

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING and AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE
of the
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on Wednesday, **October 27, 2004**.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Daniel P. Losquadro, Chairman
Leg. Jay H. Schneiderman, Vice•Chairman
Leg. Michael Caracciolo
Leg. David Bishop
Leg. Peter O'Leary

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Leg. Vivian Vilorio•Fisher, Fifth District
Mea Knapp, Counsel to the Legislature
Alexandra Sullivan, Chief Deputy Clerk
Ben Zwirn, Assistant Deputy County Executive
Thomas Isles, Director of Department of Planning
Janet Longo, Department of Planning
Jim Bagg, Chief Environmental Analyst/Department of Planning
Patricia Zielinski, Department of Real Estate
Lauretta Fischer, Department of Planning
Kevin LaValle, Aide to Leg. Losquadro
Lee Koppelman
Kevin McDonald
Maria Ammirati, Aide to Leg. O'Leary
Kevin Duffy, Budget Review Office
Sarah Landsdale
Mitchell Pally
Greg Moran, PO's Office

Charlie Bender, PO's Office

Vito Minei, Director of Environmental Quality

Michael E. White

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

(THE MEETING CONVENED AT 1:06 PM)

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Will all Legislators report to the horseshoe for the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee so we can get started. Oh, I apologize for the delay. We're going to get started. We'll begin with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Bishop.

(SALUTATION)

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. We'll go to public portion. Our first card is from Dr. Lee Koppelman. Please come forward; wherever you're more comfortable at the podium or at the table. Just please make sure the microphone is turned on.

DR. KOPPELMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The issue that I'm here today for is Introductory Resolution 1954 relative to the change from the Long Island Regional Planning Board to the new term Long Island Planning Council, which is consistent with the changes made in 239 K of the General Municipal Laws. I don't think I have to argue the justification for regional planning; but the one issue that I think the Legislature does have to be concerned about since these resolutions do not carry any fiscal implications, I think the Legislature has to be aware of the fact that if there's to be "a revitalization", there has to be a funding mechanism to make such a mechanism work.

From 1965 to the present in serving as the Executive Director, that was a position without salary. So, just the salaries for whatever staff to beef up the function will be required does

have a budgetary component that the Legislature will have to give consideration to.

The language of the resolution's pretty straight forward. It's pretty difficult to argue with. But I would caution that the concept of having support from the two County Planning Departments is not very practical at this time because neither department have surplus staffs to make staff contributions. In the creation of the Regional Board in 1965, I served both as Director of Suffolk County and Director of the Regional Planning Board. And to a large extent the staff of the Planning Department of Suffolk was the staff for the Regional Board. There were two members assigned by Nassau County, but the preponderance of staff came from Suffolk. And since we were able to bring in the equivalent of what on today's valued dollar will be in excess of \$100 million in federal funding to carry out the in depth regional comprehensive planning studies and the environmental studies, we were able to reimburse Suffolk County for the differential in staff costs since both counties are supposed to equally support the financial cost of the agency. So, this is an item that after the bill is passed, the Legislature will have to give serious attention to. And I thank you for the time to be able to make these comments.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. Next speaker Kevin McDonald.

MR. McDONALD:

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee. I'm Kevin McDonald. I'm with the Nature Conservancy on Long Island. I'm here to speak in favor of the resolution 1954 to reorganize and strengthen the Nassau/Suffolk Regional Planning Board in its renaming. And following Dr. Koppelman, who has a distinguished reputation as being Executive Director for that board for so many years, the Nature Conservancy also lends its support. And I'd like to make a couple of observations in favor of this as well.

The notion that the resolution before you would name five members from each county and then take off effectively county employees that currently serve on the Commission, I think is a good idea. And the reason for it is if you do this right and you appoint five distinguished members from both Nassau and Suffolk County who have the ability and the gravitas to let you know from time to time about new innovations and new strategies and new ideas about addressing major issues on Long Island, and even if it's uncomfortable for you to hear that message, they're the types of people who, I think, you have to hear from, who the Nature Conservancy believes it's good to hear from, particularly on environmental, planning and growth issues for the region.

We think the categories that the council has initially supposed to address itself to in the resolution on page four, the 19th resolve clause, we think is a very good start. You might want to, you know, be sure that you have enough room to look at other things that may emerge. And we think this is an outstanding resource that if better organized and better funded and better charged will help the region deal with regional policy issues that would benefit us all. And I thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you.

LEG. BISHOP:

Dr. Koppelman •• what's the point of the name change?

MR. McDONALD:

I have no idea. If it was just a name change, I don't think any of us would be here.

LEG. BISHOP:

I get the other part. I'm just curious.

DR. KOPPELMAN:

The name change is to make it consistent with the amendment to 239 of the State General Municipal Law which provides that these former regional planning boards be termed regional planning councils.

LEG. BISHOP:

Right. And there's no•• right, it's consistent with state law. But why did the state change it, we'll never know. All right.

MR. McDONALD:

No clue.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you, again, Mr. McDonald.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Next speaker Mitchell Pally.

MR. PALLY:

Good afternoon, members of the Committee. On behalf of the Long Island Association, we want to express our support for 1954 because of the importance to us of the concept of regional planning. Long Island is a region so designated by both the federal government, the state government. And what happens on one part of Long Island affects everybody else, whether it's Montauk or Great Neck and every place in between. It's essential that on issues of concern to the entire region, whether they are the ones listed on page four or any others, that a regional review be made of these issues and regional recommendations be made because in the context of funding decisions when they are made, whether they're transportation, funding issues or school aid or environment or Brownfield or whatever it happens to be, the Island is perceived as a region as a whole. And that's why from our perspective it is so essential that a regional review be made of the issues that affect everyone of us whether we happen to live in that individual area or not.

This piece of legislation will amplify that opportunity for the Regional Planning Council as it will now be called •• it will provide an opportunity for ten individuals appointed and confirmed to be able to look at these issues, to make recommendations. We might even go further and give them our •• to implement such recommendations, but that's not being asked for at the moment. But at least from the perspective of the review and the recommendations, this legislation, we think, is very important in that regard. And that's why the Long Island Association endorses it and hopes that both counties will in the reasonable foreseeable future adopt it so that the council can get moving on the types of studies that are necessary as Long Island moves into the next year. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. Next speaker Sarah Lansdale. Good afternoon.

MS. LANSDALE:

Good afternoon. I'd like to thank Legislator Losquadro and members of the Environment, Planning and Agricultural Committee for this opportunity to speak in support of resolution 1954. Sustainable Long Island applauds your efforts to strengthen and rename the Nassau/Suffolk Regional Planning Board to the Long Island Regional Planning Council. Not one community on Long Island escapes the piecemeal decision making that are endemic through

out the region. Problems of sprawl, traffic jams, failing school systems and empty downtowns are just some of the symptoms of this decision making. Cooperation is critical to the success of the region in several aspects. Mainly it is necessary to resolve some conflicts between the newer suburbs and some of the older suburbs; mainly the older suburbs in Nassau County and the newer suburbs in Suffolk County.

The need for effective regional planning and problem solving, this touches on nearly every major issue facing Long Island communities. The economy, new job creation, the environment, looking at Brownfields, the abandoned properties and equity. The success of this entity of this new Regional Planning Council relies on its ability to create a shared vision for the region, influence the towns and villages so it has real teeth, and to buy into the process and to leverage quantifiable changes that impact the region. I applaud your efforts to create forward thinking organization that can take a stand and look at issues on a regional perspective. Sustainable Long Island stands ready to assist you in making this a reality. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you for your comments. Last card we have is from Michael White.

MR. WHITE:

Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. My name is Michael White. I'm the Chair of the Long Island Chapter of the New York League of Conservation Voters. And I'm here to speak in support of this resolution 1954 regarding the Long Island Regional Planning Council. There's a clear need as has been said by the previous speakers for regional planning here on Long Island. And this legislation, we believe, will clearly reinvigorate and strengthen that sort of regional planning in this council form.

There are a number of environmental issues that will certainly benefit and continue to benefit by a regional approach. And just to name a few, groundwater protection. We are part of the Long Island sole source aquifer both Nassau and Suffolk. Open space, smart growth, energy, transportation, storm water, protection and management of our coastal resources. Therefore, we would urge your quick and favorable action on this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. I have no other cards. Is there anyone else from the public who wishes to be heard before this Committee? Seeing none, we'll close the public portion.

Before we go onto the agenda, I would just like to make just a couple of comments about the matter that has been discussed by everyone who spoke in the public portion today. We have two hearings scheduled; one on the 10th, one on the 18th of November that we're going to be getting together with the Environmental Committee of the Nassau County Legislature. On the 10th in Nassau County there will be a joint meeting. On the 18th it will be here in Suffolk County we'll be holding the joint meeting. Without sort of spoiling the surprise for everyone, it is going to be my recommendation that we do not take action at this time until all those concerns are vetted out in the public forum. We have a chance to hear commentary, such as yours today. I'm sure there will be much additional commentary. I've taken notes on your suggestions today. And we will try to incorporate all of those suggestions and possible concerns into whatever final form this bill takes. So, again, thank you for your comments. And I am going to make the recommendation to hold off acting upon that until those hearings are finished. So, again, thank you •• all of you for coming down today.

Onto the agenda. We'll begin with Tabled Resolutions. I believe there may be a couple of items, even Tabled Resolutions, if we would ask Mr. Isles to come forward. Good afternoon both of you.

MR. ISLES:

Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

First item before us 1142 amending the 2004 Capital Program and budget and appropriating funds for the improvements to active parkland at Maxine Postal County Park. I know this has been before us for some time. Counsel, do you have any commentary on the status of this?

MS. KNAPP:

I believe it's ready to go.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Mr. Zwirn, please come forward.

MR. ZWIRN:

I think everything is •• everything is in order now. We're waiting for CEQ. All the I's have to be dotted and the T's crossed. And it's done just about in the nick of time because otherwise it would have to be refiled. This is its last chance.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

CEQ, everything is ••

MR. ISLES:

CEQ is done. I'm not sure if they got the final •• the resolution from the village.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes, I believe they did. Yes.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve.

MR. ISLES:

But CEQ was definitely done.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Okay.

MR. BAGG:

It's before you today.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Yes, it's before us today. It was approved through CEQ. Okay. Glad to see everything got finished before it had to be refiled. Motion to approve by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All those in favor? Opposed? **1402 is approved. (Vote: 5•0)**

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

1518, long title. Legislator Schneiderman, what's your pleasure? **To establish task force to develop common sense plan to expedite Suffolk County Land Acquisition Program.**

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me be very brief what this bill does then I will make a motion anyway to continue to table it. The idea was to put together really the best minds in the environmental community, legal minds as well, to take a look at the County's Land Acquisition Program and make sure that we're doing everything we could to move it forward quickly with all the safeguards in place to protect public funds so that we'd have this Committee to make recommendations on some of the many bills that have been submitted such as creating the Department of the Environment and other things. Unfortunately we don't have it in place. The reason why I've been tabling this is because we made some substantial changes any way to the way we acquire real estate, creating the Environmental Review or Trust Committee.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

The Trust Review Board.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The Trust Review Board. And so I've kind of been giving time to see if these changes were working. It appears so far that they are working and the County's program is moving forward. So, what I'm going to ask is to continue to table it. And then if I feel like I need to get it voted on and we do need to put it in place, I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

I will accept that as a motion to table. And I will second that motion. All those in favor? Opposed? **1518 is tabled. (Vote: 5•0)**

1570, authorizing planning steps for acquisition under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program. This is the Williams property. Last time we had received a request from the sponsor to table that motion. I've received no request this time around. Mr. Isles, could you comment on this?

MR. ISLES:

This parcel was included on the master list so we've already started the process to ••

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Very good. I guess we'll make a motion table subject to call. Second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? I'll speak to the sponsor if he wants to withdraw that. **(Tabled subject to call. Vote: 5•0)**

1658, authorizing planning steps for acquisition under New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program. These are the Southampton parcels. This has been another item that has been before us for sometime. Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

These are actually very, very important parcels in the critical wildlands area in Southampton that's been identified. Very important for watershed protection. Some of these parcels are large. Some of them are small. What's envisioned here is that we would partner to the greatest extent possible with the Town of Southampton as well as potentially purchasing some of these ourselves and Southampton purchasing some of them themselves. The Commissioner of Planning has asked time to review this and try to filter out those that are more likely to be county partnership or county acquisitions. And he's indicated to me today that he needs one more cycle, which I wish we could move it forward but I'm going to have to make a motion to honor that request, Commissioner, and we'll table it for one more cycle.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Okay. And I would think that perhaps we could work with Southampton. Obviously, this is a lot of parcels. And I think it would tax our Planning Department quite a bit. So, if there were a way to even break up not only some of the acquisition but some of the planning with Southampton as well, I think that would be a course of action.

MR. ISLES:

I think Legislator Schneiderman has asked us to go in that direction. We have had discussions on that. We have had discussions with Southampton. We are awaiting from them some feedback in terms of what they consider to be the priorities. So we will continue to follow•up with them. The next meeting is in what, three or four weeks. And we'll do our best to get an answer and might be able to make a decision.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. So, there's a motion to table by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? **Motion is tabled. (Vote: 5•0)**

1729, authorizing planning steps for implementing Greenways Program in connection for acquisition of active parklands at Smoke Run Farm in Stony Brook. I know we've had quite a bit of discussion about this. Mr. Isles, do you care to comment on this?

MR. ISLES:

Yes. We have had •• this has been on the agenda several times. The acquisition is proposed as an active Greenways acquisition. Therefore, it would require a partner of some nature, either a municipality or community organization. Although this is only planning steps, the acquisition could be significant in terms of the County owning another horse farm. It is adjacent to county land known as the Forsythe Meadows property. The last discussion, I believe, at this Committee was to once again reach out to Brookhaven, which I did do. I haven't received anything back from them at this point. And I did speak to John Turner. I'm now trying to reach Mr. •• the Commissioner of Parks, Chartuk, I think, his name is.

LEG. VILORIA• FISHER:

Bob Chartuk.

MR. ISLES:

To try to see if there's any occasion. Legislator Vilorina•Fisher and I had met at the site with Brookhaven. So, that was several months ago, so I'm not sure what their status is at this point or their interest

LEG. VILORIA• FISHER:

If I may, Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Yes.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Can we proceed with our planning steps •• initiate our planning steps to show our commitment. And I know that Brookhaven Town ostensibly has been looking at this. John Turner did walk the property with us, a council person walked with us. Mr. _Chartuck_ and somebody else from the Town •• I can't remember who else •• did walk the property with us, expressed an interest. What is very significant to us here is that also it provides easier access to county land, to the Forsythe Meadow property. Right now the access is not •• it's simply not very accessible. And this would provide good access. There is an existing horse farm there. That doesn't necessarily mean it has to continue to be a horse farm. But we do want to partner with Brookhaven Town to continue to have an active parkland there. And I suppose contract negotiations would have to begin with regard to having a contract •• a contract or a license ••

MR. ISLES.

•• agreement. Yes.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Concessionaire. I'm not certain which term you use for that. But somebody run a horse farm. That would come much later.

MR. ISLES:

But the key thing would be having a partner. I mean at this point if we were •• if you were to go ahead and authorize this, Real Estate would get appraisals on the property and begin to negotiate the real estate acquisition. Without a partner, then, then it becomes a problem in terms of does the County want to buy this on its own. I believe the Parks Commissioner Foley spoke at a meeting or two ago on his •• rendering his opinion on the acquisition. I think it was positive. But it has all sorts of implications to the County in terms of •• it's a built facility. Some of the buildings are dilapidated.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

We certainly don't want to get into the management of this.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

And the Greenways Active Parkland is •• has always been a partnership. And so •• are you inferring from the lack of action on the part of Brookhaven Town, that there may not be an interest on their part?

MR. ISLES:

I would say that the fact that we haven't heard from them in several months isn't a strong indicator of any interest. I'm not •• I can't speak for them, of course. And maybe they have other priorities.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

No, I'm just asking what your inference is.

MR. ISLES:

And maybe they'll come around. And then •• they've got a full plate. They have their bond issue pending next week. That may affect their decision on acquisitions perhaps. So, I think we still consider it to be worthwhile. To consider your point about it being adjacent to significant county holdings in that area is very important. Just that I wouldn't want to walk down the isle and find our we're standing there by ourselves. And this is a big one. So, this is not a little playground kind of thing.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Yes. There are infrastructure problems. And there are •• there has to be some remediation, some issues there that have to be taking care of. And I'm very cognizant of that. I just •• I had just been under the impression that there was more interest on the part of Brookhaven Town. But if you're sensing that there isn't, I have no problem tabling this for another cycle.

MR. ISLES:

We'll continue to try to work with them and get an answer from them.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Commissioner, are we approaching •• doesn't sound like we're approaching this as a purchase of development rights. This is a total acquisition?

MR. ISLES:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

But it's a horse farm, which is an agricultural use. Why aren't we looking at this as a purchase of development rights?

MR. ISLES:

Right. It's being proposed now as an active recreation proposal. So, it would be an actively run public facility with the Town and providing horse riding opportunities. So, it is permitted under the Greenways program. As an alternative, it could be considered as a farm acquisition.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

How many other horse farms does the County own?

MR. ISLES:

I know one. Two?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Sears Bellows? Is that a horse farm?

MR. ISLES:

Well, we have horse concessions ••

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Out in Montauk, don't we have ••

MR. ISLES:

Well, Old Field, Bohemia, Montauk. Southaven has a concession. Several of them do, I guess.

We have a few.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We own Deep Hollow property; right? That we lease out. So, is this what's contemplated, we would lease to a •• some concessionaire to run a horse riding academy or ••

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Actually ••

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Vilorina • Fisher.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

•• what had been the initial •• what was initially contemplated was for it to continue to work as a horse farm that provides lessons and shows. So, it would be, I guess, an academy if that's •• Smoke Run Farm Concessionaire.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We're not going to have County employees scrubbing horses?

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

No. Through a concessionaire. And that's why we would be partnering with the Town and they would have a contract.

MR. ISLES:

Certainly it could be considered as a purchase of development rights. However, I think another benefit of this is providing access to the other county property there. So, you could provide a parking area for people to hike in and so forth.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

I actually hadn't thought of it as an agricultural development right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, if we did it as a purchase development rights, we wouldn't control the use. Somebody else would run it.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And it does seem to me that if we're going to move forward, we really need a commitment from Brookhaven. I can't see this as a county only type of thing.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

No.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We need a partner here to operate it.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

No. It would be a partnership we contemplated from the beginning.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Why don't we table it and wait for Brookhaven to give us a commitment?

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

Maybe you didn't hear me. I had said I would •• I would ask that it be tabled for another cycle.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

If there's no interest shown by the Town of Brookhaven.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah. I'll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Very good. I had a motion from Legislator Caracciolo and a second from Legislator

Schneiderman to table. All those in favor? Opposed? **1729 is tabled.** And I would, you know, hope that we get some sort of response from the Town of Brookhaven to give us an indication of what direction we might be moving on this in the future. **(Vote: 5•0)**

1793, appoint a member of the County Planning Commission Vincent Taldone.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Motion to table by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Caracciolo. This would be for the Riverhead appointment. All those in favor? Opposed? **1793 is tabled. (Vote: 5•0)**
Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

The Legislators to my left are blocking these appointments. But are they letting the seats remain empty? I mean, what's going on there?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No, no, no, no. We have a hold over.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. BISHOP:

In the Riverhead case, you have a hold over?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes. Dick O'Dea •• am I not correct, Mr. Isles?

MR. ISLES:

Mr. O'Dea is still a member of the Commission by virtue of hold over status. He has not resigned.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

And he attends regular meetings. I was here last month when you had your meeting at the

horseshoe.

MR. ISLES:

Yes, he was at the last meeting. He tends to attend most of the meetings. Doesn't seem to have a serious absentee problem.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Dave, just for your benefit and anyone else, I mean I understand the concern about, you know, supervisor prerogatives; however, there's nothing in the Charter that solely gives that jurisdiction to the Supervisor.

LEG. BISHOP:

Absolutely, right. You're right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

You agreee; right?

LEG. BISHOP:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So, what I've requested from the Town of Riverhead going back six months ago is to submit a name that has consensus of the board. The Town Board. And I'm still waiting.

LEG. BISHOP:

But in East Hampton, we have consensus of the Town Board.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's nothing in the Charter that requires consensus of the Town Board. This is basically •• it's a County Executive appointment. However, the County Executive wants to approach determining what name to put forward, I will support names that I believe are working in the best interest of the County.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Hold on here. One at a time here. Let's be recognized properly. Legislator Bishop, thank you

for waiting to be recognized.

LEG. BISHOP:

No, it was my time.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Does Mr. Thorsen continue to come to the meetings? Does Mr. ••

MR. ISLES:

Yes, Mr. Thorsen does. Both Mr. Thorsen and Mr. O'Dea indicated that they would like to resign from the Commission. Just so you know that. They have been gracious to attend. They want to leave.

LEG. BISHOP:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. That's all right. Okay. Onto 1865, designating a site for Suffolk County Community Greenways Fund Education and Interpretive Center. I know we had some discussion on this last time. I see Mr. Zwirn raising his eyebrows. Mr. Zwirn.

MR. ZWIRN:

We would ask for this to be tabled. This site is still being •• there are other sites being looked at. But this site, as I was speaking with Commissioner Isles, that the •• the mansion that was donated on this site still has to be reviewed for what kind of costs it would be to change it to be an interpretive center. There were asbestos problems with the facility as well. So, we still need some time on this.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

This is the Scully sanctuary site you're looking at.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And that's \$2 million? Is that what's available for this purpose?

MR. ZWIRN:

Yes, two million.

LEG. BISHOP:

We thought that was more than enough six years ago. Apparently it's not. I have a question.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Yes, Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

Who's in charge of finding a site? What's the process to finding a site? Isn't there a committee?

LEG. VILORIA • FISHER:

There was a committee.

LEG. BISHOP:

There's been two committees.

MR. ISLES:

There have been prior committees.

LEG. BISHOP:

And how are they doing?

MR. ISLES:

They made a recommendation. I don't believe anything ever happened with that. Ultimately the Legislature, I believe, with the approval of the County Executive, has to designate a site.

LEG. BISHOP:

What were their recommendations? Just refresh my recollection.

MR. ISLES:

Well, the latest committee out of the two committee, the most recent one which may be is 18 months ago or 24 months ago, recommended Southaven County Park.

LEG. BISHOP:

Right.

MR. ISLES:

The prior committee •• and I'm not sure if they ever put together a firm recommendation or not, I believe recommended Smithers in Flanders area; yeah.

LEG. BISHOP:

Smithers in Flanders. And so why •• why haven't we •• the Legislature has not moved on it? You're laying it at our doorstep?

MR. ISLES:

Well, I think the •• obviously we have a new administration that's taking a fresh look at it.

MR. ZWIRN:

I think we're just taking a looking at all the sites one last time. And ultimately the •• you know, the Legislature will make the final choice.

LEG. BISHOP:

So, can we anticipate a recommendation from the Executive, you know, like by June?

MR. ZWIRN:

Of what year?

LEG. BISHOP:

2005.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Touché.

MR. ISLES:

I don't think there was anything presented to the Legislature.

LEG. BISHOP:

It's lingered. I mean, this thing sort of has just been sitting out there for years.

MR. ZWIRN:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Are you done?

LEG. BISHOP:

Is there a time •• counsel just tipped me off to something that I guess is crucial. There's an expiration of the bond at some point?

MR. ZWIRN:

It's 2006.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Forget it. We'll never make it.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. BISHOP:

It would seem to me, though, the money ••

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

He hasn't yielded. There's no stopping him.

MR. ZWIRN:

Legislator Schneiderman's going to recommend Third House, I think.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is it my turn?

LEG. BISHOP:

It was the first cow farm in America.

MR. ZWIRN:

As you come from Europe, it's the first stop.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

I would ask that we keep this on point.

LEG. BISHOP:

The interpretive center, I was one of the sponsors of the Greenways resolution with Legislator

Caracciolo. I think the money has been borrowed, right? It's in the bond.

MR. SPERO:

The appropriation, I don't think, was every authorized to actually construct the facility. That being the case I don't believe the bonds would have been floated to actually build these. So, the authorization to make the appropriation exists. The actual resolution creating the appropriation never submitted ••

LEG. BISHOP:

It may be an idea that would not pass muster today. But I think it should be handled in a more forth right manner than to just let the clock run out on it. I mean after all, it was approved by the voters overwhelmingly. So, there's a reasonable expectation that the government is going to produce this. So, if we're not going to produce, let's at least discuss why we're not going to do it.

MR. ZWIRN:

No. I think the County Executive is in favor of the interpretive center. He just wants to make sure they recommend the right location. But I think that •• I don't think there's any •• there's not a move afoot here to let this expire without any action being taken.

LEG. BISHOP:

There'll be peace in the Middle East before we agree on a location apparently. Okay. I'm done now. Thank you

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. BISHOP:

I know there's a big schedule over there.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Yeah.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Did somebody mention Third House? No. Actually, Third House, which I've often talked about as a nature center would be a great location. My question is •• and, you know, there are •• I admit there are other potential places where these funds could be expended. Does it have to go to one place? Or can it go to three places? \$2 million is a lot of money.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Who are you asking the question?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I guess I'm talking to BRO or Counsel. Why just one? Why can't we have three interpretive centers? We could have one at the south fork, one on the north fork, and one in central Suffolk somewhere.

MR. SPERO:

Budget Review served on both committees and looked at various sites. But the discussions in those committees, even \$2 million wouldn't be enough to construct even one interpretive center.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, if you already have a building, you don't need \$2 million to make Third House into a nature center.

MS. KNAPP:

The Greenways ••

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

We're not doing site selection today.

MS. KNAPP:

The Charter ••

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Please, counsel.

MS. KNAPP:

The Charter provision does talk about the construction of an interpretive and educational center, which center shall include •• I mean, the language does seem to indicate one center.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So, then I guess one of the criteria then will be where can \$2 million be spent to actually deliver an interpretive center?

MR. ISLES:

And that's definitely related to the Scully property question. We don't know what that would cost, if it's reasonable to think we can do it there.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I would ask that the Third House facility be looked at.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

I'm sure Mr. Zwirn will tell us no options are off the table; correct?

MR. ZWIRN:

You read my mind. That's one of the reasons why we ask that it might be tabled for one •• at least another cycle.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Counsel, the resolution •• the Charter Law did address an interpretive center singular. Who is it ultimately left up to to follow through and provide the residents of this County with that interpretive center? I mean, it seems to me we have to adopt a resolution; that can be a County Executive resolution, it can be a legislative resolution as we have before us today. We can't amend the amount of funding for such center, can we?

MS. KNAPP:

It does •• the program talks about \$2 million being authorized, issued, appropriated and expended for the construction of an interpretive center. However, it doesn't say that •• that that's all you can spend. To the extent that we have a capital budget ••

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Budget. Exactly. And that's where I was going. It seems to me the suggestion which Legislator Schneiderman alluded to or made as well as Legislator Bishop and others is that maybe we should consider multiple sites using existing county infrastructure. And, you know, I would chime in. And I know there's been conversations. I'm not going to breach confidences with some of the people in this room that are in county government, but I know there have

been conversations with individuals about a number of other locations including Peconic County Dune park in Southold.

LEG. BISHOP:

We need a committee.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

And, you know, I mean, I think there are a lot of ideas about how to proceed and finally get this authorization for the \$2 million appropriated by 2006. And we really don't have a lot of time. We're really only talking about a little over twelve months to do that. I'm sorry?

MR. ISLES:

It's to the end of 2006. So, we basically have 24 months.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Oh, the end of '06. Okay. So, we could fund the Capital Program budget request, make a budget amendment to do that so that, you know, maybe we can consider multiple sites. One east, one west. I think that makes a lot of sense. You want to certainly have these centers near large population centers that are not too distant for people to get to, particularly school age children, which was the primary goal of having this center in the first place. So, I think you accomplish that by serving the needs of the school districts on the east end, if you have an east end location and if you have one in the west end location. If somebody wanted to suggest three, I would be open to that.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

Mr. Chairman, I know you're fighting. It's like a free form jazz exploration today. We're just going off on our own •• let's just go with it as we delve into the issue of the interpretive center, long delayed. I would suggest that the first step is •• I don't know if anybody's ever taken a look at it, would the center have visitors? Is there a need for it? I mean it was a concept that we put into the referendum that seemed intuitively to make sense. But I don't think there's ever been a study of whether it would receive use. And that should really drive, you know, where its location should be. I assume what would work is something near the Pine Barrens, you know, that school classes could go to and then from there and go and see nature. I don't

know if we need one on the west and east and all that, but we do need something that's going to get a lot of use. Because otherwise it's going to be a waste of money.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Okay. Thank you. Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you. On this point about where it should be located, Third House, a lot of people, as you know, a lot of school groups routinely go out to see the Montauk Lighthouse. They're going to the lighthouse already. They can tie it into a trip out to Montauk where they see the lighthouse and then they also go to this great nature center. So, a lot of people from Suffolk County go out to Montauk for various reasons and it will be one more thing to do in that area. And it would help the tourist economy out there as well, which brings sale tax revenue for you guys to spend.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Mr. Isles.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

The Central Pine Barrens acquisitions that the County has its in inventory, they seem to be centered predominantly in eastern Brookhaven as well as the Town of Southampton. And a very small branch that goes up into Riverhead.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

The Robert Kushman Murphy Park, how many acres is that? It's several thousand.

MR. ISLES:

Yeah.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

The Smithers property, several thousand. The RCA property •• not the RCA property in Rocky

Point, which is state, but the County property •• I'm trying to think of the gentleman's name that was the former CEO of •• and his name is on the •• what is it?

MR. ISLES:

Sarnoff.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes, right. I mean right there you have about 10,000 existing acres. Do we have any infrastructure •• I know Smithers was mentioned but it is in disrepair and that would require, you know, some real investment. You're the Planning Director. Give us a sense on this Committee what your thoughts are about this subject.

MR. ISLES:

I think having it central geographically to the Island is good. In terms of the Pine Barrens itself, what we have to be careful of there is if it's in the core, unless it's in an existing building, it's going to require hardship variance from the Pine Barrens Commission. And whether we should be applying for a variance is one question; whether we should be •• that's going to take a certain amount of time. So, we may want to avoid that. But I think that was part of the reason behind Smithers is that it had at least an existing building to work with. Smithers had other problems, I understand, however, in terms of a long dirt road to provide access. And things for school buses and so forth would have required a lot of infrastructure improvements for paving and so forth. So, the core, I think, would be problematic. Maybe a site adjacent to the core. Where we're using existing _inaudible_ on county lands. And I think in terms of the fact that we have the \$2 million is not a lot of money where we can leverage it with an existing building and upgrade it, enhance it and improve it, there is some logic to that. As Mr. Zwirn's indicated, I don't think we're per se opposed to the Scully site, that may be the best site in all considered, we just don't know enough about it at this point in time to say that. As part of that process, certainly we are looking at other areas, other sites. We're certainly talking to Mr. Foley from the Parks Department. And I think that's why we want to get a little bit of time to give you a sharper response.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Very good. Thank you.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

We have a motion to table by Legislator Schneiderman, seconded by Legislator Bishop. All those in favor? Opposed? **1865 is tabled. (Vote: 5•0)**

Onto introductory resolutions, **1881, making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed replacement of ITT radio tower structure, Hampton Park, Town of Southampton.** Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, seconded by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? **1881 is approved. (Vote: 5•0)**

1882, SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed donation of property to Suffolk County for park purposes point 6 acres in Carll's River Watershed area, Town of Babylon.

LEG. BISHOP:

Motion. Co•sponsor.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Motion to approve by Legislator Bishop. And he asked to be a co•sponsor. Second by Legislator Caracciolo. I'm sorry. Legislator Schneiderman. I apologize. All those in favor? Opposed? **1882 is approved. (Vote: 5•0)**

1883, SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed renovation and reconstruction of facilities at Francis S. Gabreski Airport, Town of Southampton.

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Caracciolo. Explanation, what the project is.

MS. KNAPP:

I'm afraid that what I have in my notes is that it's a Type II action.

LEG. BISHOP:

Jim Bagg must have the answer.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Jim, could you come forward, please? Mr. Bagg. We just have a question as to what this project is to earn the Type II action designation.

MR. BAGG:

It wasn't a CEQ resolution; but as I recollect, it's for repaving of roads, replacing lights and such things at the airport.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Very good. Thank you. We had a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed?

Motion is approved. (Vote: 5•0)

1884, SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed FRES communication tower removal at County Building at the Yaphank Complex. Motion by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? **1884 is approved. (Vote: 5•0)**

1935, I just have one question. I'll read the title first. **Authorizing acquisition of land under the 1/4 percent Drinking Water Protection Program, land known as Bluepoints Company Property • Uplands, in the Town of Islip.** Mr. Isles, as I see this, is this the same as 1955? Why ••

MR. ISLES:

Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Why •• okay. I just wanted to make sure that this was the one that was co-sponsored by all the members of the Legislature. 1935; is that correct?

MR. ISLES:

It appears to be, yes.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Okay. I just wanted to make sure. Thank you. Motion by Legislator •• we had too many hands up at once •• Caracciolo, second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed?

1935 is approved. (Vote: 5•0)

1943, appropriating funds in the Capital Budget in connection with the Water Quality model Phase III. Can we get an explanation of this, please?

MR. ISLES:

I believe Mr. Minei would be available.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Mr. Minei. It's on. Thank you.

MR. MINEI:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, Counsel, essential staff. I'm Vito Minei, Director of Environmental Quality for the Health Department. This money we need appropriated with regard to the comprehensive water resources plan that we're about to embark on. It's mentioned in the resolution. I have a one-page summary overview of what we plan to do. But it really marks the next phase in long-term water supply, groundwater and surface water protection. And there are a number of new elements since we did such a plan back in '87, which include new contaminants of concern and new and compelling social needs namely workforce housing, smart growth initiatives. And the intent of this comprehensive plan is to really incorporate all those social needs with the overarching concern to protect groundwater. It will be a joint funding effort with the Water Authority. The total bill is about 800,000. We have a consulting firm selected. They were the ones who developed the computer model. So, it's a matter of continuity and consistency to move from an assessment program into a management plan.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Who is that firm? What firm is that?

MR. MINEI:

It's Camp, Dresser and McKey. Their offices are in Nassau County. They're a nationally renowned consulting firm. They developed the computer model. They used it for that Long Island source water assessment program, the predecessor, which was, as the name implies, just an examination of assessment. Now, we're talking about developing management plans.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

And what was •• I guess obviously they developed the program. But what was the selection process? Obviously, I guess since they developed the program, they would probably be •• you would say that they would be best suited to conduct this. But was thought given to •• we had discussion before, would an agency like the Long Island Regional Board, would they be able to conduct ••

MR. MINEI:

Well, we anticipate them as participants. But to answer your first question about the selection

process, requests for proposals was prepared. We had several proposals. We culled that down to a group of about four consulting teams. We had interviews in conjunction with the County Exec's Office and Purchasing. And then the selection came down to the firm Camp, Dresser and McKey. One of the reasons for the Health Department taking the lead is, again, continuity and consistency. We did the 1987 comprehensive water resources plan. We were the ones who prepared the work plan and oversaw the swap program with Nassau County. We were the ones who developed the groundwater model. We also prepared the work plan and RFP. And we're ready to move forward with it. And we also sit on a number of relevant committees and commissions as either support staff or voting members. So, it's a matter of being ready, continuity and consistency.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Okay. When you said that the Long Island Regional Planning Board would be •• a partner or take part in this in some way?

MR. MINEI:

Well, we would anticipate them to be on our Steering Committee.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Okay. Will any of the information that is being sought by these consultants, is that already in the possession of the Planning Board?

MR. MINEI:

I'm not familiar that it is. I mean certainly the source water assessment plan has been distributed; whether they in particular have it, I'm not sure. But we can share that information with them.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Okay.

MR. MINEI:

And we will gladly incorporate them on the Steering Committee.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Any other questions? Do I have a motion?

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Motion by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? **1943 is approved. (Vote: 5•0)**

MR. MINEI:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

1947, authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection program, Open Space Component. This is the Goldsmith Inlet addition.

MR. ISLES:

Aerial photographs are being handed out along with the compliance review sheet and the rating form. This is a relatively small parcel, but it's important in the sense that it's located directly to the east of Goldsmith Inlet County Park in the Town of Southold. As you'll see in the aerial photograph, Gold Smith Inlet is the pond indicated in the aerial photograph. The parcel in question is right along Long Island Sound. There are two long thin green parcels, green outline parcels. The one to the left or to the west is the one that's •• pardon me, the one to the right is the one's that's the subject of this resolution. The next resolution involves the adjacent piece. So, what we're essentially looking at Goldsmith Inlet is a beautifully preserved environment of wetlands of an interesting costal environment. What you'll see with the •• you can even pick this up in the aerial. Coming off of Long Island Sound, there's a beach and then a small dune environment, then a back dune. And then in the heavier vegetation, the darker area, is a rising bluff. These are the only two lots that are in the lower portion of the beach environment. All the other lots as you can see stem from, you know, back to the road. So, any development that would have to be done could be done up on top of the bluff, away from the beach itself. This is a location that is, you know, certainly likely to be populated with lease terns and so forth.

We did do a rating in terms of the County's rating system. And it came out to a 44, which is a

pretty strong rating on the new forms. And Real Estate Division has coordinated the completion of appraisals and the review of those appraisals. The appraisal for this property can be further explained by the division. But essentially the parcels were appraised at around 550,000. The purchase price is 300,000.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

I noticed that both of these purchase prices was substantially under the appraised values.

MR. ISLES:

Right. And this is a transaction that's been coordinated with Peconic Land Trust. So, they've been doing a lot of the contact with the property owners. And I believe arranging the sale in a favorable manner to the County with perhaps certain benefits to the property owners.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Yes, we had a list going already. I apologize.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

I'll yield to •• it's his district. But I have some questions.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you, Dave.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Very good. Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Thank you. Tom, as I recall you and I and former Legislative Counsel Paul Sabatino and Tim

Crawfield met in my office sometime ago; maybe a year•and•a•half ago.

MR. ISLES:

Yeah.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

It was during a Riverhead Legislative meeting and during the lunch break. We convened in my conference room to discuss these two properties. Do you recall that?

MR. ISLES:

Yes, I do.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Do you recall that at that time Mr. Sabatino, who I have subsequently discussed these proposals with, at that time he was adamantly opposed to these acquisitions citing, as I have often cited, the size of these properties, one acre parcels. He didn't feel that there was any meaningful benefit that was going to be derived by taxpayers purchasing these properties. Now, to the east and west of these properties locations, are there other homes?

MR. ISLES:

Not on the beach portion or the dune portion of this location. Further to the south there are homes along Diamond Lane and along the road frontage in the wooded portion. So, that's actually what makes this, I think, somewhat important is that this is really an interrupted view from the County park along this dune and beach environment, a north shore beach environment. So, the homes are further back from this location.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

If I may just make a comment, I wasn't aware that Counsel or Deputy County Supervisor Sabatino had a vote or any stake in this matter, so, I'm sort of •• I'm sort of confused as to his intense interest in this. So, please continue.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, I wouldn't characterize it as intense interest. He was there at my request to discuss these properties with Mr. Crawfield and Mr. Isles; is that not correct, Mr. Isles?

MR. ISLES:

Yes, and if I could just add one point, Mr. Caracciolo, following that meeting, there was, of course, continuing review of this. We did inquire of the Town Planning Director as to the likelihood of development in this site. So, I asked Valerie _Scopez_ to please review it and provide a comment to me, can this be developed, can it not be developed. So, I did get a written reply from her, which certainly I could share that you, if you would like.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

What was it? I mean, just summarize.

MR. ISLES:

Okay. The reply was that she felt that it was likely •• that it could be developed. It's hard to say with absolute terms that it could never be developed, that it certainly could be developed. But her review was that under the town regulations, the Town Trustees' regulations •• I have a letter from the Trustees as well, their indication was that they felt it was likely that the parcels could be developed. And that was important to me. And I believe it was important to Mr. Sabatino, the County Exec's office.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

What we did not really get into at that time was what the environmental benefits or how this property would rate on environmental review form. Now, you've done that. And you've indicated it rates very, very high?

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

44 points.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. I mean that would be •• you know, that could be made clearly a compelling argument for preserving this property. Are these two lots contiguous to Goldsmith Inlet because •• they

are? The green outline is showing what on the ••

MR. ISLES:

The green outline shows in this particular case •• the two pieces along the Long Island Sound are the subject parcels.

MR. CARACCIOLO:

Right.

MR. ISLES:

Palmer is one, the one to the east. And then PLT, Peconic Land Trust to the one to the west. The Peconic Land Trust piece directly adjoins the County land which is the large parcel with the pond in it.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

He was referring to the parcels to the south, though.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Correct, where the green line •• the large parcel with the green line around it.

MR. ISLES:

Yes, those are proposed acquisitions. The map you're looking at actually came off the master list. So, we were given a double duty at on this today.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Because normally you would have shown the county •• existing county property in the same color?

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

In this case, it's not? It's in red.

MR. ISLES:

Here again, county land is not specifically shown.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Oh, it's not?

MR. ISLES:

No. What's in red is just tax map lines.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. So, where is the county property? It's to the west?

MR. ISLES:

To the west. The large pond area, the inlet, the beach environment. The large parcel immediately to the west of the beach front PLT piece.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

The sound front property?

MR. ISLES:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

And how many acres is that?

MR. ISLES:

About 30 acres.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So, this would be add two acres to an existing thirty acre county parcel?

MR. ISLES:

Yes. Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. ISLES:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Bishop, did you wish still to be recognized?

LEG. BISHOP:

Yes. We're being asked by the ones outlined in green next to the water; right?

MR. ISLES:

Yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

What's the access to those parcels that renders them dangerous to development •• imminent development?

MR. ISLES:

There's a paper street. This is called •• Diamond Lane is built •• that is developed for about, you know, up to the red ink or the red parcels. And in order to develop the two parcels in question, the paper street, which is an undeveloped road, then would have to be built in order to provide access. What the town would require for that whether it's, you know, driveway or glorified driveway or full road is not yet determined. But the properties definitely do have access to a right•of•way, yes.

LEG. BISHOP:

And Diamond Lane, that's going to be in the red parcels just to the north? South; sorry.

MR. ISLES:

Yes, just to the south. That's Diamond Lane, which •• and it curls in there a little bit; bends in there a little bit? Those are smaller lots but ••

LEG. BISHOP:

And then above that is the County park? The big green square?

MR. ISLES:

No.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

No.

MR. ISLES:

That's out. We'll have to revise the map.

LEG. BISHOP:

Where's the County park?

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Just to the left, the whole around ••

LEG. BISHOP:

Okay. It's with the land that surrounds the •• okay. So the ••

MR. ISLES:

So this is directly adjacent to the County park that we currently own. This park has a nice trail system going through it. It's got beach front, it's got dune environment. This is basically adding to and enhancing existing county holding on one level. On the other level it also •• here again, as you stand on Goldsmith Inlet County Park right now, by the beach, by the dune area, you can look all the way east and it's this large bluff coming down. And then this lower dune beach environment that is an extraordinary view. To build two houses right next to the County park in this location where they're sticking out like sore thumbs would severely impact on the vista, the viability, the natural enjoyment of that site.

LEG. BISHOP:

But next to it will be all houses; right?

MR. ISLES:

No. That's as we go ••

LEG. BISHOP:

Paper street with the boxes coming off of that?

MR. ISLES:

That's already developed. And that's up on a hill in the bluff in the woods. And maybe what I should do is show photographs. This comes down the bluff. It's an open low scrub type vegetation that's uninterrupted at the present time. So, you can look from one end to the other and this rather a magnificent environment right now. A picture's worth a thousand words. I need to get a picture here.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's my turn to cross-examine the witness? Commissioner Isles, the County, as we know, has great ambitions in terms of land acquisition. We have already approved planning steps for thousands and thousands of acres far in excess of our financial ability it might seem to purchase property. When we look at the lands that are preserved in Suffolk County, we see the ones that the County owns, we see many lands that municipalities own, various towns. And then we see that lands that are owned by things like •• groups like the Nature Conservancy or the Peconic Land Trust. And in our minds we assume that those lands are forever wild; that they are already protected from development. You have a property here that's owned by the Peconic Land Trust. Perhaps somebody gave this piece of property so it would never be developed •• I don't know the circumstances •• to the Peconic Land Trust. Maybe in an estate, maybe some other circumstance. The Peconic Land Trust is now looking to be paid for that property that's already protected so that we can protect it so that they would have some money to go out and maybe protect a different piece of property. What concerns me overall is that it really changes the picture in my mind as to how much land is actually protected. You have areas •• Peconic Land Trust is a major landholder. Are we going to be seeing more and more where they say, okay, we're going to take this piece of property that everybody believes is preserved and now have the County buy it so they can go on and buy something else rather than having them hold it and let us go out and buy something else. I'm concerned about it.

MR. ISLES:

Well, that certainly has come up where a land trust has stepped in and purchased property and retained it sometimes; but also has sold it. So, we've done that in a number of cases.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The Audubon Society •• the Scully property is a good example.

MR. ISLES:

Yeah. Absolutely. And we've gone through this a couple of times. In this case this property was on the market. It was owned by Maggio. And Peconic Land Trust went in and purchased the property as a way of holding it. They did express their interest in selling it to the County. Obviously if the County doesn't buy it, maybe they'll continue to hold it and retain it as a conservation property.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I didn't realize they were holding it.

MR. ISLES:

I don't really know. But that's •• they •• they chose to move in quickly to insure it wouldn't be developed in this case.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

The price is actually a very good price. So, if that's the role that Peconic Land Trust is playing, that's terrific because they're really have, you know, performed an important function. And I've seen the Conservancy do that as well.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So, that's good. I really •• it wasn't clear to me as to what the situation was. Now that you said that ••

MR. ISLES:

They definitely did that in this case.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I feel much better.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

It appears to be a stop gap measure. Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

In the traditional full disclosure, Tom, that was, in fact, what was discussed at that meeting; was that Peconic Land Trust was going to purchase or was inclined to purchase this property.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Hold it with the hope and desire that the County would then purchase it from Peconic Land Trust.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So that has now come full circle.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

They had, in fact •• they are the property owner right now?

MR. ISLES:

They're the property owner of •• let's get the two pieces squared away here. So, we have two pieces. The one that's before you right now, which is IR 1947, is Palmer. PLT is in contract to purchase that property I am told. The other parcel, which is directly adjacent to the current County park is now owned by Peconic Land Trust. So, they own one; they have a contract on the other.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

One should never assume, but would it be a fair assumption that in going about this transaction in this manner with PLT taking the lead, that the end result is you're preserving valuable, environmentally sensitive land; true or false?

MR. ISLES:

Yes, true.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

And that the taxpayer is acquiring that property at something less than appraised value and in both of these cases substantially less?

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

As a result of negotiations that PLT initiated and was successful at?

MR. ISLES:

Yes, we're getting it for about half the market value according to the appraisals.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

So it's a win/win situation?

MR. ISLES:

We think it is.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. ISLES:

Thank you.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Motion.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I want to second that motion.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Motion by Legislator Caracciolo, second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed? **1947 is approved. (Vote: 5•0)**

1948, (authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking

Water Protection Program • Open Space Component) open space component, same piece, but this is the one that's owned by Peconic Land Trust. Same motion, same second, same vote. **1948 is also approved. (Vote: 5•0)**

1953, authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program • Open Space Segment • of the Schleicher Property in the Town of Southampton. How many acres is this property? I didn't see that.

MS. LONGO

Schleicher is 29.8 acres. Janet Longo.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Mr. Isles or Ms. Longo?

MR. ISLES:

Mr. Losquadro, just to give you an overview on the planning end and Ms. Longo is here to add any comments regarding the appraisal end, the parcel that's indicated is about 29.8 acres, 30 acres. This is in the vicinity of Noyack, in the vicinity of the former Bridgehampton Race Track. It is within the south fork special groundwater protection area. It's similar to the prior bill that you had talked about that Legislator Schneiderman has put in terms of protecting this aquifer •• critical aquifer. And in this particular case the subject parcels are outlined with the green ink. And the yellow indicates parcels that are owned by the Town of Southampton. As you look at a larger perspective of this area, there's quite a bit of public ownership of county and public land. We've been buying some land, the town's been buying some land and in this case this is one •• there had been a prior planning steps resolution authorized. The Real Estate Division has been successful in negotiating an accepted offer. And so we bring it to you at this point for your consideration.

We have also included a compliance review including a rating at a rated 35. It is proposed for acquisition under the New 1/4% Drinking Water Protection Program.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Very good. And I see this has come in at a negotiated price of \$119,000 an acre.

MS. LONGO

Right.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

It's a very good price. Legislators Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

I said it in jest at the beginning, but I assume those are tennis courts on those people's property. Why aren't we looking at something like this which •• it's not adjacent to any bodies of water; right? It's just ••

MR. ISLES:

It's above a body of water. The South Fork Aquifer. This provides drinking water for this portion of the Town of Southampton.

LEG. BISHOP:

So, where would you recommend that affordable housing be located in the Hamptons? Have we identified those?

MR. ISLES:

We actually have. The County Executive's Workforce Housing Commission received several very good proposals from the Town of Southampton. So, we do have a number of sites actually •• are very good sites that are typically within walking distance of hamlet centers. I can't really say the particular sites; but this is not a location we would recommend for affordable housing.

LEG. BISHOP:

Why is it important to be in walking distance of a hamlet center?

MR. ISLES:

Well, it's not the only criteria. Often times to do affordable housing, you need to increase the density above, let's say, five acre zoning or one acre zoning. To do that, you really should be within walking distance of a downtown just to provide transportation choice to reinforce hamlet centers; that it's not more sprawl and dispersed development. So, in this case we're definitely not in a downtown. We're in an area, here again, as you look at it in a larger perspective, there has been a lot of preservation of land. And here again additional efforts in terms of protection of the critical wildlands in the South fork SGPA call for additional acquisitions. This would not be a location that we would recommend for affordable housing. There are many others that are

on table, on the drawing board at the present time. And we think that those will yield some good opportunities.

LEG. BISHOP:

Which golf course is that, just out of curiosity.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Golf At Bridge. You asked before what water body this is near. And this is over the deepest portion of the aquifer for this •• sole source aquifer on the east end. This is a separate aquifer for starting east of the Shinnecock Canal. And this is the purest and best water source that there is.

LEG. BISHOP:

Is the Town of Southampton partnering with this?

MS. LONGO

They're not partnering with us. But they will be able managing the property. They own the property right next to it, just adjacent. And they've agreed to manage our acquisition.

LEG. BISHOP:

Together, okay. Well, that's good but aren't they sitting •• aren't all those east end towns sitting on a nice sum of money from these transfer taxes?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

They are, and they're spending it.

MR. ISLES:

They've been buying land out here, too. So, we're basically •• sometimes we do a 50/50 partnership. Sometimes you go after that piece; we'll go after this piece. Sometimes it's easier to negotiate in that manner. They significantly have invested in this area as you can see just with the parcels identified here. So, I don't think it's a case whereby they want to us to spend all the money and they're not going to spend any money.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah, just to illustrate that, there's a resolution •• I just recently withdrew a planning steps resolution for a 300 acre plus property, the DJF properties, which •• I had a resolution to partnership with the Town. And the Town's doing it all by itself or with the State, I think, in

that case. So the answer basically is, yes, they do have quite a bit of money and they are spending it. And •• so some are partners, some we're doing on our own. And some they're doing on their own.

MR. ISLES:

Right. Some of these things change, too, as we go along.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll make a motion.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Motion by Legislator Schneiderman, second by Legislator Caracciolo. All those in favor? Opposed? **1953 is approved. (Vote: 5•0)**

1954, reorganizing and strengthening the Nassau•Suffolk Regional Planning Board and renaming the Board "The Long Island Regional Planning Council." This has been discussed earlier. I'm going to make a motion to table, second by Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. BISHOP:

Can I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

On the motion, Legislator Bishop.

LEG. BISHOP:

Is this such a significant resolution that we have to schelp to Mineola for a hearing? What is ••

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

You're invited. It's not mandatory.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's a free lunch.

LEG. BISHOP:

Basically •• but what is it doing? I mean, how is it strengthening the ••

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

This is a proposal by the two County Executives. And we feel it's important to discuss this between the two Legislatures to find out exactly what the importance of changing the make•up of the Board would be and have these discussions being that they affect the entire County and not just us here in Suffolk.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Through the Chair, please.

LEG. BISHOP:

The Regional Planning Council is still just going to make recommendations that are going to be •• sit on shelves, you know, as they've traditionally done for forty years.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Through the Chair.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator O'Leary.

LEG. BISHOP:

Good recommendations, by the way. They do good work. It's not going to have any additional power.

LEG. O'LEARY:

I took note of the interest on the part of those who spoke at the public portion, but I'm still not quite certain as to whether or not this is •• this is for purposes of form or substance. Do you know the details? I mean, is it •• is there any substance in the changing of it or is this strictly a form and just changing the name of the ••

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

There is •• the only change is in the •• it will go from a six member to a ten member board. Three appointments and three appointments is currently. The proposal would be for five and five. That is correct.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Is that in compliance with existing state law? Is that required?

MR. ISLES:

No. State law says the Legislature must set up the method of membership. And then you can determine what the numbers should be. State law has been changed, though, in 1977. And there are additional requirements that were put in. And one of the things that this legislation does do is it now conforms all those other things that are required to conform to state law will now conform. So, on that one, it's a judgement of the Legislature to set up how the method of membership should be done. The County Executive wants greater public involvement, which is what's proposed here. But it's not a state requirement per se that it be that number of members.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Also, currently, does the Presiding Officer, if they do attend, they can be a voting member; is that correct?

MR. ISLES:

No.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

They cannot. Because I know it specifically says in the new resolution that they could not. So, that would remain the same.

MR. ISLES:

Right. There are a number of positions that are ex officio positions.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Yes.

MR. ISLES:

The County Executive, the Presiding Officer and so forth.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

And they would remain non-voting members.

MR. ISLES:

And under state law they are non-voting positions.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Okay. Very good. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed?

LEG. BISHOP:

Motion to table?

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Yes. **1954 is tabled. (Vote: 5•0)**

1955, this has already been addressed. This is a duplicate resolution for the Bluepoints property. I'm going to make a motion table subject to call.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? **1955 is tabled subject to call. (Vote: 5•0)**

1967, authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of farmland development rights by the County of Suffolk under New Drinking Water Protection Program. There isn't a name attached to this parcel. Do we have any ••

MR. ISLES:

These are a number of properties that are before you that are only planning steps. These are not here today for authorization. These are farms that are •• I believe a total of nine properties throughout the County, I think, primarily in the Manorville area, as I look at this. And these have all been submitted to the County Farmland Committee, reviewed by the Committee and recommended to you today. Obviously, if there is an interested seller and we have an accepted offer, we have to come back to you for an actual authorization to acquire.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. I believe •• almost 233 acres ••

MR. ISLES:

Right.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

•• is the total amount. Nine different properties.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

You said it was Manorville?

MR. ISLES:

Yeah, the Manorville area, south of the Long Island Expressway.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Caracciolo, would you like to make a motion?

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Motion by Legislator Caracciolo. I was trying to figure out whose district that was there. Second by Legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? **1967 is approved. (Vote: 5 •0)**

1968, authorizing the acquisition of farmland development rights under the New Drinking Water Protection Program • farmland development rights component. This is the •• Zeh or Zeh farm.

MR. ISLES:

Zeh.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Zeh Farm, Town of Riverhead.

MR. ISLES:

Okay, Mr. Chairman, this is as you indicated the Zeh Farm in Riverhead. It's located in the hamlet of Baiting Hollow. It's about 29 acres. The Real Estate Division based upon the planning steps authorization had proceeded with appraisals for the property. Those appraisals have been reviewed and negotiations have resulted in an accepted offer by the owner. This would be a proposed acquisition under the New 1/4% Drinking Water Protection Program, the farmland component. Ms. Longo from the Real Estate Division is available to address any questions you may have regarding the appraisal process or results.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

The values on the appraisals, are these PDR values or fee simple?

MS. LONGO

No, this is PDR.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

PDR.

MS. LONGO

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Well, it looks like we've come a long way in Riverhead with PDR's.

MS. LONGO

They're going up and up and up.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

We're up to what, 46,000.

MS. LONGO

Well, this is 41,225.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. You took the mean, I see.

MR. ISLES:

Yeah.

LEG. CARACCIOLO

Yep. I'll make a motion to approve •• exactly, Tom, what are the cross streets where this is located?

MS. LONGO

It's just west of Edwards Avenue.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

West of Edwards. Oh, okay.

MR. ISLES:

Windy Acres; right?

MS. LONGO

Windy Acres Farm, yeah.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

So, motion by Legislator Caracciolo. I'll second that motion. All those in favor? Opposed?

1968 is approved. (Vote: 5•0)

Also, laid on the table was motion **2080, allocating additional funds for the acquisition under the Suffolk County Multifaceted Land Acquisition Program for Stage II active parklands, property of Grace Presbyterian Church.** Mr. Isles, I know this came sort of last minute.

MR. ISLES:

Yeah, I didn't know this was on the agenda. But this was an acquisition that was approved under Greenways in 2002. The initial round of negotiations was not successful in Multifaceted, but as active recreation under Multifaceted. Original negotiations did not succeed in an acquisition. It then went dormant for a while. The Real Estate Division then received an interest from the property owner, updated the appraisals to the current time and made an offer in the past month or so. That offer has been accepted at \$447,500. This is a Greenways Program so it would require an agreement with a partnering organization, which I believe is a Little League organization. They would to fulfill the requirements of the Parks Department in terms of entering into an agreement with the Parks Department. During the prior go around, the matter was reviewed by CEQ and the Parks Trustees. That part has been completed. We're not prepared today to ••

MS. KNAPP:

Just to finish one thought Mr. Isles started, I believe that the youth organization also went through the BRO process in that they were found to be financially able to •• to shoulder their responsibilities.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Did you want to make a comment? I was going to make a motion. Legislator Caracciolo.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Yes. Thank you, Counsel, for that addition because that is material to making the acquisition. The other •• just a couple of quick questions. Property location, property size, property owner.

MS. LONGO

Grace Presbyterian Church. And they're actually the fields behind the church.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Would this not be similar to, I think, an acquisition we made in Babylon Town?

MR. ISLES:

The only difference •• I'm not sure which one you're referring to in Babylon.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Dave, help me out here.

MR. ISLES:

Our Lady of Grace.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

That was more of a lease type structure. This would be for the acquisition.

MR. ISLES:

Right.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay. And ••

LEG. BISHOP:

This is a field in back of a church.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

And what's the size of it?

MR. ISLES:

I don't have the file here. We didn't know it was on the agenda but I think it's around four acres or five acres.

MS. LONGO

Yeah ••

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

About four acres.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

And it's for out right purchase for \$227,500?

MR. ISLES:

No.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

This is additional.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Oh, additional. What was the total?

MR. ISLES:

447, 500.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Less than a half a million dollars?

MR. ISLES:

Yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

For five acres.

MR. ISLES:

Approximately five acre or four acres, yes.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Okay.

LEG. BISHOP:

Cheap.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

I'll make that motion.

LEG. O'LEARY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Second by legislator O'Leary. All those in favor? Opposed? **2080 is approved. (Vote: 5 •0)**

CEQ. Thank you, Commissioner.

MR. ISLES:

Thank you.

LEG. CARACCIOLO:

Director.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Director. I apologize. Thank you.

Make room for Jim. Good afternoon.

MR. BAGG:

Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

We'll begin CEQ resolutions. **52•04 (proposed SEQRA classifications of legislative resolutions laid on the table on August 24, 2004.)**

LEG. O'LEARY:

Motion.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second.

MR. BAGG:

This is basically CEQ's recommendation for the legislative packet laid on the table on August 24th, 2004 and it outlines those actions which are Type II actions.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Motion by Legislator O'Leary, second by Legislator Schneiderman. All those in favor? Opposed?

It's approved. (Vote: 5•0)

53•04 (proposed improvement to active parkland/recreation areas at Maxine Postal County Park, CP #7178.413, Village of Amityville.)

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion.

MR. BAGG:

53•04 deals with the proposed improvements to active parkland and recreation areas in Maxine Postal County Park. I believe you reviewed this under IR 1402•04. Recommendations for

unlisted action negative declaration.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

54•04, (proposed nautical park, Greenways Program, SCTM #'s 101•007•8•4, 5,6 and 8 Village of Amityville.) This is also an unlisted action; correct? Neg dec.

MR. BAGG:

Yes. This is proposed Nautical Park in the Greenways Program. The project involves the 1.3 acres to be used as a community park.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

55•04 (proposed stormwater remediation to the Peconic River at CR 63, Peconic Avenue Phase 3B, NYS Clean Air/Clean Water Bond Act, CP #8233, Town of Riverhead.)

MR. BAGG:

55•04 is the proposed stormwater remediation to Peconic River at CR 63 Peconic Avenue phase 3B. It's funded under the New York State Clean Air, Clean Water Bond Act. Council recommends an unlisted action negative declaration because it'll take out direct discharge to the river.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

56•04 (proposed stormwater remediation to the Peconic River at CR 94 Nugent Avenue • phase 3C, NYS Clean Air/Clean Water Bond Act, CP#8233, Town of Southampton.)

MR. BAGG:

This is similar to the one I just did. It's a remediation project to the Peconic River at CR 94 Nugent Drive. It's also a New York State Clean Air/Clean Water Bond Act proposal. Council recommends an unlisted action negative declaration.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

57•04 (proposed acquisition of Goldsmith Inlet County Park addition, Peconic Land Trust Property, Town of Southhold.)

MR. BAGG:

This is a proposed acquisition of Goldsmith Inlet County Park Addition. These were already previously reviewed for you, the both of them in order. And Council recommends unlisted actions negative declarations.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

58•04, (proposed acquisition of Goldsmith Inlet County Park addition, Palmer property, Town of Southhold.), the other parcel. Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

59•04 (proposed acquisition of a conservation easement on the McQuade property for Open Space Preservation purposes, Town of Riverhead.)

MR. BAGG:

This is a proposed acquisition of a conservation easement on the McQuade Property for open space preservation purposes. Council recommends that it's an unlisted action that will not have a significant impact on the environment.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

60•04 (proposed acquisition of Bluepoints upland property for parkland purposes, Town of Islip.)

MR. BAGG:

This was previously reviewed by you as well under a previous resolution. Council recommends that it's an unlisted action with a negative declaration.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

61•04 (proposed SEQRA classifications of legislative resolutions laid on the table on September 28th, 2004.)

MR. BAGG:

This is the Council's recommendations relative to the legislative resolutions laid on the table for September 28th, 2004. These are the recommendations for Type II Actions.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

62•04 (proposed Veterans' Hospital 800 MHz Tx/Rx Antenna site on existing water tower, Town of Huntington.)

MR. BAGG:

62•04 is a proposed veterans 800 megahertz antenna site on an existing water tower in the Town of Huntington. They're simply going to put in a tower on the •• existing water tower for police purposes.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

63•04 (proposed construction of highway maintenance facilities, CP#5048, Babylon salt storage building, West Babylon, Town of Babylon.)

MR. BAGG:

This is a proposed construction of a highway maintenance facilities, Babylon Salt Storage Building. This is at Bergen Point, Town of Babylon. They're going to construct a salt storage building on the Bergen Point site where they already have a salt pile. Council recommends unlisted action negative declaration.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

64•04 (proposed acquisition of Tedford property for park purposes, Town of Shelter Island.)

MR. BAGG:

This is a proposed acquisition of the Tedford property for parkland purposes on Shelter Island. Council recommends an unlisted action. It will not have an impact on the environment.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

65•04 (proposed acquisition of Schleicher property for park purposes, Town of Southampton.)

MR. BAGG:

This is the proposed acquisition of the Schleicher property for parkland purposes as reviewed by you previously. Council recommends an unlisted action negative declaration.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

66•04 (proposed acquisition of Abets Creek • Phase II for park purposes, Town of Brookhaven.)

MR. BAGG:

This is a purposed acquisition of Abets Creek, Phase II for parkland purposes. Council recommends an unlisted action negative declaration.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

67•04 (proposed donation of property (TDR) • W. Rignola • So2•03•0048, Town of

Brookhaven.)

MR. BAGG:

This is the proposed donation of property by W. Rignola within the Town of Brookhaven. Council recommends an unlisted action negative declaration.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

68 • 04 (proposed donation of property (TDR) • P. Cicorelli • SO2•99•049, Town of Brookhaven.)

MR. BAGG:

This is another donation of property for P. Cicorelli, Town of Brookhaven. Council recommends an unlisted action negative declaration.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. (Approved. Vote: 5•0)

And lastly, **69 •04 (proposed donation of property adjacent to the Flanders County Preserve Area (SH04), Town of Southampton.)**

MR. BAGG:

And this is proposed donation of property in the Flanders County Park area preserve. Council recommends an unlisted action negative declaration.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Approved. Vote: 5•0)**

Thank you, Mr. Bagg.

If there's no other business before us today ••

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

One quick announcement for those who are interested.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

Legislator Schneiderman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

In all things environmental tonight around 10:30, 10:23 total eclipse of the moon. It will last for about an hour and you won't see it again for about three more years so ••

LEG. BISHOP:

It's a great view from the Third House.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's beautiful. Nice and dark. You can't find a better spot to be star•gazing.

CHAIRMAN LOSQUADRO:

And now that Legislator Schneiderman's bill to curb light pollution is in place, it will brighten the night sky and allow us to view that in its full splendor. There you go. Thank you. Meeting stands adjourned.

(THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 2:40 PM)

Denotes spelled phonetically