

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING and AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

VERBATIM MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on May 2, 2011.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Vivian Vilorio-Fisher, Chairperson
Leg. Sarah Anker, Vice Chair
Leg. Lou D'Amaro
Leg. Thomas Muratore
Leg. Edward P. Romaine

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel
Eric Kopp, County Executive's Office
Robert Lipp, Deputy Director, Budget Review Office
Laura Halloran, Budget Review Office
Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk
Sarah Lansdale, Director of Department of Planning
Michael Mule, Department of Planning
Lauretta Fischer, Principal Environmental Analyst, Department of Planning
Pamela Greene, Director of Real Property Acquisition & Management
Janet Longo, Real Property Acquisition & Management
Ali Nazir, Aide to Leg. Kennedy
Tom Ryan, Aide to Leg. Vilorio-Fisher
Justin Littell, Aide to Leg. D'Amaro
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Leader
Gail Lolis, Deputy County Attorney
William Shilling, Aide to Presiding Officer
Jennifer Casey, Appointee to Suffolk County Planning Department
Dot Kerrigan, AME representative
Brendan Chamberlain, Aide to County Executive
Rick Brand, Newsday
And all other interested parties

VERBATIM MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

VERBATIM MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:11 PM]

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Good afternoon. Welcome to today's meeting. Please join us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

SALUTATION

Okay. We don't have any cards. Any members of the public who want to speak? But we do have someone who has been named to the Planning Commission and that is Ms. Jennifer Casey. So I would like to make a motion to take **1368 out of order. (To appoint member of County Planning Commission (Jennifer A. Casey) (Co. Exec.)**

LEG. ROMAINE:

So moved.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator Romaine. Okay. All in favor? Opposed? **1368 is before us.** Miss Casey, if you can just come on up and you could sit right here. And at the base of the microphone there's a button that you need to press and keep your finger on it. Okay?

MS. CASEY:

Like that?

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Yep. You can move it closer to you. That sounded great. Okay. Can you tell us a little bit about yourself and why you would like to take on this charge?

MS. CASEY:

Sure. I've been residing in Huntington Station for approximately ten years. I've served on the Huntington Economic Development Corporation, which got my feet wet about development and what's going on in the County and in the Town of Huntington. From there I had the opportunity to serve on the Downtown Revitalization Committee, which really gave me a good view of what's going on in the County of Suffolk and how important development and so forth is.

I'm an attorney. I work at a private firm. I don't do zoning and planning, but I've had some exposure to it when I first started at my firm almost 20 years ago. I worked with a partner who was on zoning and planning for the Town of Lattingtown. So I used to do a lot of research for him. And it's always been an interest of mine, but more of a hobby than my regular day job.

I had an opportunity to do the Energeia Program through Malloy College for two years. I finished that up last year. And that broadened my horizon even further about the importance of zoning and planning. So I feel that I'm qualified. I've served on many committees and so forth and have learned a lot. And I'd like to be able to serve the County and go forward with that.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

You know, I just had a question. It says here Suffolk County Child Care Council, Director.

MS. CASEY:

I'm on their board.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, on the board of directors.

MS. CASEY:

On the board of directors, yeah.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. All right.

MS. CASEY:

Just an abbreviation on there.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Because I was thinking of Janet Wallerstein and wondering --

MS. CASEY:

No, no, no. She's the Director --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

She's the Executive Director.

MS. CASEY:

-- being on the board of directors, that's something that I do.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Yeah, I know. I was on that board for a while.

MS. CASEY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

And I'm saying since when is Janet Wallerstein not the director anymore, which I know she is.

MS. CASEY:

No, that's not my -- it's not the *director of*, it's *on the board*.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Yeah, yeah. Okay. And when it says *graduate 2007 Leadership Huntington*, what's Leadership Huntington?

MS. CASEY:

Leadership Huntington is a leadership program through the Town of Huntington. It's a one-year program wherein we learn a lot of different facets of the Town of Huntington including the environment, revitalization, healthcare. It's a great program. And what's nice about it, it brings people from all walks of life. It's not whether you're -- you know, running something or a CEO of something; it's -- everybody can participate in it. It was a great learning experience and I got to meet a lot of really interesting people, make some really great relationships. And from there I ended up doing the Energia Program, which is more of a regional leadership program.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

With Paul Tonna.

MS. CASEY:

Exactly. So it was a great steppingstone from -- going from there. And a lot of people that have done Leadership Huntington have gone on and done Energia. But I believe Leadership Huntington's the only town-run leadership program at this juncture on Long Island.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Great. Is there anyone else who has a question; any other Legislators have a question?

LEG. D'AMARO:

I do. Hi, and welcome. Ms. Casey, you're being put in a slot where it's the Incorporated Village slot. Are you aware of that?

MS. CASEY:

I believe so, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. But you don't reside in an Incorporated Village, do you?

MS. CASEY:

I live in Huntington. Huntington Station's part of Huntington, I believe.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. But -- yeah, I don't know that it's -- if the distinction makes a difference. George?

MS. CASEY:

I believe it's a Town of Huntington position, isn't it?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is it a Town slot or is it a Incorporated Village slot?

MS. CASEY:

I believe it's a Town of Huntington slot. That was my belief.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

First WHEREAS.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm going to ask George Nolan, our Counsel, just to take a quick look at that. Because I would hate to go through this process with you and it turns out that you're not --

MS. CASEY:

I understand.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- you know, you can't fit the slot. So, let's just double check it.

MR. NOLAN:

She's taking the Town of Huntington slot.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Town of Huntington, yeah. Sarah was just saying that from the audience. Because this is the spot that was held, yeah, in the first WHEREAS. But you know what, before it says *one member from an Incorporated Village*, it says *one member from each of the ten towns*.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

There's a phrase before that. Okay.

MS. CASEY:

My backyard's the Incorporated Village of Huntington.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

This is the position that had been held by Sarah Lansdale and now that's she's in -- our Planning Director, she has resigned from that position.

MS. CASEY:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Well, it certainly seems that you put a lot of time and effort into public service.

MS. CASEY:

I have. I've enjoyed it. It's really, I think, complements my career and what I do. It makes my career more fulfilling.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes, and I just want to add, I've had an opportunity to work with Miss Casey on the Town of Huntington Economic Development Corporation for at least two years, maybe a little bit more. And we certainly got our hands full working there with planning issues. That involved revitalization efforts in Huntington Station, which is ongoing today. And we've had some success down there now. So I appreciate your service on that board.

And I just wanted to ask you very briefly, for the record, if you can detail for us a little bit about your thinking about planning issues. What do you think are some of the global issues facing the County at this time from a planning perspective?

MS. CASEY:

I believe there's a lot of challenges. By being a resident of Huntington we've -- with the whole Avalon Bay project was a big challenge. I think education's very important for the public because I think there's a lot of misperception. But Suffolk County has a lot of valuable resources. And I think it's important that we plan appropriately so we grow in an appropriate method. I think that there's some really great ideas out there with transit oriented development that should be explored further. And I think that we have a lot of -- there's a lot of opportunity in Suffolk County. And I think it's important to do good planning so it works for the future.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. I appreciate that and I agree with you; you know, there are really challenges facing the County when it comes to planning.

One of the things we also are very mindful from a County perspective is if you have a larger development in one town that may, although it's not located in the other towns, may impact other towns.

MS. CASEY:

I agree with you. That's why it's so important to look at what's going on in different towns to see how it's going to affect everyone else. Especially with transportation and everything else that goes on.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, right. Okay. All right. Madam Chair, I have no further questions. Thank you, Miss Casey.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Would you like to make a motion?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes, I'd like to offer a motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Second. All in favor? Opposed? Congratulations. **IR 1368 approved. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Leg. Anker)**

MS. CASEY:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

This will be before us at the General Meeting, but you're not required to attend that.

MS. CASEY:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Congratulations, good luck.

MS. CASEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. As the members of this Committee will recall, we had some discussion at our last meeting regarding the balance of funds in our Land Acquisition Program. There was some questions and we requested that Miss Greene come back with her numbers and her presentation and that Robert Lipp from our own Budget Review Office join us today because there were some questions regarding a memo, an e-mail that we had received from him, which was rather brief and he's going to fill in some of the blanks on that.

Pam, would you mind because that was the first question we had was in reference to Mr. Lipp's e-mail, would you mind if he clarifies his numbers for us and then we'll go ahead to what you're telling us?

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Whatever your prerogative is, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. All right. Thank you. Thank you, Miss Greene. Okay, Robert.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. We prepared a brief table, if you will, which I'll go through. Basically the e-mail referred to -- spoke about balances that are likely to exist at the end of 2011. That was from a few months ago. It was just meant as a quick update with, you know, not spending a lot of time, I just sat here at the horseshoe and put that together. There was perhaps a little misunderstanding with it and I think the number there was \$80 million. That \$80 million figure was meant to be not just pay-as-you-go cash balances but also what's likely to be left over in terms of bonded monies at the end of this year. But if we go over the updated version that we prepared, I think that'll make it a little bit clearer.

What you see over here is, here's a listing of all the borrowing. I have -- (indicating) the cursor is over here at that area. So you could see how much was borrowed for the Quarter Cent Program. Over the allowable years, we're allowed to borrow between 2008 and 2011, the last year projected amount includes 40 million that's already going to be borrowed later this month. And then the remaining 16 million would presumably be borrowed in the fall. So we expect that we'll have borrowed \$209 million by the end of this year.

Next you could see over here (indicating) is the projected balance based upon the most recent information we had from the Division of Real Estate in the account of \$86 and-a-half million. That \$86 and-a-half million includes the full \$209 million of bonding. So that would be the balance according to the Division of Real Estate once all the \$209 million was borrowed.

From there, once again, from the Division of Real Estate's end of March update, you could see there's \$85 million in terms of various purchases that may occur in terms of what's in contract and what's accepted offers. So if you take the difference between the \$86 million balance and the \$85 million for everything that's in contract -- accepted offers, you'd have a million and-a-half left. Okay? Of that million and-a-half, then you also have 5.4 million almost in terms of in negotiation for future purchases.

Now I'm going to scroll down. And what you wind up with then is a negative balance of \$3.8 million. Now, the problem with that -- well -- which I'll go over in a minute, but what's projected in terms of cash balances then to add to that, which isn't part of the Real Estate's summary statement that they present to the Legislature, is at the end of this year based upon actuals thru 2010 and projected for this year, you'll have almost \$46 million more in terms of pay-as-you-go money that you could start using at the beginning of 2012.

And, oh yeah, by the way, during 2012 you could probably add another \$4.8 million to that in terms of cash proceeds for land acquisitions from the sales tax that will exceed the debt service that's going to be obligated. The debt service that'll be obligated will be about 16 million a year. Over time, sales tax will grow and, therefore, the additional monies instead of 4.8 million will grow to about \$10 million a year by 2019. That being said, if you add the pay-as-you-go cash proceeds that are sitting there, you've got \$41 million. Okay.

Now, what is the difference between \$41 million and the \$80 million in that e-mail? Well, there's all sorts of things. First of all, if you take -- well, if you go back over here first of all, if you look at the 80 -- if you look at the \$85 million in terms of projected expenditures for obligations and contract and accepted offers, in all likelihood we're not going to wind up needing all of that money, simply because at the end of the day projects actually that are being contracted with don't work out. And there's a 95% chance of closing for in contract. It's not clear from parcel to parcel. And an 85% chance for accepted offers and that represents a projection. So, in other words, of the 85 million, there's probably about 9.7 million of it, although it remains to be seen, that'll never get spent.

In addition to that, what you have, then, is if you netted out that \$9.7 million additional, instead of a one and-a-half million dollars left over you'd have 11.2 million. If you do the same thing with the -- in negotiation, you'd wind up with instead of a minus 3.8 million, in all likelihood there's only like a 40% chance that most of those parcels would actually close. You'd wind up with, if you took all of those likelihoods into consideration, more like instead of a negative 3.8 million, you'd have a positive \$9 million, which is a more -- basically what you're doing there is you're looking at a projection because that's all it is. At the end of the day what the status of funds from Real Estate shows is what they perceive will happen if everything closes. Okay? So the negative 3 million is as if we're spending all the bonds and it's going to all close expeditiously. In reality that's not going to be the case.

So, at the end of the day really what happens is the following: You've got \$45.6 million in cash that will be projected to be available at the end of this year. And if you look at the likelihood of what we spend, which is up here, (indicating) we purchased \$22 million in 2008, 26 million in change in 2009. Real Estate really stepped it up and purchased 6 to 8 million in 2010. Granted, it is -- and, by the way, through the end of March they made \$2.8 million worth of purchases. Granted, it's difficult to determine how much we're actually going to spend in any given period. But if you look at the average of the first three years, you're talking \$39 million as a projection, if you will, for this year what we'll actually spend. So if you use that as a projection, in reality what you're going to have, is an extra -- an extra \$51 million -- \$50.1 million leftover from the bond proceeds at the end

of this year that have yet to be spent, plus the 45.6 million projected.

So the number that I'm talking about of \$95.7 million is, yes, 50.1 million of that arguably is committed. Only 45.6 million is not committed. But in terms of balances that we'll have leftover, there will be close to \$100 million as opposed to what I was saying before, \$80 million in all likelihood. True, some parcels may close to a larger extent than the \$39 million projection for this year, but there's considerably more money out there than the negative 3.8 million one would think, especially when you consider the likelihood that not all parcels that are in contract or in negotiation, yada yada yada, will actually close. I'll open it up for any questions.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Actually, you did -- in that e-mail you did say that you were using certain assumptions and trends to come up with that number. That it wasn't a hard number. And I know that for as long as I've been sitting here in the Environment Committee since 1999 is that -- the term that is used sometimes is we oversubscribe to programs because you don't expect everything to close. But you do want to make sure you have the money there for everything so that -- that money's encumbered right now, but we don't know what will -- what we won't be able to realize. So -- but that clarifies, I think, in more detail what was in that e-mail. Are there any other questions? Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. As I understand it, we only borrow 80% of what we anticipate our needs will be; is that correct?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

So, we borrow \$209 million based on a projection of 261 million total; is that correct?

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Of that, you're saying that we will borrow 40 million now in the spring and 16 million again in the fall that we'll have money on hand to expend on future purchases. Above and beyond that, beginning in 2012 we will have another, what, about 40?

MR. LIPP:

The yellow over here, (indicating) 45.6 will be a projection.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. 45 -- right. So in essence, our ability to go forward with land purchases based on the projection of this Quarter Percent Drinking Program, it's pretty good for the next at least two or three years.

MR. LIPP:

I believe so. I think that actually given all -- given the rate that we actually close in terms of need for monies, it's plausible that we won't really need the Multifaceted and the Legacy Programs, which are the two, by the way, the two General Fund land acquisition programs. If we were going to use those to bond more, I actually think we won't need to actually go out and issue those bonds until about 2015 for General Fund programs.

LEG. ROMAINE:

We are in pretty good shape for the next four years.

MR. LIPP:

I think so. And you have to keep in mind, also, that there's a pretty high probability that even if you want to go out and borrow all that's on these various Master Lists --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Uh-hum.

MR. LIPP:

-- there's probably at least a 50% likelihood that owners have no interest in selling them.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I mean, if someone had an interest and they could holdout -- if I owned land and I wanted to sell, I certainly would holdout because real estate is at, you know, pretty much an all time low compared to the last couple of years, this is probably a low point in real estate. If I could afford to, although I know some people that can't, but if I could, I would wait until better times where I could get a better value.

MR. LIPP:

We never supported the borrowing portion of the program. We felt that the timing was pretty poor. It's a good idea to borrow when you think the market prices are going up so that the interest that you incur from borrowing is compensated by the fact that you get at a lower price. But we're borrowing during a lousy real estate market so we're incurring the interest and prices aren't likely going up so we always thought that it was a bad idea to borrow.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Prices aren't going up, but we're borrowing at a low rate of interest and I -- if I haven't missed my bet, QE2, man, is going to -- quantitative easing, the second round, is going to start driving interest rates up come this summer. And considering the price of commodities, that is also going to add to inflation. So you're going to see general pressure on interest rates increasing, I believe, this summer. You don't think so.

MR. LIPP:

Well, definitely (inaudible) pressure in price. I think this summer will be a little early though.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right, okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Robert, when we decided to do this borrowing, I think that there were economists all over the place regarding what was going to be happening with the real estate market. And I think that we thought by this time we would have been in a little bit more positive upswing, you know, this being three years later. We just didn't -- we thought we were doing a great thing going into a market that was kind of depressed and we'd be getting bargains. And the turnaround is just happening more slowly with homes.

MR. LIPP:

The only point I was trying to make is, look, you know, we have come out in documents, too, you know, and I could read them to you if you wanted to, that real estate markets are like ten-year cycles. And at the end of the day we didn't support the borrowing for the -- basically for the reasons I said. That being stated, though, you know, it's fine, you know, this is what we decided on. I don't mean to, you know, second guess us, but, you know, it's -- I understand this pressure to develop and that, you know, you want to purchase things as soon as possible. But as you can see, you know, there's plenty of money out there for a short period. Don't get me wrong, you know, we'll never have enough to buy everything we want. But in terms of the timing and the sequencing, there is plenty of money there.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. Thank you for clarifying the statements you had made. Okay.

Miss Greene.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman, members of the Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to restate and perhaps, where necessary, clarify some statements which were made just two weeks ago, which might have caused some confusion.

So if any of you had brought back with you as homework your handout from last week, I'll be able to go through the homework. I just gave you today of what the status of summary funds are for the Division as of today, May 2nd. And you will see just from a mere two weeks ago those numbers under the Quarter Percent bonded have changed because this is a fluid program. Our Division is very busy. We are constantly making offers as directed by the Legislature in response to numerous planning steps. And we are fulfilling those with closings. So those numbers have, in fact, already changed from what Budget Review has just provided just two weeks ago.

So what you will see now is that we have six more million -- 6 million more dollars moved to in contract. (Indicating) I'm sorry. I'm all the way on the right-hand side, the bonded Quarter Percent. The number has gone up from \$30 million to \$36 million in contract. Those are fully executed. Those numbers represent acquisitions with fully executed contracts, meaning contracts signed by all parties including the County Executive. They already have authorizing resolutions and they are now ready to close. So the likelihood of their closing is really quite high.

Next you have the number for in negotiation. That number will have actually gone down, less for about available, because we have had some that have gone up, exactly, into -- into contract. Some -- I'm sorry, the accepted offers have now increased from last month for just the past two weeks for more accepted offers. Those, again, are accepted offers. Absent not having an authorizing resolution or some problem with their title or getting to the ESA stage, those are quite likely to close as well. And we would project conservatively that we would like to have the money available should they be able to.

Finally, the last number you see is in negotiation. That number has changed from just two weeks ago because, one, extended offer does not respond positively so that those funds have now dropped off. And there are three outstanding offers that will expire on May 25th.

So my purpose to share that with you is that the numbers are fluid; they are constantly being monitored. We have at the helm, Karen Slater, a certified public accountant, who will not allow an offer letter to be sent out from the Division without making sure there are sufficient funds in order to culminate that purchase.

And I think it's important to note, as this Committee looks at no less than eight planning steps resolutions on your agenda today, that at the time the referendum was passed 2007, the wording of the referendum was going to authorize the bonding of up to \$322 million. And we've seen in just four short years that number now changed to 2009. So were the Division not as cautious as it is in making sure that funding is available for all the offers we are extending, we may be in a much more difficult and precarious situation.

So I would like to commend the unit staff of Acquisition and certainly the accounting staff for being as careful as they are in making sure that funds are available for the purchases that are being -- for the offers that are being extended. This is the County's name, good name and credit that's being extended and we are negotiating in good faith.

So I would just submit in somewhat of a rebuttal that it is merely just the items in negotiation that have a fluctuation standpoint or wiggle room, if you will, as far as those falling off. But once we move those numbers up to accepted offers and in contract, we're fairly firm we're going to keep

them there, and we're not going to be anticipating using portions of those funds or using -- counting those twice.

What I think is important to note is two weeks ago at my presentation I provided this overview to you. And when you looked two weeks ago at the amount of 3.8 million that was now at the bottom in the red, (indicating), I was saying that that's money that the Division already anticipates now projecting forward and for the Pay-Go amounts of 2012 to be utilized for those purchases. And really the only item at issue was what the amount of Pay-Go funding would be. So there was certainly no attempt to being disingenuous, that the Division understands there will be an amount available in Pay-Go funds. It was the amount of what we are going to be projecting that is not reflected on a status of summary accounts because that funding is not yet before us to be utilized.

So we are certainly saying that there is money already committed now to come out of the Pay-Go account. And that amount from just two weeks ago, as you'll see, has increased to \$9.6 million. So if the Division concurs with BRO's report that we are looking at \$45.6 million available at the end of 2011 for Pay-Go funding and we deduct 9.6 that is already now committed, including some in negotiation, granted, but the majority not, we're already down to 35.4 million, which I think would be a very -- would make the statement of *there's plenty of money* a very subjective one at best.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I usually don't have to ask about individual parcels, but I'm going to do so.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Normally I answer if it's still in negotiation, Mr. Romaine, be assured.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I know it's not. First of all, I know that there was an offer made, the offer was accepted, I know you drafted a contract, the contract was signed last fall. The reason I'm asking about this one parcel, I think you'll understand, this is North Fork Preserve, it's 311 acres, which obviously is going -- and I also know what -- at least tangentially what the offer -- the range in which the offer was accepted. Is that a resolution that's going to be coming forward shortly?

DIRECTOR GREENE:

We certainly hope so.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. Is there a problem with that since there was an offer, it was accepted, a contract was drafted, the sellers signed the contract? And that was a couple of months ago.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

I believe as you're aware --

LEG. ROMAINE:

The reason I'm mentioning that for my colleagues, that's 311 acres.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Yes, I believe as you are very aware that's a rather complex and very large negotiated purchase containing two different contracts with numerous members of boards of directors.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, there's a minority and a majority shareholders and they're all agreeing. But that obviously is going to have some impact on our expenditures.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

And, Mr. Amoroso from the County Attorney's Office is to be commended for shepherding through what is a very complex contract negotiation to the point where it is.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, I'm not being critical. I'm just making my colleagues aware that just one acquisition, because it's 311 acres, will have an impact on obviously our budget.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Well, you would be correct in saying that. And also in noting that that would be a number that's already in accepted offers in the 52 million.

LEG. ROMAINE:

So that's already included in there.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes, okay. Thank you.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

So what I wanted to just clarify from two weeks ago is the Division has complied with the mandate of the referendum. All \$209 million has already been targeted for acquisition. So we are, as you can see, looking into spending next year's Pay-Go already; conservatively at best.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, not to go back at this, and either between yourself and Robert, the \$209 million is a number that we come to by indicating that we will borrow up to 80% of what we project the revenues will be from the Quarter Percent out to 2030 if I'm not mistaken.

MR. LIPP:

That's close. Actually it's a little more conservative than that.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. LIPP:

It can't be more than 80% of the revenues for any one given year so accumulatively we have way more than 20% whole but --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right, okay. But how is this 261 number, which we're basing the 80% on, determined? Two hundred and sixty-one million?

MR. LIPP:

It's a forecast of the revenues for each year.

LEG. ROMAINE:

All right.

MR. LIPP:

And a projection of what the debt service will be, which by the way is going to be probably around, once we borrow it all, about 16 million a year. So if you do that, you're going -- and then you have a 20% holdback, which is typical for financial markets to be conservative. And that's how you come up with the number. How is that verified? It's a number that's agreed to by our office, Budget

Review, you call it your office, and the Executive's Budget Office.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. Thank you very much.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

May I add one more point, if it's helpful to the Committee, again, as you're considering the resolutions before you, we would also just point out that while Mr. Lipp would correctly state that the Legacy Fund may not have to be accessed, there is now a growing amount in the CPF funds for the eastern towns. And if acquisitions do rise to 50/50 partnership, it should be noted that those would meet the qualifications for the Legacy and show a commitment of funding on behalf of the towns. And if it is appropriate, to consider that in the big picture as opposed to waiting till the end of the day to access that funding.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

That's good news because I thought that the CPF funds had been depleted in most towns that have them. So they're building up again?

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Good. And I guess we'll get that information, find out how much each Town has. Okay? That would -- do you have that information that you could share with us?

DIRECTOR GREENE:

I believe we can obtain it for you.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you very much.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

It would be good to know that so that we can say, *hey, you got to ante up here*. All right. Thank you very much. Thank you for clarifying that for us.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Robert, for clarify that for us. It was very helpful. Okay. With that we'll move to the agenda.

We'll start with CEQ. Mr. Mule.

CEQ RESOLUTIONS

MR. MULE:

Good afternoon. All right. First we have CEQ resolution number **22-2011 - Ratification of Recommendations for Legislative Resolutions Laid on the Table March 22, 2011**. The CEQ's recommended classifications are in the margin of the memo and resolution transmitted to your office.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

I'll make a motion to approve, second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Okay.
Approved. (VOTE: 5-0)

MR. MULE:

CEQ 23-2011 - Proposed Acquisition for Open Space Preservation Purposes Known as the Beaverdam Creek Brookhaven Vacant Land, LLC Property, Town of Brookhaven (Unlisted Action, Negative Declaration) CEQ recommended classification as an unlisted action with the issuance of a negative declaration.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **Approved. (VOTE: 5-0)** Thank you.

MR. MULE:

Thank you.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Tabled resolutions. **IR 1207 - Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 (Peconic Land Trust, Inc. Property Town of Southampton) (Schneiderman)**
And this is, as everyone might recall, that very, very large parcel that had -- that was pretty complicated because some if it was in the Pine Barrens and some not. Right? Am I talking about a different piece? I'm on the wrong one.

MS. FISCHER:

This is Cat Cove. This is up on Flanders Bay.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, I'm looking at -- I'm thinking at 1308, I'm sorry.

MS. FISCHER:

No problem.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I'm going to make a motion to table that one.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

1207 is tabled. (VOTE: 4-1-0-0 Opposed: Leg. Romaine) Did you have a change in the rating of that one? That was still -- oh, low rated.

MS. FISCHER:

No, we haven't rated it yet.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

This was being reconsidered as a hamlet park.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

And the Town of Southampton was not interested in partnering.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

So a questionnaire was not done and we have not completed.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

You haven't made a rating.

MS. FISCHER:

No.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

IR 1229 - Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 (Zoumas property) Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-075.00-03.00-004.000). (Romaine) This is the Zoumas property in the Town of Riverhead.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'm going to make motion to table. I'm still waiting for the Town of Riverhead, which has made a commitment, but they haven't -- they're not timely in getting a letter indicating their willingness to manage this property as a hamlet park.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Tabling motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1229 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1295 - Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Saw Mill Creek addition - Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-131.00-01.00-002.001). (Romaine)

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'm going to make a motion to table this. While we're interested in promoting preservation along Saw Mill Creek this property is currently heavily used in a way that has me concerned in terms of acquisition and, in fact, I may even consider withdrawing this resolution. But for the time being, I'd like to table it.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

How do you mean heavily used, Ed? What do you mean?

LEG. ROMAINE:

It's used by an auto guy. He had a lot of cars stored on the property. They've done auto work. And because he saw that this was part of our efforts to preserve the Saw Mill Creek area, he's thinking he'd offer it for sale. But I explained to him, *look, you're going to have to clean this up, you've got structures that you've got to take down.* And in the end of the day, this may not be

something that we may take a look at acquiring.

So I'm going to table it for the time being, but within the next two weeks -- right now I'm a little handicapped because of the lady that handles all of this for me, Lisa Keys had surgery so she's been out. So when she comes back we're going to make a decision on this piece of property. But it's one of the things that I don't want to go forward with something that I don't think will add to what we should be adding.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Too bad it isn't 300 acres.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, I'm looking for more of those every day.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

There was a motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1295 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)** Okay. And now we get to the one that -- Jay called me as I was driving here so that one was on my mind.

Okay. **1308 - Approving planning steps for the acquisition of environmentally sensitive properties known as East Quogue Partners, LLC. (Schneiderman)** Okay. And this is the one that was rather complex and you were looking at a way to get a handle on it.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes. This was the 415 acre parcel. The East Quogue Partner's property.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

There goes next year budget.

LAUGHTER

MS. FISCHER:

This is a substantial acquisition as it is. Of the 415 acres or so there's about a 100 acres in the Pine Barrens Core area. The other remaining portion of the property, approximately 300 acres is within the compatible growth area. There are preliminary subdivisions that have been presented to the Town and the Town has been working with the owner to do a cluster development with 86 lots at this point, or 82 lots, I'm sorry. It's a five acre zoning category. And they're requesting that the -- the development be clustered on the southern half of the properties south of Sunrise Highway.

The most environmentally sensitive parts of the property are the northern half of the area south of Sunrise and, of course, the Pine Barrens Core area north of Sunrise, which the County owns the surrounding lands of Maple Swamp and Sears Bellows. So we -- you know, we are very interested in the core properties obviously to protect them and the upper half of the southern parcels.

We did have a meeting with regard to this property with the -- our Parks Department, Real Estate, with the Town of Southampton and the representative for Legislator Schneiderman. We had indicated that there were concerns both on the Town of Southampton's part and as well the County Parks Department with regard to management of this property if, in fact, we do acquire it. The County Parks Department stated that they do not have adequate staffing to look into management of an area this large alone. The Town of Southampton was -- had indicated that they would not be interested in managing this as part of their partnering. They have actually indicated on adjacent parcels to the east, that we are in contract to move forward on, the Links at East Quogue. That's about 150-acre acquisition we're looking at right now. And they, in fact, put in their resolution, the Town resolution that they would not manage it, that it would fall on the backs of the County. So we do have concerns in that regard.

As well as they are, you know, considering this -- they -- actually the Town, I'm sorry, has also started an appraisal process. And we felt it was important to possibly look at that information before we move this forward. And we've requested that this be tabled until we get some further information in that regard as well.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

So there is a written commitment that the Town will be partnering with us on this acquisition?

MS. FISCHER:

We do not have a written commitment at this time. They're -- Legislator Schneiderman had indicated at our last meeting that they would do a 50/50 partnership, but we do not have anything written in -- written from the Town on that.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. And another issue that we discussed at the last meeting was that because of the size of the parcel and the different characteristics -- different parts of this acquisition, that the Department might be interested in looking at it in segments?

MS. FISCHER:

True. We would, but we are not sure if the owner of the property would be because they're using the northern portion of the property as part of their yield to cluster down below. So that would have to be something negotiated. And we're not sure if they would be willing to separate out those portions. What we would like to acquire first, and we can certainly move forward on them as we speak, are the core properties right now. So, if in fact, they would be willing, we also would support acquiring those parts of the property.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Legislator D'Amaro has a question.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Where are the core properties?

MS. FISCHER:

The core properties --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Are they north of Sunrise?

MS. FISCHER:

They're north. And then there's a segment south of Sunrise about a thousand feet down --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, okay.

MS. FISCHER:

-- that are also within the core. And then the remaining from that line south is within the compatible growth area.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. Is it -- just educate me about the compatible growth area. Is that an area that we normally target through a Master List type of acquisition?

MS. FISCHER:

No, not necessarily unless there's some specific environmental significance of the parcel.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I had raised, as the Chair had spoken to, about the piecemeal approach here, only because it's a very large acquisition. If we do one set of planning steps somehow, you know, that -- then we'll have one authorizing resolution to purchase, I would assume. Or could we still break it up on the purchase resolution so to speak? Or would the Planning Department even approach it as a separate negotiation? I mean, in my mind, I felt like we should have prioritized or broken up this property into the different segments that we might look to acquire so that we could prioritize them. And, you know, perhaps then when you're negotiating, you would have some guidance from us with respect to what property we felt was more important to pursue than another given the limited funding that we have.

But what I'm hearing today is that there hasn't been any change to the resolution. This would be one planning steps resolution, one appraisal and then it would come back to us to with one authorizing resolution to purchase.

MS. FISCHER:

That's my understanding.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So it would be all or nothing at that point.

MS. FISCHER:

Possibly.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Well, is it possible that it would be less than all or nothing?

MS. FISCHER:

I think that would be up to the sponsor if he would --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. All right. Because I know we talked about that last time.

The other question or issue I have in my mind is, you had mentioned that the Town is looking -- or probably reviewing plans from the owner of a proposed development, a cluster 82 residential development on the southern portion of the property or south of Sunrise Highway. Do you know if that plan would preserve the entire balance of this property south of Sunrise?

MS. FISCHER:

No. It would preserve the northern portion of the property north of Sunrise as well as approximately half of -- the northern half of the property south of Sunrise Highway so --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. All right. You can almost see a line on the southern part where it splits it in half, looking at the aerial view.

MS. FISCHER:

Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But -- so in effect if 82 lots were developed --

MS. FISCHER:

It would be on the southern half of the property south of Sunrise.

LEG. D'AMARO:

On the southern half of the property.

MS. FISCHER:
South of Sunrise.

LEG. D'AMARO:
South of Sunrise. So would it be beyond that open -- or looks like a sandy area?

MS. FISCHER:
It's just about in that area.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Just about where you have some development now.

MS. FISCHER:
Yes. It would kind of -- there's a residential subdivision kind of in the middle of it in the white.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right.

MS. FISCHER:
It would be to the east of there from that line, a little north of there in that open area.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Okay.

MS. FISCHER:
That then -- from that point south would be the area that would be developed.

LEG. D'AMARO:
All right. And that would be within the compatible growth area.

MS. FISCHER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:
All right. But not within the core Pine Barrens area.

MS. FISCHER:
No. The core -- yeah, the core is only north of that line. And north of Sunrise.

LEG. D'AMARO:
So in exchange for building permits to develop 82 lots, we would be preserving half of the -- or the balance of the compatible growth area as well as the core area without having to do any acquisition.

MS. FISCHER:
Correct. That's my understanding.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Right. So now let's -- looking beyond that, let's say that subdivision went in, the rest of the property to the north is preserved both south and north of Sunrise. The only thing left really is the easterly portion of the lot, the southern part of the -- south of Sunrise lot. Right?

MS. FISCHER:
Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So that's exactly my point with respect to at least breaking this up. Again, if we can preserve, I don't know how many hundreds of acres that might be in exchange for development in a residential area that's already -- seems to be zoned residential and is already supporting some residential subdivisions, that might be a more cost effective way to preserve this property.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. Okay, okay. That's, you know, that's something I think we need to consider.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Actually going to back to your original question regarding whether or not it could be treated, I use the term piecemeal, but segmenting it or separating it, the wording in the title of this resolution is different from the titles that we're accustomed to because he called it a Master List. So he treated it as separate pieces. So, in fact, although we were to -- if we were to approve the planning steps, it wouldn't preclude you from going forward and working separately on these because he mentions them as separate and distinct parcels and even refers to different programs. That was my memory. But I just asked Counsel and he said you could do it differently because of the -- because of the way this resolution's worded. You don't have to have just one acquisition coming out of this, one acquisition resolution, because it's called the Master List; not one piece.

MS. FISCHER:

Right. But they're all owned by the same owner. And I think whatever, you know, you're going to present, generally we acquire by owner. I'm not sure how this could move forward at this point. We could certainly explore that. But, again, I think I'm hesitant to say that we could readily cut this up and make an offer because I -- at this point I don't think the owners are willing to do that. I think they're willing to sell it all together because of the fact that if they cut out the northern portion, they're going to lose yield on the southern portion and may not be able to build it as they wish.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

But we have seen cases where, for example, AVR has had properties all over the place on our Master List. And they are treated -- we do them separately.

MS. FISCHER:

Right. But they're all over the place. In other words, they're not contiguous parcels and they're not using those parcels for yield on another portion of it. So that's why I think that the owner wanted to move forward as a whole. But that's my understanding.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

You know, I'm willing to table this again because I also want to -- although Jay had called and asked if we could move it forward, but I'm reluctant to make a motion to approve without having some kind of firm -- at least a firm commitment from the Town that they're going to partner with us. This is a tremendous amount of money.

MS. FISCHER:

I would agree.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Is there a second to my table?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes, I'll second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And I agree with the Chair also that we need a -- I think we usually require a resolution from the Town.

MR. NOLAN:

Not for planning steps.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Not for planning steps. Okay. But at least a letter or something.

MS. FISCHER:

Not for -- well, not for open space acquisitions.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, okay.

MS. FISCHER:

But if they're -- with regard to active recreation and hamlet parks, we would require, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Do you know how many acres would be taken up by the development proposal, the actual construction area, the residential area?

MS. FISCHER:

I'm not sure, but I can figure that -- I can find that out.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, I'd just like to know the breakdown of that plan.

MS. FISCHER:

Yeah. Yes, I can do that. I can get that for you next meeting.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. And just from a planning perspective or environmental perspective, would you consider the development plan an acceptable means to preserve the balance of the property or not?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, I would.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You would; okay.

MS. FISCHER:

Because it is protecting the most environmentally sensitive portion of the properties.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MS. FISCHER:

The area -- the area obviously in the core and then that portion in the compatible growth that is within the steep slope area and the hills and dales of a Pine Barrens habitat.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. We have a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. **1308 stands tabled. (VOTE: 4-1-0-0 Opposed: Leg. Romaine)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

Introductory resolutions, IR 1320 - Amending the 2011 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with shoreline protection at Hashamomuck Cove (CP 5330) (Romaine) Good name. All right. You have information on this for us?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion to approve. And I can give you some information on this.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

First of all, this should not be in this Committee. This should be in Public Works. We called -- I think my office called Counsel's Office or Clerk's Office.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

This is for the County Road, right.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yeah, this is for the County.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

This is -- Hashamomuck Cove has been a Public Works Committee type of thing. What we did just by way of explanation --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Counsel is explaining something about moving it to the other Committee.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yeah, yeah. I guess it was too late in the --

MR. NOLAN:

Or you could just take no action, we'll reassign it to that committee. Because, you're right, it's in the wrong committee.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well -- however, it's before us. And I'm going to move it. And I made a motion to move it and I'll tell you why. Last year this County committed -- this \$100,000 has already been committed as part of an overall larger erosion study for the North Fork to be undertaken by the Army Corps of Engineers. The County has already voted this \$100,000 to commit it. However, in the interim, what has happened is massive erosion has happened not only at Hashamomuck Cove but at

Southold Town Beach. In fact, we spent a lot of money doing drainage and half the beach parking lot went into the Sound this past winter.

What was decided was that instead of taking our 100,000 match we would -- the Department of Public Works, in fact, I believe they even have a vendor on board, contractor on board, would take that \$100,000 and do a study of just the Cove because this is where we fully expect within a matter of months, hopefully longer, that there will be a breach of County Road 48.

County Road 48 is one of only two east/west highways for the entire North Fork; the other is New York State Road 25. This \$100,000 would give us an opportunity to take a look at specifically what we could do at where we expect the breach to take place to prevent that breach from occurring. That's why there's some sense of urgency. That's why instead of using our 100,000 as the match for the, which the town has already committed and the state has committed and the federal government to do this erosion study for the North Fork, that we would just spend the \$100,000 just on designing protection at the breach point for 48. So that's what that's all about. This \$100,000 has already been committed. I want to emphasize this. This is simply redirecting it towards the study because of the emergency nature of this situation.

I'll answer any questions you have on this matter.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, but I'm going to follow the advice of Counsel and not act on this because the appropriate assignment should have been to the Public Works Committee and --

LEG. ROMAINE:

But unfortunately it hasn't been reassigned to Public Works.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

But Public Works hasn't met yet so they'll have before them this week.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'm not aware of that.

MR. NOLAN:

Legislator Romaine, as soon as this Committee's over, I will make sure that it's assigned to Public Works. I'll contact Legislator Schneiderman's Office, make sure it gets on their agenda so it's considered during this cycle.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay, because that's, as I had indicated to you last week, my staff had, this is the appropriate committee because they've been dealing with this issue.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. And so it makes more sense for it to be before them and so we will just not act on this. But thank you for the explanation. **(No Action Taken. Will be Moved to Public Works Committee)**

IR 1324 - Appoint member to the Equestrian Task Force (Elaine M. Wagoner). (Eddington)

We need to table this because this is a position that is being created by the following resolution. And so until the following resolution is voted on and signed, we can't have anybody appointed to that post. So I will make a motion to table.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1324 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1325 - Extend Deadline for the Equestrian Task Force (Eddington) But it also creates another position for the task force and that's the position to which I referred a minute ago. So I will make a motion to approve.

LEG. D'AMARO:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:
Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1325 stands approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1338 - Amending Resolution No. 913-2010, amending the 2010 capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Goldsmith Inlet, Town of Southold (CP 8207) (Romaine)

LEG. ROMAINE:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:
Now is this another --

LEG. ROMAINE:
No.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:
-- this should belong --

LEG. ROMAINE:
No.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:
Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:
No. What happened is we approved \$85,000 to begin a study of Goldsmith's Inlet. What this is, it directs the County to enter into a intermunicipal agreement with the Town of Southold to allow Southold to administer this 85,000 and undertake the study of Goldsmith's Inlet. Yeah, we voted for this. We've already approved the money. What we've decided to do -- originally we were debating whether it was going to be Cornell. We've decided it's actually better for us not to administer this, let the Town of Southold administer this, get it off our plate and move a little quicker.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:
Okay. You made a motion.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Right. I made a motion to approve.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:
I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1338 stands approved. (VOTE: 5-0)** I thought I remembered voting on Goldsmith's Inlet, yeah.

IR 1340 - Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County

Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - School Board of Education property - Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No. 0200-392.00-04.00-016.000) (Muratore)

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to table by the sponsor. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1340 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)** But, you know, if you have the information, we'll still look at it just so that I can put it with the resolution.

1368, we did that.

1375 - Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 (De Lea Sod Farms Property) Town of Huntington (SCTM No. 0400-168.00-03.00-041.003). (Stern)
And I will make a motion to table at the request of the sponsor.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1375 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

Did I skip?

LEG. ROMAINE:

1342.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, do you know what, that's mine. I was looking at Tom's and I thought we had done it already. Actually, I'm going to be making a motion to table that one, too.

IR 1342 - Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 (Global Home Properties) Town of Brookhaven (SCTM Nos. 0200-159.00-02.00-008.002 and 0200-159.00-02.00-008.003) (Viloria-Fisher) I'm making a motion to table.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1342 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)** We're also waiting for information from the Town. Okay.

IR 1403 - Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 (Aero World Corp. Property) Town of Islip (SCTM No. 0500-355.00-01.00-005.001) (Lindsay) And I believe that the sponsor has a request to table. Is there a rating on that?

MS. FISCHER:

No, we haven't. We're waiting for information from the sponsor.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

And that's why we're --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. All right. So I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1403 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1405 was withdrawn.

That concludes the agenda. Is there anyone else who wishes to address the Committee? If not, we stand adjourned.

THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 2:15 PM

{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY