

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING and AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on October 3, 2011.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Vivian Vilorio-Fisher, Chairwoman

Leg. Lou D'Amaro, Vice Chair

Leg. Thomas Muratore

Leg. Edward P. Romaine

Leg. Sarah S. Anker

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Leg. John M. Kennedy, Jr., Twelfth District

George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature

Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel

Eric A. 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/Department of Planning

Pamela Greene, Director/Real Property Acquisition & Management

Michael Mule, Department of Planning/CEQ

Lauretta Fischer, Principal Environmental Analyst/Department of Planning

John H. Corral, Planning Department

Katie Magee, Planning Department

Jessica Kalmbacher, Planning Department

Janet Longo, Real Property Acquisition & Management

Tracey Bellone, Deputy Commissioner/Parks Department

Nick Gibbons, Parks Department

(ALSO IN ATTENDANCE continued on next page)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: (Continued)

Brian Culhane, Commissioner/Department of Environment & Energy
KelliAnne Sacchitello, Aide to Leg. Muratore
Tom Ryan, Aide to Leg. Vilorio-Fisher
Justin Littell, Aide to Leg. D'Amaro
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Leader
Marge Acevedo, Aide to Presiding Officer
Vito Minei, Executive Director/Cornell Cooperative Extension
Chris Colahan, Director/Peconic Dunes/4H Camp
Deb Shinkewicz
Daniel Ercolu, Island Hopper Camping
Richard Hardy, Island Hopper Camping
Carmella Masem, Suffolk Commission for Camping
John Nastasi, Stevens Institute of Technology
Ben Silvernman, Stevens Institute of Technology
Michael Marvin, Stevens Institute of Technology
Richard Murdollo, Long Island Fire Burns Society
Richard Meyer, AME/Leg. Director
Annemarie Prudenti, Deputy Town Attorney/Town of Riverhead
Thomas Jones
Carol Paulsen
Lorraine Trentini
Richard Murdocco
Stephen Searl, Peconic Land Trust
John Cullen
Herb Strobel
Jennifer Hartnagel
Randall Parsons
Glynis Margaret Berry, appointee SC Planning Commission
Rick Brand, Newsday
And all other interested parties.

VERBATIM MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:21 PM

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you everybody. And please join us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

SALUTATION

Thank you. We have a number of speakers today so I'm going to ask all of our speakers to please be cognizant of the time. Our first speaker is Thomas Jones.

MR. JONES:

Good afternoon. My name is Thomas Jones. And I'd like to speak for a moment regarding the possible purchase of North Fork Preserve in Riverhead. For the past few years I had been a representative for Suffolk Committee for Campers. While in this position I would meet periodically with past president -- I'm sorry, past Suffolk County Parks Commissioner Pavacic, present Commissioner Montuori and Deputy Commissioner Bellone to discuss various issues related to camping at our campgrounds. The idea was to have the camping community and the County Parks Department working together with a common goal of making our County campgrounds the best they can be by bringing to the County camping related issues as seen through the eyes of the campers. We discussed everything from amenities to changes in policies. And I believe we've been successful in making camping at our County Parks easier and more enjoyable. And I thank the Parks Department for all their efforts.

But of all the issues that were discussed, there is one problem that has had little hope of being solved. That being the fact that there are far more campers on Long Island than there are places to camp. It is a constant problem for campers to try to reserve a site but find none available. Legislator Romaine's proposal for the acquisition of North Fork Preserve in Riverhead with the conceptual plan that includes the creation of a new campground is a great leap towards solving that problem. It would be a boon for the campers by giving them another venue in which to find a site as well as being an added revenue source for the County. There are not many win/win situations around, but this seems like one to me.

For the many campers without a place to camp each week, I ask to please vote in favor of Legislator Romaine's proposal for the acquisition of the 300 acre parcel known as North Fork Preserve. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you very much for your comments, Mr. Jones. Carol Paulsen.

MS. PAULSEN:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. I have been a camper in Suffolk County and other places, of course, but mostly in Suffolk County for over 30 years. I raised my children camping. They enjoy it. We really don't have enough campgrounds. And some of the campgrounds that we have have had problems. And this would be such a wonderful, wonderful thing for not just myself, of course, but for people who want to bring camping to their families so that they can enjoy Suffolk County and all that it has to offer.

So I urge you to vote in favor of this acquisition. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. Our next speaker is Lorraine Trentini.

MS. TRENTINI:

Is that good? Good afternoon. My name is Lorraine Trentini and I am born and raised in Suffolk County and I love Suffolk County. I love camping in Suffolk County. I think we've all done a fabulous job of creating beautiful parks and beautiful campgrounds. I've made friends. I was raised camping. My kids have made friends camping. It's a beautiful family tradition that we have. And I absolutely love it.

In a few weeks, I'm actually going to start making my reservations for next year and hope that I get my days off at work to coincide with them. And I'm going to pray on the phone 180 days prior at exactly seven PM that I get a campsite to spend a week with my family and friends. Because it is that hard and it is that challenging because there's that many people that love the beautiful parks we've created.

This is absolutely going to be fabulous. It's going to create a new place not only for campers, but for everybody who just loves Long Island and love the beauty and the nature on Long Island. We've got so much to offer out there. And to allow another development or something else to go in there, I think, we're not doing ourselves justice. We're protecting beautiful, beautiful land.

So I am from the bottom of my heart asking that we please, please, please consider this, move forward with this, create not only for campers which are dear to my heart, but everything that this park is going to have to offer. It's a fabulous use of a big piece of land. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Ms. Trentini. Our next speaker is -- I believe it's Richard Murdocco.

MR. MURDOCCO:

Hello. Good? Hi, my name is Richard Murdocco. And I'm speaking on behalf of Richard Amper, Executive Director of the Long Island Pine Barrens Society. The Pine Barrens Society has always and will continue to object to the operation of the Suffolk County Trap and Skeet Range in the core preservation area of the Central Pine Barrens. The fact that Trap and Skeet is inappropriate at this location is unrelated to the desirability of protecting the North Fork Preserve. That linkage appears to be being advanced by Legislator Browning as a campaign effort to make it appear as though she has solved the problem with Trap and Skeet's location in her district.

Legislator Browning was part of the committee, which many, many months ago explored relocation and produced no acceptable result. And it would be inappropriate for this Committee or this Legislature to equivocate about the acquisition of the North Fork Preserve to facilitate Legislator Browning's re-election campaign.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, I really do want to stop you because what you're doing is you're assuming an agenda on somebody -- to somebody else. If you could just please speak to the issues and keep your comments directed to the issues. Thank you.

(MR. MURDOCCO WALKED AWAY)

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Stephen Searl.

MR. SEARL:

Good afternoon. My name is Stephen Searl with Peconic Land Trust. I wanted to address actually three items and I'll do it quickly. The first is the North Fork Preserve. I would like to urge the

Committee today to vote it -- vote on the acquisition of the park. I know that this has been a long-term project. The landowner, we've been working on and off with the landowner for years. I know that now the Parks Department has been working on this for a longtime. I know Legislator Romaine has been working on it for a longtime. I know that the County -- the Planning Department and the Division of Real Estate, everybody has spent a long time working on this. It's finally come together. And I think it's something that you should all vote on today and pass. So I appreciate your consideration.

The other two, quickly, one is on the Starkie resolution, which got a -- which was tabled in the prior committee, was approved by the Farmland Committee. I would urge you to approve that today.

And I also just wanted to make a note on the Marion Carll resolution as well. It's been something that we've been working on, the Peconic Land Trust is involved in, along with a number of other non-profits. And while the resolution today -- we've also been working with Legislator Kennedy on this -- while the resolution today is for the development rights purchase, we don't think that that's appropriate, but we would like to see the County in the coming weeks, months look for other funding streams in order to acquire that property and preserve it for its educational, historic and cultural uses. So, thank you for your time.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Stephen, before you go away, it's my understanding that with the Marion Carll acquisition, that there is still some problems with the interpretation of the will and the use of it. And it has been fallow. It hasn't been farmed.

MR. SEARL:

That's correct. It's not a working farm at the moment.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Yeah.

MR. SEARL:

I mean clearly in my mind, at least in our minds, the Chapter Eight's purchase of development rights legislation is for commercial working farms. So it wouldn't fit under that.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Yeah.

MR. SEARL:

But to the extent that we can clear up some of the title issues, which we're working with Legislator Kennedy and others on, and to the extent that the County can look to other possible funding streams, not using the purchase of development rights --

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

So we would probably need to amend this or introduce another piece of legislation.

MR. SEARL:

Correct, correct. And I see that -- I just kind of wanted to give you a heads-up more than anything on this that we look forward to working with this Committee on that down the road.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to clarify that. I wasn't sure if you were supporting it as it stood. I know you said there were changes, but I think the way we're looking at it, it's very hard to support that.

MR. SEARL:

That's right. The way, I think, we're looking at it right now, but we would certainly support a modified or a new resolution.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

As always, thank you for your input.

MR. SEARL:

Thanks.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Our next speaker is John Cullen.

MR. CULLEN:

Good afternoon. John Cullen, Northville Beach Civic Association. I'm here just to represent the people at Northville saying that we hope and understand -- we wish for the County to purchase the Northville Beach -- excuse me -- North Fork Preserve. I'm a little nervous.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

It's okay. We knew what you meant.

MR. CULLEN:

I understand. And we've been told that in some ways that there is a skeet shooting -- thinking of bringing it over into the area. And we oppose that very much. We really, really do not want the skeet shooting brought over to the North Fork Preserve. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. Question. Mr. Cullen, Legislator Romaine has a question for you.

MR. CULLEN:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It's one of those do-you-know questions. Did you know that the Town of Riverhead is contributing to this acquisition and they're using CPF monies? And in their resolution they specifically outlaw the use of -- or prevent the use of any trap and skeet for this property. And that CPF funds cannot be used for that purpose. And, therefore, their contribution negates any possibility of a trap and skeet on this facility. Were you aware of that?

MR. CULLEN:

Yes, I was.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Good. Thank you.

MR. CULLEN:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I love the deep profound questions that come from the end of the horseshoe. Okay, AnneMarie Prudenti.

MS. PRUDENTI:

Good afternoon. AnneMarie Prudenti, Deputy Town Attorney for the Town of Riverhead. I want to,

on behalf of the Town, express support as the Legislature is likely aware, the Town Board unanimously adopted a resolution in support of the preservation of the North Fork Preserve. As announced by Legislator Romaine, it is true that the Town of Riverhead as and for a partnership and contribution limited that or actually stated a prohibition that there should be no ATV's or skeet shoot range and determined that that would be incompatible with the preservation goals of this property.

I have a copy of the certified resolution. And in addition I would like to submit on behalf of the Town of Riverhead all of the letters that were received by the Town Clerk with respect to the North Fork Preserve in the public hearing, if I may.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes. As a matter of fact, Madam Clerk, my aide is going to get a copy of the resolution from you to distribute to the members of the Committee. I appreciate your providing this for us. Thank you.

MS. PRUDENTI:

And if anyone has any questions, I'm available to answer them at this time. Or if Legislator Romaine feels I should remain to answer questions, I will do so also.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

We'd appreciate that. Thank you very much.

MS. PRUDENTI:

You're welcome.

LEG. ANKER:

I have a question. I'm sorry. AnneMarie, the attorney? Okay. So my question is -- over here --

MS. PRUDENTI:

Thank you.

LEG. ANKER:

There are three parts to this acquisition and there are different types of requirements involved with this. Two of them are -- part of the Town will be putting in 5%; and then on the other one 10% towards the purchase of the property. Why is there a difference?

MS. PRUDENTI:

Simply it's -- unfortunately the Town of Riverhead has very limited funds. And essentially our contribution was limited to a contribution of 500,000. It was simply truthfully a mathematical calculation. That's all it was.

LEG. ANKER:

Resolution 1817 with 173 acres you got a 95/5 percent split. And that's active recreation. Is that -- Legislator Romaine, is that what you were saying?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. The parcel's split in two. It's 311 acres. The northern half is going to be for passive recreation. And the southern half will be for active recreation. And that's where the campsites are going to go for the campers. There's also a clubhouse there or hunting lodge, whatever you want to call it, that's there and some tennis courts. And that will be for active recreation. The northern half will be for passive recreation.

MS. PRUDENTI:

Well, I actually think I can better respond to your question. If you look at the tax maps, you'll

notice that it is two different parcels. One, 3.2 acres is located essentially to the north. And the larger portion that the Town is participating in is completely along the south. The reason being is when you actually look at -- unfortunately I don't see one here, but if you look at an aerial view, that 3.2 acres, which is a different tax map -- 2.6, sorry -- the 2.6 is a different tax map --

MS. LONGO:

No. Can I --

MS. PRUDENTI:

Yeah, go ahead. I'm sorry.

MS. LONGO:

It's math. Under the active rec program on the open quarter percent open space, we, Suffolk County, are required to have a partner. Riverhead only had up to \$500,000. So the north part of the property we had a cleared area, 2.6 acres that the Parks Department wanted to keep in an active rec funding so that it could be used as camping. Open space you can't do that. So we had to cut that out and it all become a matter of math. A 95/5 partnership on the southern piece plus the 2.6 acres on the top together, we kept it just under the \$500,000 so that Riverhead could participate in with us.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. That's our crackerjack Real Estate Department. Okay, Herb Strobel, please.

MR. STROBEL:

Okay. Good afternoon. I'm here to speak on resolution 1790 that is before you this afternoon. For those of you who don't know, I'm a member of a farm family in Center Moriches. I'm a member of the Brookhaven Town Agricultural Advisory Committee as well as the Open Space Committee for the Town. However, I am here today speaking for myself and not on behalf of either one of those two bodies.

I just want to offer my support for 1790, which involves the purchase of farmland development rights on 140 acres of the Ringhoff Farm in Eastport. This is one of the largest remaining farms in Brookhaven Town and actually in the entire County. My own family has a history with -- dealing with Ringhoff family. They're good farmers. It's an excellent acquisition. It's along the County Route 51 corridor. And, again, I just want to encourage the Committee this afternoon to move that resolution forward to the full Legislature for its approval. Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Mr. Strobel, Legislator Romaine has a question.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Hi, Herb. Another one did-you-know. Did you know that the Ringhoff Farm is the only farm -- active farm that is currently in the Pine Barrens?

MR. STROBEL:

Yes, I did.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you.

MR. STROBEL:

You're welcome.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Jennifer Hartnagel.

MS. HARTNAGEL:

Good afternoon. My name is Jen Hartnagel. I'm speaking on behalf of the Group for the East End. For the record Group for the East End is Eastern Long Island's largest professionally staffed environmental organization. And we work within the five East End towns.

And I would like to address the North Fork Preserve purchase. I just wanted to reiterate what my colleagues have mentioned regarding the importance of moving forward with the purchase of this parcel. In our view, this would be one of the County and Town's most important and valuable purchases.

Tabling the resolution for the purpose of discussing a trap and skeet seems to make little sense at this point given the Town stance and legal constraints. And why would we jeopardize the County's hard work, all their time, their effort, the consideration and the planning that went into this? These large parcels that possess such ecological and recreational capacity are few and far between. And we do not believe there is time to waste. On behalf of the group, we fully support approving the resolution to allow this to move forward for consideration before the full Legislature. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Ms. Hartnagel.

MS. HARTNAGEL:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Randall Parsons.

MR. PARSONS:

Hello, Madam Chairman, members of the Committee. I'm here on behalf of the Nature Conservancy's Long Island Chapter. I'll just read -- I have a short letter and copies for you.

"The Nature Conservancy is committed to the preservation of the diversity of life on earth and the protection of the lands and waters that plants, animals and human communities need to survive.

The Nature Conservancy is now in 32 countries and all 50 states in the United States. And we have 18,000 members in Nassau and Suffolk County.

We have identified what we believe are the 14 highest priority properties for protection in Nassau/Suffolk. The 304" -- or 311, I've heard both -- "the 304 acre North Fork Preserve is one of the top 14" in Nassau/Suffolk.

"Suffolk County and the Town of Riverhead have reached agreement with the owners to acquire this site after years of litigation amongst the owners and negotiations with the Town and County.

While it is understandable that those County residents who either want to participate in outdoor trap and skeet activities and those County residents who would like to see existing trap and skeet

operations relocated away from them, see the North Fork Preserve as a possible location to satisfy their wishes, for a variety of reasons this location is not suitable for this activity. And further, the acquisition of the North Fork Preserve by the Town and County should not be delayed or derailed by attempting to resolve issues regarding a new trap and skeet facility at this location.

We urge the committee to move full speed ahead with the resolutions and committee business necessary to complete the North Fork Preserve acquisition and to continue to look for other suitable indoor and outdoor facilities in the County where trap & skeet can be accommodated."

I see you're also discussing the East Quogue Partners property in East Quogue, which is also one of the top 14 sites for the Nature Conservancy in Nassau/Suffolk. Thank you. I'll hand these in.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. We are going to move to the agenda. Is there anyone else who wishes to address us? I'm sorry, I can't read your lips from here.

PRESENTATION

MR. MINEI:

I was hoping we could have a presentation before you adjourned.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, thank you. Thank you very much. I just keep trying to move these along and I'm moving too quickly. Vito, just hold on a second.

Vito, come on up. Cornell Cooperative, you're doing -- yes, I see, a presentation on the *Planning the Future of an Environmentally Sensitive and Energy Efficient Camp*. Actually it's very interesting, Mr. Minei, that the last -- when we were talking about the North Fork Preserve, many of us asked questions about, you now, having energy efficiency and, you know, we talked about a number of cottages being built. As we move along with this big plan, we want to look at everything we do being sustainable. So, go ahead, and give your presentation.

MR. MINEI:

Thank you, Legislator Vitoria-Fisher and members of the Committee. I am Vito Minei. I'm Executive Director of Cornell Cooperative Extension in Suffolk County. And together with Cornell University as our administrator and technical lead, we try to attain our three part mission of strengthening families and communities, enhancing and protecting the environment, and promoting economic development.

Many of you are aware of our core programs. Our agriculture Program supports Suffolk County farmers and growers. We're still the number one agricultural county. In Suffolk County our research and education helps them in their livelihoods. Our Marine Program likewise with our research, education and camps helps support the marine industry here in Suffolk County. Family Health and Wellness provides education to confront some of the pressing social and health issues facing Suffolk County residents and Americans today. And under our 4H Programs, we're very proud of a lot of our youth development programs, in particular a number of our camps throughout Suffolk County reaching all the residents of Suffolk County.

And today I think I have a very exciting proposal for you on this Committee to understand and entertain. I'm joined today by one of my colleagues, Chris Colahan. Chris is the Director of the Peconic Dunes Camp at Peconic Dunes County Park. And also with us today is our prime speaker Professor John Nastasi from Stevens Institute, Hoboken, New Jersey. And Professor Nastasi is also a

visiting professor at Harvard University.

At this point I'd like to turn it over to Chris to give you a little background on Peconic Dunes Camp. And then I'd like Professor Nastasi to give you an overview of what we think the future of the camp entails. Thank you very much. Chris?

MR. COLAHAN:

Thank you very much for this opportunity to speak with you today. This is a brief overview. The Peconic Dunes is located in Southold. We are a County Park and a 4H Camp, 60 acres; has a 30-acre pond. In the last five years we have strategically added all the programs you see in green there to address pressing needs in our community: Childhood obesity, science education and leadership development, supportive relationships.

Our audience comes from across Suffolk County. We are represented in every Legislative District. Thanks so much in part to funding from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. So you can see we have many partnerships and we would like to add another.

Our campus has 24 buildings, many of which date back to World War I. And it is in -- these are some of our residential buildings. Our grounds, we have 60 acres with five distinct ecological zones. And you can see how beautiful this campus is. However, we have a big problem. And that is our dining hall. This facility is 79-years-old and is in a state of disrepair. We have hired an engineer to do a report on it. We have addressed many of the concerns that the report suggests. But ten years ago the County Parks Department suggested that it was time for a new dining hall. And we definitely believe that it's time. Ten years ago? It's definitely time today. So, thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Anker has a question for you.

LEG. ANKER:

Hi. Thank you again for coming here today and showing us your beautiful camp. I have a question regarding the funding. And the first thing that comes to my mind and what we're trying to move forward in this direction is a public/private partnership. Have you contacted or reached out to private catering facilities or restaurants to see if they would be interested in participating in this camp?

MR. COLAHAN:

For our dining hall, we do run a food service. And this past year we did approach one deli that worked with another camp. And the prices that they were offering were substantially greater than what we were able to provide in-house. We need to hire our own cooks and purchase our own food.

LEG. ANKER:

I'm thinking more in the line of actually someone who can come in there and build the building, you know, refurbish the building and actually have a business or service. Is that a possibility? Is that something you might want to look into?

MR. COLAHAN:

I haven't heard of any partnership like that happening. I'm a standard visitor for the American Camp Association. And I haven't heard of any partnerships like that.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. COLAHAN:

We have a very exciting partnership proposal for you today.

MR. MINEI:

Before John gets started, we have another celebrity guest here. Deputy Parks Commissioner Tracey Bellone would like to say a few words.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Hi, Tracey. Welcome.

MS. BELLONE:

Hi, Legislator. We had the opportunity a few weeks ago to meet with Cornell and Mr. Nastasi -- I'm going to say it wrong -- Nastasi from Stevens Institute. And we actually heard this presentation. This is actually a nice partnership between Stevens Institute and Parks if it's able to go forward. So we actually encourage them to come here before you today and hear the presentation. So we're excited. And Parks is very supportive of this.

MR. NASTASI:

Okay, I'll jump right in and hopefully not take up too much of your time. My name is John Nastasi, Professor at Stevens Institute. I run a graduate sustainable engineering design program called a product architectural lab at Stevens. And the program is comprised of multidisciplinary graduate students that come from various backgrounds. And the common goal of this program is to look at -- look at architecture and engineering with 21st century views towards sustainability. And the tools that we use are very advanced; probably the most advanced design tools in the world. And when the students are learning how to use these tools, we go about things like redesigning surfboards, sailboats, hydrofoils. We look at composites, fluid dynamics. We look at biomimetics such as whales, fins and whales geometry. And we look at fabrication at the most advanced levels.

So what the students are doing is they're using 21st century tools to solve longstanding engineering design problems. You can see on this image here, this is a good cross section of some of the analysis, simulation and design tools that Stevens students study deeply. And it's these tools that allow us to get breakthrough results in sustainable engineering.

People come to Stevens in the graduate program from various backgrounds such as mechanical engineering, computer science, mathematics, biomimetics. They also come from different schools such as a cross section of all the Ivy League schools as well as other schools from all over the country. So we have a nice cross section of students coming to study these advanced methods.

And part of the program, which is why we're here talking with the Parks Department and Cornell Extension is that the student undertakes research at the highest level. And over the past years, we have designed and built churches, buildings in Beijing for the Olympics, installations at the Museum of Modern Art, New York City, environmental facilities in Kuwait for the military academy and seven-star hotels in India, which are dealing with heat gain and insulation issues. And in each of these projects, Stevens' students played a key role in developing all of the methods for engineering and fabrication.

The curriculum, which is what you're looking at, is a cross section of many different fields in engineering, computer science, mathematics and sustainability. And the thinking is that by putting multidisciplinary students together, you can get breakthrough results. We're currently working on sponsor research for both the Department of Energy and Department of Defense. And in the past year we completed the design of 100 person camp for the military. And the reason why we were brought into the picture at Stevens is that the Department of Defense tell us that 10 to 15 percent of the casualties of Marines are simply delivering water and fuel to the base camps.

So we were set with the task of redesigning their camp from scratch and eliminating as much waste environmentally as possible in the usage of the camp. So the students developed microgrids, trigeneration systems, state-of-the-art tent enclosures. And then simulators so that we can determine how much energy will be used at any point in time. And the thinking is that if you can do this for a hundred-person camp in the middle of the desert off the grid, you can do this for a hundred-person community anywhere in the world.

So at the end of the annual research event, I presented this to the Associate Secretary of Defense and showed them that over a six-month period, they delivered 127,000 gallons of water and 51,000 gallons of fuel to a camp at what they call the tip of the sword. And then if they implement the system designed by Stevens, they would reduce their usage considerably and then save tremendous amount of lives. And these systems in year two are now being implemented both with the Department of Defense as well as with the Second Division in the DOD, which is the Disaster Relief Housing Division. And we're now currently working on a hundred person camp for Haiti using the same principles.

We also just finished entering the Department of Energy Solar Decathlon, where we had to build a highly affordable but zero energy house and put it on the Mall for exhibit for the past two weeks. We partnered with Habitat for Humanity and we designed a house that's exhibited on the Mall and is now on a truck in route to the Seventh Ward in Deanwood where we gave the house to a young single woman with three kids who lives in the Deanwood section. This house has been published in every major magazine, every major newspaper, on NBC, on CBS and in Jim Lear's segment, which aired just yesterday.

And the kind of methods that we pioneered for the solar decathlon come from Germany where we develop systems that save 85% of a house's energy while being highly affordable so that Habitat can afford to build it. And these things are unheard of today in house building construction. We use all of our advanced tools, which were used doing the surfboard and all of that other crazy stuff, but we're using it on real problems of today. So a typical house in the Deanwood section of DC costs a resident \$2,300 a year in energy costs. When we were done with the house -- actually when I made the slide, \$2,300 in energy costs came down to \$300 in energy costs. By the time we were finished, it was zero dollars in energy costs over the course of the year. And the house cost at the same rate that Habitat built their houses across the country.

We used a lot of advanced methods, but with readily available components not unlike the research for the Department of Defense. This is Stevens on the water in Hoboken, which is a university for innovation and engineering. It's 150 years old. And I have here a few images of the house that was exhibited last week in DC. I think 250,000 people visited the house over the past two weeks. So this house is highly affordable and readily available to anybody.

And that brings me to the reason why I'm actually here which is the Pine Crest Dunes Camp, which is now the Peconic Dunes Camp. I live two doors down from this in Southold and have been quietly watching this camp operate for seven years. And I finally got the opportunity to meet Vito and Chris from Cornell Extension. And we're presenting this proposal to you today.

I see that the camp is a highly successful camp. I watch it on a daily basis. The kids kayak past my house all the time. I actually feed them bagels on Saturday mornings when they're still hungry from breakfast. But I see that the camp is at its -- at its capacity for summer enrollment. I find that its conditions, its multitude of terrain and microclimate is absolutely unprecedented. It has a fresh water pond. One also has walkable frontage on the Sound. And I totally appreciate the research on indigenous ecosystems that the camp deals with.

The camp, however, is a summer camp. It's very crowded for just several months out of the year. My son sells lemonade to the parents who line up to get in the camp in the eight weeks of the

summer. However, I think this camp really needs to be a twelve-month camp. And it needs to expand its educational outreach to Suffolk County. And as somebody who's been teaching for over 20 years, I think this camp is positioned nicely to have a broader and far ranging effect on education in the spirit of this 4H summer camp.

So the way the camp is laid out from an architect's viewpoint is that it has at its disposal five main sources of energy. The ground for geothermal, the sun, the wind coming off the Sound, the rain and then the motion of the tides. I gave this presentation in DC two weeks ago to Lockheed Martin. And a fellow from Lockheed Martin pulled me aside and he said "you can probably get all the energy you need just in the motion of the Sound right outside the camp."

The camp also utilizes four sources of energy: Heat, electricity, water and waste. And what we would like to do is combine those two graphs to see how does sun, wind and tide affect electricity, how does the earth affect heat, how does the rain and the well water affect water? And then how can we recycle waste so that one camp's waste is also its energy?

There are many steps to getting to this level of zero energy that we reached at the solar decathlon as well as beyond and it's incremental. It's not magic and it's simply taking one step at a time. So if we're looking at traditional consumption here, which is the way the camp operates now, by integrating some very simple passive techniques, you can really reduce the camp's footprint. By redesigning the envelopes of the building, you can eliminate a majority of the energy by introducing some active systems and some renewables, you can be positive energy with this camp. If you combine positive energy with the camp with its educational outreach, you could probably have an environmental camp that's unprecedented in the United States. It can be a camp that is looked at by any camp and all camps across the country.

I think we have to start at the center of the camp. The camp is a spoke design where buildings radiate outward. And at the very center of the camp is the place of assembly or the dining hall. And it happens to be the same building that Chris previously mentioned is in disrepair. So it makes logical sense that by reinvestigating that dining hall, making it 12 months out of the year, you can get this camp to function at some level on a 12-month basis; not to mention give it the crown and the jewel of the camp by redoing its most important building, its place of assembly.

And with a little ingenuity, you can redesign the public area right outside the the dining hall, which right now is a service entry. And I think it's a place that you can expand population from several hundred in the summer to many hundreds, if you can flood out onto a public space outside the dining hall. It's a place you can teach all year round. And then with some foresight, master planning and long term scheduling, you would probably want to look at the sand castle buildings, which are the most developed buildings. And if they're brought up to a 12-month year usage, then you pretty much have a nucleus of the camp that can function 12 months out of the year.

The way we work at Stevens, which is probably not unlike the way we would love to work with Cornell and Suffolk County, is that students design and prototype during the academic term. When the camp opens for the summer, we would exhibit some of the prototypes and design. And then when the kids leave at the end of the summer, we can go in and start fabricating buildings. So the academic calendar and the summer camp calendar actually work nicely. They dovetail well. And the thinking is that we could take a camp who's deeply rooted in history and bring it to the 21st century. And I think by bringing it to the 21st century, Suffolk County will have something that will put it on the map across the country for state-of-the-art zero energy education systems for kids. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

This is very exciting. I have a couple of questions about the presentation. Were you talking about tidal turbines when you said using the tides? Because we had had a presentation. And there were several types of systems that were presented to us years ago. And it seemed there had been some

near Governor's Island, that area of New York. And for some reason those weren't as successful as they had anticipated.

MR. NASTASI:

We have them right now in the Hudson River just off the edge of campus across from Manhattan and working with --

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Are you happy with --

MR. NASTASI:

Yes. And we're working very closely with Lockheed Martin developing this technology.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. And when you talk about the military camp and the reduction of the water use, is that because you were using grey water much more?

MR. NASTASI:

We were recycling grey water for everything but for potable use. And that took 85% of the water use away from the camp.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I think San Antonio has been doing that a lot, too. It's one of the few areas in Texas where they're not experiencing that kind of water shortage.

MR. NASTASI:

What's really interesting is when we were looking at grey water recycling, we started with some very expensive methods to clean grey water. And then we figured out at the very end that with three feet of sand, you can get any type of water to potable conditions. And here's the military and the Middle East trying to figure out what to do with their water.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Lots of sand.

MR. NASTASI:

Lots of sand, yes. We actually scrub --

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

That was one of the problems with LEEDS, though, that it was so expensive to create that grey water.

MR. NASTASI:

Right. And we actually figured out a very affordable way to do this. And we actually scrubbed the Hudson River Water and tested it for potability and were able to clean it 99 percent with sand.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm glad you did that because my grandson was just swimming in the Hudson River a few weeks ago in a triathlon. You know, there's one thing I wanted to ask about. I think this is so exciting and it's so much in the direction that we want to move in. But I've been working, as Vito knows, with community gardens. And one of the issues that we have with school gardens in particular and working with children is that we have them as captive audiences all year. And they're not there to reap very literally their rewards because in the summer there are no classes.

So this -- you use the word dovetail. This would dovetail perfectly with maybe school districts in the

area who could adopt, let's say, school gardens on the ground. And then when you have the kids there in the -- you know, with the work you're doing around the dining room or that we want to do around the dining room, and I saw that piazza area, that could be a gardening area or -- I don't know how large it is. I don't have a real concept of the size. But there should be a gardening area and continue this over the summer. And I think that that would be a wonderful -- our Food Policy Council is working on developing these ideas. Yes, Chris.

MR. COLAHAN:

We actually three years ago partnered with a local farmer who comes in and sets our garden up in the spring so that the kids can work on the garden and harvest it very incrementally. So each week a camper gets to work on three plots of the garden. And that food goes back into the dining hall. And then we compost food in the dining hall to bring back down to the garden. So we are trying to educate our campers. So it sounds like there are many opportunities to partner with Suffolk County schools.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

As far as expense, one of the problems when -- you were here, Vito, when I introduce LEED legislation; the first county actually in the country to introduce that kind of legislation. One of the problems and criticisms was cost in green building. And I remember even when I was building a room in my house, if we wanted to make it really green, we would have introduced six panels which were so expensive. And you're saying now we've reached the point that we can do a green building cheaper than --

MR. NASTASI:

The systems that we implemented for the solar decathlon are probably ten years past LEED certification. And the things that we're doing really foster affordability so that it's not unobtainable. We exhibited this house with 19 other schools from across the world down in the Mall. And the Stevens Parsons House won first place for affordability. So we were in some instances a quarter of the price of other schools. So green sustainable engineering need not be expensive if thought of and studied properly.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I apologize to my colleagues. This is just very exciting and very, very interesting. It's wonderful to hear all this, all the details (inaudible - off microphone)

Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Again. Thank you for coming and giving us this information. I was the former Director of the Energy Department with the Town of Brookhaven. It was the first time that the Department was ever created. I worked on the green homes Go Solar projects with the town council people there and the supervisor. And I don't know if you're familiar with Mark Lesko and Accelerate Long Island, I would suggest you look into that also as far as partnering. I have -- I'm looking at the Center for Wireless Technology. Are you familiar -- that was Stony Brook. Again, an educational institution. You got Stony Brook and you've got private -- public/private partnerships within that promoting energy efficiency renewable energy projects. So, if there's any way that, you know, my staff can help connect you or help -- or our Counsel, our Legislators here can help connect you, more than happy to, I'm sure. But, again, thank you and I give you a lot of credit in pushing through a -- the ability to be energy efficient and affordable. That's what we need to get to. And I think we're pretty close. So thank you.

MR. MINEI:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Last words, Vito?

MR. MINEI:

If I may, thank you. Again, this has come together rather quickly. I just want to thank a few people. First, I want to thank Professor Nastasi who explains very complex systems so that an old Villanova/NYU grad can understand. So I appreciate that on a personal level. But more on an institutional level, I want to thank Tracey Bellone and the Parks Department. They immediately embraced this. We were only meeting with them a few minutes and Tracey decided to write a letter of support to Stevens Institute on behalf of the Parks Department. We posed a number of questions in the last few weeks to DPW. And Mike Monahan there, the chief engineer for buildings and grounds, quickly embraced it as well. And I was just on the phone with Mike recently. And he said actually they're there to collaborate with us. And he just, you know, wonders as DPW does when I get ahead of myself some times, is that we'll have to deal with a number of legal issues. And that's the practical reason. We didn't come here just to bedazzle the Legislature and to capture your interest. We're here on a practical mission.

I believe we need a resolution, and I'll defer to Mr. Nolan on this, I think we need a resolution giving us direction to move forward with this partnership with Stevens Institute. What Professor Nastasi is offering is the services of himself now. And you see they're internationally recognized and they're attracting some major corporations in the energy and environment field to help us out. So we're looking to move forward with this project.

Our immediate focus, again, is on the dining hall. But we're hoping to go long-range with the vision that John just shared with you with regard to an energy conservation, environmental preservation camp that would be educational and enjoyable for the kids when they attend camp in a year round setting. So, again, I believe that we need some direction from this body to move forward with a relationship. We will indeed have a Memorandum Of Understanding with Stevens Institute if, again, you agree with us going forward. But we're looking forward to moving very quickly into the construction phase for that dining hall.

You saw the condition that it's in. And I would appreciate all the support. I would suspect maybe the Legislator from the district at Peconic Dunes, he might want to play an active role as we move forward. But I want to thank you again because I really agree with Professor Nastasi. This could not only be the premier camp in New York State, but what we're learning as we research this a little bit more, it could certainly be unique and premier in the United States. So, again, I want to thank you all.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I think even more importantly it could be a model in the direction in which we go with educating kids and in a way that's authentic.

MR. MINEI:

And we want to do that again at the County Farm with the -- you know, the Visitors Center and the staff offices. I went to the Capital Program. And we asked for, again, a very strong energy conservation, environmental preserving visitor center, move it towards Yaphank Avenue so it could be an educational facility as well as a model. And, again, DPW is encouraging us because I believe that your initiative of their working to have the first sustainable energy building constructed in Suffolk County, we'd like to do that on your behalf.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I just asked Counsel about, you know, sponsoring legislation like this. And we'll be talking about details. And, George, you said you weren't even sure if they needed a resolution? So I'll just let Counsel speak for himself.

MR. NOLAN:

Right. I think I have to have a conversation with you guys to determine exactly what you're doing and do we need to give you a resolution.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I want to say if legislation is needed, I had talked briefly with Vito in my office about this. First of all, Doctor, thank you so much for your volunteering your services, and Stevens. I can't tell you how much we appreciate this. I definitely think this camp can be a model. I strongly support it. Happy to represent you. Hopefully you vote out there as a resident of Southold. But happy to support this because I think this is the direction that the County should be going in. Not only could this be a teaching tool as you point out for the kids, it could be a teaching tool for the adults and more importantly for Suffolk County government. Because what we should be doing is analyzing all the government buildings that we have, looking to get our waste product down to zero, looking to get our energy use as low as possible, looking to use all alternative means of energy as a way of supporting our governmental facilities. And this could be a model. And it's -- I got to tell you, doctor, again from the bottom of my heart as a representative of this area, thank you so much. Deeply appreciate it.

MR. NASTASI:

Thank you.

MR. MINEI:

If we could just sort of harness one small portion of your energy, Ed, we'll get this done in no time for you, all right?

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, thank you very much. Thank you.

MR. NASTASI:

Thank you.

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And now we will move to the resolutions. And as promised, I'm going to go to 1836 on the last page of the agenda. You'll note that the title of this resolutions is **to appoint member of County Planning Commission, Glynis Margaret Berry (Co. Exec.), number 1836**. I'll make a motion to take that out of order.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator Romaine. Miss Berry, if you could come forward, please.

MS. BERRY:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

You can just sit down here. Okay. There's a motion to take 1836 out of order and a second. All in favor? Opposed? 1836 is before us. And welcome, Miss Berry.

MS. BERRY:

Thank you very much for considering me.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And thank you for stepping up to serve. It's a very important function. Can you tell us a little bit about yourself and why you would like to serve on the Planning Commission?

MS. BERRY:

I've always been interested in planning because I think it integrates many disciplines. I do have experience. I was an associate planner with New York City Department of Transportation eleven years. That was my Civil Service title. I continue to be involved with planning issues on the East End. I think it's critical that we really examine what we're doing and how we're doing it so that we can improve, so that we can protect what we have and enhance it. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. Legislator Romaine, your Legislator, has a question.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I know Glynis very well. What she did not say is she's also President of the American Institute of Architects, the Peconic Chapter. And she has been deeply involved in looking at nitrogen reduction and on site waste water treatment systems and a whole host of other things in that regard. She's come to be regarded as an expert. I know I've worked with her in nitrogen reduction programs that she is studying now. And I cannot recommend her highly enough. I would ask the Clerk to list me as a co-sponsor. She is a resident of Southold and someone that is well known and I think would serve our County well on our Planning Commission.

MS. BERRY:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Romaine, if I may add, when her name happened to come up at CEO, that enthusiastic endorsement came from a number of different members. You certainly are well known for your advocacy and your knowledge. So do we have a motion?

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'll make that motion.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Motion is approved. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)** Thank you very much for being here. You don't have to come next Tuesday. I mean you can if you like to hang out at places like this. But congratulations. And thank you very much for your willingness to serve.

MS. BERRY:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I am also going to make a motion to take -- I think -- it's the North Fork Preserve. What's the number of that one, George? 1819? Because we have so many people in the audience who are interested in that. And I believe that there is a question by Legislator Anker for Budget Review.

Legislator Anker, you have the floor.

LEG. ANKER:

Hi. Okay, so my question is, I guess the question of the day is, how much money do we have in our funds for open space? What's the total right now?

MS. HALLORAN:

Well, we have -- when we're talking about the New Drinking Water Protection Program, which most of these acquisitions -- not all, but most of them fall under that category, we have as of August 31st around 74 million in bonded money. That includes all remaining available bonding under that program.

Now the North Fork Preserves are -- anything that's an acquisition resolution are generally accounted for by the Department as a -- like an encumbrance more or less. It's not official because there's no -- no -- the Legislature has no -- does not have to purchase these properties even today. Just because there's a planning steps, there's no obligation to purchase. However, the Department wants to make sure we have enough if we do decide to purchase it. So they have it accounted for under accepted offers already. Okay, so, for the most part.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

In other words we have the money to acquire these parcels? I just want to put it on the record.

MS. HALLORAN:

Yes, we have the money to acquire the parcels.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Because once it's at this point, you've set aside the money so that if we were to approve of the acquisition, you can go ahead and close the deal.

MS. HALLORAN:

Correct.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I just wanted to make that very clear.

MS. HALLORAN:

Yes. And in addition starting in January, we do have cash balances that will be available for use under that program totalling around 45 million. Okay. So this is the end of -- the last year we can use the borrowed because -- last year we could borrow. And we are going to borrow by the end of the year all available borrowings; just comes to 209 million borrowed to date under that program.

LEG. ANKER:

What's the interest on that? How much are we paying to borrow that money?

MR. LIPP:

Each bond issue is a little bit different, probably about 3% it averages. We're going -- moving forward we get about \$20 million a year for the Open Space component. And we'll pay about 16 and change for debt service once the 209 million is borrowed, which will lead to four million extra each year on top of the borrowings and the \$45 million in cash and all of that. And that amount will increase a little each year as sales tax grows.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And that's paid by the fund, Robert.

MR. LIPP:

Correct. Right. It's part of the sales tax. It's not General Fund.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Is there anything that Planning would like to say about 1817, 18 and 19 before we have a motion?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Wow, wow, wait. They were just taking -- hold on. I just asked them a question. And the Commissioner was about to take the mic.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Planning Department fully supports the acquisition in moving forward all of these acquisition resolutions. Laretta.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Did you just want to --

MS. FISCHER:

I just want to give you a brief overview of the three resolutions before you and how it was split up. The 1817 resolution includes a southern portion of the -- southern parcel, which totals 173 acres plus or minus being acquired under the New Drinking Water Protection Program for the active recreational component.

IR 1818, the majority of the northern parcel, we are looking to acquire 126.67 acres under the New Drinking Water Protection Program for passive recreational use.

The third resolution IR 1819 is also to acquire 2.6 acres of the northern parcel for -- under the New Drinking Water for active recreation. So there will be a total of about 175 acres for active recreation and 127 acres for passive recreation. There will also be an additional four acre parcel acquired by the Department of Public Works on the northern portion of the parcel shown on your map as the dotted yellow area. That will be before you at the full Legislature for a vote for that portion under their funding sources. So in total there's about 106 -- 306 acres total that the County will be buying.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

And we would like to ask Nick Gibbons from the Parks Department to give you a brief overview of the concept plan for the active parcels.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Actually he's gone over it with us. Haven't you?

MS. FISCHER:

That was at CEQ.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I know I saw you doing it. Didn't you do it here?

MS. FISCHER:

Whatever you wish.

MR. GIBBONS:

Happy to --

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Put those tap shoes on if you want to give us a presentation because we're all ready to move forward with it. We're very excited about this. But I could have sworn you showed that to us before, but you're welcome to do it again.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Madam Chairman, before we move forward, I would be remiss if I did not point out the tremendous work that not only Nick Gibbons has done, but our Deputy Parks Commissioner, Tracey Bellone; they've done tremendous work on this. They've worked very closely with my office; very impressed. And I think this is going to be one of Suffolk's last great parks that will be available to our campers, to those who like to hike, to those who like to fish. There'll be other activities there. I'm sure softball, tennis, etcetera. This will be one of Suffolk's last great parks. It'll probably be the last great one that we will develop.

Obviously we're looking now in a recession. Recessions end. We will have the money to go forward in the future and develop this as our last great park in this County. And I will tell you that generations will continue to use this park and appreciate that members of this Legislature had the wisdom to set aside some land for both passive and active recreation; and that we had park visionary peoples like Nick and Tracey and others that worked on this, people in Real Estate that worked so well, Janet and Pam, and a whole host of other people throughout this County that worked so hard -- and I can't forget my good friend, Eric, who worked so hard on this acquisition. This is going to be something that many years from now people will remember the vision of all the people that worked behind the scenes on this. And I want to thank all of them. Thank you so much.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

It takes a village. Nick, would you like to go ahead? Deputy Commissioner Bellone, did you want to also come up or -- okay. Didn't know it was going to be a team presentation here. I think you need to bring it a little closer to us because we can't see it from that distance. Thank you. You know, when you're Chair of this Committee you get to see many iterations of these presentations in the different -- other committees that we serve on.

MR. GIBBONS:

I'm hope I'm consistent.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

You're going to trust my memory?

MR. GIBBONS:

Okay, thanks. Okay, not to backup too far, but I'm just using real rough numbers in very loose terms, I'm talking about a 300 acre parcel here made up of three different individual parcels. The passive recreational piece is roughly 125 acres along the northern portion of the property. There's an additional 175 acres on the southern portion including this two-and-a-half acre bump out, which was the subject of your inquiry earlier.

This is a conceptual plan developed mostly in-house within the Parks Department. And it's a

necessary component in the SEQRA process for the planning steps, of which you are all familiar with, the subjects later on -- the parcel will be the subject of a Master Plan, a formal Master Plan. And that process, too, will have to go through SEQRA as well and in addition to this body and the full Legislature.

The adoption of that Master Plan once adopted would then no longer be subject to SEQRA. So the implementation of the Master Plan would be the subject of a capital program many years in the future. However, each component, as long as it was consistent with the Master Plan adopted, would not need any additional SEQRA review.

So I just want to talk real briefly, really working from west to east, left to right, the proposed components within the park and in no other order really than that. The first -- and I'm not -- for the purposes of today's discussion, I'm not going to get into the equestrian facility we have in mind for the 50 acres immediately to the west. So beginning with this blue line, which is the western property boundary of the recreational component, we've identified some existing -- and I should preface the entire thing by saying we've made the best use in our opinion of previously cleared and disturbed areas, trying to minimize both cost for development of this site and to respect existing environmental constraints on the property. There are wetlands. They're primarily focused on the far east end of the property. And so we think we're using -- making the best use of the existing site conditions and buffer areas to enhance the overall parking experience.

So from the west side here we have previously existing cleared areas. We propose to divided those up into three activity fields. They're general purpose in nature. They're really for informal recreational activity, so a pickup game of softball, frisbee, what have you. And it would be both for day trip uses as well as campground uses.

There's a thin strip of existing vegetation. We would retain that as a buffer. And then we get into formal camping area. We propose here three group camping areas. This is primarily RV camping, although not exclusively. It does have utilities. And utilities at least in this case at this park would be both water and electric. Not sanitary. The sanitary would be handled in the far southwest corner of the property with the use of a dump station, which is common at least within a County Park system.

The group areas are really camping in the round. It's a reservation for the entire 10 or 15 sites. For the purposes of identifying a number of sites within the EAF and the analysis, we cite 15 sites. So 15 in each of these for a total of 45 RV sites.

Next we propose having a buffer area before the beginning of our formal RV camp site area. We think we can fit in three strips of 25 units each for a total of 75 individual RV sites. Again, they would have full water and electric hookup, not sanitary.

Immediately to the north, this area here, which is a configuration of various trails and existing woods roads ways, we feel we can accommodate a tent camping area and approximately 90 tent sites. The site lends itself, which we're very excited about, is the separation of the RV campers from the tent campers. It enhances recreational opportunities for both groups while keeping them separated. And it can also avail themselves of sharing a central parking area, central bathhouse, picnic pavilion; all those amenities can be shared by both constituencies but still separates those, in particular for the tent camping experience, serve to protect their experience rather than having a tent in between two campers, which is the current condition we have in some of our other parks.

Still further to the east we have a wooded section here. It's bounded on the east by an existing paved roadway that goes up to existing clubhouse, that the Legislator mentioned earlier. This area, we believe, can accommodate, and which would be a new feature for County parks -- it's very popular and exists Upstate within the State park system -- are seasonal cabins. These would be

individual units that can be rented most likely on a weekly basis similar to our RV sites or tent sites. They would be for year-round use. They would have some limited utilities including possibly sanitary within each individual cabin; again, the details of which are subject to the future master plan. However, we feel it's important and exciting to promote this idea, the idea that this could be a year round facility and bring people out to use the park and the surrounding area by way of these cabins. And a lot of folks aren't comfortable with camping be it RV or tent camping. This is a way to get them outside and used to -- avail themselves of parks amenities.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm sorry to interrupt you, but as you're talking I'm thinking about the fact that there are some vineyards that are having some programs now. And people are afraid to drive out there and get in that parade of traffic that you have in the fall. Imagine being able to get one of those cabins and take advantage of all of those things going on in the North Fork. It would just be really great. The wheels are turning.

MR. GIBBONS:

Sure. So just coming down to the south here, this is the southern portion of the property; again existing entrance road into the property, just a few of these features, I skipped over, I just want to point out. Again, another activity field, nothing specific but, again, an existing cleared area. It's immediately adjacent to the RV campsites. And we have -- there's no limit to what this can be used for. They're very popular in our other campgrounds as well for a variety of uses or special events even. We would need some sort of central parking area to accommodate the general public, maintenance facility, check-in station. And I think that's pretty much it for the western side.

Now still moving east of the existing roadway from north to south here, we have retained existing parking immediately adjacent to the clubhouse. The clubhouse could be used for a variety of purposes. It's current condition there's a commercial kitchen, a locker room, a dance floor with a dining area. And we're not sure what that could become some day; possibly a laundry facility, an arcade for camp users, maybe retain the ballroom area for special events, that type of thing.

There's existing tennis courts. We propose to retain those on site. And then further develop this area with more formal recreational pursuits which would be a playground, a spray park, volleyball, basketball courts, those types of amenities.

And then finally this entire area to the east, this is envisioned to be our youth camping, scout camping, church youth group, that type of thing. And then have a number of different opportunities. It could be -- we propose using existing cleared areas for youth campsites. And those would be tent sites, not RV sites with any kind of utilities but more low key primitive type of camping as well as lean-to areas. Lean-to is really nothing much more than maybe a ten by ten shed with one of the walls missing. That just gets people up off the ground out of the elements, kind of roll out a sleeping bag. We propose having five separate areas of five lean-to's each or 25 lean-to's for a total youth camping opportunity.

Again, we propose another row of cabins in this area, although not winterized and for year round but for maybe three season use. We think another 18 cabins can fit in that area. And I may have failed to mention earlier, figured 18 cabins can fit in this area for the year round cabin use. Again, additional activity fields, central parking area.

And then finally on the far east side, we have two existing ponds. One is artificially manipulated by an irrigation valve so the level can be brought up. And we'd like to investigate whether or not that's suitable to do so that we could help to enhance the paddling and or fishing experience with the general public's use of that pond. And then the pond immediately north to that would sort of be a gateway into the whole passive recreational area. We'd have a recreational trail head here with nature trails that would get people up and into using the 125-acre passive recreational piece of the

park.

That's the abbreviated version. And if there's any questions, I'm happy to entertain those.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I just have to add to Legislator Romaine's comments, I think you had a lot of fun doing this, Nick.

MR. GIBBONS:

It's very exciting.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Legislator Romaine, I think you had a motion?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes, I do. I have a motion to approve.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I'll second it. Have I taken them out of order officially? I'm going to make a motion to take 1817, 1818 and 1819 out of order.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator Romaine. All in favor? Opposed? Okay. 1817, 1818 and 1819 are now before us. Legislator Romaine has made a motion to approve 1817. I second that motion.

(Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - active recreation component- for the North Fork Preserve, Inc. Property - Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-021.00-01.00-001.002) (Co. Exec.)

On the motion, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Again, I think this is an amazing project. It's a lot of land for the amount of money. It's a great investment. Again, my concern is, you know, hopefully we will improve in our economic situation because we are in financial crisis right now. But this is an opportunity that I think will help us down the road. Three percent interest on the bond, you can't beat that with the land being so close to the water. Partnering with the Town, I think, is an important element, again, reducing our costs to the taxpayers, which is really just the top priority right now. Because people are leaving Long Island. The people that are leaving Long Island cannot afford to go and enjoy these places, what you're preserving. But we have to do everything in our means to make sure this is not only sustainable, you know, but practical. And I think what you're doing, too, though is creating a situation that is self-sustainable. Is that true? In other words, you're going to have a camp situation there and possibly an equestrian center. Would that bring revenue to help sustain this type of park system?

MR. GIBBONS:

Yes, I think it will. It'll be a revenue stream for the park. Whether or not it entirely offsets the park operation is another matter; however, yes, it will generate revenue that will come into the County, absolutely.

LEG. ANKER:

And, again, the other suggestion I highly recommend that a public/private partnership, I know I had worked on this work with the Mount Sinai Civic, with the Heritage Park. The County bought the

land, the Town helped maintain it and private industry, not-for-profit helped oversee it and runs programs there. So something very, very successful. But I do wish you the best and I do support this project.

MR. GIBBONS:

Thanks very much.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, there's a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1817 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1818 (Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the North Fork Preserve Co. Property - Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-007.00-03.00-041.000 p/o) (Co. Exec.) Motion to approve by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1818 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1819 (Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - active recreation component - for the North Fork Preserve Co. Property - Town of Riverhead) (SCTM No. 0600-007.00-03.00-041.000 p/o). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1819 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

Thank you all for coming and speaking with us today.

CEQ RESOLUTIONS

Okay, Mr. Mule, I know you're here somewhere.

MR. MULE:

Good afternoon.

CEQ resolution number 47-2011, Proposed IR 1464-2011 Declaring as Surplus and Authorizing the Sale and/or lease of Real Property in Selden, Town of Brookhaven (Unlisted Action) CEQ recommends classification as an unlisted action with a negative declaration.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to approve by myself, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

MR. MULE:

CEQ resolution number 48-2011, Ratification of Recommendations for Legislative Resolutions laid on the Table September 17, 2011. CEQ's recommendation are in the left-hand margin of the attached document.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

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

MR. MULE:

CEQ resolution number 49-2011, Proposed Rehabilitation of CR35, Mill Dam Road Bulkhead and Shorelines Improvements, CP 5375, Town of Huntington (Type II Action) CEQ recommends classification as a Type II Action.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

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

MR. MULE:

CEQ resolution number 50 - 2011, Proposed Construction of a Recharge Basin for Stormwater Remediation, North Fork Preserve, Northville, Town of Riverhead (Unlisted Action) CEQ recommends classification as an unlisted action with a negative declaration.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And for the members of the Committee, you saw the map. There was that little yellow dotted piece on the north side of that. That's what this refers to. Same motion, same second, same vote. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

MR. MULE:

CEQ number 51-2011, Proposed Suffolk County Eelgrass Restoration Initiative (Unlisted Action) CEQ recommends classification as an unlisted action with a negative declaration.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

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

MR. MULE:

CEQ number 52-2011, Proposed Final Scoping Document for the Suffolk County Sewer Capacity Study for Bellport, Sayville, Ronkonkoma Hub, Middle Island Corridor, Mastic/Shirley, Yaphank, and Southampton (CP8189) (Type I Action) CEQ feels that the document adequately addresses all of the comments received on the draft and recommends adoption.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

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

MR. MULE:

And finally CEQ resolution number 53-2011, Proposed Acquisition for Open Space Preservation Purposes Known as the North Fork Preserve Property, Town of Riverhead (Type I Action) CEQ recommends classification as a Type I Action with a negative declaration.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

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

MR. MULE:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. Thank you for your patience. Okay, and now we turn to tabled resolutions.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

IR 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 believe that the sponsor still wants that to be tabled.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion to table.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to table by Legislator D'Amaro, second by myself. All in favor? Approved? Tabled. **(VOTE: 4-0-0-1. LEG. ROMAINE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1481, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Lang Property - Town of Shelter Island (SCTM No. 0700-018.00-03.00-004.000) (Romaine) I

will make a motion to table, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? You know what? I'll wait 'til Legislator Romaine comes back in the room. I didn't realize he wasn't here. Okay, so I'll wait until he comes back. I'll skip over 1481.

1540, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of development rights under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Szuster Farm Property - Town of Brookhaven (SCTM Nos. 0200-500.00-01.00-001.003 p/o). (Browning) Was there a planning -- did the Farmland Committee meet or --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The Farmland Committee met. There's some background that I wanted to just bring to your attention. So after the EPA meeting was held on August 8th of this year where this motion was tabled, we did send -- Planning Department sent a letter to the Legislator as well as the applicant and explaining both processes, both the annual review process, which is set forth in the revisions to Chapter Eight as well as ways to nominate this and go through this process outside the annual review process. And the letter detailed the missing items that were necessary. And this letter, again, was sent on August 18th. We have received word from the applicant as well as the Legislator that they would like to go through the annual review process for this.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

So they opted. So I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1540 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1541, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of development rights under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Longmeadow Farm Property - Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No.

0200-974.20-02.00-021.100). (Browning) I'll make a motion to table, second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **1541 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1544, Adopting Local Law No. -2011, A Local Law eliminating financial disclosure requirements for Farmland Committee members. (Romaine)

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Romaine, you're back. Can you tell us the --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yeah. This resolution does that but it also substitutes a financial disclosure form that was put together with the Farm Bureau's input that would be able to disclose any potential conflict and yet not be as onerous as the ones that paid elected officials are required to fill out. All of these people are volunteers. What they do is they sit on the Farmland Committee and they make judgements about land that should be acquired in terms of PDR's and how those PDR's can be used if there's a question about usage. And I thought this would be appropriate. Anyone connected with farms, the committee can tell you that when this requirement was in place, many of the members considered resigning in mass.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I apologize. I should have clarified where I was going when I referenced this. The last time we met I was made to understand that you and the Presiding Officer were going to be discussing this because of the new Ethics Guide Lines legislation. Perhaps --

LEG. ROMAINE:

The Presiding Officer has yet to have that discussion with me. I mean if that is something that he wants to entertain, I'm always happy to entertain any discussion with our Presiding Officer.

MR. NOLAN:

I can speak to this.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I'm going to ask Counsel to speak to this because he has the knowledge of both documents. That's much clearer than mine.

MR. NOLAN:

Right. As everyone knows, right now we're going to be -- or soon we'll be considering an overhaul of the Ethics, the Financial Disclosure Laws. And I think the Presiding Officer and that committee was waiting to see what happened with this bill; that the Legislature adopted this less onerous, less expansive form for the Farmland Committee members, that this would probably also be the form for the other unpaid board members: The Planning Commission and perhaps the Park Trustees, that it would be equitable and fair to have all the unpaid board members have the same form. Or if this legislation was adopted, then everybody would probably go back to doing the more expansive form. So that's my understanding where that question is.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

So what you're saying is that he was waiting for this to be passed --

MR. NOLAN:

Correct.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

-- before moving along --

MR. NOLAN:

He wanted to see what happened with this bill, if it was the pleasure of the Legislature to have the Farmland Committee members complete a less expansive form, then he would probably incorporate that into his bill.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

And that it would probably be then applicable to the Planning Commission and the Park Trustees; that this would be the type of form that they would file.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And, Commissioner, you worked with Legislator Romaine on this, it's my understanding. And it seems that the final iteration of this reflects the Riverhead Town disclosure that's similar. And so are you comfortable with it as it stands now?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, the Planning Department is comfortable with this.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. So was there a motion?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

There's a motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator Muratore. On the motion, Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes, I'd like to ask you, then, is this a changing of the ethical standards or disclosure requirements, a loosening of those requirements? If you say you're comfortable with it, what justifies different requirements? I mean, after all the goal of all of disclosure that I have to file or anyone else has to file is the same for me as it would be for any volunteer on any committee in the County. So why the different standards? Why the different disclosure requirements?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

It's my understanding that there are different forms that currently exist for various different committees within the County, that there's a form for staff and elected officials. And then different forms already -- for instance, the members of the Planning Commission. There was a thorough analysis of all of the Farmland Committees that each Town has in Suffolk County and discussion with the Farm Bureau and members of the Farmland Committee as well as the Legislator to -- I wouldn't characterize it as a weakening or softening of the ethical disclosure or financial disclosure requirements.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, let me ask this: There is something that the members of this committee need to file presently and there's something now that's proposed. What's being omitted? What disclosures are being omitted in the proposed bill that we have before us?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure. The difference is the members of the Farmland Committee were -- received what staff and elected officials currently have to fill out, which is a seven page form disclosing all sorts of things including, you know, stocks, bonds, things like that, things -- items that are not germane to the duties of members of the Farmland Committee.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But let me just stop you there because when you say that it's not germane, what it's germane to is the person's financial status or condition so that an ethics commission or whatever committee's charged ultimately with reviewing this, can determine if there's any improper conduct, undue influence. And, again, I don't see how when you're serving in an official capacity and serving the

County of Suffolk, I don't see any distinction between a member of this Committee or any other volunteer committee not being subjected to the same types of influences that any other person would be subjected to. So where's the justification for, in my opinion, lowering the disclosure requirements for this committee? They make important decisions like we all do.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The Farmland Committee is not making the final decisions.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But they're making recommendations. And those recommendations are influential recommendations. In fact, I would argue that they're even more important because we're relying on this committee for its expertise. And if that Committee is subject to any type of undue influence, that can have a major impact on the decisions that we make. So why the change? I mean is it -- you know, this committee threatened to resign. So? What does that mean? They threaten to resign. I mean is that supposed to then say to me, well, then you better change my disclosure requirements? I mean that's ludicrous.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The -- this was the -- the Farmland Committee was one of -- I think the only committee -- the volunteer committee that was asked to fill out the same forms that other -- that other -- that staff and elected officials need to fill out. Members of the Planning Commission, for instance, do not have to fill out -- we're not asked to fill out the same lengthy form that others, that the members of the Farmland Committee were asked to fill out.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Sitting here, I don't know the differences in the forms. That I don't know. What I do know is that this had started out as eliminating any disclosure. And the sponsor was, I think, wise in amending it to at least now requires some disclosure. But I'm not so sure that the disclosure required in this bill really meets the standards that we should be maintaining when it comes to this. So I'm not going to support this bill.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. My question has to do with, again, the reason why we're changing this. And I understand and I can see why to some extent. But in your perspective, is there a shortage of farmers willing to be on this board? I mean you're asking for 19 farmers to come up and take their personal time out and participate in understanding some of the issues pertaining to the farming community. Do you see that that could also be a reason why we need to make this less cumbersome to be on the board of this -- to be on the commission?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The farmers that serve on the County's Farmland Committee have been longstanding members and have provided valuable expertise to the County in a volunteer capacity. And it would be a shame to lose their collective wisdom and expertise -- and it is, as the challenges of development continue to pressure farmers to sell and develop farmland, their expertise, their farming expertise becomes even more rare. So it is important to weigh that also. But it's not to create a separate class or a separate standard for them.

LEG. ANKER:

And with the other commissions, part of Suffolk County, they're the only ones that have to file the seven page. How much shorter is the other form that they have to file? The form that we're asking -- that we're asking for the change?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I'm not sure what the page number is, but it's something that the Town of Riverhead has used successfully with its Farmland Committee members.

LEG. ANKER:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. I just want to follow-up on this. I have sat on many, many committees with volunteers including the Aquaculture Lease, which would have been very cumbersome for our bureaucracy to -- with the many members who served on that, who were volunteers. It would have been very cumbersome for our administrators to go through the seven page report.

I also serve on CEQ, which has very dedicated volunteers. We don't have to fill out this form, the same form as us. They're not paid. We are collecting taxpayer salaries. And so we do have a different position. These are all business people. And we're asking these people who are in a competitive business and need to make a living, put bread and butter on their table to disclose all of their financial proprietary information. And so I think we have to be sensitive to the fact that we're dealing with business people. And if anybody -- you know, I know people who sometimes have not run for office because they're private business people and they don't want to disclose all of what they have to disclose in order to run for office.

So I think -- and by the way, before the amendments to Article Eight, they didn't have to -- the Farmland Committee members didn't have to. So they volunteered for this position. They've been serving in this position. And then all of a sudden we change the rules in the middle of their tenure. And so that was also part of the problem. You know, it was a sudden change. They've been working very hard. I've attended these meetings and I know how much expertise they bring into this and how seriously they look at every issue.

And -- so I think this is a fair way to go about this. We shouldn't have the bar at the same level as those of us who are collecting salaries that come from taxpayer monies. These are volunteers. But we do have Legislator D'Amaro, who has another comment and --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So this form, then, doesn't require the listing of any assets other than Real Estate holdings? Right?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's my understanding, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No assets. So you're not getting any picture of the person's worth other than real estate holdings. It doesn't require assets, disclosure, liability disclosure, but it does require that you list your income; is that right?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's my understanding, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So you're getting half the picture. So if I'm a commission that's charged with the responsibility of reviewing this information, and it's my job to determine whether or not I see a red flag here, if I'm only getting half the financial picture, how do I make that decision? If someone discloses their income, but not their assets and liabilities, how do I know if there's any kind of monetary impact to

that person over time? I don't. I don't. And I wanted to just ask Counsel, if this form is approved and filed, is it subject to a public disclosure, this form? Or is this something that's --

MR. NOLAN:

I think it would be subject to the same disclosure as the usual forms.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's with -- redacted with respect to amounts, if I'm --

MR. NOLAN:

I'm not sure if Chapter Eight talks about redacting of the values. It certainly is in our financial disclosure law that covers the elected's and County employees. I'm not -- I just don't remember if Chapter Eight, which deals with the Farmland Committee, addresses that issue.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, you know, just again, I don't want to belabor my point, but I just feel that if anything, we should be looking to strengthen our disclosure requirements, not make them less onerous. I think that, you know, whether you're paid, a volunteer -- it's wonderful that people choose to volunteer, and I think it's a very noble thing to do. But nonetheless that distinction really has no consequence when it comes to ethics, and whether or not a person in a position of influence should be subjected to the same disclosure requirements as anyone else who might be able to influence government whether it's by as an elected official, an appointed person or a volunteer.

So, you know, again, I don't think we're moving in the right direction with this type of legislation. And I don't think see any harm in requiring further disclosure, especially when it comes to assets and liabilities. That's the only way we can really make a determination whether or not there is any undue influence on persons in a position to influence a body like a Legislature. So, you know, again, I'm not going to support this.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Is there in the contract when the farmers sign onto this, this group, that -- is there an ethical part to the contract that basically says they're aware of what their responsibilities are being on this commission? And that there will be no self gain? Is there something in the contract that -- or is there a contract that they sign to --

MR. NOLAN:

I'll answer that. I don't believe there's any contract. But they're bound by conflict of interest rules, just like a County Legislator would be. So this bill just goes to disclosure. But in terms of conflict of interest and their behavior, they have to abide by the same rules.

LEG. ANKER:

So again the issue is how do we make sure that there's not a farmer that's not benefiting from the decision that that farmer's making bottom line? Is that through this -- do they sign something that basically legally binds them that they're not allowed to do that?

MR. NOLAN:

They're bound by the existing law that the conflict of interest rules of the County do apply to them. And if they violate those rules, then they would be subject to penalty.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

We have a motion and a second to approve. Am I correct? Yeah. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Opposed.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Note the opposition. **1544 passes. (VOTE: 4-1-0-0. LEG. D'AMARO OPPOSED)**

1658, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of development rights under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Starkie Farm property - Town of Southold (SCTM No. 1000-096.00-03.00-009.000). (Romaine)

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Would you like a presentation?

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes, please.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The Department of Planning recommends authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of farmland development rights for the Pinewood Perennial Gardens property, also known as Starkie Farm. The proposed acquisition is approximately 15.4 acres out of the parcels 17.7 acres. There are two areas on the parcel which are outlined on white on the map not being offered for development rights acquisition. This includes a proposed 80,000 square foot exclusionary area and approximately 21,000 square foot exclusion for an existing right of way.

The proposed acquisition received a Suffolk County farmland rating of 12.75 out of 25 possible points and was recommended to the Legislature for inclusion in the Suffolk County Purchase of Development Rights Program by the Suffolk County Farmland Committee last week on September 27th. A score of ten or higher usually advances these proposals. And this score received 12.75. So we recommend moving this forward.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

We have a motion. Motion by Legislator Romaine, second by Legislator Muratore. Legislator D'Amaro, on the motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I just want to ask that this resolution -- this acquisition was recommended by the Farmland Committee? Is that the same committee that we were talking about in the prior resolution?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

It is.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Am I supposed to be influenced by that recommendation at this point? It's a rhetorical question. I'm not a sore loser, but I just want to make my point.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Can I give a rhetorical answer? A rhetorical answer is you take from it what you may. Some Legislators look at that and say, okay. And other Legislators more skeptical, they ask more questions. I think Legislators by their nature are elected to ask questions. We get recommended to do a lot of things. And many of the things we get recommended to do, this Legislature doesn't do. In fact, it has a contrary nature sometimes. Sure, whoever sat in the Executive chair would tell you that. However, you take from it what you may.

I've sat there, I've met the farmer. I went to the Farmland Committee. It's surrounded by preserved farmland. It's part of a farm belt in Cutchogue. Immediately south of there, if you know anything about Cutchogue, is the King Kullen. And across the street is the Peconic Bay Winery. It is a farm belt that stretches all the way to Sound Avenue and north. So it's something if we're going to save farming, ensure that farming stays as an active industry, I think it's worthwhile.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Sarah, I have a question regarding farmland. I know if this -- now this would be part of the County? Or that's just for development rights? How would this --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, this is the County's. This would be going through the County Purchase of Development Rights Program.

LEG. ANKER:

Would that be part of the pesticide CAC or is that completely different? Is that outside the box of that one?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I would have to research that further and get back to you.

LEG. ANKER:

Yeah, because, again, I know the County has very, very high restrictions on pesticides which, you know, I absolutely agree with. And I really would like to see, you know, the farming community -- and I know they have in the reduction of pesticide use, especially in areas where there's residential communities, but I curious, if you know, what they're doing or how they have actually decreased the use of pesticides, especially with property or development rights related to the County?

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I'd be happy to forward that question to Polly Weigand who heads up our Farm Stewardship Program. And we have over 200 farms that have signed up with that so we can see if there's a cross reference between the farms that have signed up with that and the ones that have had the development rights bought by the County. They have made great strides regarding conservation, irrigation, you know, using less water. They are -- they are using pads to do -- the mixing pads so that they're not introducing fertilizers and other extraneous materials into the soil. They're using organic -- well, I should say biosystems to reduce their pesticides. So, you know, they've done a lot of reductions in a lot of different ways so it's hard to quantify it specifically, but I think maybe -- and I see that Commissioner Culhane just came up because he knows how we've been working on this program.

COMMISSIONER CULHANE:

Under the County's Pesticide Reduction Program, agriculture is exempted. And we don't -- we don't make that a requirement of the properties that we purchase development rights on. There has been

some discussion of that over the years whether we should put conditions on these purchases. And up to this point, the County has chosen not to do that. It's something to consider. I think there are probably -- you know, if we put too many conditions on these things, then we would scare people away from the program. And I think it's been a good program and it's -- it would put the County in a funny position in terms of trying to tell farmers how to conduct their operations.

All that being said, there are good programs in the County. And, you know, that's the way a lot of our agriculture is going. Best Management Practices, Cooperative Extension works closely with the farmers to reduce their pesticide work and the IPM Program works very well. So there are a lot of things going on there that all farmers can do whether they're in or out of the program.

LEG. ANKER:

Can I comment on that? I agree. I think threats do not work. If you put a farmer in defense, that's no good. We need our farmers here. But I think one of the best directions we need to go is incentives and encouragement. And if there's any way you can think of, you know, creating this type of atmosphere for our farmers, I think -- I know the Legislature as a whole would be very supportive of that. So thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

You know, I'm going to have Tamson Yeh come and dazzle you, when she starts talking about pheromones and not using pesticides and she'll talk about sexy bugs, you know. Yes, so she can tell you that farmers have voluntarily been part of the program. And they have found that they're getting good results and saving money because they have to put less chemicals into -- onto their farms. So, you know, they're saving money.

Okay. So we have a motion and a second, yes? I think we do. All in favor? We didn't have a second? I thought Legislator Muratore but I may not have said it. Okay, so we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1658 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1716 (Adopting Local Law No. -2011, A Local Law to reduce the use of disposable bags by retail stores) (Viloria-Fisher) is still in public hearing so I will make a motion to table, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1716 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1729 (Adopting Local Law No. -2011, A Charter Law to amend the Drinking Water Protection Program to fund remediation of contaminated commercial sites) (Cilmi) is still in public hearing. I will make a motion to -- oh, was that closed? I apologize. I have in my notes that it was still in public hearing.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

We're just going to double check the status of that so we'll go back to it.

IR 1481 (Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Lang Property - Town of Shelter Island (SCTM No. 0700-018.00-03.00-004.000) (Romaine) Legislator Romaine makes a motion to table. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? **1481 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

Okay, we will go to **1748 (Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of Development Rights under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Marion Carll Farm Property - Town of Huntington (SCTM No. 0400-251.00-04.00-005.000) (Kennedy)** This is the Marion Carll Farm property. And I believe

that an amending resolution has been distributed, but the sponsor has suggested a motion to table. So I will make that motion, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. So IR 1748 there's a motion to table. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1748 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1772, Adopting Local Law No. -2011, A Charter Law to authorize the use of development rights for municipal fire, ambulance and police districts in Suffolk County. (Kennedy) I would like -- is there an opinion of the Planning Department on this?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes. The Planning Department has looked into this and looked into this idea of using these credits. And we were unable to find this anywhere else in the country. So we think that it's an idea that's worth exploring. And we support this -- this concept and note that right now only one workforce housing credit has been retired since 2005.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion.

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

A motion to approve? On the motion, I have a problem with this, because -- oh, is there a referendum? If it is, I can say yes. But is it within the body, it's calling for a referendum?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I believe that we do have the permissive referendum language in there, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you.

MR. NOLAN:

It will go on the ballot next year.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, it would go on the ballot a year from November.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, if I can, Madam Chair, let me just divert to Counsel. It is -- the referendum request, George, would be the permissive referendum?

MR. NOLAN:

No, it's not a permissive referendum. It calls for --

LEG. KENNEDY:

It's a mandatory referendum?

MR. NOLAN:

Yep.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, nevertheless that means the programs came to be and were created by a majority vote of the

people. The intention with the legislation is to try to address a very specific narrow subset by applying the sum of 9,000 TDR credits that we have at this point that have come from acquisitions throughout the County. And it would relieve emergency and special district entities charged with protecting public safety from in essence having to incur an additional cost in order to achieve density credit under the sanitary code. It comes as a direct result of an issue that we've had right here in Smithtown, Madam Chair, for expanding a fire department substation that has gone on for the better part of two-and-a-half years. So it is targeted, it is limited. And nevertheless, it would facilitate emergency services going forward.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. So it would be a referendum that would be held a year from November.

MR. NOLAN:

Yep.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. I'm still not in support of it, because we saw a presentation by Mr. Dawydiak in the Health Department. And the impact on our water and -- quality of our water. And I hate to see our Water Protection Program -- it's not a pun -- diluted in this manner and so I will oppose it. But Legislator Anker is first. Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Can I just say something?

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

So, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Again, in reading through this, basically, you know, we're pulling from the open -- Save Open Space and the New Drinking Water Protection Program specifically for open space and water protection. How can we justify it going towards public safety?

LEG. KENNEDY:

May I, Madam Chair? It's very simple, as a matter of fact, Legislator Anker. When you look at -- and I can only point to the specifics that occurred with the Smithtown Fire District process in attempting to expand a substation that's literally only about -- maybe a half mile away from here, to accommodate some additional equipment that the Commissioners have asked for. By virtue of the square footage of additional space, it triggered an increase in septic capacity necessary for the structure.

The irony of this is, is that the facilities in this substation may be used at best three or four times in a month. The irony, and if you will, Madam Chair, I don't think any kind of relief, no pun intended, for these facilities, undermines protection for our drinking water, our groundwater, because they're held to a standard analogous to our residents. People don't live in these buildings. People don't use the bathrooms and the sinks and the other things day in and day out. But, nevertheless, the requirements for sterilization and square footage are the same. There's no differentiation, if you will, under our Suffolk County Sanitary Code. Therein lies the irony.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

So then shouldn't that be the fix?

LEG. KENNEDY:

You know --

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

It would seem to me that we're dealing with a very specific issue and use of the code. And rather than looking at the code and its deficiencies and the bureaucracy, that's not really interpreting the true use of the property. Instead of rectifying that, we're doing a sweep, which I think is much too broad and I think contrary to our Water Protection Program.

LEG. KENNEDY:

You know, I would be more than happy to take a look at the sanitary code and try to make amendments there, too. The only issue that I guess I would say that I disagree with you on is, is that I don't perceive this as being a broad sweep at all. Because there are only 110 fire districts in the County of Suffolk. There are only 20 ambulance districts. When you look at the qualifying language, it is very, very, very specific. It's not as if we are looking to allow this to be something that would be open for developers that theoretically could apply the enhancements to the 550,000 discreet parcels that exist throughout the County of Suffolk. I see it as just the opposite; that it's extremely targeted, limited and by definition will never impact in a negative way our aquifer or our drinking water.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Legislator Kennedy, just refresh my memory. The transfer of these development rights, the County pays for them, we buy them, they go into a bank. They would -- any receiving parcel, then, would get some relief from the Sanitary Code requirements, as you mentioned, if you increase the footprint of a building, you need a higher capacity.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Would the receiving entity, in this case the fire district, police district, would they be paying for these development rights?

LEG. KENNEDY:

The concept, if you will, Legislator D'Amaro, is that payment has already occurred once by virtue of the Quarter Cent funding or the SOS funding or any of the other multitude of programs that we, as a County agency, have put in to place to acquire. Actually it's quite the opposite. Once Planning establishes the criteria for eligibility and deems that, in fact, this expansion is a legitimate, bona fide expansion, the request would be made to Planning and the appropriate credit would be provided.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I don't want to say free.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, because it's going from one taxing jurisdiction to another is what you're saying.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, I understand that. So other users of the credits under current law would be -- who could apply for and use a credit right now?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I believe the only place that this is applicable right now would be workforce housing. I believe.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

That's only the SOS.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Now, if you took -- I don't know if it's one credit or ten credits, if you took a credit and we conveyed that for workforce housing purposes to give some relief to help enable workforce housing to be produced on a parcel, that credit would result in a residential setting probably with a higher usage than it would in the facilities that may expand under your bill? Is that what you're trying to --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Undoubtedly.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Undoubtedly. So in effect we should encourage transferring these credits to this type of use because it would have less impact on groundwater?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I would say so, yes. In essence, it really is -- it's not only designed to help protect from the environmental perspective, it's also, I think, if you will, a recognition that residents of the special districts shouldn't be compelled to have to spend a second time to achieve or acquire a parcel for sterilization purposes, when, in fact, when you look at the acquisition programs that we've had in place, for the better part of 30 years, what are we -- we're at 45,000, 50,000 acres in total that have been acquired and preserved throughout the County of Suffolk? County residents, as you well know, from your district, from my district, all over, have made the commitment time and time again to acquire and preserve property for the whole variety of reasons that we articulate.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And this would not exhaust the credits --

LEG. KENNEDY:

No.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- where we wouldn't have anything available for workforce housing. In fact, I think, Director Lansdale mentioned we've only used one credit since 2005.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, that's what our records indicate.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So here we have the ability to transfer these credits for a public purpose, to enhance facilities within Suffolk County for police, fire, what have you, emergency response. And at the same time by using some of those credits in that way as opposed to the residential use, you'd have less impact on groundwater. So I'm at a loss to see the downside for doing this.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Did you want to make a comment?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

(Shaking head no)

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

You just raised your hand. Or you were saying -- which of these programs has the -- have the ability to have TDR's? Not the Drinking Water, just the SOS? That was part of the referendum.

MS. FISCHER:

The SOS, yes, but also the New Drinking Water.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

The New Drinking Water?

MS. FISCHER:

New Drinking Water.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

The one that we revamped --

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

-- a few years ago.

MS. FISCHER:

Correct. In 2007.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Under SOS, we've transferred more than one credit.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, absolutely under SOS --

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

MS. FISCHER:

-- we did transfer a number of credits.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Yeah, that's what I thought.

MS. FISCHER:

There's only one credit as Sarah had mentioned that has been utilized. There has been over 9,000 that we've amassed both under --

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. And why haven't they been utilized?

MS. FISCHER:

There has been no developer coming forth to request of them for affordable housing -- workforce housing.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Because very often where the workforce housing winds up getting put is in sewerred areas where they don't need them.

MS. FISCHER:

Possibly, but we haven't researched all the reasons at this point why.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Currently the Planning Department is undergoing a study that's funded by HUD to evaluate and assess all of the TDR programs, not only that the County has but that Townships within Suffolk utilize as well to optimize their performance overall.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Well, I still feel that you're taking something that is protecting our drinking water and trying to solve a problem that's a completely different problem. It's a problem with the interpretation of the sanitary code with regards to the use of the square footage and so I will continue to oppose this.

LEG. D'AMARO:

George, did you mention that this is subject to a mandatory referendum?

MR. NOLAN:

Sure did.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You did.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Because, you know, it's important when you're using the funds that were approved initially by a referendum, in my opinion we're going back to the voters and say, "do you agree, do you want to spend your tax dollars?"

MR. NOLAN:

Right. I will say, as I've always said, this does not have to be subject to a referendum. It could be permissive.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. NOLAN:

Or it could be no referendum at all.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. NOLAN:

But the sponsor directed that we do it this way.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Very good. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. So there's a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. ANKER:

Opposed.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Motion is approved, right? There's only two of us. **(VOTE: 3-2-0-0. LEGISLATORS VILORIA-FISHER and ANKER OPPOSED.)**

Introductory resolutions. Oh, wait a minute, I have to go back to one. **IR 1729, Adopting Local Law No. -2011, A Charter Law to amend the Drinking Water Protection Program to fund remediation of contaminated commercial sites (Cilmi)** That is still in public hearing. It was recessed. So I will make motion to table, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **IR 1729 stands tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

Okay, **IR 1789, Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the Links at East Quogue, LLC property - East Quogue County Watershed addition Town of Southampton - (SCTM Nos. 0900-250.00-04.00-002.000 p/o, 0900-250.00-04.00-003.000 p/o, 0900-250.00-04.00-004.000 p/o, 0900-250.00-04.00-005.000 p/o, 0900-250.00-04.00-015.000, 0900-289.00-01.00-001.000, 0900-314.00-02.00-020.004, 0900-314.00-02.00-048.000, 0900-315.00-01.00-005.000 and 0900-315.00-01.00-015.000).** (Co. Exec.)

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The rating sheet is coming around. Would you like a report on this property?

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Members of the Committee -- Ed, if I could just have your attention. Members of the Committee have certainly seen this before. We've discussed it before. I don't think we have to have another presentation.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Nope.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I would like to know if there is a motion?

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Is there a second?

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, there's a motion to approve by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator Muratore. On the motion? Did you want to say something?

LEG. D'AMARO:

No. I'm waiting to vote against it.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. This is already up to the acquisition. Wasn't that quick?

MS. FISCHER:

This is the Links at East Quogue versus East Quogue Partners. This is 125 acres versus the 400 acre adjacent acquisition so it is not the same one that came before you a month or two ago, just to clarify that.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

So you are doing -- going forward as one of the Master List type of thing, you're treating them separately, right?

MS. FISCHER:

Yeah, we're creating two resolutions before you. One for the Pine Barrens core area, which is 1791. And this one, 1789, is the remaining portion and the compatible growth area. So we did split it up between the two programs, the Old and the New Drinking Water to help acquire it with those different program funding sources. And you have two maps before you. And we're just showing you the total but in two different formats. The 139.96 acre acquisition before you right now, 1789, has 12 structures. And they will be removed before closing. We are also having a partnership, a 50/50 partnership with the Town of Southampton on this acquisition.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

So the partnership is there. Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

All right. Legislator D'Amaro has a question.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you. What's the -- so the County cost is close to five million on this?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And if the County were not to acquire this, is this located in an area that could be developed or is threatened to be developed or is under contract to be developed? Do we have any of that information?

MS. FISCHER:

I knows that they had -- the owners had put in preliminary subdivision plans. I don't know if they were approved by the Town.

LEG. D'AMARO:

A subdivision plan on the whole -- do you know if it's the whole 139 plus acres?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Because I'm looking at the tax map and it seems like half of it could not be developed.

MS. FISCHER:

No, it was considered -- well, actually there are 14 parcels that make up this acquisition.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I see.

MS. FISCHER:

And they were all considered as part of the subdivision plan. They were incorporated into one subdivision proposal.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It was a residential subdivision?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Because I know there's a massive demand for housing right now. So it must be severe development pressure that they're under.

LAUGHTER

I say we hold out and hack another million dollars off the price.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

But going back to Legislator D'Amaro's questions, if I remember, Lou, when we first looked at this, there had been an application. There was clustering and there were a number of acres that were going to be preserved under the plan?

MS. FISCHER:

That was the East Quogue Partners that you're referring to, I believe.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

Sorry. That we did an extensive --

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I keep getting confused with these.

MS. FISCHER:

-- evaluation for you on.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Right.

MS. FISCHER:

Not this one.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

All right. No, I'm sorry, I did get confused when I saw the configuration. And so I think we'll let you keep talking.

MS. FISCHER:

The East Quogue Partners is in the yellow; outlined in the yellow on your map.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

The big one.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, that 400 acres is outlined in yellow. And that's the East Quogue Partners.

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's not this bill.

MS. FISCHER:

No. But we identified it on the map for you so you could see its relation to this acquisition in the red. And pink is actually IR 1791.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

That's why I was surprised that you did planning steps so quickly. Okay, so that clarifies. But this did have something before the board but it hadn't gotten approval.

MS. FISCHER:

That's my understanding. I don't think they went through with the final subdivision process with the Town.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

This is in -- what special protection or environmental consideration is there here?

MS. FISCHER:

Okay. The property is outlined in pink. And north of there that are under IR 1791 are located in the Pine Barrens core area. The area outlined in red is in the compatible growth area.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, I see. So it's just outside the Pine Barrens Core area.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes. IR 1789 is outside the core area.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But it adjoins it?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes. And portions of the properties bisect -- go between the two areas. It's hard to read, but there's a few of those parcels that are -- that bisect both areas.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, yes, I do see that. Okay. And the Town is splitting this acquisition 50/50?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, 50/50. We do want to make one comment in the resolution from the Town. It did indicate that there's a condition on the acquisition that Suffolk County assume management and stewardship responsibilities in full.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. We have a motion and a second. Did you have a question, Legislator Anker?

LEG. ANKER:

So what would the cost be for maintaining this parcel?

MS. FISCHER:

Well, it's in passive recreational use so it would be minimal. It's not an active recreational site, which would have substantial cost associated with it.

LEG. ANKER:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And you referred to buildings. Is that that southerly --

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, on the southerly portion of two of the lots, you'll see the one on Lewis Road has some structures on it, old buildings. The one -- the most easterly parcel has a -- two structures on it. It was a former hunting preserve. And it was more like -- it was -- it was somewhat looking like a residence rather than a larger structure. There's also a smaller building on that property as well that accommodated further people for overnight stays.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

All right. Are we ready to vote? Any other questions on the motion? Okay, we do have a motion and a second to approve. All in favor? Opposed? Okay, motion carries. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1790.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion.

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Authorizing the acquisition of Farmland Development Rights under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2007) for the Ringhoff Family Limited Liability Company #1 property - Ringhoff Farm - Town of Brookhaven - (SCTM Nos. 0200-512.00-01.00-017.000 and 0200-512.00-01.00-018.000). (Co. Exec.)

And, Commissioner, can you just tell us about the status?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure. The Department of Planning recommends authorizing the acquisition of farmland development rights from the Ringhoff Family Limited Liability Company. The acquisition is for two parcels totalling approximately 140 acres, which are located in the core preservation area of the New York Central Pine Barrens.

The large Ringhoff Farm parcel being offered for development rights acquisition includes out parcels, which are outlined in red on the map. Most of these out parcels are already owned by Suffolk County. The proposed acquisition received a Suffolk County farmland rating of 13.75 out of a possible 25 points and was recommended by the Legislature for inclusion in the Suffolk County purchase of Development Rights Program by the Suffolk County Farmland Committee in 2009.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Just for fun, what are all those little letters in the box at the lower right?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The parcels are -- the SC parcels are Suffolk County. Is that what you're asking for?

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Those.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's a soils map.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Thank you. Okay. Is there a motion?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator Muratore. On the motion? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

LEG. ROMAINE:

Will the Clerk please list me as a co-sponsor on that resolution, please.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And I just want to go back to a question that Legislator Anker asked earlier. I see that this is a potato farm; it's potato and corn. And is it still a potato farm?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, according to the information we've received, yes.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And, Legislator Anker, I think it'll be good to keep an eye on potato farms because they're, you know, heavy nitrogen load. We need to grow potatoes, but I hope that they keep up with all of the great work that we have in Cornell Cooperative with helping potato farmers to lower the amount of nitrogen that they're adding.

LEG. ROMAINE:

They also grow corn. I pass this farm everyday.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes, potato and corn. I said that.

IR 1791 Authorizing acquisition of land under the Old Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program [C12-5(E)(1)(B)] - for the Links at East Quogue, LLC property - East Quogue County Watershed addition - Pine Barrens Core - Town of Southampton - (SCTM Nos. 0900-219.00-01.00-026.000, 0900-219.00-01.00-027.000, 0900-219.00-01.00-028.000, 0900-219.00-01.00-029.000, 0900-250.00-04.00-002.000 p/o, 0900-250.00-04.00-003.000 p/o, 0900-250.00-04.00-004.000 p/o, 0900-250.00-04.00-005.000 p/o). (Co. Exec.) Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

This is the -- yeah, one that we had referred to before. This is the Pine Barrens core section of the acquisition just south of Sunrise and just a little north of Sunrise as well.

LEG. ROMAINE:

So it's Pine Barrens and whatever appraisals we're just paying for, understanding it can never be developed.

MS. FISCHER:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. And it's nine acres? Nine point something acres?

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

9.79.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

9.79 acres. I know in the scheme of things it's not a lot of money. But I'm going to vote against this because it's not going to be able to be developed. And I know that people have an as-of-right, we're supposed to make them whole, they can't build on their property. But you know what? The Pine Barrens Act is a State law and I'm tired of State laws. Let the State buy this. And I just -- I'm so tired of the State cutting us out of things. Let the State buy this. We can use the \$85,000. And I know we can't use it, you know, any way we want because it's dedicated. But we can buy another piece of property that might be -- might have development pressure. So that's my vote.

Yes, Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I wish I could vote the same way and cast caution to the wind, but I can't. The State set up the Pine Barrens Commission. They set up the Pine Barrens. And when they did, there's a lot of people that own property within that Pine Barrens area that had hopes of maybe retiring there, building something on that or doing whatever. They all got hurt. Because the State said "you can't build on it." But guess how much money they spent to buy it? Not one penny. What instead they did is they put up Pine Barrens credits. Well, that's great when the economy's going strong and people need credits, you know, to get a better yield on a project outside the Pine Barrens. But when it's not, no one's buying these Pine Barrens credits now. I got to tell you I feel for people that own --

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Let the fire departments buy them.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, maybe. John isn't here to defend that. But I feel for people that got hurt by this law. There's some that questioned it. There was a lot of litigation. They said how in the United States can you tell me if I own property, I have no right to develop it? And you need buy it. And the State will buy it from them. They said, "well, you can use Pine Barrens credits." So here we have an opportunity, and I'm going to turn it over to a far more learned person on this and that's our person from Real Estate to address this, Janet.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

The Chair recognizes Ms. Longo.

MS. LONGO:

I just want to explain I did work for DEC for the state for many years buying Pine Barrens land.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MS. LONGO:

Out of State environmental --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

-- protection money, which is how the state purchased land. The State purchased many, many hundreds, thousands of acres of Pine Barrens.

LEG. ROMAINE:

When did they stop that program?

MS. LONGO:

When they -- when the State ran out of money. Actually, you know when they stopped? When I came here.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's what drove you here. One job ends; another begins.

MS. LONGO:

To answer your question, the money that we're using for the core Pine Barrens, again, is dedicated money. It's cash in the bank. It's not being bonded. It's not being borrowed. It's there. And it can only be used on core Pine Barrens parcels. So the threat of development is the same on core Pine Barrens parcels, all of them. We still have money available in this fund. We're trying very hard to spend it to finish this program. There's not much left in the core. So any time a core piece comes to us, the money is there. It doesn't cost anything. There's no bonding. Doesn't cost -- there's no interest, there's no nothing. It's sitting there. Actually we made interest on that money sitting there; something like \$3 million, I think, we found about five years ago. So we were able to buy more Pine Barrens property. So we can't use it for anything else; only core Pine Barrens.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, that answered my question. So the money's sitting there and it can't be used for any acquisition outside the core Pine Barrens area.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I didn't know that.

MS. LONGO:

That's it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Where did the money come from?

MS. LONGO:

This money came originally from the State of New York.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You need to put your mic on, please.

MS. LONGO:

It's the original 1986 Quarter Percent money. Right, Laretta?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, it was 1987, the Old Drinking Water Protection Program.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So what would happen if we finished the program and had money left over? What would happen to that? Would it go back to taxpayers?

MS. LONGO:

I doubt it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Do you know?

MS. LONGO:

When does anything go back?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, do you know?

MS. LONGO:

Do I know for sure?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes.

MS. LONGO:

My understanding is the same as our Quarter Percent money. It was tax money.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, when you say it has no cost, my point is that if this property is located in an area where there's no risk of development -- right?

MS. LONGO:

That's not true.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, how is that not true?

MS. LONGO:

There's always a small risk of development in the core Pine Barrens. People can get hardship exemptions. They can apply to the Pine Barrens Commission --

LEG. D'AMARO:

But looking at this parcel, I think, the risk is non-existent given the size and configuration of this parcel for development.

MS. LONGO:

It can be used for density on the southern part which is in compatible growth.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, we just bought that.

MS. LONGO:

We didn't. Well, we're trying to buy it, yes. But it's all together.

LEG. D'AMARO:

My only point is that when you say it doesn't have a cost, it does have a cost.

MS. LONGO:

Everything has a cost.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I mean let's think rationally for a moment. Okay? So we're using taxpayer money, whether it came from the State or the County or anywhere else, to buy property that most likely will never, ever, ever be developed.

MS. LONGO:

Correct.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And you're telling me that there's not a cost to that. But what I'm saying is that, well, there is a cost to that because that's the taxpayers' money that we're using.

MS. LONGO:

It is -- the taxpayers are required -- the County and the State taxpayers by the Pine Barrens Law, they're required to purchase the property. We have to make people whole. There are three ways for people to be made whole under the Pine Barrens Act. Article 57 of the Environmental Conservation Law and the Land Use Plan that was created for that -- there were three ways that people could be made whole when their land is encumbered by the Pine Barrens Act. The State buys it, the County buys it or they can put a conservation easement on it, take their Pine Barrens credit, sell it to a developer; or they can keep it and use it. They could run dogs on it. They could lease it out to people to hunt. They can --

LEG. D'AMARO:

But you're not suggesting that County's required to purchase this property?

MS. LONGO:

I am.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

I am. Madam Chairwoman --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, wait, before you go, I'd like -- could you --

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Legislator D'Amaro, you would -- may I answer your question?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Wait a minute. No, hold on a second, please. No, just hold on. Just come back up because I saw the smirk when you left and I want to know what you think is so egregious about me asking about how we're spending a taxpayer's money.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

I'm going to answer that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, I want an answer from Janet.

MS. LONGO:

No, I don't think it's egregious at all.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. That's all. I just wanted to know because I --

MS. LONGO:

No --

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- noticed the reaction. Go ahead. Thank you.

MS. LONGO:

I'm trying to explain the Pine Barrens, which I know happened a long time ago. I know that there -- you know, things get forgotten sometimes along the way. Personally I've been working on the Pine Barrens properties for fifteen years now --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

-- between the State and the County. And it's almost done.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, I'm not asking any of that. All I'm asking is whether or not the County is required to purchase this property. Okay, yeah, go ahead.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Madam Chairwoman, thank you. And, Legislator D'Amaro, I appreciate your inquiry. But I believe you would appreciate the owner of this property was made an offer to have their property purchased by the County. That offer was made on the entire property. We, the County, are splitting up the acquisition.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I didn't vote for either one of those planning steps, so, you know.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

They've been passed by this Legislature. We wouldn't have gotten to this point.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, I agree. But that's not my question. My question is whether or not we're required to buy this property.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

And I would say it would be disingenuous for the County to have made an offer to the seller and have --

LEG. D'AMARO:

That's just your opinion now. It's my job to make a decision here.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

We've split this acquisition up --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Are we required to buy the property?

DIRECTOR GREENE:

I believe you are.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Under what authority?

DIRECTOR GREENE:

An offer that was made on behalf of the County to purchase the property. We, the Division, have split this acquisition into two parts so we can utilize that money that already exists.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I understand that.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

We felt we were doing a good thing by doing so.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, I understand all of that. I understand all of that. We're not required to pass this resolution and buy this property.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

And I would submit it goes part and parcel with the previous resolution that you just submitted. And it would be disingenuous to the seller of the land to now bifurcate out parts that they could have used for the development.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The Chair of this Committee took a position that the prior parcels maybe should be purchased because it would be subjected to development pressure where as this would not be.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

It would be used for the development on the southern parcel.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I don't see anything disingenuous about that. And I think that's a poor choice of words, frankly.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

And quite frankly, with all due respect, if you were the attorney for the seller --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

-- I think your argument would be very vehement that it was disingenuous for the seller to have been made an offer on their property and to now have part of that property split off and not be purchased.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's irrelevant. I'm here to decide today whether or not to buy this parcel. I'm not here to consider whether or not the attorney for the buyer would be angry at me. I'm here to decide whether or not it makes sense for taxpayers.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

And we submit that it is. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Wait. Don't go away, Pam. I have a question for you because when I looked at the resolution, I saw that it was 12-5 E money.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Correct.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And I remember buying regular open space parcels outside of the core with 12-5 E money. That's what, you know -- and each town was allotted a certain amount of 12-5 E money. And so I'm very confused. Please explain to me because -- I think Laretta wants to explain it to me. Everybody wants to explain it. But it is confusing. And there's people who are sitting around this horseshoe right now who weren't sitting here in, you know, '99 and 2000 and 2001 when we were still using 12-5 E money.

DIRECTOR GREENE:

Madam Chair, I'm perfectly fine allowing Planning to direct that. And you are absolutely correct. There are those sources of funding. But I would also submit, and again to Legislator D'Amaro's question, that this is an acquisition when it was presented at ETRB and then passed to now come here, it was done as one acquisition of all the property.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm just trying -- this is an academic question. Okay? Not about even this specific article. Okay? We're talking about whether money is money, or if it's not spending any money. Okay? That was -- that's where we are right now. And I recall 12-5 E money being spent outside of the Pine Barrens, that each Town had an allocation of 12-5 E money. So explain to me why this is only in the Pine Barrens.

MS. FISCHER:

There are two sections of 12-5 E: 12-5 E one (a) and 12-5-E one (b). 12-5 E one (a) is the non-Pine Barrens Towns portion of 12-5 E. 12-5 E one (b) is the Pine Barrens portion of the law that

stipulates to be -- to acquire properties within the core. So there are two parts of 12-5 E money. And this is the Pine Barrens portion of it.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MS. FISCHER:

Rather than the non-Pine Barrens. And I understand the confusion, but this is separate.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. So, you know, my error in reading the legislation was that if we didn't use this \$85,000 to buy Pine Barrens credit -- Pine Barrens property, which doesn't have -- it virtually doesn't have development pressure. I mean is there a chance that somehow rules can be bent and it could be bought? Sometimes, yes. But it really has virtually no development pressure. But you're saying it's in a lockbox account which is the 12-5-E (b).

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, E one. Correct.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

E one (b), which can only be -- that's seems like such a shame, when we can use the money in other places. But I guess to protect the rights of ownership; of land ownership. That's why that had to be allocated that way.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes. Our requirement to be a part of the Pine Barrens initiative and legislation, that was to be our role; the County's role. The Towns also have roles as well as the state.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Can we access the interest that we get on it? Or does that have to be kept within that fund?

MS. FISCHER:

We keep them separate; as separate fund sources. That can be reiterated by Real Estate.

LEG. D'AMARO:

How much is in that account?

MS. FISCHER:

Excuse me?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Sorry.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

How much is in the account?

MS. LONGO:

Okay. After this acquisition gets approved? \$238,000 is left.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

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

LEG. ANKER:

(Indicating)

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Opposed.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Me, too. It's a waste of money.

MS. ORTIZ:

It fails.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yep, we got to turn off the spigot at some point. So how much is left now that the resolution wasn't approved? Two can play that game. We can go back and forth all day like that.

CHAIRWOMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, we have no more business.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:05 PM
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**