

1/28/2013 EPA Committee

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A meeting of the Environment, Planning & 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 January 28, 2013.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Kara Hahn, Chairwoman
Leg. DuWayne Gregory, Vice Chair
Leg. Sarah S. Anker
Leg. Thomas F. Barraga (excused absence)
Leg. Albert Krupski, Jr.

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Presiding Officer William J. Lindsay, 8th Legislative District
Leg. Kate M. Browning, 3rd Legislative District
George M. Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Alicia Howard, Legislative Aide
Thomas Vaughn, County Executive Assistant III
Robert Lipp, Acting Director/Budget Review Office
Laura Halloran, Budget Review Office
Sarah Lansdale, Director/Department of Planning
Lauretta Fischer, Principal Environmental Analyst/Department of Planning
Janet Longo, Real Property Acquisition & Management
Walter Dawydiak, Chief Public Health Engineer, Environmental Quality
Frank P. Castelli, Environment Projects Coordinator/DEE
Michael Maraviglia, Environmental Analyst, Economic Development
Seth Squicciarino, Aide to Leg. Hahn
Amy Ellis, Aide to Leg. Anker
Michael Pitcher, Aide to PO Lindsay
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:12 PM

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Will all Legislators please report to the horseshoe for the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee? All right. Will all Legislators please report to the horseshoe for the Environment Committee. And then we'll all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Krupski.

SALUTATION

And I was told by the Clerk that we don't have any cards today. Is there anyone from the public who would like to be heard? Okay. Seeing none, I would like to welcome our newest Legislator, Al Krupski, to the Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee. Welcome.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Look forward to working with you on this Committee. And Legislator Barraga has an excused absence.

With that, I was told that the Executive branch had a request for a few items to be taken out of order quickly before the presentation because they have staff from other departments here to answer questions that we may have. So I would like to -- am I going to be told something else? Okay, good.

MR. VAUGHN:

I thought you were asking me to advise on that. No, we're good.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

What I do need you to verify is the bill numbers that I'm going to take out of order.

MR. VAUGHN:

Thank you very much, Legislator. The bills that we were just asking to be taken out of order were the ones that pertain to the 477 funding, the newly introduced ones. And they would be IR 1009, 1013, 1014 and 1015. And we have -- yes, we have a member of our Health Department here and we also have a member of our Budget staff and -- our Budget Analyst we need to get returned back over to the Dennison sooner rather than later, please.

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay. I am going to make a motion to take out of order Introductory Resolution 1009, seconded by Legislator Anker. All in favor of taking it out of order? Opposed? Okay, it's now before us, 1009. On the bill, who wanted to come forward from the different Budget Offices and Health Department? Hey, Frank. Just state your name, both of you. I know we see you all the time, but state your name for the record, please.

MR. CASTELLI:

Frank Castelli from Department of Economic Develop and Planning.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Walter Dawydiak, Suffolk County Health Department, Division of Environmental Quality.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Excellent, thank you. So we have before us **(1009) amending the Adopted 2013 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with an evaluation of innovative/alternative sewage disposal systems to remediate water quality in Suffolk County (CP 8710). (Co. Exec.)** That is now before us out of order. And so -- this came through Water Quality Review Committee; correct, Frank?

MR. CASTELLI:

Yes, this project came originally before the Committee during 2011. And it was recommended for funding at the July -- July 26, 2011 meeting. And it was further affirmed at our September 25th, 2012 meeting.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Excellent. And I'm very excited that this is going to move forward. Walter, I'd love for you just to tell the Committee, you know, your two sentences or three, if possible, on what this -- the purpose of this. Because it is a really important purpose. And I would like the Committee to hear that. Thank you.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Thank you, Legislator Hahn. I have to hold this button down. I'm sorry.

Thank you, Legislator Hahn. I came pretty much just to answer questions. I'm happy to give you a brief overview of this. The Health Department is now completing phase one of our Innovative Alternative On-Site Disposal System Study. That study looks at systems capable of achieving the groundwater discharge standard of ten parts per million total nitrogen. So that could be used in lieu of density and any land use setting in Suffolk County.

We now have three systems: The Chromaglass, the Nitrex and the Best and shortly we believe that the AirRotor a fourth, will be added to this list of tools being able to support environmental health protection as well as economic development opportunities in this County, which are inextricably intertwined, of course. These systems are approved for flows from 1,000 to 15,000 gallons per day. In terms of households, that mean three to 50 homes.

The questions that would remain unanswered are whether any of these systems really can be viable for single family residences. None of them were definitively shown to be useable in our environment in a cost effective or logistical matter to protect groundwater and surface waters.

We also are finishing our Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan. We have a good idea of the status and trends of groundwater quality countywide. And we hope that this study will tell us the ultimate answer, what will happen to our groundwater if we do nothing and what will happen if we implement a series of different management alternatives, which is information that the policymakers need before they can implement any regional sorts of strategies.

What this study does is it focuses primarily on small flows. And we lower the bar on nitrogen removal to 50 percent removal, meaning un-sewered areas. We'd still be required to have density potentially if doesn't meet ten milligrams per liter, but we're looking for cost effective systems that might remove nitrogen, but not necessarily ones for the drinking water standard; the idea being that -- if there's a much less expensive system out of there, it may be viable. We have vendors who are promoting different sorts of additives and treatment processes. We want to systematically look at these and test these to see whether they'll be useful.

The study is going to be roughly 12 to 24 months. It was initially designed as a two-year study. The County Executive would like to see it done with one year to the extent possible. And at the end

1/28/2013 EPA Committee

of the day what we want is answers to the questions of what's happening to groundwater and surface water. We know that our sanitary code is doing a good job for new development for drinking water. Estuaries require additional protection particularly with respect to nitrogen removal.

It's also going to help support development of a map of areas, which areas are going to be viable candidates for individual onsite disposal systems that come out of this evaluation, which ones may be subject to cluster decentralized wastewater treatment, and which ones may be appropriate for large scale sewerage with the 20 some odd studies that the County Department of Public Works is doing.

So it's a pretty exciting time. We think we're about a year or two away from putting all the pieces together and making some meaningful change in County wastewater technology and policy, again, to support the environment as well as the economy. That's a nutshell of this project. We'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And if those were all commas in there, maybe you were within three sentences.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I'm sorry?

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

I'm just kidding. Just kidding. Three things: We obviously could sit here for four hours today discussing this study and the benefits of this study, which direction you're going and why, etcetera, etcetera. We don't want to do that, of course. But three things: Really, really -- and I've been pushing, but really, really want to see that Comprehensive Resource Management -- am I saying it right-- Plan finished ASAP. Like that's something, I think, that all of us on this Committee are in agreement with. We really need that done. I'm glad you are doing that.

Two: I'm very excited about the -- this is very important research that's happening about these treatment systems. But the environmental standard is probably, I think, from what I've been told closer to two parts per million and we really got to come to some kind of understanding of that and really, really be working on that. So I look forward to working with you in the future. I don't know where you're going with allowing greater than the 10 parts per million so we'll have to talk about that at a later date. But we need the research you're doing to have the statistics, the data so that we know where we are and what these things can do. So that's very important. And so -- and this was approved by the Committee. And that was something that a couple of us had questions about or were told otherwise. So I'm glad to hear that.

Any other questions of the Committee? Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes, thank you. I thought we did allocate four hours for this subject.

(Laughter)

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Any relevant questions? We welcome them.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You know, you mentioned that you're looking at alternative systems already for more than one household. How many of those systems has the Suffolk County Health Department approved?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

To date we've approved the Chromaglass, the Best System and we have applications pending for the Nitrex. So those three different types of systems are approve-able. In terms of the actual number that are out there, I don't have the number handy. It's on the order of 20 or so, plus or minus as an estimate. Most of them are Cromaglasses today but I can get that number for you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I'm sorry. No, you don't have to. I'm sorry. I mean besides the Cromaglass, which have been approved. What's the timeline on approving those?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Well, the Best and the Nitrex are approved. And they can go into use immediately. And again we have -- the Best is in place and the Nitrex has applications pending. The AirRotor is going to be approve-able shortly with the publication of the report, which is coming within a month or so. These, again, are commercial systems from 1,000 to 15,000 gallons per day. They're subsurface. They qualify for reduced separation distances to structures and property lines, which makes them a lot more cost effective to install and it gives you a lot more flexibility working with the land that you have available to you. So the short answer is four systems approved; two are in the ground, one will be shortly and one will be approve-able.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You mentioned a, you know, a comprehensive plan for groundwater resources and sewage treatment. Would that result in expediting permits and approvals for systems if people had a better idea of what was expected for them in different areas?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I think it would certainly help. It's a complicated question you're asking. The next resolution it will be discussed as a cluster decentralized resolution, which is a good example of why it's so difficult. To the extent that we could provide some clarity, focus and direction to the community about which systems are presumptively approval-able and where they should be used and to the extent that we can streamline our own housekeeping internally as a result, it's certainly going to make for a more predictable and protective process, which is good for everybody. That's the goal.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Any other questions? Okay. So, this is before us. I'm going to make a motion to approve; seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Introductory resolution 1009 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-1. PO LINDSAY INCLUDED IN VOTE. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE)**

I'm going to make a motion to take out of order **Introductory Resolution 1013, Amending the Adopted 2013 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with a Pilot Study for Clustered Treatment of Decentralized Wastewater in the Peconic Estuary (CP 8710). (Co. Exec.)** That was a motion to take it out of order. I need a second. Seconded by Legislator Anker. All those in favor of taking 1013 out of order? Opposed? Abstentions? 1013 is before us.

Same question, Frank, this was approved by the Committee?

MR. CASTELLI:

Yes, it was. This one was approved by the Committee at our September 25th, 2012 meeting. This project was brought forward by Peconic Green Growth, the primary representative being Glynis

1/28/2013 EPA Committee

Berry. Glynis, unfortunately, cannot be with us today, but I should be able to answer any questions about this project. This project goes along pretty well with the one that was just addressed. This --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay, I'm going to make a motion to approve 1013; seconded by Legislator Gregory. On the motion? Anybody have any questions about this project?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Is there a location for this pilot project?

MR. CASTELLI:

There are no specific locations yet, but it will be within the Peconic Estuary. I think that Peconic Green Growth did identify several sub-water sheds within the Peconic Estuary area that they are targeting for the study, but I don't think they've actually made final determinations yet on the location.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Well, what's the timeline for that study?

MR. CASTELLI:

The study will be done within one year.

MR. DAWYDIAK:

If I may clarify, we worked with Glynis Berry, the sponsor of this, quite closely. One of the threshold tasks is to work with municipalities and community groups to further tailor an area where this might be viable and workable. So while there's a number of communities that are on the table, the point of the project is to really work with the group and get to the preliminary design phase to find out where something would be cost effective and workable in an area. So it is a great companion to our regional project.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

So remind me, was this about retrofitting?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Yes. It would be a component of retrofit potentially with accommodating additional flow also.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Excellent, excellent. Yeah, I think that's very important; like, for example, you know, the Forge River. I always think of when I think of these -- these things, the possibility of buying up vacant property, foreclosed property, maybe the County giving it over, putting at the -- one of these systems on and having the homes that are currently cesspooled sitting right on the Forge River be retrofitted to almost like a sewer system, but much smaller. So if that's -- that's sort of the kind of think we're studying and piloting here? Sort of?

MR. CASTELLI:

Yeah, that's what we're talking about; really trying to study the viability of connecting several residences, maybe up to -- up to 50 so that they could come up with more viable -- more environmentally beneficial treatment.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Excellent. So, again, I made a motion to approve. And we have a second by Legislator Gregory. Were there anymore questions? Good. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Good.

Introductory Resolution 1013 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-1. PO LINDSAY INCLUDED IN VOTE. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE)

One more time I'm going to make a motion to take out of order **Introductory Resolution 1014, Amending the Adopted 2013 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with Village of Sag Harbor Havens Beach stormwater remediation (CP 8240). (Co. Exec.)** That was a motion to take out of order by myself. Any second? Seconded by Legislator Anker. All those in favor of taking it out of order? Opposed? Abstentions? Introductory Resolution 1014 is now before us. Once again that went before the Committee this past -- this past cycle?

MR. CASTELLI:

Yes, it did.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Yeah.

MR. CASTELLI:

This was recommended by the Committee at the September 25th, 2012 meeting. This is a stormwater remediation project for the Village of Sag Harbor. This is fully matched by the Village. They are coming up with matching funds. This is a project that will do a lot of good in remediating stormwater that currently rushes down from the hills of Sag Harbor down towards the harbor through a drainage ditch untreated. And with -- untreated source of stormwater has resulted in numerous problems for this -- Haven Beach. There's been closures due to excessive runoff fecal coliform counts. This project will put in a series of treatment. There's some biological treatment that's going to go on and also end of pipe filtration that will be installed to help treat the stormwater prior to entering the beach area.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay. I'll make a motion to approve 1014; seconded by Legislator Anker. On the motion, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

I have a question as far as the type of remediation. Can you briefly describe what that may look like?

MR. CASTELLI:

Okay. I'm going to see if someone's here to answer that question. If not, I have a good idea, but there might be someone that could answer that better than I could.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Hello, come on. You can sit down where Walter sat. And please state your name -- name and title for the record, please.

MR. SCHIANO:

Michael Schiano, from Inter-Science Research Associates. We're the Environmental Planning Consultants for the Village of Sag Harbor. And we've been doing a lot of the work for both permitting and planning this project.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Your question, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Can you describe the type of remediation system that's going to be used with this project?

MR. SCHIANO:

Yeah. Right now it really is just a drainage ditch. There's a pipe that collects about 33 acres worth of stormwater. We're going to dredge out that -- all of the stuff that's been collecting there for the past the 75 to 100 years and create both a small wetland area, kind of a wetland channel. That'll collect a lot of the sediment and should also help to filter out nitrogen and other nutrient pollution. But the main thing is there's going to be a concrete vault that's going to hold a filtration media called Smart Sponge Plus, which is made by a company called Ab Tech Industries. It's a filtration media that has the ability -- that when water with fecal coliform bacteria that's in it -- in the water passes through it, it actually takes out the -- kills the bacteria and removes it from the water before it flows back into the -- goes into the Bay.

LEG. ANKER:

Great. Actually it sounds like -- I think -- a vegetated swale?

MR. SCHIANO:

(Nodding in the affirmative)

LEG. ANKER:

That type of -- where the water would flow into. And then there's an additional Smart Sponge Plus. Now how does that differ again? We had -- there was some questions with the Fabco units. And I know that those were basically taken out and given away. How does this differ from the previous remediation filtration units that the County has?

MR. SCHIANO:

I'm not sure -- I know that compared to the Fabco Units, the Smart Sponge Plus, it's a lot denser. So a lot more of the surface -- so when water passes through, there's a lot more surface area in the sponges themselves. So it treats the water a lot better than what we've seen in terms of technical results from the Fabco Units.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. Would this system need to be maintained?

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Well, we also have the Village. We have the Village partnering with us on this. I'm assuming they'll be doing that, right?

MR. SCHIANO:

Yeah, the Village -- we're in the process of preparing a maintenance plan that's going to be reviewed by the DEC, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. We're still trying to iron out exactly what the maintenance is going to be, but the Village is going to handle all the maintenance as far as I've been told.

LEG. ANKER:

Again, it's a shame that we could not maintain those Fabco Units, which I think probably would have been a very valuable source of remediation for the County. But, again, my concern would be let's -- let's make sure that that's resolved, you know, before we move forward; because it was an issue prior with remediation. And it's so important.

I know in my district in Mt. Sinai, there's a huge issue with our Mt. Sinai Harbor, the stormwater runoff. And they actually closed down the entire harbor, the people that fish there, that clam, that use it as recreation. The entire harbor gets closed down. Is there a priority list for water areas that

might be able to participate in what you're doing here in Sag Harbor?

MR. CASTELLI:

I do not have any knowledge of a priority list. There very well may be. The Health Department may have such a list, but I don't have that information. I do know that this area here in Haven Beach in Sag Harbor was one of the areas that has historically been a problem in terms of stormwater runoff. So if there is any such list, I'm sure they're on it, because this has been a problem, but I'm not familiar with an actual list.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

But this project, we're funding one site and what sounds almost like -- I mean, one pipe way. Because the problem that the County has had was there were hundreds and hundreds of filters. And it was a real, like, maintenance problem for our DPW staff. This is one site, maybe only a handful of filters and the Village is going to maintain it and we're just helping get those filters in.

MR. SCHIANO:

Yeah, the filters are only going to go in one location. There are going to be a lot of filters in order to handle the flow of the water that goes through. But instead of having them all in catch basins and in street filtration areas, it's really -- it's point source. It's one point that all the water's going to go through.

LEG. ANKER:

And this is a pilot program, this particular -- is this the first time it's been done?

MR. SCHIANO:

It's been done in other places in the country, but we haven't been able to go to any places that -- I think that maybe it has been done in Massachusetts, in Long Beach, California and in other places. But in this particular instance, it's the first one that I know of within this region.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. Thank you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Is part of the DEC permitting requirement for testing for coliform levels before and after construction? Or coliform and nutrient levels?

MR. SCHIANO:

It's not part of the DEC's requirements. They are happy of the fact that there's going to be some treatment in general. And because it is a public bathing beach, the Suffolk County Department of Health will be monitoring this through their Bathing Beach Program. So we'd hoped to be able to work with them and have that data afterward to see that it really has helped the situation.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So now it's just a mainline flow through. And it's going to be filtered and treated now. But I guess my point was in response to the other comments about the other filters that the County had used and hadn't worked out well, I guess my point is should the County require then some sort of -- any sort of testing to make sure that the treatment's effective just moving forward?

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Frank, you're -- oh, I'm sorry, maybe this is Walter. If there's been testing that the County has done, we have a baseline data for that beach and that water body that we then can compare any

post tests to; is that correct? Or is there something more specific?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

It can be done any time, pre-construction really. And then, you know, hopefully in the summer when there would be more -- presumably more contamination. And then just even once post construction, just to get an idea. And then, of course, as the filter operates, you'd know if it was effective or not just because of the water flow through it.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Do you have knowledge of this and what's going on here?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

I do. The statement about the bathing beach is correct. That'll provide an accurate although somewhat indirect measure of what's happening in water quality in the area. We do have a long history of monitoring in the area and have worked with the Village and its consultants. We're happy to grab some samples to take some indicator as a measure of effectiveness of this system. This is one of the few high priority areas that have been identified in the Peconics. It's crying out for some sort of control. This is a worthwhile project to implement and test moving forward.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Do we have a -- I'll make a motion to approve. Do we have a motion to approve and a second, I believe. So all those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1014 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-1. PO LINDSAY INCLUDED IN VOTE. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE)**

One more. I'm going to make a motion to take out of order **Introductory Resolution 1015, Amending the Adopted 2013 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with the project for Monitoring Tidal Water Elevation and Water Quality to Assess Tidal Wetland Loss in Flax Pond and embayments of Long Island Sound, New York (CP 8710). (Co. Exec.)** That was a motion to take that out of order. I would like a second.

LEG. ANKER:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Seconded by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? Introductory resolution 1015 is before us. Again, this was approved at the last Committee and -- so okay.

MR. CASTELLI:

Yes, it was. This was recommended on September 25th, 2012. This is a project that is also going to be fully matched in terms of the funding that Suffolk County will provide out of our Water Quality Funding. This is a water quality monitoring station up in Flax Pond which is --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

In my district, yes, yes.

MR. CASTELLI:

-- north of Stony Brook in the Old Field area. And this is an important monitoring station that has fallen into disrepair. And the funding that we are recommending be provided by the County would go a long way towards repairing this station. I have someone here if you have any specific questions from Chris Schubert from USGS.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you. Thank you, Chris, for being here. I don't have any questions. I'm going to make a motion to approve 1015, seconded by Legislator Anker. So on the motion we have -- we have the motion on the floor. Legislator Anker, you do have a question? Okay.

LEG. ANKER:

And, again, for USGS, again, it's great. It looks like the funding of \$250,560 for the network operation. Do you want to give us a little bit of information about the actual system and, you know, how badly it's needed? It looks like it's well outdated and it needs to be updated.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Just state your name and title and organization you're with for the record, please.

MR. SCHUBERT:

Sure. Chris Schubert with US Geological Survey. And the station is part of a four-station network in wetlands embayments of Long Island Sound. One of the sites is in Suffolk County at Flax Pond in Old Field. The other three sites are along the North Shore of Nassau County. This was something that was originally set up and conceived by the DEC Marine Bureau several years back. And over the years because of funding cuts, we've had to discontinue various monitoring elements. That said, there has been a coalition of the willing to continue to fund the stations on an ad hoc basis and are -- what we're looking for today is to put the Suffolk County station on a more stable footing moving forward. We're also having some parallel discussions with Nassau County, Office of Emergency Management about trying to do the same thing for those.

But essentially the matched funding and the funding for the Flax Pond Station is for operation and maintenance expenses. So it covers the cost of replacing and advertising equipment, labor for USGS staff to quality sure, quality control, the equipment at the site and to publish the record as well. And the data are available via the internet and also available from our online Annual Water Data Reports. As far as getting the Flax Pond Station fully rehabilitated, essentially it would be reinstalling equipment that had to be removed from it because of funding reductions and bringing it back up to a full functionality which would include making the data available in real time on the web; so within a few minutes of it being collected.

LEG. ANKER:

And I think it's a very, very important project. Our Long Island Sound is so vital to our economy. And you're looking at -- the Legislators you're seeing right here are all along the north shore; so whatever we can do to create better water quality.

As far as maintaining the system or monitoring the system, is -- you know, I'm assuming some of the funding will go towards that. But is there a chance that you might be able to use student interns? I'm trying to push this as much as I can. I'm Chair of Education, and how important it is for the kids and the people coming out of school, coming out of college, that they have firsthand experience on new technology related to, you know, very important projects like this.

MR. SCHUBERT:

Absolutely. Actually to address the first question on the maintenance, essentially all of the funding is either for equipment or for staff time to operate and maintain the station. As far as student interns, I should say that many of our employees actually have come on as student interns and

given an opportunity to work on stations like this. And ultimately they have become a pool from which we select future hires. But as far for the Flax Pond Station in general, I know there are a variety of researchers both at the secondary school level and also at the State University that regularly conduct research in that area. And so it's a bit of hotbed -- it's a bit of a hotbed of student research. And I think even Amanda {Beers} and her teacher, who you may recall from being in the news a few years ago, the young woman, the homeless woman, won or placed fairly high up in the Intel Science Competition, have actually been doing work at that station using our data.

LEG. ANKER:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay. We have a motion to approve and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Oh, I'm sorry. One question. One quick question. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Water quality testing for what?

MR. SCHUBERT:

So, the station will collect baseline data on water temperature, on salinity, on dissolved oxygen, on Ph and on tripartite. And dissolved oxygen is usually, as you probably know, is a very important parameter for Astramicro Systems. And Ph is also an important measure of ocean certification. So in addition to these parameters, we also have a tide gauge at the site to provide some context as to the tidal stage when we collect the data. And ultimately, most if not all of these parameters, can also be the foundation for a climate change set in a modern program.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you. Okay. We have a motion to approve and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1015 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-1. PO LINDSAY INCLUDED IN VOTE. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE)**

Thank you to the Committee for allowing those to be out of order. Thank you to staff from other departments for being here today. Thank you, Walter, and all those who were ready to answer questions on those projects.

PRESENTATION

Now we'd like to get to the presentation. It may actually help us with other items on the agenda later today. And so I'd like to bring forward Director Lansdale. And I would like to take this opportunity once again, because she is in the audience, to give a very special thank you to Laretta Fischer for all her hard work on the report that was done as a result of my legislation that I authored and that this body approved. And I know you're probably cursing me half the time (laughter) but thank you very much for all your hard work on this and the entire Department who put in many, many long hours to pull this together. But it was very much needed. I do believe and I know you all agreed and now we are going to hear from Director Lansdale and maybe some of you as needed about where we are with the Master List update and where maybe we should be going.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Thank you so much, Chairwoman Hahn. And it's a pleasure to be before all of the members of this Committee and welcome, Legislator Krupski, to the Committee.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Happy new year to everyone.

I'd also like to just extend my thanks and appreciation to not only Laretta Fischer who worked on this and spearheaded this effort, but also the other staff in my department, including Katie Magee, Carl Lind, Kate Oheim and Andrew Amakawa for working on this project as well.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you, Director Lansdale. And I -- of course we all extend thanks to them as well.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Thanks.

So if you could just look at the screen before you which has the presentation, as you see, Suffolk County has made a huge investment and a commitment to open space and farmland acquisition. On the map on the screen right now shows the acres that the County has had a hand in acquiring. The dark green are the open space parcels. And the pale green includes the farmland development rights parcels.

For the purposes of the Master List report that we prepared and delivered on time to the Legislature, we focussed in on the open space parcels highlighted in dark green. And here are the parcels in orange that are -- were acquired -- identified on the Master List and acquired. The purple shaded parcels are the ones that make up this report. These are the ones that we're recommending be retained on the Master List so -- and that is approximately 4,649 acres. That's in the purple.

In addition as we know we're not the only ones acquiring open space. We've had great partnerships with our Towns as well as the Federal and State governments. And here is a snapshot of all of the land that is preserved. The areas in yellow are the areas that are the private golf courses and cemeteries. So while they're technically in open space right now they -- well, the golf courses -- the private courses could in the future be developed. But the area in green, if you were to focus on that, both shades of green, the light green and the dark green, account for approximately 20% of all of the space in Suffolk County.

So, briefly, there were -- on the original Master List 7,733 acres that was identified for open space acquisition representing 138 assemblages. We through the legislation looked at properties that have already been acquired by the County. So of that 7,733 acres that were originally identified, we've acquired approximately 1400 acres.

Others: Other partners, whether that's -- our Federal, State, Town partners or others, acquired approximately 1,187 acres. And in reviewing all of the properties identified originally on the Master List, there are approximately 440 acres that we are not recommending be retained on the Master List. They've either been developed or there's other reasons why we're not recommending acquisition moving forward.

We've also assigned a numerical rating and have a rating sheet for every assemblage in this effort. So, we're suggesting that 1,040 parcels remain on the list with an acreage of 4,649 acres, representing 86 assemblages. So the funding source for this:

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Love that penny image.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Quarter penny, get it?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, quarter penny. So the funding source, as we all know, comes from the -- what's called the Quarter Penny Sales Tax and Water Quality Protection Programs. And those were the resolutions that you just passed. Some samples or projects that come out of that source of funding accounts for 11.75% of the Quarter Penny; sewer tax protection is 25%; open space and farmland protection is 31.1%. And then there's countywide protection -- tax protection of 32.15%. This is all information that you already know so I'm not going to dwell on it.

Here is the funding status for this funding source from the Quarter Penny. So I think at one of the last legislative meetings in 2012, there was a funding resolution that was passed to bring forward funding of approximately 17 million for open space acquisitions, open space farmland and other acquisitions. That leaves us with a funding balance, if you add the 75.5 remaining to the 17.6, you get approximately \$25 million of funding that we currently have for open space and farmland.

If you subtract out, then, everything that -- what we like to call is in the pipeline, properties that are in contract, which equal about 1.3 million, accepted offers of 13.3 million, in negotiation 7.3 million, that leaves us with total projected expenditures of approximately 22 million. That does not account for the line four, which is in planning steps of eight parcels approximately 100 acres.

Now I should note that one of the eight parcels that's in planning steps currently is 80 acres. So the rest of the -- the seven other parcels are smaller in size. And that 80 acres represents a partnership, a 50/50 partnership with a local municipality. So as you can see we have a heightened concern for --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

I'm sorry, I'm just going to interrupt to clarify.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

We do have some new members on the Committee. So "in planning steps" means that the planning step has been passed by the Legislature and it has not yet made its way to ETRB to know the price.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you. And anything "in negotiation" with prices there has been through ETRB.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, obviously because there's is a --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

-- a price, yeah so -- and we have -- as we just looked at in the previous slide with a penny on it,

1/28/2013 EPA Committee

future funding acquisition comes from 31.1 percent of the Quarter Percent Sales Tax. So it's projected, and this is in anticipation, this is a rough number, that approximately \$5 million could be available as of December 31st, 2013 for future acquisitions.

So we are -- we have a heightened concern about this situation, that there is -- we want to make sure that -- we're concerned that interest letters can you be sent out without having that funding be available. So we wanted to bring that to members of this Committee. And we have some suggestions and recommendations on how to move forward.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Excellent. And just because we are kind of moving on -- after this is kind of what comes next, do you mind if we interrupt just for a few questions about where we are?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure. Yep.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

I want to bring in our Budget Review Office because sometimes numbers and dollars don't match up. But I want to -- I want to understand. Robert, are you in agreement on, you know, what we can possibly be spending this year where we are here? Obviously you guys not knowing all the details about what just passed ETRB, and what, you know, where we have those numbers, but are there any other pots of money out there that maybe we should be thinking about that is cash and not the bonded -- the Multifaceted or the Legacy, but such as Local Law 35 of '99 or other pots of money that maybe we should -- that should be part of what we're talking about?

MR. LIPP:

Right. Okay. So, first of all, just to reflect on what Sarah had just mentioned, we wrote a memo that we just distributed. And it's consistent with what's being discussed now. Our numbers were from year end 2012. And apparently there were about \$3 million more of properties in negotiation that she's presenting now. So if you add that to the list here, then, we're in complete agreement on that.

In terms of additional monies, the previous Quarter Cent Program, that is the one that was adopted in 1999, the current program was adopted in 2007, according to the budget still has balances of almost \$10 million; almost 1.1 million in open space acquisitions and another 8.8 million for farmland acquisitions that we're not quite sure what -- at this point we haven't had a conversation with the Budget Office -- what is planned for that, but apparently those monies are out there in addition to this.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay. And so --

MR. LIPP:

That needs clarification with the Budget Office, what's going on.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

That needs -- that needs clarification. Still doesn't bring us to -- what did we spend last year, 55 million? Somewhere in that range?

MR. LIPP:

It was close.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Fifty-six.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Fifty-six million dollars we spent year on open space and farmland preservation properties. So we're still not talking about the kind of money that would allow us to move forward at a steady pace and not decline. So we're in a -- we're in a serious place even with maybe there being another ten million available.

MR. LIPP:

And I should also add that there's approximately 4.4 million in available Pay As You Go balances from 2012 that hasn't been appropriated yet. The rest of it was appropriated in addition to the 5.6 million that will be coming in net over the course of 2013.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Right, which is mentioned at the bottom of her slide here. Approximately five million could be available by the end of this year from the Pay Go.

MR. LIPP:

Well, 4.4 from 2012 also. And probably closer to 5.6 for this year.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you. I want to understand, because usually when we talk about money that we have available and we see charts from the Department -- Real Estate Department, I think Planning, at least, I want to understand what it means, the Legacy Program and the Multifaceted Program, I know that they're obviously debt service programs so we would have to bond and put out bonds. What does that mean to our General Fund when that happens?

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So the Multifaceted Program has available appropriations, just over 9 million. And the Legacy Program has available appropriations of just over 20 million. So if you combine the two, those are Capital Projects for land acquisition that would total a little over 29 million. If you actually went out and you borrowed, and you make some assumptions about interest rates and a typical 18-year period of borrowing, you're probably talking a little over 2.2 million per year in debt service to the General Fund. And typically what happens is if we -- let's say hypothetically we borrowed all that money this year, the debt service would start next year.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

When was the last time we touched either one of those?

MR. LIPP:

There's a very small amount that -- maybe two years ago, like a little over \$100,000. But prior to that, I'd want to say perhaps six years ago or so, prior to recognition of the economy really going south.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay. For now that's all I have. Does anyone else at this juncture want to know about the money situation? Want to ask questions about the money and where we are and what all this means that's been presented thus far? Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So where was the 55 million -- where was that funded from last year that was spent?

MR. LIPP:

That was the Quarter Cent Sales Tax Program. So it's a dedicated fund just for that as opposed to what we're talking about out of the General Fund, which would have a different cost structure.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

I think I know we're he's going. Just so you know, we were asked to bring forward money from out years, the Quarter Cent money that comes in every year brings in around \$22 million. And so we were asked to borrow against future sales tax revenue, bring it forward and spend it on land before the land gets developed.

We did that and we are -- have just spent all that money. And now every year we spend 16 million in debt service out of the 22 million. And what's left over is that 4.4 from 2012 and approximately 5.6 from 2013.

MR. LIPP:

Right. Or just to give you a better perspective --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Better description.

MR. LIPP:

Between 2008 and 2011, four-year period, the Quarter Cent Sales Tax was allowed to borrow. And we borrowed a total \$209 million. Most of the spending last year was from the proceeds of those bonds. Starting last year, 2012, we no longer borrow but there's probably about six million left of the proceeds of the 209 million that we'll be spending as the year progresses. And we've already started to spend money from the Pay As You Go portion. So we're going, as Legislator Hahn said, from upfront borrowing of the 209 million to Pay As You Go borrowing. And we'll have 22 -- we get 22 million in of the sales that goes for land acquisitions, but 16 and-a-half of that is dedicated to the debt on that 209 million.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

What's the time on the debt service?

MR. LIPP:

'Til the end of the program which is in 2030. Or perhaps 2029, it ends, the debt service.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

16 million a year until 2030.

MR. LIPP:

Sixteen and-a-half that is. So the difference between the 22 and the 16 and-a-half is what we have going forward on a net basis. It will increase the amount a little bit each year, because sales tax typically grows and the debt service is a flat amount. You smile at the growth factor.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, I like your optimism.

MR. LIPP:

No comment.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Any other questions at this juncture? Okay. Director Lansdale.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So what comes next? What we really need to do is have one comprehensive list. Bottom line: We need to continue the work that we've done thus far in identifying and adding parcels. For instance, the Pine Barrens core parcels and others so that we have one list and one strategy on how to proceed with our Open Space Program.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And so just to -- for edification of the members here, the Master Lists were passed in 2004 to 2006. They were identified assemblages that the County determined -- the Planning Department and the Legislature determined were key priority assemblages for purchase. And so -- but they do not include every potentially environmentally sensitive property in Suffolk County obviously. They are identified assemblages that are important; very, very, very important, but they do not include, for example, some of the Pine Barrens core properties are not necessarily in there. There are other -- there may be other properties here and there and everywhere that are very environmentally sensitive, but were not passed as part of a Master List.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right. So what we want to do is have one Master List with a Pine Barrens core as Legislator Hahn mentioned. And others so that we have a list where every parcel or assemblage has a rating; and so that we can proceed with as much information possible to move forward and make those strategic decisions. We also recommend that we identify parcels on this list that have outstanding environmental or contamination issues, remove parcels that have a rating below 25, which has been historically our minimum threshold unless there's additional information that is made available at the time. And we also recommend removing parcels or cleaning the list where there's been an offer rejected by the current landowner except for priority areas that would be defined by the Legislature and the County Exec.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Are you able to tell me how many -- and so now we're talking about the list as it exists, the four Master Lists and anything that --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Well, we're slowly moving to one Master List. And I'm actually -- this Master List, which there was a draft provided to all members of the EPA Committee on time, this Master List is actually available on line as we speak. So it's available to members of the public and all of the other members of the Legislature for download.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And so how would there be parcels on there -- and can you tell me how many that rate below the 25 points?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

There are a handful of parcels that are below 25. There's approximately three parcels below 25 that received a rating below 25.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay. Excellent. Thank you.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So -- and that's also -- it speaks to the integrity of the Master List that these are priorities and they remain priorities for open space preservation.

Further, we recommend that this is just for open space. As we've done for the Farmland Program, where there's an annual priority list, that we have one for active recreation, as well as for open space and for farmland.

So moving forward further recommendations include longer term, perhaps further prioritizing the acquisitions. In the wake of Super Storm Sandy, the Legislature may want to consider looking at acquisitions. So taking the current rating system and then further prioritizing that and amplifying ratings for acquisitions that promote climate resiliency and water protection, watershed protection.

So looking at areas that are flood prone, watershed habitats, wetlands and Pine Barrens core so that we can be better prepared for future storm events and have areas that can withstand these areas and promote stormwater protection as well.

Further, we should look at creating policies that target future County open space acquisitions so that there's a -- the limited funding that we do have, that we're spending our dollars most wisely and looking at the property that has been identified on the Master List, and using that as our guidance document for making decisions. And, again, it's one Master List that we're striving, not to have all of these various lists hanging out there; one Master List. And targeting that -- the limited dollars on Master List acquisitions. And then looking at -- perhaps if there are parcels that we haven't identified, and acknowledge that there are parcels out there, that perhaps we're not aware of, that are municipal partners, our Legislative partners have identified, that those can be brought forward any time during the year. And that we'll review those in a comprehensive way similar to what we do with farmland acquisitions. And to make the farmland and open space process fairer and more even.

Also, looking at another recommendation is to limit and modify the planning steps language so that we're accepting the appraised value as determined by ETRB. So what that means is, is the offer that we make is the offer that's extended and that's it. So that there -- sometimes there's additional information that's brought forward and then there's a reappraisal or a reevaluation of the new information. That process would end.

The other recommendation is to bring to this Committee -- to members of this Committee, to limit or modify the planning steps language to compare the total appraised value of funds to the funds that are available. So looking at everything that's in the acquisition pipeline, before we extend an offer, looking at whether or not we actually have the funds to do that, and having members of this -- of this Committee review which -- there's probably going to be a time that comes very soon where we don't have the funds to move forward with everything that has a planning steps attached to it.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Excuse me.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

What's your proposed time limit on that? You know, you said that you act on the parcels that are in the pipeline. I suppose you have one in the pipeline that's 35 and you have another one that's at a 45 and there's no other coming in. You know there's always much higher rated parcels out there, but they're just not available. What's your time limit on acting?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

You know, that's something that I'd have to think about more and would love to hear your thoughts and thoughts of the Legislature on that.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

We clearly -- this -- the purpose of this study and what we have done was certainly to point out how much is left to do when knowing we were -- we are getting to a place where there's very little money left. And so we clearly need to make some decisions in the coming months very soon about how to make sure we are going in the direction of greatest environmental protection and how do we handle that given the current way the system works and the money we have. And there are some, you know, big policy decisions we as a Legislature are going to need to make to direct the Department on how to move forward. And we are going to have to struggle with how do we get more dollars. We clearly do not have enough money for the amount of land that's left to buy.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

But you want to have a program that continues.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Yes, no question.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. But right now you have a program that continues under the financial limitations that you have today. But you have to make some adjustments mechanically and that was my question: If you have a parcel in process in front of you, an application, a parcel of land that's offered to the County, how long do you wait before you purchase that? Because on Monday you could be reviewing it and say it's great, it has a 35; but on Tuesday suppose that parcel comes in that's a 95 that everyone is so excited about and waiting for for all these years, so at what point do you say to the guy with the 35, who's been in process for four months or six months, oop, now you're second in the pile again because this parcel that we've been waiting for for years has just come in the door. They're ready to act; the price is right and all -- everything's in place. So I think mechanically you're going to have to figure that -- how we work that out.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Yeah. These are all -- these are all fairly new questions because we've had a very large pot of money that we borrowed against the future revenue. We brought this very large pot of money forward. There hasn't been a whole lot -- or any -- or any slowing down because of this. And now -- so now we need to -- that's the whole idea, I believe, of making it more similar to the farmland; possibly that recommendation of reviewing maybe twice a year the pools that come in because you do have to move forward. You can't wait forever for the best parcel.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

That's my point: How long do you wait?

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Right. That's what we're going to have to decide certainly.

LEG. ANKER:

Can I ask a quick question --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Of course.

LEG. ANKER:

-- related to your conversation right now.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

You know, I was reviewing the whole process and I believe I counted 18 to 20 steps it takes before we, you know, submit the planning steps until the end of acquisition. Eighteen. It could take about a year; one year. And I had no idea it takes so long because it gets vetted through a number of committees; I think four or five, six different committees to make sure that parcel's really a valid piece of property that the County wants to acquire. So again it does take time. But I'm looking at the recommendations and I know you're at the bottom one, I don't see the priority of partnership -- of a partnership with other, you know, Towns, State, Federal Government. Am I jumping the gun here or are we seeing more?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's a great recommendation, to look at further prioritizing parcels. And with that information, we do assign points for partnership. And one of the ideas was to reach back out on an annual basis with our municipality partners to hear their priorities. And I just want to emphasize real quick that, you know, we want to make sure that any commitments, any offer letters that are extended, we want to make sure that we have the funds to close. And that's really what -- we've always had that and we want to make sure that moving forward with the limited funding that we continue to do that; that once we commit to an acquisition, that we have the funds to close the deal.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And that's critical to the legitimacy, the -- what's the word I'm looking for --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Integrity.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Integrity of the program, yes. That's very critical. And we need to make sure that people know that when they enter into dealing with the County and they finally get an offer and they agree upon it, that it's going forward because we put our, you know, our word out there to them.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Definitely. And while we acknowledge that there are many steps to this process, we want to be able to provide the Legislature with as much information as possible to make an informed decision moving forward and setting what those priorities are parcel by parcel with limited funds.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a quick question. You had mentioned compiling the list or making one Master List. How long do you think that would take?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Well, it's going to take a couple more months to do that. I would have to go back to my staff and ask for, you know, a specific recommendation. But currently this is -- this product that you see before you is what I would consider the comprehensive Master List until we have the time to further update it. It's going to require partnership with various different entities including the Pine Barrens Commission to get information from them and other sources. So let me get back to you on a specific timeline on that.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. And while you're working on the new list, will you be -- your office be recommending that we put a hold on any further acquisitions or anything that needs planning steps?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Well, we need to -- the parcels that we have committed to and made commitments to, we need to move forward and honor what we've agreed to as a County. And I'd have to think about -- there's a lot of questions that we've raised today that we need to sort through before I'm in the position to make any further recommendations.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And certainly how many core Pine Barrens acres remain? Is it in the 1500 acre range?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

It's around that. And I'd like to confirm that with the Pine Barrens Commission.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Oh, okay. Thank you. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Is this the end of the presentation? I know you have the conclusion. Since we're on this roll of questions, you mention as far as the farmland, is it included on this Master List? I wasn't clear on that.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The Master List that we prepared is just for open space. We already have a preservation priority list that's established under Chapter 8. And that -- and we just had a Farmland Committee Meeting last week and we approved that preservation priority list. And then, as you know under Chapter 8, if there are parcels that have extenuating circumstance -- farmland parcels that have extenuating circumstances, there are four ways to nominate parcels -- farmland parcels outside of the annual review process. So, there's other ways to introduce farmland parcels throughout the year.

LEG. ANKER:

But, again, those parcels basically can be bought by the same pot of money which is only three million something.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right. That three million figure is for open space farmland and active recreation.

LEG. ANKER:

It's not a lot of money unfortunately. But, you know, I think the County's done what we have been able to with the resources. And that's

Why I think it's so important to look into partnerships. But I also just wanted to state on the record that, you know, when you go to other places in the world, you know, Europe and -- just other countries, and you see they've been around for thousands of years, and they look very similar -- and I'm assuming it's because of, you know, legislation that they have preserved their integrity of their land. And I think that's what our job is, especially being on this environmental committee, is to do what we can to preserve our, you know, what people think Suffolk County is, which is a lot of open space. And, again, we do get a lot of sales revenue from our tourism. So, it is incredibly high on our priority. And we -- the Committee thanks your Department for doing this work. It's so important.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

In conclusion.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Thank you. Thank you for your attention on this issue.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And Legislator Krupski has another question just before you get to the conclusion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

How many people, do you think, will come in the door? How many people have come in the door this year for open space and farmland? And are there -- are there any criteria now for just -- flat

1/28/2013 EPA Committee

out -- which will, I think, we'll need in the future for turning people away and saying, no, we're just not going to be interested because of location or situation; you know, really isolated parcels wouldn't -- you know, minimal value.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The criteria is our evaluation forms that we use to rate parcels. And you'll see that later on in the meeting. You'll see parcels that have all sorts of ratings. And, you know, it's up the Legislature to set that policy on which parcels to move forward with.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Okay. How many, do you think, will come in the door this year? How many have come in so far?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

You know what? I have to ask my staff that question. And I can report back at the next meeting for you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So in conclusion, Suffolk County has had a strong track record. We have spent close to \$950 million purchasing more than 60,000 acres of land. In addition, as I said earlier, approximately with all of our partners, you know, the Federal, State and local partners, close to 20 percent of Suffolk County's preserved. And we remain committed to continuing our acquisition program and look forward to working with each of you in advancing that. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you for all your work. And I do believe we are at a real serious crossroads here. I believe that the Legislature, the people of Suffolk County are committed to continuing this program. And I think that we have many very important discussions to have soon about, you know, how to move forward immediately with the money we have and how to, you know -- and make sure we're protecting that. But then also how -- we clearly have more to buy than we have money. So how do we responsibly figure that out? And so I look forward to your participation in those discussions, your staff, advocates that are in the room today, this Committee. And I hope to bring forward, you know, a round table with individuals to discuss, you know, those issues and what we can do to address them and your recommendations; and to have a real serious discussion on them and make sure that we are acting in the best interest of our environment, our taxpayers and the people of Suffolk County. So, thank you very much for your work and all that of your staff. Thank you. Okay.

Okay, so we're going to move onto the agenda; the rest of the agenda. I just got to find that. Sorry. It got buried under a lot of paperwork.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

We are now at **Tabled Resolution 1814 - 2012, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 (Tuccio property Town of Southampton) (SCTM No. 0900-248.00-01.00-110.003). (Schneiderman)** We have a motion to approve by Legislator Anker. You know, just because we have new members on this Committee, Director Lansdale, would you mind kind of summarizing the Department's recommendation and maybe reminding us of the map and what it looks like and anything that we -- and the score; the rating.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Will do.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I have copies of the rating sheet. And members of the Committee should have received an e-mail prior to this meeting with the maps on line.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

That would have come from Lauletta?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, that's right. Great. Would you like me to proceed?

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure. So this property is 75.5 acres in size. There are multiple existing structures on the property. Approximately 8 acres of the property have been cleared, which is approximately 10% of the site. The proposed acquisition is outlined in red on the map. And it is located just north of Gabreski Airport and within the Pine Barrens Core.

One of the questions that have come up is why this parcel and this property was not on the Master list. And as I explained earlier, it was not originally part of the Master List. It was part of the Pine Barrens assemblage. So this will eventually be brought in, too, so that we have one Master List but it's currently outside of that. But it is in the Pine Barrens Core, in the Central Suffolk Special Groundwater Protection Area. And in hydrogeologic zone three, which is the deep recharge aquifer area. So it's surrounded by County and State-owned parklands primarily and primarily contains a globally rare dwarf pine plains woodland community. So it received a rating -- a total rating of 46. And I'd be happy to answer any specific questions on the acquisition -- on the planning steps.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

So now that we have that list, and it received a total rating of 46, and -- can you just remind me that number 46 is ringing a bell for me. So can you -- do we now know, you know, how many parcels scored higher than 46, how many -- you know, how many got a 46?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

How this kind of rates in relation to the rest of the list? And on the list -- I mean eventually maybe what we're going to have to drill down is, you know, how many of those on the list that are above this are anywhere near being interested in the County acquiring? You know, I don't know how we'll ever know that, but certainly -- that's certainly what we got to be thinking about, you know, as we move forward is how all this is going to mean something to us when we're sitting here asking questions about what we have and what is still to come. And I'm letting you count so I'll keep talking so you can count.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Okay. So to answer your question specifically about how many parcels are on the Master List that are -- that have a rating of higher than 46, it is a -- it is a couple of pages of properties. It's 48. It's 48 different assemblages. We have not totalled the acreage of what that is, but it's -- 48 assemblages have a rating higher than 46. And the score that received the most -- the most frequency, the highest frequency, is 46. There were seven assemblages that received a score of 46.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

So -- but I'm going to kind of repeat: The only reason having 48 assemblages that rate higher than this -- because this is a high score based on what we normally see -- how many of those are in the pipeline, would you say, if any, that maybe we are competing for funds against? Do you understand what I'm getting at here?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I do. Looking at my staff, and I don't believe that we have parcels that are in the pipeline that are -- looking to my staff to correct me -- hold on one second.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Thank you. Take your time.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

That was my -- maybe that was my question. At what point do you tell people there are other ones we'd rather buy. And then you have to be fair to the applicant and say "we're not going to consider you." Or "try again next year," you know.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We're getting that information for you. And I think that moving forward, we'll have this information readily available in relation to all of the parcels.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Yeah. And I think -- no, but, again, this is, like, all new to us. So what's going to be valuable to a Legislator here, you know, you're going to learn. But as we're deciding, okay, so now we know based on the other things on the Master List, you know, 46 and where it rates, but -- but which you're competing for the dollars at the moment or which -- you know, we're going to have to know more about which might be interested soon or, etcetera. Or, you know -- or change the planning steps, as I think was recommended, so that we're not authorizing you to go make an offer and promise that we're going to pay them. But instead, you know, have you come back to us before we do that or something, you know, so that we're not promising the world just by approving a planning steps on something that appears to not be competing with anyone else and has a, you know, relatively high number. But, again, this is kind of -- we're -- now that we for the first time in a very longtime have what is dwindling funds, but maybe not enough for an offer, we need to understand what this means.

Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

I have, again, a thought as far as -- I think in the presentation you mention you're going to re-evaluate every six months. So my suggestion would be, you know, previously the land planning steps have been first come, first served. Pretty much anybody and everybody could submit planning steps and that would basically create the move to -- move forward in land acquisition.

So my question, Sarah, is in the current understanding of how you're going to move forward, and, again, just from the slide that had previously, are you still going to have like a six month review situation where you're putting all the planning steps in a hopper and then you're sifting through to see where the priorities are? Is that something that you might consider or -- in other words what do --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Yeah, well, I think that's what we have to decide as a policymaking body, how we're going to direct them to proceed. Right now the law reads that when we plan -- when we pass a planning step, they're authorized to go make an offer. And then they come back to us and say "we made an offer, we can't back out on the offer. You have to pay them this amount of money."

1/28/2013 EPA Committee

And so, I think, we as a Legislative body, the policymaking body have to now take that next step and decide are we going to change how we operate? And I think the answer is, yes, we should change how we operate. The question is exactly how do we change that. And that's what, I think, we have to get together as a Committee in a roundtable scenario, you know, outside of when we're doing our regular business and decide exactly how we're going to move forward and take their recommendations, the Planning Department's recommendations and either act on them as is or change it a little bit, you know, according to our beliefs, but we need to act soon on this. Because you can see what we're facing. And we don't want to slow down the acquisition process, but we want to make sure we're doing it right. So I think we now need to start really giving what's next serious consideration.

LEG. ANKER:

So should we take the time and table, you know, the planning steps that are coming up, Kara? You know, I don't know. I mean, I agree with you. We do need to have, you know, language to follow.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Is there development pressure on this property?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

There is -- I'll answer that, Laretta. There is -- currently it's being used as a trap and skeet range so it's currently in use. And that's -- that's the background of the property.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And as far as you know, there's no serious development pressure? Or we have somebody in the audience that will know? All right. Maybe we'll find out at a later date if we know anything more on that.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I can definitely research that and get back to you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

And, again, I'm looking at my notes. Evidently we wanted to see if we can partner with either New York State or the Town. Has that been reviewed?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Our understanding is the Town has not expressed an interest in partnering with us. And we're looking at -- we're looking at the State to see whether or not there's any interest. But our latest information is that the State does not have funds to partner on acquisitions like this.

LEG. ANKER:

What about -- I know we asked -- we mentioned Town and State. But what about other not-for-profit -- I don't see Kevin -- you know, groups? Do we actively, you know, communicate to see if they will partner with us? And have we -- I'm assuming we have before.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

You know what, I don't have any information on that, but I can get back to you on that.

LEG. ANKER:

Because I think the Peconic Land Trust has an amazing amount of funding available so, again, that's just one in the course of Nature Conservancy. That would be wonderful, so.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

It's important to explore all -- all options in funding these days.

LEG. ANKER:

Absolutely.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

George, can you clarify for us where this is in the process and what it means? It would have to be resubmitted. Is it that close to the time -- the deadline? Yes.

MR. NOLAN:

It may not show that it -- it will lapse on 2/21. So if it's not approved out of Committee this cycle, then it will have to be -- it will lapse and then it'll have to be reintroduced, which, you know -- the sponsor could withdraw it after this meeting if it's not discharged from Committee. And it would be on the Committee agenda next time.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Right. It wouldn't -- I mean, clearly, they could file something today that would be introduced as -- Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

And I know this question has been asked before, but, you know, with that three million -- what's the end figure? Three million eighty five --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

-- three hundred and eleven.

LEG. ANKER:

Is there any way we can get an estimate of how much this property will cost? Because this could eat up the entire amount or there may not be, you know, enough. So, again, it's important information that we need to know before we move forward and even committing extra energy, time, money in acquiring the property.

MR. LIPP:

I can give you a ballpark, if you want. So it's 75 and-a-half acres. A typical, you know, rule of thumb price is 100,000 an acre so that would be 7.55 million. That being said, when you're looking at the three point whatever million dollars that would be available, if all pipeline properties were purchased, over 7 million of it -- I think 7.4 million was in negotiation. That stands maybe a 50 percent chance of going anywhere. So you can probably take those off the table right away. So you go, instead of three something, you got ten million and change right there, of which -- if you were only going to purchase this under the assumption of 100,000, you'd be eating up 7.55 million of it.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And, again, Pine Barrens Core, we just have to come back to like what these terms all mean; really is the super important, environmentally sensitive -- excuse me -- I'm like scrambling here -- but for water quality, there is no more important location, right, than Pine Barrens Core. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

What is the parcel zoned?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The property is zone light industrial.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Is this part of a plan for the Gabreski area Airport?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

This property is just outside the Gabreski Airport property line. So I'd have to check specifically, but in reading a recent version of the Gabreski Plan, I don't recall that this property was highlighted.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Do you know why Southampton Town passed on partnering or preserving this parcel outright by itself?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I don't have the details on that. I can find out and report back.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I mean, that might be important if they have the resources and they passed on it.

LEG. GREGORY:

Madam Chair, I have a question.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Yeah, Legislator Gregory.

LEG. GREGORY:

Do you think by Tuesday's meeting you'd be able to follow up on some of the questions that were asked here today?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Definitely.

LEG. GREGORY:

So if we were to discharge this today to the floor, you can address those questions?

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay. I make a motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. ANKER:

I'll second.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Seconded by Legislator Anker. On the motion, Director Lansdale, did you want to comment?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

My concern is there seems to be some differences in opinion between BRO and the Budget Office on whether -- you know, what the funds are that are available. My concern is, I just want to make sure that we have enough money to be able to proceed with this. Because as planning steps are currently written, this gives us a directive to go straight through and make an offer. And my concern is that we may not have the funds available.

LEG. GREGORY:

I appreciate your concern. My intention was more procedural. If we bring it to the floor, and should

1/28/2013 EPA Committee

we decide to recommit it to Committee, it wouldn't die. I'm trying to reach out to the sponsor of the bill. He hasn't responded to my text yet. So out of respect for him and not let his bill die, this would kind of preserve his -- you know, instead of him having to re-file or resubmit the legislation.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Procedural question, Mr. Counsel. If something is discharged to the floor, the six-month rule no longer applies question mark?

MR. NOLAN:

If it's discharged to the floor and then it's recommitted to committee, the clock starts running again on the six months.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And there's no clock on the floor.

MR. NOLAN:

It can stay there almost indefinitely -- well, at least until the end of the term.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Until the end of the term. Okay. Are there any other motions? Okay. So we have a motion to discharge without recommendation and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(1841-2012) It is discharged without recommendation. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE)**

Okay. **Introductory resolution 2028-2012, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 Avalon Bay property Town of Brookhaven (SCTM Nos. 0200-547.00-01.00-019.000, 0200-578.00-01.00-044.000, 0200-610.00-01.00-022.000, 0200-610.00-01.00-023.000, 0200-610.00-01.00-024.001 and 0200-610.00-03.00-002.000).** (Browning) Okay.

LEG. GREGORY:

I'll make a motion to table just for discussion purpose.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Motion to table; I will second. And on the motion we are now looking at Avalon Bay property. Okay. And, Laretta, do you have a rating -- oh, and this was amended. Okay, so tell us about that. Do you -- does the Department know about what happened when it was amended?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes. We suggested the amendment.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

It is now 20 some odd acres instead of -- tell us about the amendment.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So this property, four of the parcels that were previously part of this resolution were on the Master List. We recommended removing one of the parcels, which has been done. So the parcel before you is the parcel that's to the east. And that's the -- what appears to be farmed, but is actually not farmed. It's just fallow and hasn't been in active farmland production, I've been told, for years. So the recommendation is to move forward this parcel as part of a larger assemblage, larger acquisition and have this be as open space. Again, this received a rating.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

I'm a little confused. Do you mind if I stop you?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Sure.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

So we're looking at the map that has one, two, three, four, five -- six parcels in red.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes. It's six parcels in red. And the parcel that is on the eastern side on the right-hand side, that looks like it -- it's a farm field -- is the parcel that is being recommended for acquisition currently. The other ones -- the other parcels, the largest parcels to the west -- to the left --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

A-huh.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

-- those are identified on the Master List already.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

So we're choosing to --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

All Master List parcels already have --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Right.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

-- planning steps --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Got it. Okay.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

-- attached to them. So that would be redundant.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Yes. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I just want clarification for those of us who are colorblind and are looking at the red and yellow lines and orange lines. The -- could I ask a ballpark figure acreage for -- price wise?

MR. LIPP:

What's the current acreage?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Twenty-five acres.

MR. LIPP:

Okay, so it was amended to 25 acres, I just heard. So that would equate at a 100,000 per acre to 2.5 million.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

If I may, just a clarification. There's two parcels that look like they're currently being farmed. One is all the way to the east next to -- what looks like German Boulevard; is that the one? It has a little cutout on the east side.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

LEG. ANKER:

That's the parcel (indicating).

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

So it's on the parcel on the eastern side on the right-hand side that has -- most of it is cleared and there's a little field to the north. That's the subject parcel.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Legislator Anker; and then Legislator Gregory.

LEG. ANKER:

The parcel that we're looking at, the amount of acreage is?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Approximately 25 acres.

LEG. ANKER:

You know, you mention that it hasn't been farmed. It's pretty barren looking. And I have concerns on perhaps the pesticide use or -- why hasn't this parcel regenerated itself? I'm just curious because I'm looking around the other areas and there's beautiful forest and, you know, north and west of it. But what was on this parcel prior to us reviewing it for land acquisition?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I just want to note that the aerial map that you're looking at, in the lower left corner, it says that's -- it's dated. It's an aerial from 2010. So it could be -- it could look very different on the ground. And I've been told that it is going through forest succession currently on the ground. I haven't been able to visit the site personally, but that's what I've been told. So that partially answers your question, but we haven't done -- further along in the process is where we would get into the environmental -- the Environmental Site Assessment in looking at what has occurred on the property in terms of the pesticide use and things like that.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And that you would do during the planning steps.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's correct.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Legislator Gregory was next; and then Legislator Krupski.

LEG. GREGORY:

Thank you. The first question that comes to mind is the last parcel that we just discharged, that had a 46, but no development pressure that we're aware of. This parcel is a 36 and does have

development pressure. And it seems to be with the lower rating, obviously, but we seem to be -- I wouldn't say pushing, but advocating for a purchase or a planning steps of this parcel. To me that seems to be a conflict. Why -- is it solely because this parcel has development pressure that we're -- or -- even with the lower rating? You seem to be prioritizing this parcel to a higher rating parcel -- prior rated parcel.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Well, when we conducted the -- if you look at this in a broader assemblage within the context of the Carmans River Watershed, this actually receives -- if you look alone at just the parcels, without looking broadly at the Carmans River Watershed, it received a rating of 36. But then when my staff looked at it within the context, the larger context within the proximity of the Carmans River, the rating in the document that you received at the end of last year, it received a higher rating. It received a rating of 69. And unfortunately we don't have that specific rating for you today. But I'd be happy to go through the differences in how we approached a rating of 36, if you just look at the parcels in question versus a higher rating of 69. But certainly we're not advocating for one parcel over another. That's the purview of the Legislature.

LEG. GREGORY:

No, I get it when you put it in the context the assemblage is a 69. I'm just looking at, you know, 36, 46, okay. 46 is higher than 36. Maybe I'm missing something. But I understand it better now, so thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Legislator Anker. And this is part of probably what we'll have to decide is, do we -- does -- what constitutes development pressure and does that add points for movement -- for moving quicker? You know, how do you define development pressure? You know. Anyway, Legislator Anker. I'm sorry. Krupski had a question.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, go ahead. I'll wait.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Krupski's on the list. Legislator Krupski; and then Legislator Anker.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

The parcel to the east, is it currently being farmed? And the other adjacent parcel to the west, have they been historically farmed?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

The parcel to the east is currently being farmed, yes. The parcel to the west has historically been farmed. I'm not sure what was farmed on that site, but I can find out.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, you don't have to find out. It just looked like they had been farmed adjacent to it. I just -- I was just curious. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And we own the western most parcel, the development rights.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Been told it's a horse farm. And I just want to -- just re-emphasize that our point stands -- our previous point stands that with limited funds, we -- you know, we're concerned about passing any planning steps right now without knowing whether or not we have the funds to extend an offer.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Yeah, I would imagine --

LEG. GREGORY:

Madam Chair, I would like to change my motion to approve.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

I'll second. Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay, again this question -- I'm being consistent, at least. Have you looked into partnering with another municipality or not-for-profit?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

This is a planning steps. So we would do that along the way. But we have not yet, to my knowledge, had that conversation yet with -- with the Town yet.

LEG. ANKER:

And only for -- you know, the Legislators, we're struggling to make these decisions again because once we pass planning steps, then basically, you know, it's a bullet train. You just go. But if we had more information, again, if the Town was interested, if the State, if the Federal government, if Nature Conservancy or Peconic Land Trust, it would help us make more rational decisions. So is it possible before the planning steps are approved to have that as part of the rating system maybe added as -- considering that the funding issues --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

It is part of -- it is part of the rating system currently. And usually what happens is a planning steps resolution is passed and then along the way it will pick up additional points if a local municipality is interested in partnering. But I agree with you, that those conversations should be had before the planning steps resolution is considered before the Legislature.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

But you continue to recommend approval of this parcel; correct? Is that what you did? Didn't you say that?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We are -- we are concerned about this -- this planning steps resolution and other planning steps resolutions because of the way the planning steps language is currently written, which allows us to go all the way through and make an offer. Our concern is that if this is passed or other planning steps resolutions are passed, and then we don't have the available funds, we're in a pickle.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

It directs you to go all the way.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

In a certain sense, yes.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Right. If you don't have the money, though, you wouldn't make an offer.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

That's right. But it sets up an expectation.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Certainly. One more question, Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Sarah, there were -- again, you see we're struggling. We're trying to --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Definitely.

LEG. ANKER:

We are -- we're environmental champions. We are. We're here to preserve land. We're here to keep Suffolk's identity as a beautiful place to visit, but we don't want to stop your work in doing just that; preserving parcels. There's a balance between expectations and realistic or practical initiatives. Where does this fall? You know, in other words, if we approve this, is there a way in your Department to slow it down until we can find out if there's enough money to do this. Or that's not in your purview to be able to do that.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I would imagine we would have to look at modifying the language in that resolution to reflect the sentiment of the Legislature to do that.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. I apologize. Maybe I misunderstood you. I thought originally you said that you were in favor of planning steps. That's why I made my earlier comments about 46, 36. But you're saying that you didn't -- but you're not necessarily recommending at this point?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

I'm sorry I wasn't clear on that. We are --

LEG. GREGORY:

You might have been. I just didn't hear clearly.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

We want to make sure that there's funds available. And I think that this -- members of the Committee are raising a lot of questions that I'd like to be able to present you with all of that information. There are important questions that should be answered at this Committee.

LEG. GREGORY:

Okay. All right. So I will resubmit a motion to table. Do I have a second?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Okay, seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor of tabling? Opposed? It's tabled. **(VOTE: 4-0-0-1. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE)**

Introductory Resolution 2059-2012, Authorizing planning steps for the acquisition of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Fish Thicket Preserve property - Town of Brookhaven (SCTM Nos. 0200-895.00-04.00-015.001, 0200-895.00-04.00-014.001, 0200-895.00-04.00-014.002,

0200-895.00-04.00-006.000, 0200-895.00-04.00-007.000, 0200-895.00-04.00-008.000 and 0200-895.00-04.00-009.000). (Calarco).

I think we have a -- from the sponsor -- no, maybe not. But I'm going to make a motion to table under the same kind of scenario here. Okay, motion to table, seconded by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **2059 is tabled. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

New **Introductory Resolutions 2234-2012, Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection program (effective December 1, 2007) - Open Space component - for the Janet W. Krudop and Myron Kaplan property - North Fork Preserve III Town of Riverhead - (SCTM Nos. 0600-021.00-01.00-004.002, 0600-021.00-01.00-004.003 and 0600-021.00-01.00-004.004). (Co. Exec.)** Let's get a motion. For the purposes of discussion I'll make a motion to approve.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Seconded by Legislator Krupski. On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And the money for this acquisition is in the kitty and on the --

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

And reflected on the screen.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

Yes, it's reflected on step number three "In Negotiation."

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Excellent.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:

In fact -- in fact, all of them are -- the remaining authorizing resolutions are reflected in that step.

CHAIRWOMAN HAHN:

Great. And so we have commitments from the County -- I mean, I think as we've discussed here, we don't want to in any way hurt the integrity of the program. So I would like to move forward with a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **2034 is approved. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE)**

Introductory Resolution 2235, Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection program (effective December 1, 2007) - Open Space component - for the 6 Pierrepont, LLC property - Beaverdam Creek - Town of Southampton (SCTM No. 0900-356.00-02.00-001.006 p/o and 0900-356.00-02.00-002.000). (Co. Exec.)

So the same applies here. I'm going to make a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **2235 is approved. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE)**

Introductory Resolution 1008, Authorizing the acquisition of land under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection program (effective December 1, 2007) - open space component - for the Kramer property - Mastic/Shirley conservation area - Town of

1/28/2013 EPA Committee

Brookhaven - Village of Mastic Beach (SCTM No. 0209-036.00-03.00-037.000). (Co. Exec.) I'll make a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstention? **1008 is approved. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1. LEG. BARRAGA EXCUSED ABSENCE).**

And we've dealt with 1009, 1013, 1014 and 1015. So with no further business in front of us, I make a motion to adjourn. Thank you.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:08 PM
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**