

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A special joint meeting of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee and Parks & Recreation 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 May 20, 2008 to discuss the matter of the Capital Budget.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Jay H. Schneiderman, Chairperson of Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee
Leg. Vivian Vilorio-Fisher, Chairperson of Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. Lou D'Amaro, Vice Chair of Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. Lynne C. Nowick, member of Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. Steven H. Stern, member of Parks & Recreation Committee

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Gail Vizzini, Director of Budget Review Office
Lance Reinheimer, Assistant Director of Budget Review Office
Robert Lipp, Deputy Director of Budget Review Office
John W. Pavacic, Commissioner of Parks
Carrie Meek Gallagher, Environment & Energy Commissioner
Chris Kent, Director, Real Property
Tom Hroncich
Karen Summers-Solinas
Terry Maccarrone
Carol Ghiorso Hart, Vanderbilt Museum
Steve Gittelman, Vanderbilt Museum

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

(THE MEETING COMMENCED AT 2:49 PM)

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Because we want to conclude our Parks meeting quickly so that the Education Committee can continue, I'm going to begin the Parks Committee meeting right away. And after I am done, Legislator Schneiderman will begin the Environment Committee. So if anyone is still here from the college and would like to continue your conversations while I'm doing Parks, please go to the lobby so that we can commence our review of the Capital Programs in the Parks Department.

Commissioner, I know that you're eager so I'm calling the Parks and Recreation meeting to order. And I know that you're on a tight schedule, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Thank you very much. I really appreciate that.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

And I'm going to have some questions for Budget Review based on some of Budget Review's recommendations. Oh, Robert, did you lose your computer? I'll ask Lance the questions in that case.

Good afternoon, everybody. And we will try to expedite this as much as possible. And so I'm just going to -- Commissioner, if you could just make your statements if you have some. My name is incorrect up here. You know who I am.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Certainly. Thank you, Madam Chairman. My name is John W. Pavacic, Commissioner of the County Parks Department. I'm accompanied today by several of our senior staff. To my right is Karen Summers-Solinas, Senior Accountant, head of our Accounting Unit. Terry Maccarrone, Coordinator of Community Based Programs and Tom Hroncich, who is our Parks Foundation Director. They've all been intimately involved in helping us craft our proposed Capital Budget today.

I do have one specific comment in regard to Budget Review Office's proposed changes to the Capital Budget. And that is in regard to capital project number 7173, maintenance and operation facilities. This particular one it is proposed that a --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Can you refer to the page in the budget document, please, so that it's easier --

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

That is page 351.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

And that's in the review or in the Capital Program.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

In the review. It's in the section entitled Budget Review Office Evaluation.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Overall what is being proposed is the elimination of a proposed maintenance facility for Indian

Island. Indian Island, a lot of people think of it as actually being one park complex and that is not true. There are actually two separate park facilities there. One is the Indian Island Golf Course, one of our four golf courses there, which is a separately functioning entity. And then we have the Indian Island Campground and Park, which is located further north on County Road 105. We have a maintenance facility for the golf course itself. And as you may know, golf courses utilize very specialized equipment. There's all different types of mowers, for example, whether it's for greens or fairways or rough. And other types of specialized equipment which are utilized for that.

In addition, there are such specialized facilities as pesticide storage and chemical handling facilities built into maintenance buildings for golf courses. They are also sized to accommodate the equipment that we have there. They're not generally built with significant amount of excess.

That coupled with the fact that there's a fair amount of distance between the two facilities, one has to go down, I believe it's probably at least half a mile down 105 to get from the existing golf course maintenance facility which is located at the intersection of Riverside Drive and 105 if you head north, at least half a mile to get to the other Indian Island Park, so just in terms of physically transporting equipment that makes it difficult. Even if one were to utilize or to add on to the other maintenance facility for the golf course, you're talking about having to either drive tractors and other equipment down 105, which can be a fairly fast moving -- in terms of traffic or having to flatbed it somehow. So it's an inefficient way of managing what's going on.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Well, essentially what you're saying is, and I saw Budget Review's recommendation which is that it would be two maintenance facilities in one complex, and what you're saying is that in function and in location they're virtually two different facilities.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Right.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Because you have the campground and the golf course and so you need the additional facility in order to provide the functionality and the location.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

That's correct. And I will just point out that Indian Island is our second largest campground after Smith Point, so it gets quite a bit of usage. It's a significant facility in and of itself.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Thank you, Commissioner. Was there another item to which you wanted to draw our attention?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

I just wanted to point out that we are pleased with the inclusion by Budget Review Office of additional funding for capital project 7507, which is on page 375 of the report, which is Blydenburgh. And then also CP 7510, which is our Historic Restoration and Preservation Fund. And ask that that be -- those proposed changes be made.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Now in 375 with regards Blydenburgh, it said the Budget Review Office does not agree with the proposed funding presentation for this capital project. We recommend advancing 150,000 for planning and 500,000 for construction from 2011 to 2009 and advancing 500,000 for construction from subsequent years to 2009 to provide sufficient funds to stabilize the structure's exterior and foundation that is currently held up with temporary shoring. Okay. What's your response to that? Do you have any problem with that schedule?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

No. We're basically -- we are in favor of the change proposed by BRO.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. And members of the Committee, if you have any comments as we go along, just chime in.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Madam Chair, if I can?

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I want to thank the Commissioner for going ahead and paying specific attention to the Blydenburgh Historic District. As you know, this is in an area that actually is quite close to the border that Legislator Nowick and I share. There has been an extensive reconstruction report prepared by Dunn Engineering in conjunction with Public Works. We've actively sought to go ahead and get the funding necessary to keep the mill from falling into the river and to actually restore to operational level. It is one of only three mills here on Long Island that reflect that type of a structure from that period of history. So it's fairly critical that we get the funding to stop the erosion to restore it to operation and to allow for the rest of the district to go ahead and be brought back to use.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Legislator Kennedy. I'm going to just go through some of the projects and ask for your comments, Commissioner, and perhaps have Budget Review expand on some of them.

One of the perennial discussions that we have here as we're looking at the capital projects in the Parks Department is fencing being part of the Capital Program rather than Operating. And if you look again at Budget Review's review on page 317, Budget Review agrees with the 2009-2011 Capital Program, however, recommends changing the funding from serial bonds to transfer from the General Fund in 2010 and 2011, And I think that's consistent with what Budget Review has said in the past. Lance, would you like to comment on that or Gail? I didn't see you come in.

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, that's correct. It's equipment which has a life of less than five years. So it's -- to be consistent with Local Law 2394, it should be shown as transfer from the General Fund.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. So I'd like to make a note of that on the record for the members of this committee who also serve on the budget working group that I believe is a very powerful change that is sought by -- is recommended, rather, by Budget Review because we have been moving to bonding far too often rather than trying to use our pay-go ability. And we do have the 25-5-5 guidelines that we do try to use.

Commissioner, I'm going to agree with that recommendation, that in the years 2010 and 2011 we do look at pay-go.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

We don't have an issue with that.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I also would like to direct your attention to another recommendation by Budget Review

regarding the dog parks. And the Budget Review recommendation on page 323 refers to Resolution Number 461 of 2007 wherein -- that there be some kind of comprehensive compilation of where we plan on doing these parks. Let me just refresh my own memory because I'm looking at my notes. Right, regarding recommended sites. It will give us an idea of some kind of overview of where we're planning on having these sites. You probably don't have all the sites set yet. I know that we were going to look in my district and we didn't get to look at that.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Right.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Your comments?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

As I had relayed to the Budget Review Office, we do have a number of sites under consideration right now. But the reason we have not gone forward and put that in writing and presented that to the committee or to the Legislature is because some of these are in environmentally sensitive areas, either the Pine Barrens or in wild scenic and recreational river corridors, or there's some other issues pertaining to that that we need to take into account and also get a sense from -- in some cases either the community or particular regulatory agencies or from the active dog organization.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Do you know anybody in the DEC?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Yeah, I know a few people. But even then, even with my intimate relationship with some folks at DEC, that's not always enough to sway the day. So those things we are having some preliminary discussions behind the scenes just to determine if the sites have a reasonable degree of feasibility given all those planning and environmental constraints and potential community issues based on some of the past concerns that have been raised.

We are looking to have a geographic distribution at least from Central Suffolk through western Suffolk on both north and south shores. So we are looking at areas in central Brookhaven, south Brookhaven and also the southwestern portion of the County in order to effect a fairly even and equitable geographic distribution.

One of the other things we're looking at is, as you know, one of the other laws we're mandated to follow is one that requires natural dog parks with natural borders and not fencing. So that's something else that makes this a little bit more complex an issue for us to address. And that's, again, one of the issues that gets wrapped into the environmental and planning constraints as well. Because once you do not have a fence you have to have -- look at potential for some dogs not being contained in an area and perhaps affecting adjacent properties. So we know that those are concerns that have been expressed by certain agencies and organizations. And we do hope to have, I would imagine, in the next couple of months a better sense that we can -- of sites that we can present to the Legislature and to address the reporting requirements.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Let me just ask Budget Review. In your reading of IR 461, is there a prohibition about going forward with some of the dog parks and capital programs without having the sites before us first? Or is this just a recommendation that we try to get an overview?

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, it's just a recommendation that, you know, the legislation asked for a written report. We

haven't received it yet. Our recommendation to agree with the funding really is separate from the report, two different issues. We looked at in terms of limited resources. It would be Pay-As-You-Go funds. So we agreed with the County Executive that, you know, we have to make decisions someplace and we figured dog runs were of a lower priority than some of the other things in the Parks Department.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Where's Legislator Stern, let's see, and Legislator Cooper. Yes, Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yeah, just as an aside, I have to say when we were doing this, I thought to myself dog runs, I think we spent hours on dog runs, too.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Seemed like days.

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes. But I have to tell you, Blydenburgh Park, I have gotten more complimentary calls from dog lovers who say that that is just wonderful so --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

It's the cat's meow.

LEG. NOWICK:

It certainly is. So I'm not so sure it's a low priority because our constituency absolutely thinks this is great, so just hats off to you.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Well, it's putting good use of our parks for people to be able to use them.

We also have again with the next project, which is wonderful and it's in conformance with our Dark Skies legislation, which is more eco-friendly lights in our County parks. But there is again on page 325 a Budget Review recommendation regarding pay-go in 2011; is that correct, Lance?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes, it's equipment. You know, overall for the recommended Capital Program there's about \$20 million in capital projects that if you were to fund them in accordance with Local Law 23 of 94, they all would fit the definition of pay-go. So this is not unique to the Parks Department.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Right. Lynne, are you in the working group?

LEG. NOWICK:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I just want to really emphasize this for the people in the working group, that there's a lot here in the, you know, 2011 that's in -- bonded that Budget Review's recommending that we look at pay-go for it.

LEG. NOWICK:

And Budget Review will be in there on Thursday so we'll talk about that.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Well, hopefully we'll be building up our funds. And lastly -- no, I have a couple of other just quick ones, which is when we look here at the meter installations and utility accountability, that's another kind of item that Budget Review is asking for the, you know, the dog park list. This is a priority list of those meters? Is there a list of those or can we look forward to having that?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

We're working on them right now. We have some ideas but one of the things we have to look at is whether or not there would be an impact on existing contractual agreements we have with certain concessionaires and other occupants of some of the buildings. So before we publicly talk about that, we need to examine those contractual agreements.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. If you can get back to us at the Parks Committee meeting, I'd like to learn more about that and what it entails. Okay? And we move to Coindre Hall. That looks like continuing to add money there. But on 329 Budget Review had a couple of good recommendations regarding cost sharing. Are we looking at those or, you know, on 329 looking at cost sharing with the Town of Huntington and Sagamore Rowing Association, just to see if we can lighten the load a little?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

In regard to West Neck Farm, Coindre Hall, are you referring to the boathouse?

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Okay. Over the past year or so the County's been negotiating with Town of Huntington in order to reach an agreement that could be executed which would allow the town to contribute \$600,000 toward the restoration/stabilization of Coindre Hall Boathouse. As of today that agreement has not been reached. And because of that we have decided to move ahead with the restoration and stabilization of the structure. Otherwise we would run the risk of further deterioration. Also, we've had concerns expressed by members of the community, not just users of the facility, but others in the area about the condition of the boathouse. So we have sufficient funds in '08 to commence substantial restoration and stabilization of that structure. And we're planning on doing so, commencing that work later this year.

The project has been broken up into phases. And as I've alluded to it's a multi-year project so certainly the town can contribute at any time in the interim towards the restoration. And that would certainly help to accelerate the process. We felt we couldn't wait any longer at this point. There's a number of significant structural elements that need to be addressed and other issues regarding security of the facility. And we felt that we could not put that off any longer and decided to move ahead with that. But certainly we would welcome any contribution made by the town towards the restoration and stabilization.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I'm just going to see if -- I had another note. Does anyone else -- that pretty much is the gist of where I was going with most of the questions which is looking at pay-go. Budget Review, is there something I missed which is glaring? I think I covered most of the recommendations that you had that were --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, we made a sum total of our recommendations, was an increase of \$875,000 for the Parks programs and that was taking out the maintenance facility at Indian Island but also providing additional funds of \$2 million -- well, a million a year in 2010 and II for historic services restoration

of buildings.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Now, the Commissioner had referred to one of the items that you mentioned, which is the Indian Island facility.

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's correct. Again, it's a case of looking at limited resources and capturing some of those funds to ensure that the other maintenance facilities that they're building for other facilities where they need them, they're isolated, are sufficient for their needs. And that they don't value engineer or scale down the project to meet the budget. So taking some of the funds that's in subsequent years from Indian Island, advancing them forward for other maintenance facilities and, you know, we feel -- I know there's -- I certainly agree with what the Commissioner said and use and different facilities between the parks and the campgrounds, but again, it's a case of limited facilities or limited resources. If we had unlimited resources, they certainly do -- it has merit

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

We'll do it all.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I mean the project does have merit. It's a case of choices. And we're concerned that the facilities that they're building in the early years will be obsolete before they even open.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Commissioner, did you want to comment on that or, Tom? I mean, I'm assuming that you've looked at this and reviewing what your needs are. And so what Budget Review is positing here is that better to do the facilities right than to stretch our resources in such a way.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Well, we realize that, you know, we have competing -- competing concerns just within our own department as well as others within the County. So we do appreciate BRO's understanding of the gravity of that, of trying to balance competing needs and different -- the different -- the different responsibilities that the Parks Department has in meeting a whole bunch of different constituent needs, whether it's camping or boating or historic projects and so forth.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Well, I guess we'll look at that as the working group looks at the Capital Program. Commissioner, is there anything else that you wanted to tell us?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Did you have any other capital project --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Any members of the Committee have -- Legislator Schneiderman has. Or two.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll go quick because we have to have Environment too. I just wanted to put on the record a question I had asked during the Public Works Committee concerning the Third House facility out in Montauk. It's a historic building. The County's done a tremendous job in restoring the exterior but the interior's not finished. Apparently we're out of money in terms of that restoration. So -- and there's no money budgeted to finish the job. So it would help if we could sit down as I know we will and figure out the long range plan for that facility and maybe get some money in for planning and for construction to just finish the job. It's mostly done. It's probably 70, 80% completed, but there is that last portion that needs to get done.

The other question I would have for you is just a status update on the walkway at Cupsogue to make sure that you have enough funds in there to finish that walkway. I think it's scheduled to be built next year. You know, it's like a -- there's a walkway that goes out on to the water for birding or -- I think that's -- one of the trustees had brought it to my attention. There's also the house that's being removed near Cupsogue, too, and I'd like to have information on that as well. I just want to make sure that you have adequate funds in the budget -- in the Capital Budget to take care of those things.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Yeah, we're pretty confident that we do have sufficient funds in the Capital Budget to accomplish that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Both of those projects. The removal of the one house.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

The removal -- the removal is a separate -- that's already being covered under a separate item in the -- line item in the budget. And that has already been commenced. They've already engaged in asbestos removal on that facility. However, we need to, I believe, get a permit from DEC for that. So that's what is holding up any further work on the removal.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Because that's not only an eyesore, but it's potentially a danger. It's a dilapidated house that the County took, I guess, for tax default purposes. And the other piece, that walkway out into the harbor there, you say the funding is in place as well for that?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Yes, I believe it was actually '07, if I'm correct. It was in the '07.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So that's moving forward so you don't need any help with that?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

No, not at this point.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So only thing it sounds like in terms of my district is the Third House, finishing that. We're going to need to plug some money in for that.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Thank you very much, Commissioner. Are there any other questions? Okay. Did you want to say something else?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Yes. I'd just like to amend something that I said before in regard to 7507 and 7510. I just wanted to indicate that I appreciate what BRO's review, recommending restoration. But I'm also mindful of the fact that you were in a very tight fiscal situation and we have a need to try to make sure that the budget is as tight as possible in this difficult economic situation. So I am mindful of the County Executive is -- does have an obligation that we support to balance the budget and also to provide other services which we have to balance against.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Thank you very much. Okay, thank you. Carol Hart, did you want to come up? And Steve? Steve Gittelman.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I have to leave in ten minutes so I'll have somebody else run Environment.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. We're going to try to run these quickly because we're running so far behind. There's a lot of disagreement between what was presented and what was reviewed and so we just want to go through these very quickly because there are a number of Budget Review recommendations. So, Lance, I'm going to go one by one and ask you just to respond because we have -- the first project title, which is the restoration of Habitat Wing. And there is nothing in the --

LEG. NOWICK:

What page are you on, Vivian?

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm sorry, 359. This is a little bit complicated, Lance, the Budget Review Office recommendations regarding this Stoll Wing and the water infiltration between the habitat area. So, what you're saying is that it does agree with putting the money in -- well, you don't make any provision -- you agree with not having the money in but there is a problem there?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes, there's definitely a problem there. There's \$200,000 in the '08 Capital Budget. Rather than the removal of that wing, you know, again, it's a case of limited priorities. It certainly has -- the project has merit just like the Parks Department projects. But our philosophy with the Vanderbilt is to stabilize the facilities, protect their revenue stream. So doing it, I guess, in a way that, you know, the water intrusion has to be dealt with. But the removal --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

So the recommendation is to use that \$200,000 for the water infiltration problem?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Correct. And, you know, the other part is something that, you know, we can come back and re-visit, you know, the removal of the Stoll Wing at a later date. And part of removal of that is the restoration of the original entrance that's part of the museum. As you know the Stoll Wing is not part of the original museum. It was added in the '70's. It has, in my opinion for what it's worth, not very good architectural interest considering it's just kind of tacked on to the museum and actually detracts from the museum. So I understand they're concerned about having it removed. But our concern is the water infiltration and to stabilize the facility.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. And I'm going to go through all of them and then I'll ask you to comment on them just very quickly because there's one where Budget Review agrees with discontinuing the funding, some not.

With the boardwalk, and I know that's near and dear to your heart, Steve, and the Budget Review Office does agree with discontinuing this project but because there's already money in it, right? There's one point one million that has been appropriated but not been used. And with the tight --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah. Again, it --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

With the tight budget this year, you're saying use that and prioritize how you're using it first.

MR. REINHEIMER:

It has been partially funded. It's the last phase which I think is the gazebos and the interpretive stations --

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Right, okay.

MR. REINHEIMER:

-- that are not included.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. And then in the next project which is Normandy Manor, you do say that you would like to see more money included, that's 450,000, right, because we had made that commitment when we purchased the property?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Okay. Wait a second.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm sorry.

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's okay.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

In your book I'm on 365.

MR. REINHEIMER:

You're on 365, okay.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

This is Normandy Manor, and we have nothing in 2009, 2010 and 2011. And what you're saying in Budget Review is, "We recommend including \$450,000 in 2009 for construction to protect this County asset from the elements and not from public access."

MR. REINHEIMER:

Correct. The vision that the museum has for this facility is to use it as a welcome center and to have it open for public use which involves handicapped accessibility in construction of handicapped restroom facilities. Again, it has merit. We're looking at -- it definitely needs work on the roof and the gutters and windows, they have water infiltration. So we're looking to first stabilize the building. In future years we can come back and re-visit, you know, other uses and to make it a public facility, if that's the place that the Legislature wants to go. But this point in time we're just concerned about preserving the building so that in the future we don't have to do more restoration work.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, and that's the same logic that you're using with Project No. 7433, which is --

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's the same logic we're using for all the --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Do the maintenance, protect the asset, but expansion of programs. So I'm going to stop because I think I've pretty much covered it and I'll turn to Carol and Steve.

MR. GITTELMAN:

Okay. Am I on? Let me just start at the beginning.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

And I'm sorry to be rushing like this, it's just that we got backed up.

MR. GITTELMAN:

That's okay, we've been here before. All right, we understand the priorities, we understand the squeeze, okay. So we are in -- we accept the logic from Budget Review on the restoration -- the removal the Stoll Wing. With the caveat that we have \$200,000 that's currently in planning that has to be converted over to construction and we will need some of that to become planning in order to facilitate the construction, and that is -- it's like a missing element. Usually it's 10%, so we'll need 20,000 in planning and probably 180,000 in construction which we hope will do the job.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Lynne, you got that?

LEG. NOWICK:

I do.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Yeah. Okay.

MR. GITTELMAN:

All right. Going on to the next project, the William and Mollie Rogers Waterfront. The key concern that I have here is twofold. One is that the money -- this is old appropriations, so the money keeps shrinking, okay? And as it shrunk it became -- it's covering less. It will be difficult to remove the loading ramp inside of the project for the seaplane hangar, that's going to be tough to cover. But one of the problems here is that this is not just gazebos, this is also completing a circle of boardwalks. The traffic flow here is going to be impeded severely. So we are concerned about removing this particular aspect of the project and not at least having it on the planning -- you know, moving forward. Because when we do the section going from the boathouse to the seaplane hangar, we want it so the people don't have to repeat the same pathway in order to get back. We want it to have a loop so they go up to the Planetarium so you have a circle of traffic. It does seem to us critical in order for people to avoid backtracking and also to have a shorter route.

And the interpretive stations are more than -- they're critical, so. But here it's a question of being able to go back. So we are reluctant to see that particular aspect deleted.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

And with the next one you're not going to argue with Budget Review because they're saying to include the funding.

MR. GITTELMAN:

We are going to give a small argument, okay. The small argument is that Budget Review -- I understand the view is stabilization. For the price of putting ADA -- putting in ramp and ADA bathrooms, we can bring this to public use. We would like to bring it to public use, and you get much more for the use of the building for the price of a suite of bathrooms and a ramp, and that's what we're deleting in this project. Although I'm grateful to Budget Review for the way they've analyzed it, I understand their position. I'm not sure if the shoe fits this particular project.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Do we have an estimated cost for that, for the ADA compliance and the other --

MR. GITTELMAN:

If I can answer, the original cost was 650, to my knowledge, so we're reducing it from 650 to 450. And I'm not so sure that --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

But you're saying the ADA bathrooms would only add \$200,000 for this?

MR. GITTELMAN:

That's what my knowledge is.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. And the catch basins and gutters, Budget Review is recommending that we include them.

MR. GITTELMAN:

Yes, and it's critical.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

And the environmental control systems is --

MR. GITTELMAN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MR. GITTELMAN:

That's it.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

So we're okay then with the rest of the recommendations.

MR. GITTELMAN:

Yeah, with that little bit of tweaking.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Thank you very much. Is there any member of the committee who has a question for either Ms. Hart or Mr. Gittelman? Thank you very much.

MR. GITTELMAN:

Thank you for having us.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Just --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Just one thing before -- I just wanted to let you know on page 63 is an overall summary of the

Vanderbilt in our report. So in addition to the individual projects, there is an area that summarizes projects in the front end of the report.

MR. GITTELMAN:

One of the things we did note -- I'm sorry. Lance, are you done? First of all, I do want to thank Budget Review for their hard work and the accuracy with which they presented this.

One of the things I don't understand, and I guess it's just a choice of language. You do say that the waterfront was a tentative agreement? I'm not sure, on page 361, "The museum has a tentative agreement", under status of project? I'm just not sure what that -- what you're --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Well, is that that agreement with William Rogers?

MR. GITTELMAN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Is that what you're referring to, Lance, that that's a tentative agreement because he had committed money at the point at which it were completed but that money hasn't come yet, is that what you're --

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's language out of the legislation, out of the resolution. That's where we got that from.

MR. GITTELMAN:

All right, I didn't recall. But believe me, they're committed, so.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

But they are committed with stipulations. I think that's why the language "tentative agreement" was used in the resolution, that there were stipulations.

MR. GITTELMAN:

I think that given the timeframe that has passed, those stipulations might be negotiable. What we need to hear is what needs to be negotiated. I think there's flexibility in there. You know, of course Mr. Rogers went from 80 to approaching 90 and I think time changes people. So if you do need flexibility, by all means reach out to us.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you.

MR. GITTELMAN:

Thank you.

MS. HART:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you very much. Okay, if there is no further business, that concludes the Parks & Recreation portion of this meeting and I hand it over to Legislator Schneiderman.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right, let's jump right into Environment. If I could have Commissioner Gallagher step forward. This meeting was supposed to start an hour and a half ago, I apologize. It wasn't my fault, but I know you're busy and I thank you for your patience. I only have about five minutes left before I have to leave, in which case if we go more than five minutes I'll turn things over to Legislator D'Amaro to finish the meeting. But I want to start by allowing Commissioner Gallagher to address any of the comments in the BRO Report and any of -- anything you want to underscore in the Capital Budget, and then we'll go to questions.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yes, thank you. We really have two programs in the Capital Budget, the Legacy Fund and Multifaceted, so it all deals with land acquisitions. And the BRO Report, essentially pages 25 through 35, deal with the Land Acquisition Program.

One over-arching comment is just that as many of you who sit on the Environment Committee know, whenever you're talking about amount of funds or what we've closed on, so on and so forth, that is a snapshot in time, that changes every day and month to month. I actually have with me our May 12th update of where we're at with acquisitions and you'll see -- you'll see that there's already a significant difference just in one month from what was mentioned in the BRO Report because they are basing it on the April 1st.

A couple of other comments that were made in the BRO Report. On page 25 they talk about, kind of right up-front in the fourth paragraph, The planning steps reports which are printed and distributed quarterly about the need to include acreage; we did, in fact, back in March make that change. And so in the next iteration of the Planning Steps Reports you'll be seeing acreage included as well as where we have the information, the rating for the properties or the parcels.

And just so you know, there are over 14,000 acres and outstanding planning steps right now, either Master List or individual planning steps. So that's a lot that's already outstanding, not including everything that's put on every committee cycle in additional planning steps.

A couple of other things. They talk about -- there's a concern over the SOS Program in terms of the fact that the money was -- there's money left over, it hasn't closed out. What we did this time to try to avoid what had happened with the Greenways Fund was we got a determination that as long as we had fully executed contracts and encumbered the funds prior to the expiration of the program, we would still be able to close on acquisitions after the fact. So we will still lose some money in the Hamlet Parks Fund, there simply were not as many projects brought forward that met that specific criteria, but we will have expended as many of those dollars as we can.

There's also a general comment made about the overlapping and competing Land Acquisition Programs, the number of programs. There's really only three moving forward that we have funding in that we can use, as I would say broadly. You've got Multifaceted, Legacy Fund through 2009 and then the bonded -- what we're calling the Bonded Quarter Percent or the New Quarter Percent Program. Many of the other programs that are on the chart on page 27 are either expired or severely restricted in what we're able to use those funds for. So we were trying diligently to use up where we can the 12(5)A, 12(5)D, 12(5)E, all that very old original Quarter Percent, you know, Water Quality money, but it's extremely restrictive and it can't just be -- you know, it's restricted to the town and to specific criteria, parcels that were on specific lists. There's a whole host of very restrictive criteria and we do our best to try to use that up because we don't like to see that money just sitting there either.

In that same category is the Farmland 8701, the Parkland 7144, the miscellaneous account, and then obviously the three SOS accounts are expired and the Setauket Woods are off -- you know, it's tied to specific parcels that were on specific lists at a previous date and time.

Let's see, there were a few other issues that I wanted to address. You'll see on the May 12th status report that we do, in fact, now include the Quarter Percent bonded money in the -- in the revenues, in the balance of accounts. And in terms of addressing the issue of what we count in negotiation, what's accepted offers, I think we've explained this a couple of times at committee, that something -- we only carry it as an accepted offer after we receive a signed contract back from the seller. And we do feel it's important to a certain extent to track what is in negotiation. We do some of what the Budget Review Office Report talks about, which is we make more offers than we know we have available funds for, you know, we make -- we send out offer letters, a certain percentage. But we don't want to go too over because then we would be oversubscribing the programs. We have to wait and see how many of those offers come back officially accepted.

And there was also -- under the suggested changes, section -- pages 28 and 29, let's see.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

In Budget Review's or in yours?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

In Budget Review's, yeah, I'm just going through Budget Review's Office. They just mention the fact that in the real estate industry common practice is for the seller to prepare the contracts. The County prepares all our contracts to make sure they are uniform, to make sure they all have the same, you know, covenant, deed restrictions, language in the {conservation easements}. We would not want to give up that control to an outside -- you know, to the seller's lawyer. We would want to retain that control.

Oh, let's see. Oh, and one other issue that I did want to address that was raised here is about the Multifaceted. It's on page 30. It talks under 3A, Multifaceted Land Preservation Program in that second paragraph. It just talks about the fact that there is going to be a borrowing of 17.2 million under Multifaceted, that is money that was appropriated in 2007. We already borrowed money from the Treasurer to close on many of those acquisitions and now we are bonding that money to pay the Treasurer back. So it's not any of the 2008 appropriation. We appropriated 8.83 million, we are trying, we're not planning on touching that money unless later in the year it, you know, becomes necessary, so that's all -- the only money in Multifaceted that we're moving forward on is 2007 or earlier appropriations. I just wanted to reiterate that.

Those were essentially, you know, the key points I wanted to go over. There was also one comment on page thirty -- where is that comment on the environmental facilities corp payment?

DIRECTOR KENT:

Thirty-one.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Thirty-one, yeah. How are we going to pay the EFC bonds? We don't deal with the debt service specifically in our department, but the practice has generally been that the Budget Office -- we're not given what our available fund status is under Quarter Percent until that money is already accounted for, meaning the model for repaying that debt is in the Quarter Percent model and the Budget Office --

DIRECTOR KENT:

It's taken off the top.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

It's taken off the top before we even know what's available. So that's how it's being handled. We just recently did a bunch of technical corrections to move money from the old Quarter Percent

Program into the new Bonded Program to ensure that we had enough, you know, money there. And that's really -- Chris or Ken, were there any other issues that -- okay. I think we hit on all the other issues, so.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We have questions; I'm going to start because I've got to run in a second. Two quick items. One is at the committee level and at the Legislative level, we're seeing a lot more scrutiny on planning steps resolutions than we've seen in the past and a lot more reliance on the rating systems.

As you said, there's a lot of properties in the pipeline and we probably don't have the funding to close on everything. Just my one comment is the Master List, which has so many properties on it, were not individually rated, they were basically -- it was just one giant Omnibus bill. And we are now starting to reject properties that don't meet certain ratings and it wouldn't be fair to hold that document to review it differently, those properties, than everything else. So I don't know how you want to deal with that, but as we prioritize, some of the properties that come to light as we go may be more important than some of the Master List properties. And maybe we need to look at that rating system and what the scores are and try to develop some kind of priority based on environmental attributes.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Just to comment on that. Because the Planning Department was like the master builder of those master lists, they essentially applied the same criteria that then they have to go and are required to apply to the planning steps rating forms. However, it's certainly, you know, a legitimate question to raise given our limited funds and the amount of parcels that are out there in terms of how do we balance that. And maybe when you see the new planning steps report it will help.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. The other thing has to do with when we bond money for preserving land. And my sense is that we're starting to see some resistance out there to some of the increased debt service for borrowing money to preserve land. And right now what happens in most cases, like the \$70 million bond we did a few years back, that additional debt service falls into the General Fund and let's say if it adds hypothetically, let's say, \$10 million to our debt service, in our efforts to stabilize taxes, we need to cut \$10 million in other expenses, and that's not really fair, in a sense.

What might be a better way to handle it in the future is if we're doing -- if we're going out for a public vote on borrowing money to buy open space, and in general the public has supported it, it would be helpful if there is a special -- a separate line on the tax bill so people can say, "Oh, yeah, that's my tax increase that I voted for." Right? That's the whatever, the additional dollar or \$5 I'm paying to preserve our open space and not force us to have to resolve that issue internally in our effort to try to stabilize taxes. People want to raise their own taxes and vote for that and I'm -- I personally have supported those initiatives and don't mind paying higher taxes to preserve open space. I think it would make sense to reflect that on the tax bill, otherwise we're going to run into this resistance and it's really an unfair resistance.

Now, not every one of our bond programs is voted on. I think the Legacy Fund was a County Executive initiative for \$50 million, I don't believe that was a public vote. But certainly the Quarter Penny -- and that has its own separate taxing. But particularly the Multifaceted I believe was voted on as well as -- there was another one a couple of years ago that we did, a \$70 million bond that was a public referendum.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yeah, I don't know if Multifaceted originally was voted on and then combined, but it's --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think there was --

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Right now -- now it's just put into the Capital Budget every year, similar to Legacy Fund.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think originally there was three -- I think a \$60 million bond that goes back; I don't know, maybe BRO remembers the year.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Greenways.

MS. VIZZINI:

The Greenways Program and the 75 million for SOS were public. That's all that I recall.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Right, and the Quarter Percent.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. Is it possible, Ms. Vizzini, in the future, if we're going to do this again, to show those on a tax bill as a separate line?

MS. VIZZINI:

That would present a challenge to the towns since they send out the tax bills. It would probably require legislation on our part. I know that it was somewhat of a challenge to get the towns to differentiate between mandated and discretionary when we first had them do that and then of course to reverse ourselves more recently. But it would probably require legislation and then we'd have to get the -- seek their cooperation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do you agree that that would be a prudent course to pursue?

MS. VIZZINI:

I'd have to look at the information and see how it broke out, you know, if it was -- I mean, it's going to be -- it's a driving force and a debt service, but in the whole line it's going to be a small number.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's millions of dollars in debt service, right? If you're doing a \$70 million bond, you must be talking something in the neighborhood of \$7 million a year in debt service.

MS. VIZZINI:

I'm thinking in terms of, you know, the average \$100 that the public pays for their County portion which is where this is from.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, I'm thinking last year when I was working in the Budget Work Committee and we were struggling to come up with \$11 million, how difficult a process that was.

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes, that is a difficult process. That's another question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So if -- well, it's a related question because we're struggling to not raise taxes, that's why we were

coming -- trying to come up with that money. And if the money that the public voted for for land acquisition was shown separately, it would help.

MR. LIPP:

Right, if we were going to hypothetically do another bond issue, say for 75 -- say for \$70 million; let's say. That would be about \$5,250,000 per year of a 20 year bond, which would be like nine and a half dollars for the average homeowner.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. But what did you say, seven million on the --

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Five --

MR. LIPP:

Five and a quarter million per year over 20 years for a \$70 million bond.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, so \$5 million in the Operating Budget is a lot of money.

MR. LIPP:

Yeah. And we did calculate in the review, we looked at the Land Acquisition Bond since the year 2000 through 2007, what we actually borrowed for serial bonds, and we calculated it to be like 19 million or about 21% of General Fund Debt Service and that will be going up.

The good news is we are going to be issuing less dollars in terms of serial bonds starting in 2009. As the Commissioner said, you know, we have stuff in the pipeline now that we're issuing that relates to appropriations in 2007.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. And certainly things like the Quarter Penny Program, that's a dedicated fund, that's not going to affect the property tax bill because we're taking money out of specific dedicated sales tax component, so.

All right, I'm going to turn things over to Legislator D'Amaro to chair the meeting, I think Legislator Beedenbender was next on the list.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Hi, Carrie. I just wanted to talk a little more about Multifaceted and really the question I have -- I know it's about -- it's \$13.3 million every year, right; that's what Multifaceted is?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

And we generally do about five million for -- somewhere in the neighborhood of five million we dedicate to workforce housing and the remainder goes towards land.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yes, that's been the practice.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

What would be the affect -- given the new policy to move towards their Quarter Cent and all the money that's available with that, what would be the effect if let's say not permanently but this year

we simply cut Multifaceted by let's say \$8 million and left five for workforce housing and that was no Multifaceted Program? And the reason I ask that is because the new Quarter Percent Program is much more inclusive and includes all the things we can previously only do under Multifaceted, right?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. So from your perspective, if we were to make that \$13.3 five, would that prevent you -- would that prohibit or restrict your ability to buy land?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Well, not necessarily because we'd have two options. One, we could either just shift that 8.83 million that we were planning to spend out of Multifaceted and do an additional amount in bonded Quarter Percent later in the year once we saw how many accepted offers we had in, or we could shift it to next year, you know, so everything would just be -- take a little bit longer in terms of land acquisitions.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Well, my thought was really the Quarter Percent. And just to refresh me, how much money do we have, after we pay the debt service, how much of that do we have to buy land; what was the number?

DIRECTOR KENT:

Three hundred and twenty-two million over four years.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Well, that we can borrow.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Yeah, 322 million we can use to purchase land over four years.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Right.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

So I guess my suggestion, you know, given how tight things are, if we have a \$322 million pot, of which I think we've only borrowed 32 so far?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

It would seem, at least in the condition we have now, that that might not be \$8 million well spent if we can spend it -- if we can buy the same things out of the Quarter Percent. So I guess -- that's why I want to know, do you think if we did that it would restrict your ability in any way?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

No, I think that as long as we get the authorization from the Legislature later in the year to go out and bond an additional, whatever it is, 50, 58 million depending on, again, what we have --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

From the Quarter Percent.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Right, what we have in accepted offers, it would not restrict our ability right now. Four years from now, when we no longer have the Quarter Percent and Legacy Fund is done and we really only have -- you know, if Multifaceted continues, then we would -- you know, then it would restrict us.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Well, thank you. And the other question I had was about the old Drinking Water, the 12(5)E and D monies. I know that in BRO, the BRO Report said there's about \$8.6 million in balance and that was specified for individual towns, was it not?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

And most of the towns, I guess the east end towns and I think Brookhaven, have spent a large majority of their money, right?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yeah. I think it's mostly the western, but let's see.

DIRECTOR KENT:

The western towns, you're right.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yeah, that have money. So Babylon has 1.5 million; Huntington, 2.6; Islip, one million; and then -- yeah, then, you know, Shelter Island and Smithtown are negligible, 35,000 and 17,000.

DIRECTOR KENT:

Yeah, that's the non Pine Barrens, and then here's the Pine Barrens.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

And here's the Pine Barrens.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Well, the reason that I ask that question is just this was before me; when was that approved? Gail, when was that original Quarter Percent, in '98?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Eighty eight.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Eighty-eight. So when is the last time we put money into that? I think you put it in the report but I couldn't find it.

MR. DUFFY:

November of 2000.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

November of 2000?

MR. DUFFY:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. I guess my question is for eight years there's been money sitting there and if it hasn't been spent as we sit here on May 20th, 2008, is there anything we can do? I mean, I would assume since there was a referendum to do that, we couldn't really take it out for something else, it's just it seems that -- you know, I don't want to take anything from the Town of Huntington, the Town of Babylon or the Town of Smithtown --

But my question is, seriously, that, you know, over eight years, if it hasn't been spent and the program has been around for 20, is there any way we can put this to a use or is there any public education or reaching out to the towns that have large balances that need to be done in order that they can access this in place of the Quarter Percent or other programs, or has that happened already.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

We are still trying where we can to get properties that qualify or meet the criteria. It's very difficult. I mean, there are some right now in Babylon. We have some in contract and in accepted offers, actually, what is it, over -- it's like 1.3 million almost.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Okay, so that's almost their whole fund.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Well, no, that's after that. They have right now -- I'm sorry, they have 2.9 right now and then if you take out what is actually in contract, in negotiation, in accepted offer. Similarly, in Smithtown we will basically -- that's why there is only 17,000, we're going to be closing on, you know, \$2.4 million --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

-- within the next six months. So we are trying where we can find --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

I was going to say, from that, you know, it sounds like there's been a new push towards it.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

So I guess my question is kind of -- you're doing it.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Yes, Chris has been very diligent.

DIRECTOR KENT:

Yes, I've been trying to move properties into this program, especially out of Multifaceted, where we can because we should be utilizing this money.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

DIRECTOR KENT:

And we have some ideas on expending the money in Huntington that we did have in Multifaceted, we're moving some programs into the 12(5)E in Huntington, so.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Well, then, good job. I have no more questions.

VICE-CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Okay, any other questions? Is there anything else you folks would like to add?

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

No. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

Is there anyone else here who would like to address the committee on the Capital Budget? That's it.

Okay, then thank you very much.

Very informative, as usual.

COMMISSIONER MEEK-GALLAGHER:

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:

We appreciate it.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:51 P.M.)

{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically