

**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 18, 2010 to discuss the matter of the Capital Budget.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator Vivian Vilorio-Fisher, Chairwoman of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee  
Legislator Lou D'Amaro, Vice Chair of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee  
Legislator Wayne R. Horsley, Vice Chair of Parks & Recreation Committee  
Legislator Ricardo Montano, Member of Parks & Recreation Committee  
Legislator Steven H. Stern, Member of Parks & Recreation Committee

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Presiding Officer William Lindsay, Eighth District  
Legislator Kate M. Browning, Third District  
Legislator Thomas Cilmi, Eleventh District  
Legislator DuWayne Gregory, Fifteenth District  
Gail Vizzini, Director of Budget Review Office  
Lance Reinheimer, Assistant Director of Budget Review Office  
Jill Moss, Budget Review Office  
John W. Pavacic, Commissioner of Parks Department  
Tracey Bellone, Deputy Commissioner of Parks Department  
Karen Summers-Solinas, Principal Accountant, Parks Department  
Terry Maccarrone, Coordinator of Community Based Programs, Parks Department  
Carol Ghiorsi Hart, Vanderbilt Museum  
Noel Gish, Vanderbilt Museum  
Justin Littell, Aide to Legislator D'Amaro  
Greg Moran, Aide to Legislator Nowick  
Jason Richberg, Aide to Legislator Gregory  
Robert T. Zielinski, AME

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

**MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:**

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

**(The meeting was called to order at 2:30 PM)**

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

We are going to move right into Parks, Environment and Planning. I understand that Ms. Nowick -- I think she is out of town or she is unable to make it today, so what we'll do is we'll do Parks first. Would you rather -- I'm still chairing if it's Parks because I'm the Vice Chair.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Well, I'm Chair of Environment, so.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Then why don't you -- do you want to do Environment first?

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

You could do whatever you like. I don't think I have anybody here for the Environment. We just have people from Parks. So you may go ahead, take it away.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Okay. There you go. Are there any cards for Parks? There are no cards for Parks. Okay, that being the case, is there anyone who would like to be heard concerning Parks? And if not, what I'll do is I'll ask the Commissioner to come on up and to let us know how they feel -- how the Parks people feel about the budget submissions and what's in the budget and how can we improve it. Commissioner, would you like to -- and welcome and welcome Parks et al, the gang.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Why don't we move right into it. Sorry about the tardiness, the lateness of the hour, but that doesn't mean that we won't give you more at the end of your time period, so feel free. Why don't you talk about what you feel is in the budget, the Capital Budget, and how you feel about it and what could be made better.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Actually, I would prefer if the committee has any questions for us and then we can go into the specific questions and issues that you might have.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Let me ask just quickly, then, the submissions that are in the budget for Parks, you are okay with it? I mean, how do you feel about it?

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

He's trying to let us do it.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

I'm not going to let him do that. How are you feeling there, Commissioner?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Like a short timer.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

This may be your moment.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

I will say that, you know, we do understand that we are still in a significant economic crisis,

particularly here in Suffolk County, and that will unfortunately perhaps continue for some time. I know there are certain factors that the County is facing in 2011 that have to be accounted for in the budget. I know that everyone is eagerly looking at such things as sales tax revenue projections and so forth and how that will affect everyone's budget, including our own. And the fact that there is a need to hold the line on debt service because of the budget situation. And basically we try to do -- make due with what we are provided.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

A professional to the end. Okay. Who would like to go first? Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. You know, I was looking at the budget because as you know, I have been past chair of Parks, and I have been very, very concerned about historic structures. I know that last year historic services budget was -- became totally dependent on Hotel/Motel Tax, and now I'm seeing that the capital monies are not being -- there is no budget here for any capital monies on historic structures. You know, we all have our own homes, and I cannot imagine, and my home is a very old own home, and I cannot imagine letting a year go by and not putting something into the maintenance of my home. And yet I see here with all of the historic structures that we have, and thinking back to the -- I had received a report I think it was the year before last of all of the historic --

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

I saw it.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay. And there is a schedule, kind of a suggested maintenance schedule, and this doesn't -- is not reflected here at all. Isn't there a need to spend some capital money on our historic structures?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Well, I will, first of all, in regard to the report that you referenced, that was the Historic Structure Survey. That was what was called phases I and II. It's the first 49 structures of the more than 200 that we have in our Parks Department inventory. Those first 49 are our top priority. They were based on a combination of factors, which included whether or not they were on the State of Natural Registers of Historic Places and also listed on the County Historic Trust. Also, their historic significance and prominence as well as their condition.

Basically the Parks Department did a blending of two of the approaches that we use. One was based on historic significance, the other based on condition and we came up with a prioritized list of those first 49 that's presented in that report. In our minds that should be the bible for any kind of historic restoration going forward, that those first 49 should be the primary structures that are addressed first.

If you look at the cost estimated there in that report, what was first provided was just a cost of simple stabilization and mothballing just to prevent further deterioration over time, and then all the way up to a full blown historic restoration of a structure. Obviously we are talking tens of millions of dollars for just those first 49, so there is a significant need there in that regard.

The other issue in terms of going on in time is that yes, deterioration will continue to occur, and the cost of restoration goes up with time and materials and then of course just having to undue further damage that occurs as one goes on over time.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay. Was that sort of an answer?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

I think so.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

If we were just to look at stabilization and mothballing, the very lowest level of maintenance, there's not any money for that. And so if we don't do that stabilization and mothballing of these very precious structures, because I'm talking about those top 49, the ones that are on our State registry and our County list of historic places. Is there a requested figure to -- in order to achieve that stabilization level?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

For those first 49 it was about \$6 million in total. One of the other things I want to point out is that hotel/motel funding is treated like operating funding. So if we don't use the money within a particular calendar year we lose it. It's rolled over at some point in the future, but we lose that money at the end of the year. So it cannot be used for capital funding. Capital projects go on multiple years. First you have to -- we rely obviously almost exclusively on the Department of Public Works. They are experts. When it comes to historic structures we are relying primarily on the County Architect's Office within the Department of Public Works, and they have only so many staff and projects that they can attend to in addition to the others in the County and within DPW. So that's part of the reason why we came up with that priority list.

What we do try to do internally is using those operating funds and the hotel/motel funds to do as much as we can internally using our own dedicated and very talented staff to do such things as maintenance, painting, repair, but there are certain -- obviously there is certain needs that go well beyond that. You'll need engineering services, first of all, to assess some structural deficiencies. Then you need a professional who is going to design even a stabilization project. Let's say you have a sagging floor, a sagging roof line in a building, or you have a foundation wall that is bowing out. That type of thing goes beyond the expertise that we have in-house and requires somebody who is a qualified architect or engineer to assess that, design a project to deal with that and then implement that project before it gets worse, at least to prevent any further damage or potentially collapse from occurring.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

And you can't contract with a consultant like that with the funds that you're getting from the Hotel/Motel Tax?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

The problem there is that it goes beyond the calendar year, so you are talking about having to do an RFP -- even if you start in January, the time that it takes to draft an RFP, circulate the RFP, review the bids you get back and then finally select somebody, then get them up to speed and get them going, you're well into the year. You've used up a good portion of the year just in that process.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

And then you can't spend the money quick enough.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Correct. Correct.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

And just to remind my colleagues, if you remember last year in the Parks Budget their historic services was wiped out in the budget, in the Operating Budget, so that all of their historic services funds come from the Hotel/Motel Tax. So that pays for the Operating Budget, and now we're wiping out the Capital Budget for historic, you know --

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

So much for the Helen Keller House.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Well, the Helen Keller isn't even, what, the top 49. It isn't even on any of the lists. It's not in that report that we got from the survey because the Helen Keller house only has one wall. So I just think -- just I'm going to throw this back to Budget Review now because I usually like to go with Budget Review recommendations, but I have to say that I really disagree with the recommendation not to have anything on this line and I just want to understand what the rationale was.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Sure. Well, we also are trying to be sensitive to adding to the Capital Program, first of all, because of the limited staffing in Public Works and Parks to progress these projects. And that's evidenced by the fact that in this particular project, 7510, and we address this on page 428 of the report, there is an available appropriation balance of 1.9 million dollars. So that -- that's the money that's available that was already appropriated to progress certain projects. And this was money for Timber Point, the Little Red School House, the Historic Restoration Fund and the Yaphank Historic District. Various resolutions have already appropriated those monies.

In addition to that there is 1.2 million in 2010 which has yet to come before you in the form of a resolution. So the legitimate question we have to ask ourselves is how much do we continue to appropriate if we do not have the staffing to progress the projects and some of these, as the Commissioner indicated, the historic restorations really do require special skills on the part of the design and construction staff.

If the issue is the time frame, if we were going to use the hotel/motel or operating monies, what we could do is transfer cash from the Operating Budget to the Capital, and the Capital Budget is what gives you the extra time frame. You have, you know, five years to spend that cash.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay. You know what, Gail, I didn't realize that the money that was -- maybe I didn't understand your -- I thought that the 110 had been adopted at 2010 and spent. I didn't know that it was still outstanding there. And I read this and I just guess I didn't see that part. Okay. Deputy Commissioner, you were shaking your head?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Just in terms of the existing appropriations that are out there, what I would point out is that a lot of those are for planning and design and not for construction. And normally what happens is you want to have both before you proceed with a project. DPW understandably will not move ahead on designing a project until it knows it has the construction money. Because cost can go up, your design requirements may change. They have to abide by, even with historic structures they have to abide by the New York State Uniform Building and Fire Code.

There are certain exemptions for historic structures depending on their status, if they're Natural Register, State Register or Historic Trust, but you want to have at least a significant amount of money for construction before you commence because then you can phase even a project that maybe will require more money than you have immediately for construction. If you have a sufficient amount for a particular phase perhaps you could commence that, but you still need to have a concern amount of construction money to coincide with the planning and design money for certain ones. That's a lot of what we have now or the amounts that are remaining are too small to proceed to do a particular phase, and what we look to do is amass more funds over time until we have a critical mass for a particular house or historic structure and then are able to proceed.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Okay. I yield, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much. Legislator Lindsay.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Just getting back, John, to the hotel/motel money and the historic structures, I see the problem with the spending the money on an annual basis and putting out bids, and is it possible to put out like a requirements contract and pre-qualify? I mean, when you are talking about restoration work you're talking about very specialized contractors. I know DPW does this with some kind of design teams. They'll do it with paving contractors. It might be a way for the department to spend down their allotment on any annual basis without, you know, but going through a competitive bid but you're bidding on units. You know, I know it's something that is done in other public sector bidding.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

In answer to your question, Presiding Officer, yes and no. Unfortunately, historic structures ran the gamut. You're talking -- we have structures that are -- our oldest ones date from the late 1600's in Sagtikos Manor, and so the modes of construction that were utilized are quite variable. And the issues as well. For example, the Blydenburgh Mill, recently a contractor was selected for that, but it was somebody who was very, very experienced in dealing with that type of old barn structure where you had -- this predated the use of certain types of nails and other types of more modern carpentry. The person selected had a lot of experience both here on the Island and Upstate in doing that.

So as a case in point, the historic structure survey used a more general engineering firm that happened to do a very good job. They did an overall assessment and a summarization of the needs for each of those 49 historic structures, but when you are getting into the specifics of a particular structure, again, it depends on the site, it depends on the location. There's a lot of issues that have to be addressed. Certain structures, for example, they have wood shingled roofs. Not all of them have that, some of them have more modern -- asphalt shingle roofs or they have slate roofs, and there is different specialties that handle those. You have some structures that have stucco exteriors, again -- or plaster interiors as opposed to wallboard or some other form of interior finishings. Again, the experience required for that can vary.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

But doesn't, you know, a restoration contractor bring in the proper subs that they need? I mean, the restoration general contractor doesn't do the plastering himself or the roofing themselves. They'll bring in a qualified sub to do that.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

That's true, but it also depends on what the ultimate use is going to be. Case in point is Sagtikos Manor, for example. Sagtikos is categorized as a museum. What you see is what you get. It came with the original collections and, therefore, we're never going to turn it into something more than it is because we don't want to impact that museum quality. It's basically what you see there today is what you had in 1900. Other uses, such as Timber Point, Timber Point is an historic structure but it's been adaptively reused as a clubhouse for golf. We have the golf pro in there and then there is a catering facility, and so different standards are being applied and you aren't necessarily doing a historically correct restoration on the interior because of that ultimate use. So, again, it depends on the site.

What's also pointed out to me is that the subs have to be approved by both DPW and Historic Services as well. They want to make sure that those folks are qualified in what they're doing.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And I understand that, but you're going to have this ongoing dilemma of the money being appropriated annually, and if you have to go through a specific bidding process for every contract, you're going to have problems with timelines and spending the money down in any particular year. And I'm just trying to think out of the box that some kind of pre-qualification -- I'm not saying to throw out the bidding process. I'm just saying, you know, if some thought process you might be able to pre-qualify contractors to do work as it comes up and spend down the accounts during the year.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

I will tell you we do use existing County contracts. For example, Statewide Roofing. We have done a tremendous amount of work with them. They are very, very talented. They've done our wood roofs, do a tremendous job, and they have a specialty in that. And so we use as much of existing County contracts as possible. Austin Interiors is another where we maximize the use of that. We load these contractors up with as much work as possible without having to go out and do a new bid.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

They can roll it into the next year. I think Gail said they can do that.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Different subject matter. Marinas. I see that we have 7108, there's a 7109 on marinas. Last year when we were doing the Operating Budget there was a whole controversy about privatizing the marinas. The user groups came to us and said they would be willing to pay higher fees. They were requesting some improvements to the marinas in exchange for the fees. Is this the first step towards that?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Yes. We're not -- the RFP Committee did meet and it was a unanimous recommendation -- the RFEI Committee I should say, met. It was a unanimous recommendation not to move ahead on privatization, but to instead make improvements internally and keep marine operations under the auspices of Parks and we're moving in that direction.

We have already established a working group with representatives of those folks who inhabit both of our marinas, both at Shinnecock and Timber Point. We had a committee meeting I think about a month ago. We are scheduled to have another one, I think, in another month or so. I think we planned on quarterly meetings similar to what we do with our camping organizations. We already are looking at implementing some of the recommendations, including some simple fixes for security, putting in bar gates at some locations, improving security lighting, we are looking at security cameras. And then we also are looking at other improvements such as some additional floating docks in some areas as well. The major capital improvements also we have discussed in the RFEI Committee, discussed this as well, which included basically the bulkheading at Shinnecock, which is need of replacement, and then some electrical work at Timber Point. That's what this -- these funds would be used for.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

So we're -- the improvements are going along with the recommendations from the users group.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

That's correct.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. Did we raise the fees? I forget.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Yes.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

We did.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

The marina fees were raised for one year, and then that sunsetted in March of this year, March 12.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Didn't we put the increase with the budget? Didn't we raise it, remember, based on the recommendations?

**MS. BELLONE:**

(Shaking head no)

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

That sunsetted too? I thought we had put that as a separate recommendation when we did the budget.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

It was discussed but it didn't make the final -- it fell on the floor in the cutting room.

**D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:**

Well, we've got to go back to the drawing board then.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I mean, because the user groups were talking about, you know, more pump out stations, our marinas aren't handicapped accessible, which is sitting on a time bomb. I forget some of the other recommendations. There was ways of including more slips with proper bulkheading. And, I mean, these are the people that are using the marinas. They came to us and they said just keep them in County hands and we'll pay additional fees for the improvements. I thought we did, too.

And the last thing is the Cherry Avenue site where the proposed dog park -- there is nothing in that to move forward with any improvements?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

I think the only hesitation with moving forward -- we have fully designed plans that have been reviewed and approved by CEO. We've met with the town and the town is on board with the proposal. I think the only -- there was a question about need for a skate park in Sayville and whether or not that needed to be considered for that site. And that was the only -- the only remaining item that needed to be addressed.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Well, the Executive's office talked to me about that. I said I don't object to that. We were trying to get a private developer to do it over there and that -- he fell on some hard times so, you know, he isn't moving forward. But he didn't include any development money for that project.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

If that's the case, then we're ready to -- there is money available to do the dog park at Cherry Avenue and so if that's the case, then we can move ahead fairly quickly with getting that implemented.

**MS. BELLONE:**

You're saying that you agreed to a skate park possibly going to that location? Because we also have the ball fields from the Town of Islip. They want soccer fields there. It was supposed to be split in half, soccer fields on half that property and a dog park on the other half.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

No. The Executive Branch asked me about this and I said go ahead and put it in. He never put it in. I guess he wants me to put it.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

The problem there, if we are talking about three different facilities, a dog park, a skate park and ball fields, then we'd have to go back and revamp that. We'll have to meet with the town and decide how to -- we'd have to downsize the dog park and then determine what size skate park would go there, what type of facilities, and then we'd need funding for that as well.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

That's my point.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

We have nothing allocated --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

You have the money to go forward with the dog park, though, right?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

We're ready. The money was appropriated last year so -- for the full blown plan that we have, but if there is a need to --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

When is that scheduled for construction, next year?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Well, we were waiting because we had heard about the ongoing discussion about the possibly of needing to reconsider Cherry Avenue for a skate park, so that's why we haven't moved forward with that. If, however, a skate park is not going to be considered for that site we're ready to start moving forward on, you know, placing orders for materials we need for the full fledged dog park immediately. We can start putting in purchase orders for that soon.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

We have, first of all, Legislator, I thought that your bundling concept made a lot of sense. I think that is something we should look into, as far as bundling contractors for historic sites. I mean, that's -- I thought that had merit. Legislator Cilmi.

**MR. CILMI:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner. Question for, just to kind of follow along the same lines as Legislator Vilorio-Fisher and the Presiding Officer, we're talking about -- but more in relation to some of the more revenue generating facilities that we have in the County such as golf courses, and actually as the Presiding Officer said, marinas, etcetera, the beaches. Are you satisfied that we're allocating sufficient resources towards maintaining some of the facilities that are necessary to continue the revenue generation of these facilities, that we enjoy from these facilities, or do we need to be committing more money? That's the first question.

And second question is are there any capital improvements that you would recommend that could help us generate additional money from some of these facilities?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Let me tackle golf courses and marinas first. I think with the budget that has been proposed for golf courses, for example, the single most important need we have facing us right now is to put in a new irrigation system at the West Sayville Golf Course. The original system that was put in there was really along the lines of a residential type system. It does not have the capacity and it is so outdated that we are doing repairs on a regular basis. And we do have -- there is sufficient money proposed, the 1.2 million that is proposed for 2011 will allow us to accomplish that.

Basically we had started a three phase project for that site which included putting in a new irrigation well, a new irrigation satellite and computer system; that's being done this year. And in the last and final leg of that was to put in a new irrigation system. So in terms of addressing that issue, I think that is the money that we need to get that done. If we had not done that I think we would have potentially faced a few years down the road some significant issues at West Sayville.

The other golf courses are in good shape and I believe that we're pretty much maximizing, particularly during the summer months, we are maximizing the rounds of golf that we can, particularly on weekends. Our golf courses are very, very popular. They get a lot of use and we can see that from the reservation system and the other statistics we have.

In regard to marinas, same thing. We have amassed a fair amount of capital monies. We are working with DPW to move towards the first critical project which we feel should be the Shinnecock Marina and the replacement of the bulkhead there. That, we think, is the most important of all the capital projects to be done and something that we hope to progress over the next year or two with DPW. So in that regard I think we have, you know, we have targeted that. And we have also looked at putting in a new floating dock at { T dock } assemblage at the end of the existing floating dock there to add additional slips.

And also at Timber, we have also -- our Deputy Commissioner has previously investigated that as well as Timber Point East marina and we can also install some additional floating docks and get additional slips there. So that is something we'll be looking to do as well.

In regard to campgrounds, we do have existing campground monies. We're moving ahead with different projects, including installation of new bathrooms at some of the facilities and additional individual campsites at some. We're doing electrical upgrades. Right now, for example, we are in the middle of a major electrical upgrade at Smith Point County Park campground, one that has been sorely needed, to bring in three phase electrical and to increase the amperage that is necessary for the campsites there.

As the Deputy Commissioner just pointed out to me, we are diligently working towards getting funding for replenishment of our beaches. Smith Point is -- we have met with FEMA and SEMO. Just based on the November 13th nor'easter we have commitments from FEMA and SEMO. We have not seen the final paperwork on that, but they have committed to giving us funding towards beach replenish projects at Smith Point and Meschutt. We were lucky that this past go around Cupsogue or other major Atlantic Ocean beach was fairly unscathed.

The problem there, though, in terms of getting that project moving forward, is it's rather onerous. Because we are on the ocean, because we are dealing with marine environment, we have to deal with probably upwards of a dozen regulatory agencies; New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, US Army Corps of Engineers, they have a regulatory branch that issues permits, National Marine Fishery Service, National Park Service because we are within the Fire Island National Seashore, US Fish and Wildlife Service, the New York State Department of State, and the New York State Office of General Services. So just getting through that maze of regulatory paperwork is -- can be daunting, and in order to do that we have to hire professionals and DPW has already moved ahead with that and has hired an engineering and environmental consulting firm. They are moving ahead on design plans for Smith Point.

The problem also for us is not just with the design, but then getting through that environmental review process, and then we're also restricted as to what time of year we can actually do a project. If you are looking to dredge sand from an offshore underwater area, be it an inlet or an underwater bar site, there are only certain times of the year in which you can do that because of the daunting environmental regulations. Basically we are forced to dredge at the worst time of year, which is from about September through mid-January, and then you might have a very short window from about mid-February to the end of March. So the worst time of year in which to do a project, and obviously much more costly because of that, and because of weather. If you have an ocean going dredge that's anchored off shore, if they get a blow coming in they have to pull it back and they have to come in and stop the process. So that's why it becomes very difficult to do, but we are committed to that.

Terry Maccarrone of our office has been diligently, working feverishly to try to get us the funding and the money and even working on the past erosion control projects, so we are moving towards that. And we recognize that our beaches are revenue generators. Meschutt, which is our third major

lifeguarded site on the Great Peconic Bay, we -- the only source of sand we can bring in there is by truck, and we are moving ahead with bringing in several thousand yards of sand there just prior to Memorial Day so we'll have more of a beach there in time for the summer season.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Can you speak at all about the catering facilities either at our golf courses or other, in other facilities? Do we have the responsibility, does the County have the responsibility of maintaining those facilities from a capital improvements point of view or is it the concessions that we lease the facilities to that do that?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

It's a combination. First of all, these are long-term agreements. These are contracts that are upwards of 20 years, with generally an initial ten year period and then two five year option periods. There are usually capital improvement requirements placed on those concessionaires. They are often fairly substantial. Case in point is at Timber Point, for example. Lessings is the caterer there, and we're working with them to get some substantial capital improvements done, including perhaps looking at additional work on the roof and some additional electrical work there. The same is true at Meadow Edge, which is the restaurant facility at West Sayville. Our newest catering facility or catering contract, I should say, is up at Coindre Hall. Again, it's Lessings and again, they have significant capital improvement requirements they have to do there.

And the same is true for our beach facilities. Beach Hut has the contracts, concession contracts, food concession contracts, for us at Smith Point, Meschutt and Cupsogue, and again, we're working closely with them. Right now we're finishing a major capital improvement at the Smith Point Pavilion that is probably the most significant change there in decades to improve the facility there, working in conjunction with Beach Hut. They are putting up part of the money, we're putting up the remainder to get that work done. The same is true out of Cupsogue. We are undertaking a major expansion of the pavilion there at Cupsogue, again with Beach Hut, putting up a substantial amount of the money, doing the planning and engineering work for that.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Last question, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the time. Are there facilities that we operate that do not currently have these types of catering operations that we might consider, you know, developing?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

The problem is unlike beaches, which are modern structures, most of the other structures are historic, so they come with their own issues and own restrictions. There is only so much you can do in these facilities. And then we are dealing with own Health Department and we have to meet Health Department requirements. So if you're talking about putting in a prep kitchen or a full blown commercial kitchen, again, there is significant requirements, permitting requirements that have to be obtained, and it is not always feasible for a particular site. You're dealing with several units in the County Health Department, not just the food service end, but also sanitary systems. They need to make sure that we have a sufficient functioning sanitary system. If you don't have a grease trap, for example, a separate grease handling system, you have to look to put that in. So there is -- those are some of the issues that we look into.

Plus, if there's an interest in having food at a particular location, just because you build it, they may not come there. That's one of the other issues, and whether a structure can support that. To put in a kitchen or food operation could result in significant alteration to a site which may then interfere with an impact upon its historic designation. And that's why I think if you look at so many of the sites that we have, we don't have food operations there because of that, because those are historic designations.

**LEG. CILMI:**

So would you say, then, that there are no facilities that we currently operate without such -- without these catering operations --

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

I'm going to ask our Deputy Commissioner, Tracey Bellone, to jump in.

**MS. BELLONE:**

Each of the four golf courses all have food services. Our three largest historic services buildings all have food -- have catering facilities. Each of our beach facilities that are lifeguard protected have catering services contracts. So there really isn't a location that doesn't have a food service contract that has that kind of attendance.

**LEG. CILMI:**

All right. Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Legislator Montano, you had a question, right?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yeah. I'm going to try and do this in two minutes so we can finish up. Just one thing, an aside. We keep using the term revenue generator, generators for the golf course and the other facilities, but that may not be an accurate term as I understand it, because we don't really have a separate study or an idea of whether or not as an entity in and of itself these golf courses provide a positive revenue flow versus -- not from a quality of life standpoint, but just from a purely financial, whether it would be a revenue generator or a revenue drain on the County. Am I accurate in that? Because we had this discussion a while back and there has been no departmentalization of what produces revenue and what loses revenue in your department. Is that a fair statement, Commissioner?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

As we have discussed, Legislator Montano, we don't have individual -- each particular park, for example, a particular golf course does not have its on independent, stand alone budget.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Got you.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

And so we don't assess, you know, compare the revenue that that particular site generates against the cost of operating that facility, because it's coming out of our entire Operating Budget.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

General Fund. So there is really no profitability aspect to a particular park or beach or any of your facilities. Am I correct?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

There is no -- there is no indication of whether or not a particular golf course is profitable or not profitable individually.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

We don't have a means of determining that at this point.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I just want to be clear on that, that's not where I'm going. Deputy Commissioner Bellone, you

indicated earlier the park in Brentwood I thought you said, where they were talking about soccer fields, baseball and the dog run. Did I hear that correctly?

**MS. BELLONE:**

No, we were referring to Cherry Avenue in Sayville.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. That's good. There is a park in Brentwood, I understand, next to the Brentwood High School, or at least land that is designated as parkland. Am I accurate in that?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

I think that might be --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Adjacent to the high school.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Yes, it's an Oak Brush preserve. It's essentially a nature preserve.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right. And there really isn't anything other than a preserve there. I mean, you don't have any facilities. Do you maintain that facility, the Parks Department?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Yes. It's not an active park facility. There is no playgrounds there or active ball fields, correct.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

There's nothing there other than the -- and is there like a separate budget for that or is that just included in your overall maintenance budget.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

There's no separate budget for that. That comes out of our general budget.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Can you give me an indication of -- do you know what, if any, work has gone on in that preserve in terms of maintaining it? And the reason I ask is that while you're here, you know, I know that I have been -- had some conversations with the school district in terms of the park. We visited there the other day, it seems to be overgrown. I'm just trying to see what, if anything, is being done there or is it just laying as an open space with really no maintenance.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Well, as open space, as I indicated, it is considered to be part of the original what was known as the Oak Brush Plains. The Edgewood Preserve owned by -- owned and managed by the New York State DEC is probably the largest example of that. It's a rare habitat type or echo system. If you remember going back decades ago I think it was multi-town, a solid waste facility. That's where the -- that was proposed in the Oak Brush Plains and thence after that you have -- part of that multi-town owned land I believe went to DEC to form part of that. This is similar to that, that's habitat that is similar to that, so there's not, in terms of establishing active recreation there, that's not proposed and could not be proposed because of the environmental sensitivity. There are some trails there and signage, but that is the greatest extent of what is at that facility.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Would you or in your department would you have a schedule of maintenance or activity in that, maintenance activity in that park, or you don't maintain those records that way. In other words, if you sent a crew in there to clean it up a month ago, would you have a record of that?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Yes, we should have a record of that.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

It's also known as the Bishops Tract piece.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. Thank you very much.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Thank you very much, Legislator Montano. As Legislator Kennedy said, just a minute, that's all it will take.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes, and I promised, as a matter of fact, I'll keep it real brief. I want to speak, if I can, about Capital Project 7099 I believe it is. It's the culverts and {laws} project. You're very familiar with it, Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

The spillways.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes. I know -- I think that the department sought 350,000 for the 2011 budget. It was submitted at 250,000. I've already filed a budget amendment to add I believe 150,000, though I'm going to ask BRO to confirm that, and the reason is very specific. It's for two culverts that are integral in that northeast branch. The Millers Pond and also the Blydenburgh spillway. Can you speak to us for just a second about what those structures currently do and where, you know, some assessment and planning and probably, you know, possible upgrade might help with some of our drainage issues?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

At Millers Pond specifically or others?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, both Millers Pond and Stump because they are both on the same water course.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Basically very often where you have a spillway you might have once have had an old mill that caused the damming of the surface water body. Most of the lakes and ponds you see on Long Island, Stump Pond and Millers Pond included, are not true ponds or true closed systems. They are actually somewhat impounded portions of active rivers or streams. In this case both of those water, surface water bodies, are part of the Nissequogue River.

In Stump Pond at the south end or north end of Stump Pond there was -- you have a mill known as the New Mill, even though it's several hundred years old, which led to the damming of that surface water body. That was dammed obviously to provide for a water power source for the mill complex that was there.

Millers Pond was created by the Miller family, I believe, well over 100 years ago. I'm not sure of the origins of that, but the spillway structure that is present at the west side of Millers Pond I believe was put in several decades ago. It's a more conventional type of spillway structure that is designed to retain the majority of water in that so you have that water feature remaining as opposed to a trickle of a creek or a stream, but allows for adjustments to the water level in cases of storm or increases in overall groundwater level.

The structure is concrete and steel. It has three spillway features on it on the northeast and west sides. It has boards that are approximately eight inches in height, which are removed manually when there's a need to do so, and then those boards are put back when the water level drops to an appropriate point to maintain that water level. And Millers Pond in particular we operate that spillway under a DEC permit which mandates that we have to maintain a certain water level in that body of water. We can't completely drain it because of that.

However, there are other structures elsewhere. I'll give as a case in point the south side of Canaan Lake in Patchogue where several decades ago they put in this new structure that is not removable wood boards, but it's concrete and aluminum which has cranks on it. It basically allows someone -- it's essentially as vandalism proof as you are going to get and allows you to more precisely control water flow in that by someone cranking a series of gears and handles. Plus it allows -- it can be locked so that nobody can tamper with it as they have done unfortunately at other locations.

There is a movement afoot across the country to examine such things as dams and spillways and determine whether or not it's appropriate to maintain them. I'm not here to talk about those particular benefits, but it is something that at Millers Pond obviously we have gotten a lot of interest, a lot of local interest, in how that water level is managed and certainly it's an area that is deserving of further study. But I would say scientific study, database study over time to determine what your actual flows, your water levels are in there and then whether or not there is a more appropriate type of structure at a different elevation that would be more suitable for that site.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. I appreciate that assessment. And also, were there to be some modification to Millers, there would be a logic to also addressing Stump since both ponds, if you will, are located within the same water course. Correct?

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

Not always. Because of the distance between Millers Pond and Blydenburgh, you do have a relatively small creek, that section or reach that runs from Millers Pond all the way to Blydenburgh. The water level is not always as immediately affected at Blydenburgh, and even though you may be adjusting water levels at the Millers Pond spillway, that does not always equate into having to make adjustments at Blydenburgh. The spillways at Blydenburgh are, even though there is much more water there, the spillways are also much more massive than what you have at Millers Pond.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Can I just turn to BRO for a second? That amendment is something that was prepared, Gil, or it's in the process of being prepared?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Yes. We prepared a draft. We're just checking it over and we'll forward it to you for your review.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Thank you, Legislator Kennedy. Is there anything else you would like to add? And again, Gail, just as I did quickly with EEE, the differences between what the County -- what was -- well, actually there wouldn't be any, it is what it is. Never mind. I take back my question. Is there anything else

anyone would like to add? Very good. Thank you very much.

Would anyone from the -- would the Vanderbilt want to make a comment? Is that something that you guys would -- I see you in the back of the room -- or are you good for the moment. Carol?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

I did have a short presentation.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Okay. Please, come on up. Thank you, everybody.

**COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:**

You're welcome. Thank you.

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

Yes, I did have a presentation to give, sort of a tour. I'm not sure how late you guys are running today, though.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

We are running late.

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

All right. Well, quick comments.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Could we save it for the regular Parks meeting or how would you like to?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

Yes. I guess that would be up to you. I'll just -- I'll quickly --

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Is it about the Capital --

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

It was an overview of the capital projects, some visuals for people who haven't been to see what we're talking about when we talk about the seaplane hangar or other issues. So that was an attempt to have some of the images explained visually what we are talking about when we say we are concerned about projects. But if no one is here, I'll leave that up to you.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

How long is it?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

I was hoping to go through it really quickly and maybe I could just like zip through some of it and just get to some of the pertinent -- if you have any questions --

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Sure. I'm in for the long run. I can't speak for my colleagues, but please, Carol, go ahead. Carol, do you have anything in writing?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

No. Again, mostly this is photographs.

**LEG. STERN:**

Can it be e-mailed?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

It's a really large file. I can probably burn a disk if you want to look at some of the files.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

I'm in for the long run.

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

Okay. While we get that set up, just quickly to just comment on the review of our Capital Program. I think it's very -- Budget Review worked very, very long and hard and thoughtfully on our budget request. They worked very closely with the Department of Public Works which also informs very much our requests as they go in, so I would say that the Vanderbilt Museum would love to see the Capital Program go through as requested by BRO.

I will try to go through this really quickly for those of you who haven't been at the Vanderbilt Museum. There is Mr. Vanderbilt. You know our mission and how we are a unique combination of mansion, marine and natural history museum and we are dedicated to education and the understanding of diversity of life. That is the Vanderbilt Museum. Please make note of the bridge to your right. A capital project does concern that bridge. And you'll see facades, a little bit more the -- that black on the tower is netting.

Again, 43 acre estate, quite extensive, a lot of different buildings, and we interpret our artifacts as well as the Gold Coast Mansion. An example of a room with some of our collections. We have over 30,000 different kinds of objects ranging from natural history specimens to ethnographic objects, we have wonderful natural history dioramas; it's a rundown of some of what we've got. We have an ancient Egyptian mummy. Architectural features like the sundial. I'm going to quickly go through it. We are an accredited museum so we are under certain standards.

Again, a quick map to give you an idea and Goggle map to see how we relate. We are on the Northport Harbor, upper right hand, sort of like a rectangle. That's the seaplane hangar. The middle upper there is a circular driveway. That's where the boathouse is. Here is a schematic to get a better idea of how our buildings relate to one another. What you can't see is how hilly the facility is, so if you haven't been out there, it's a very strenuous walk, cobblestones and deep gullies and hills.

This is the main entrance to the bulk of the state, Eagles. A rooftop view. The building on the right is the garage. It is now our education center. Off in the distance you see the main mansion and again, the wonderful view. You also get an appreciation for the topography. Again, some of our views. This is the curators cottage. The garage, again, are at center.

Our bell tower. We are going to quickly go through some of our bell tower pictures. Again, that netting has been up for quite a while. It is protecting visitors from falling masonry. The lower right you see a scaffolding that's been up for about five years while this project moves forward. You can see the netting does hold back some things as they fall. Pictures. This is the basement area of the tower and close ups of some of the failures in the facades.

A beautiful view of the mansion. We have a lot of roofs and many of them leak. This is a bedroom in the bell tower that currently has quite severe water damage because of the leaks. This is on the roof of the bell tower. The bell tower again. Underneath the bell tower, extensive engineering analysis was done to make sure that the structure could support the bell tower, and there is still frame structure there but there is a lot of leakage and we do have money appropriated for that. Here are some of the facades in other places, again, to get an idea of what's happening. That is the Memorial Wing, the golf course entrance, and you can see what's going on there. And these are areas that I can easily access, but you can see what's happening. Some of this looks quite beautiful from a photographic -- it's quite sublime, but the concerns are this is areas that we can see and reach. There are other areas that pose more of a threat.

This is our boathouse. There is where Vanderbilt's sea captain lived and where there was a dock and his yacht would come. It is currently closed. It has been closed for about two years because of structural problems. The capital project ran out of money. We did appropriate money but the money wasn't bonded, so that's the project. We need to move forward. Here is the view from the water and you can see this has pretty much remained this way for two years. There's only enough money to monitor movement. Extensive scaffolding, they had made wooden frames to pour cement and ran out of money before they were able to do that. This is some of the interior rooms of this space. That's from the beach.

Again, our bridge and there is a request in underneath -- you can see some of the damage and, again, the engineers have studied that and anticipate a major reconstruction of this bridge.

This is our marine museum. This is the first floor. We do have a lot of water infiltration issues on the first floor. This is the second floor, again, upper right you can see where we have water infiltration issues. This is the second floor. This is on the roof, it's a flat roof. A number of our roofs are flat and cause difficulties.

Normandy Manor you've heard about across the way. That was taken about a month ago. Our gardeners are hard at work putting in gardens there. Our planetarium you know as well. That's our -- this is our current star projector that will be replaced with a new star projector. We don't know which company yet, but the new projector will be a ball, much smaller. Again, part of the planetarium roof is flat and we have major leaks and problems coming down into our lobby area as well as some of the interior dome. And in talking to DPW it looks like we really need to replan, rethink and just continual patching, which is what we are doing now, is not quite doing enough. This is our, again, interior lobby. If you look up you can see some of the water damage right outside our observatory.

Seaplane hangar. This is our seaplane hangar view from the water. This ramp -- I'll just show the pictures. Consider it to be a hazard. I think anyone that goes down there considers it to be a hazard when at high tide much of this is under water and it's not feasible to block this off for different DEC regulations. So it is a boating hazard as well as a hazard to people that might stroll along, and we're very, very concerned about this. Money is appropriated, it just hasn't been -- the project is stalled. There's concern for the integrity of the structure itself as well. When we talk about the seaplane hangar this is the interior of that.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Carol, can you hang on one second?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

Sure.

**LEG. STERN:**

What would that project entail? The boards are coming out; it's an issue. I mean, what is that project? Is it to shore it up, is it to remove it? What would it be doing?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

That project really is -- needs to work in tandem with the seaplane hangar restoration as well as the waterfront project. The wood -- that ramp would be removed. Because you're now removing sort of the water break they would have to do foundation work and put rip rap and different things there. So there is foundation work on the seaplane hangar that would have to be done in conjunction with removal of the ramp. The removal of the ramp is in the waterfront project. The foundation work is in the seaplane hangar project. So monies from both projects would need to be used to make that stable and safe.

**LEG. STERN:**

Are you saying that you cannot remove the ramp without shoring up the hangar, as far as the

foundation goes. They go hand in hand.

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

Yes. Again, just more interior. There was concern for the main steel truss in this building as well by engineers that feel it's in eminent danger. Again, this is exterior, more ramp photos. Interior as well.

We also have dinosaurs on the property in another building. Our Habitat Wing. This is our whale shark, 32 foot whale shark. That restoration project was wonderful, finished. Some other natural history dioramas in here. Some of the capital projects are hard to visualize, like when I talk about electrical. I show this because there are nine dioramas. There is one switch to turn it off. When you turn it off they all might turn off or three might turn off. Hit it again, two go off; hit it again, five go off. Sometimes it takes six tries to go off and apparently there are relays that need work, and there are some areas of the mansion that definitely need electrical work.

This is a diorama in the Stoll Wing, another diorama in the Stole Wing. This you might have read about. This is a 15th century Della Robbia sculpture that was hidden behind one of the dioramas when the Stoll Wing was built in 1970, so we are looking very closely at that Stoll Wing and how we might bring back that particular sculpture. We are looking at different plans for restoration and the Stoll Wing project that we hope to do someday. It's not currently recommended by Budget Review Office, and we understand that. But in the long-term that Stoll Wing area is something that we feel we will have to deal with. That was about 180 slides and I hope not too long time.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

No, no, that was good. Actually, that was the right timing. Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yes. Just very quickly, what are your infrastructure, what do you need for infrastructure improvements, you know, on a yearly basis for the next five years? You were here when the college did their piece, were you not?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

No, I wasn't.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. So I was going to ask you along the same lines. What are your infrastructure improvement requirements if you can, if you quantified it, on a yearly basis for the next five years? Do you know?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

We are working on a strategic plan so I don't have a five year plan, but clearly with our new planetarium coming in we need technological upgrades. We don't have internet access in many of our buildings, for example. So certainly we are looking for those kinds of infrastructure upgrades.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Right. I understand that. What I'm looking for is a dollar amount. Have you been able to put a dollar sign in front of what it is that you need to do to maintain the infrastructure that, you know, essentially is shown there as in relatively poor condition we would say, or not poor but not great.

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

There is, you know, BRO, a couple of -- we want some studies of our electrical, our plumbing and then we will be in a better position so that's exactly what we are trying to look at over the next five years.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. And then the second part of that is how is that funded? Is that funded strictly through the County Capital Budget or is there other -- how is it funded? I'll ask you that.

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

All capital projects have been historically for the most part through the County. Occasionally a grant might come in, but generally not for infrastructure, but maybe restoration.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Quick question to BRO. What, if any, amounts coming from hotel/motel could be used for some of these projects, if at all.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Based on the adopted Operating Budget there really isn't surplus hotel/motel funds for capital projects, whether it's for the parks or for the Vanderbilt Museum. You know, historic buildings, there is really nothing there for the Capital Program. You know, in future budgets, when you construct future Operating Budgets, you can treat Hotel/Motel Tax similar to pay as you go. You could transfer Hotel/Motel Tax like water quality funding to the Capital Budget so that appropriations wouldn't expire. For instance, like Parks with historic buildings, you could set up a separate Parks historic buildings project funded with Hotel/Motel Tax; you could do the same thing for the Vanderbilt if you had, you know, sufficient funds after you met, I guess, your currently operating needs for that.

**LEG. STERN:**

Are those changes that we are able to make either wholesale here or on an annual basis without -- without any kind of State approval?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Yes. The State law outlines what structures or what use you can use with that money; that's outlined. Historic buildings could be used for that. The money is also used for the Vanderbilt Museum for their Operating Budget, but probably could use it for capital projects too. That's probably a little bit more difficult question to answer at this time without really looking at the legal ramifications, but a certain percent is earmarked for the Vanderbilt.

You could argue that some of the maintenance and ongoing projects are Operating Budget costs and therefore you could transfer funds to the Capital Budget for those ongoing maintenance programs. You would have to look at this during the Operating Budget adoption process to see what anticipated revenues are coming in from the Hotel/Motel Tax, what the current needs are through the Operating Budget, and then if you make a policy decision on what you'd like to transfer to the Capital Program. That's probably possible. And especially after this year we should have a better idea of what the revenue will be from the Hotel/Motel Tax. With the increase in the room tax we did a projection based on historic revenue projections and kind of extrapolating what the higher room rate would generate, or room tax would generate, and with the economy and sales tax lagging it's kind of this year is -- we hope we're close, but we should have a better idea next year what the revenue is:

**LEG. STERN:**

Okay. Thanks.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Are there any further questions? We're good? Carol, just one quick one. The Goto, I understand we're now at the RFP stage. Steven, I have been here for what, four years now, is that how long we've been here, and I have been hearing about this since the first day I got here. Where are we?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

Well, this is actually a really big, important week for us. On Thursday the Department of Public Works is meeting to go over the proposals that we received. We did -- received three bids on the proposals, so we are meeting Thursday. On Friday all concerned parties who -- are going to meet and make a decision I hope on who we think should get the bid. So from then it will be hopefully not take too long to go through County Attorney's Offices and reviews. That's where in the past things got a little bit delayed.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

And then how long to build it?

**MS. GHIORSI HART:**

It will take 12 months from the time the contract is signed. So we still hope for, well, at this point it may be in October, 2011, but that means the contracts can't take as long to get approved and signed as some of the other processes took.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you. That's very frustrating. Would anyone else like to be heard concerning Parks in the Environment? We really haven't spent much time on the Environment but it was part of our calling today. Anyone like to be heard? Okay. Ms. Vizzini, is there anything else you would like to add?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

No, just in terms of the Vanderbilt our recommendations were to advance construction for the roof repairs to protect the projector once it's installed and also to advance funds to refurbish the seating in the planetarium. The priority being fix the roof so nothing gets damaged and refurbish the seating.

**CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:**

Sound advise. Okay. We will take that up and we'll be moving forward. Anything else anyone else would like to add at this point in time? All right. We'll close this hearing on Parks and the Environment. I'd like to thank everybody for their participation. Meeting adjourned.

**(The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM)**