.

MS. COSTIGAN:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:
Is this the one with the letter?

MS. COSTIGAN:
No.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:
Counsel if no one else will do that please prepare --

MR. SABATINO:
Yes. Somebody has to get the -- none of the information on either of these procedurals is in this accompanying packet so --

MS. COSTIGAN:
I submitted over two weeks ago a letter to the P.O. pursuant to 712 --

MR. SABATINO:
I'd be happy to do it, but I need the information.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:
The letter hasn't gotten to Counsel. Could you get it to him?

MR. SABATINO:
It's not a legislative initiative.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes. We gave it to the Clerk as well.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Could we get it to Counsel?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Or do you want to discharge it without recommendation?

SPEAKER:

(inaudible)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to discharge without recommendation by myself second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0)** Which two do you need?

MR. SABATINO:

The two that you want procedural motions for the County Executive. I mean, those really -- (inaudible) responsibility. I'd be happy to do it for legislative sponsor, but I haven't got the information.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

And which are they?

MS. COSTIGAN:

You have four matters on today that all exceed the mean.

MR. SABATINO:

2040 and 2048.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

I'll make the request and please give all information to Counsel at the conclusion of the meeting.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I don't think 2040 requires a procedural motion. I thought it was only a --

MS. COSTIGAN:

If it exceeds the mean it requires a procedural motion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

But it's not 10% above the mean.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

That's right; 10% is the cap.

MS. COSTIGAN:

It requires a procedural motion if it exceeds the mean.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, just if it exceeds the mean at all so 1%.

MS. COSTIGAN:

That's right.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Got it.

MS. COSTIGAN:

One is 3%, one is just 1%, one is 9.2% and one is 10%.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay.

**2049 Donation and dedication of certain lands to County Parks (File No. S02-00-138).
ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.)**

MS. FISCHER:

This is a TDR property that would dedicated to the County is in the Miller Place Yaphank Road County Park area. The other piece is north of there; they're both in zone three.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Guldi second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? I'm sorry Legislator Losquadro made the motion. Second by myself. All in favor? Opposed? You guys are out. **(Vote: 6-0)**

**2050 Authorizing acquisition under the Greenways Program in connection with
acquisition of Farmland Development Rights at Center Moriches (Town of Brookhaven).
ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.)**

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

It's yours now, Mike.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Caracciolo second by Legislator Guldi.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

I have some questions.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

On the motion.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

As Christine is aware we've both have received ongoing correspondence from the seller via e-

mail within the last several months which I've forwarded to you. So if you'd just put on the record why this acquisition has taken as long as it has since the County commenced negotiations several years ago, Jim, or Christine.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Well, if I may lay out first what terms of the proposal are?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Sure.

MS. COSTIGAN:

In this matter the appraisals varied between 1.5 million and 1.1 million. Those were the final appraisals after it had been pending for sometime and indeed these were the latest appraisals. So the mean for acre was \$56,400. Mr. Strobel advised us that was unacceptable. The offer that we made him he wanted 10% above the original offer.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

What was the original offer?

MS. COSTIGAN:

It was 10% below this one.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

No, when, when.

MS. COSTIGAN:

It was in September.

MR. BURKE:

Well, in terms of what the definition of original. We've been speaking with the Strobel's for a number of year.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

That's what I said.

MS. COSTIGAN:

But the one that he said he would take 10% more that was in October.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

All right. So lets get the time line for the records straight. We began to look at this property when?

MR. BURKE:

It was probably some time in around two or three years ago probably.

MS. COSTIGAN:

The initial acquisition date was July of 2000.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Okay. And here we are three years later as a result of property value increases we've had to

adjust or bring up our appraisals current; that's now been done. What is the date of the most recent appraisal?

MS. COSTIGAN:

It was May of '03; all our previous offers were rejected.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay. The sellers now accepting our most current offer from May?

MS. COSTIGAN:

He's accepting 10% over our most current offer.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay. And you need the Legislature's approval to exceed that appraised value by 10%.

MS. COSTIGAN:

I need the Legislature's approval to exceed the mean of the appraisals by 9.2%.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

Okay. Is part of 712 is there not some explanation or justification as to why we should consider going above the mean?

MS. COSTIGAN:

Yes. In deed that was in the letter that I sent to the Presiding Officer and the justification in this instance is that the selling will not take less.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

I just want that on the record.

MS. COSTIGAN:

That is already in the Clerk's Office.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

But we don't have it.

MS. COSTIGAN:

I don't know why you didn't --

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

As Counsel said previously, we have not received that so I think it's important to establish it on the record.

MS. COSTIGAN:

But that's the reason.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

And does Real Estate concur that this is a piece of property, a farm that should be purchased for 10% above the mean appraised value?

MS. COSTIGAN:

In the letter we recommend the acquisition. I should point out too that Brookhaven is paying 30% of the price at the level recommended.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Okay.

MR. BURKE:

They're historic barns on it also and senior Mr. Strobel is here in the audience today and he's probably one of the reasons why the farmland program is in place. He's been a farmer for many, many years.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Well, this has been an active farm, dairy farm for many, many years until I think the mid 80's. So I made the motion, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion having been made and second. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. **(Vote: 6-0)**

2051 Authorizing acquisition under the Greenways Program in connection with acquisition of Farmland Development Rights at (Town of East Hampton). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.) It's farm day here.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Guldi second by Legislator Caracciolo.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Co-sponsor.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0) 2052 --**

MS. COSTIGAN:

I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

2051 I'm sorry, go back.

MS. COSTIGAN:

2051 is another one that's 10% above we'll require a procedural motion.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Make the same request for procedural motion from Counsel; please provide him with the information.

MS. COSTIGAN:

In this instance it's a 60-40 acquisition with the town paying 40% not 30%.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

How come Brookhaven gets off with 30% and East Hampton pays 40?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

You know what we're going to need is a memo on all of these that all 18 Legislators can refer to at the meeting.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Okay.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Counsel, does this one need the account number changed as well as the other bills? Does this need the account {inaudible} acquisition money is coming from changed?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Christine, while he's doing that, in the memo you would need the, you know, the location, the size, the two appraisals, the negotiated price and the justifications.

MS. COSTIGAN:

Fine. If I clean this up a little bit you'll have what you want.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay.

MS. COSTIGAN:

I misspoke by the way, Damiecki is 1% over the mean.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Which one is that?

MS. COSTIGAN:

That's the one we're doing now 2051.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

2051, 1% above the mean. All right. We have a motion and a second correct?

MR. SABATINO:

To answer Legislator Guldi's question there's no problem on the account.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion having been made and seconded. All in favor? Opposed? 2051 is carried. **(Vote: 6-0)**

2052 Authorizing acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (Patchogue River Watershed - Town of Brookhaven). ASSIGNED TO

ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.)

MS. FISCHER:

This is a property north of Woodside Avenue and west of North Ocean Avenue in North Patchogue in an area of Patchogue River. We own significant pieces in this watershed.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

This is this little green square within the mist of --

MS. FISCHER:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

How much.

MS. FISCHER:

4200.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Yes. Okay. Motion by Legislator Losquadro second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Opposition from Legislator Caracciolo. **(Vote: 5-1-0-0 Opposed: Caracciolo)**

2053 Authorizing planning steps for land acquisition under water quality protection component of the ¼ % Drinking Water Protection Program (Fresh Pond Addition, Towns of Huntington/Smithtown), (SCTM # 0400-014.00-07.00-009.000 (p/o) and 0800-001.00-02.00-024.000). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.) Right on the boarder. We have a map on this one. It's the green parcel at the bottom.

MS. FISCHER:

This is a 2.7-acre parcel, actually, one parcel and part of another parcel adjacent to it at the southern most part of Fresh Pond system in the Towns of Huntington and Smithtown. This parcel and these acquisitions were actually part of the original 1986 open space program and the individual is interested in selling this parcel now. We gave it a 35 --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is that a home on the left?

MS. FISCHER:

There is a home on the left. We denoted it on the property a dash line to indicate where just east of there's where the stream corridor is; you cant see it very well on the aerial, but the

stream corridor is just in between the dotted line and the solid green line. And we're hoping to pick up that portion of it as well.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What is the structure to the right of the solid green line?

MS. FISCHER:

That's just a -- like a shed barn that they'll be taking down.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I see. Okay. Is there a motion?

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Guldi second Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0)** Where am I?

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

2084.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

2084 Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under Pay-As-You-Go 1/4% Taxpayer Protection Program (Land of Hauppauge Springs, Town of Smithtown) ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Crecca)

MS. FISCHER:

Hauppauge Springs.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Hauppauge Springs, I'm sorry.

MS. FISCHER:

This piece is just north of 347 and west of Brookside Drive. The two parcel -- we own the dark blue parcel we picked up that piece. The other two parcels showing the wetland to the south we are in negotiation with the owner on those two parcels. This is the two green parcels north of there. There's a residence on the eastern most parcel which we would take that part of the parcel out obviously. The other structure on the second larger parcel would be taken down.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

By who?

MS. FISCHER:

The owner, that's what they indicated to us.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

I'll second the motion.

SPEAKER:

(inaudible)

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

It's planning steps lets figure it out.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. It's planning steps only. Motion by Legislator Viloría-Fisher second by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0)**

2088 Amending Resolution No. 222-2003, Approving acquisition under Pay-As-You-Go 1/4% Taxpayer Protection Program (Adamowicz property, Town of Southold, Suffolk County Tax Map No. 1000-121.00-05.00-004.00)ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING(Co. Exec.)

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Explanation.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

This is {Laurel} Lake?

MR. BURKE:

Yeah. It's just east of {Laurel} Lake piece.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILOLO:

Do you want to explain what the County owns (inaudible) and what the purpose of the acquisition is.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Well, what's the change?

MR. BURKE:

The change is just a slight adjustment in the price because when we did a final acreage there was just a \$500 more than the original resolution stated.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So motion by Legislator Caracciolo.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Second by Legislator Guldi. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0)**

2089 Authorizing planning steps for acquisition under Suffolk County Multifaceted Land Preservation Program (Property at May Croft Village of North Haven) Town of Southampton. ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION &

PLANNING (Guldi)

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Planning step. Motion.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What are we buying?

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

43.5 acres, Village of North Haven, Town of Southampton.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

What's in the middle?

MS. FISCHER:

That's a former nunnery.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Get thee to a nunnery.

MS. FISCHER:

The other building is a school used for like I guess pre-school children where they have teachers and activities there for children. So the nunnery at this point is vacant. The other structure is being used as a school and also above it are rented apartments at this point.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Pre-school and a nunnery.

MS. FISCHER:

Pre-school and a nunnery.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

I'll open it up for jokes. Anybody?

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

I have a question; we're buying property with these two houses on it?

MS. FISCHER:

No. We're assuming -- we've spoken with the Village of North Haven and their indication to us is that they'd be willing to take on the area with the developed structures on it. And we had indicated we'd be more interested in buying the open space areas possibly. They're also interested in the Town of Southampton is also showing some interest as well.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

And I trust that we the planning steps will be fully exploring the use of the partnership dollars that are available for both the Village and the Town of Southampton since they both have a revenue stream from probably transfers for preservation purposes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Is there a motion.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion by Legislator Guldi second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0)** I'd like to go back to 2053 for a moment.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

2051?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

2053 which is the Fort Salonga 2.7 acres Fresh Pond. Is this wetland or is this developable land?

MS. FISCHER:

Most of it is wetland. Which one, I'm sorry, Hauppauge Springs?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

No. Fort Salonga 2053, Fresh Pond. Blue line seems --

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, the blue line does go all the way including down to about $\frac{3}{4}$ of it.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

80%. So it's about 20% that vulnerable to development. How large is the 20% that's vulnerable to development? Is it large enough to sustain a application.

MS. FISCHER:

It's lets say three acres; it's less than one acre, I don't think so.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So why should we acquire it then?

MS. FISCHER:

Well, because they could --

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

(inaudible)

MS. FISCHER:

Crecca, Legislator Crecca. Oh, I'm sorry it's us, yes, sorry. This was part of the acquisition this property was on our list to be acquired in the 1986 open space preservation program. We never picked this piece up at the time, but we would like to see it as part of this whole watershed. We own not only in yellow here, but north of here we own a few more properties.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

If we don't buy it though it's not in any danger of being developed.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, it would be because it's three acres, yes, it would be.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

That's what I wanted to know.

SPEAKER:

(inaudible)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Well, it's not. Most of it --

MS. FISCHER:

But if they have less than an acre lets say to be able to --

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, it's like the Town of Islip do I get the right to go on there and build if --

MS. FISCHER:

Yeah, they'll make it the least invasive as possible, but they can't deny you development of it.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Without a defacto condemnation proceeding where we pay for it anyway.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Okay. Legislator Caracciolo has a question.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

I think the Chairman's line of questioning is right on target. In other words, if that has been an interest to the County for the last 17 years, why now?

MS FISCHER:

Because the owner is willing.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

This is the first time that the owner is willing to sell the property?

MS. FISCHER:

I don't know if he was a former owner in 1986.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Did he approach us or did we approach him.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes. He approached us.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All right.

SENSE RESOLUTIONS:

Sense 69 Memorializing resolution requesting EPA to reject dumping of dredge spoils

off of Huntington shoreline. ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Cooper) Motion by myself second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0)** All right. CEQ resolutions, no red coat today. On a holiday meeting we don't get the red coat. How ironic, but you're wearing a lovely shade of green, Loretta.

MS. FISCHER:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

TABLED PRIME RESOLUTIONS:

1476 Approving Adopt-A-County-Shoreline Program. ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Cooper) Motion to table Legislator Caracciolo second by Legislator Guldi. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 6-0)**

1852 Adopting Local Law No. –2003, Prohibiting use of invasive plant species by the County of Suffolk. ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Fields)

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Motion.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Motion to approve by Legislator Fields second by Legislator Caracciolo. All in favor? Opposed? Motion is approved unanimously. **(Vote: 6-0)**

1867 Authorizing program to update of Suffolk County Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan (without funding). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Foley) LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Vito saying, no.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Vito says Veto.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

He's saying he's opposed to it.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

I thought you had a question.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Explanation, please. Counsel, provide an explanation.

MR. SABATINO:

This was Legislator Foley's resolution to direct the Health Department to enter into a cooperative agreement with the Long Island Regional Planning Board to basically do an assessment to the quality and quantity of groundwater. I think it was a presentation made at our last committee with regard to something the Health Department had done internally. The reason this one says without funding is because there were two versions that were floating around. One was to have the Water Authority pay half the cost with the County doing a matching share. Then there was on the theory that funding was going to be put into the Operating Budget. That theory didn't materialize so the authorization would be in place, but there wouldn't be funding at this point.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Because it would be anticipated to come from the Water Authority. I'll make a motion to approve.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

I'll second the motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Second by Legislator Guldi. Motion to table by Legislator Caracciolo. Is there a second.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

I second the motion to table.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Second by Legislator Vilorina-Fisher. All in favor of tabling? All opposed to tabling. I'm opposed. Anybody else?

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Opposed, Legislator Guldi. Motion is tabled. **(Vote: 4-2-0-0 Opposed: Caracciolo, Guldi)**

1876 Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed donation of property from Silver Ridge Homes to the Suffolk County Nature Preserve, Town of Brookhaven. ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Pres. Off.)

MS. FISCHER:

This is in conjunction with IR. 1935.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

So what did we do with 1935?

MS. FISCHER:

That was tabled last meeting.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Oh, the next one.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Yeah, these are donations.

MS. FISCHER:

This is a TDR again.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

These are donation parcels for (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

In Legislator Losquadro's district and he hadn't had a chance to review it. He now as I'm sure had a chance to review it and has a comment to make. He's A-okay with it.

LEGISLATOR FIELDS:

Can I ask is it worthy of nature preserve?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes. The property that we would be getting is in the North Patchogue River Nature Preserve around where that other piece we are buying is.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1876, motion to approve by Legislator --

MS. SCHMIDT:

What resolution?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

1876, we're now going to take a vote on it.

MS. SCHMIDT:

I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

That's all right. Motion by Legislator Losquadro second by Legislator Vilorio-Fisher. All in favor? Opposed? 1876 is approved. **(Vote: 6-0)**

1935 Donation and dedication of certain lands to County Parks – A SCDHS Board of Review Transfer of Development Rights (S02-01-0051). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second, same vote.

LEGISLATOR CARACCILO:

(inaudible)

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Same motion, same second. I'm sorry.

MS. FISCHER:

In the North Patchogue River area --

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

(inaudible)

MS. FISCHER:

That's the receiving area; that's where we're getting the property. I mean, the sending area.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Where are the credits going.

MS. FISCHER:

Credits are going to Mt. Sinai area. South of 25A, east of 112, east of Crystal Brook Hollow Road.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

The (inaudible) is Silver Ridge Homes?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

(inaudible)

MS. FISCHER:

I don't believe so, but I'm not a 100% sure. I think {Silvestre} has silver in the name, but I think it's another group, but I'm not 100% sure.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Ready.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

(inaudible)

MS. FISCHER:

2.5 acre I'm sorry, .37 acres is what we're going to get donated to us.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

All in favor? Opposed? Carried. **(Vote: 6-0)**

1980 A Resolution rescinding Bond Resolution No. 1190-2002, Adopted December 17, 2002, and repealing the authorization of the issuance of \$3,650,000 Serial Bonds of the County of Suffolk, New York, to cover the cost of the State Share of grant funds for the Suffolk County Farmland Preservation Program for the acquisition of Agricultural Development Rights (CP 8701). ASSIGNED TO ENVIRONMENT, LAND ACQUISITION & PLANNING (Co. Exec.) Well, no explanation needed here. Counsel.

MR. SABATINO:

It was tabled the last time because we wanted an explanation. Nobody seems to understand or know where it's coming from.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Excellent.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Are we still there?

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Does anybody have --

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Hold on. You know intellectually we can only rescind the bond resolution if the bonds haven't been issued and if the bonds haven't been issued, why? Didn't we need the money to buy farmland?

MR. SABATINO:

It's \$3.65 million plus it was done in the year 2002 and so there's been a whole year that's gone by. Well, actually, almost two years have gone by. I don't know what the basis of geniuses was. We raised the question in committee last time.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Who put the bill in?

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

It says to cover the cost of the state share of grant funds. So in other words we issued a bond to cover the state costs. The state came up with the money so we don't have to do the bond.

MR. SABATINO:

Well, that might be the case, but I don't know before you rescind 3.65 million.

LEGISLATOR CARACCIOLO:

Motion to table.

LEGISLATOR GULDI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BISHOP:

Brilliant. Motion to table having been made and second. All in favor? Opposed? It carries. **(Vote: 6-0)** This concludes our business for the year. It's been an honor to be the Chair. I appreciate all your services particularly Legislator Fields and Guldi and wish them best of luck. Thank you. We stand adjourned.

(Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:20 P. M.)

{ } denotes spelled phonetically)

