DATE

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A special joint meeting of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee and the Parks & Recreation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on May 20, 2014 to discuss the Capital Budget.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Leg. Kara Hahn, Chairwoman of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee/Vice Chair of the Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. Jay H. Schneiderman, Chairman of the Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. Al Krupski, Vice Chair of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee
Leg. Sarah Anker, member of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee
Leg. Thomas Barraga, member of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee
Leg. Thomas Cilmi, member of the Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. William Lindsay, III, member of the Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. Kevin J. McCaffrey, member of the Parks & Recreation Committee

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory
Leg. Robert Calarco, 7th Legislative District
Leg. Robert Trotta, 13th Legislative District
Leg. Kate Browning, 3rd Legislative District
Robert Lipp, Director/Budget Review Office
Greg Dawson, Commissioner/Parks Department
Robert Doering, Budget Review Office
Joe Muncey, Budget Review Office
Tom Vaughn, County Executive's Office
Christina Delisi, Aide to Leg. Schneiderman
Terrence G. Pearsall, Chief of Staff/Suffolk County Legislature
Lance Reinheimer, Executive Director/Vanderbilt Museum
Catherine Stark, Aide to Leg. Krupski
Jason Hann, Aide to Leg. Schneiderman
Robert Martinez, Aide to Leg. Muratore
Pam Donovan, Aide to Leg. Anker
Michael Pitcher, Aide to Presiding Officer
Deborah Harris, Aide to Leg. Stern
Justin Littell, Aide to Leg. D'Amaro

MINUTES TAKEN BY:
Diana Flesher, Court Reporter

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:37 PM

CO-CHAIR HAHN:
Will all Legislators please return to the horseshoe for the Capital Budget hearing for Environment, Planning and Agriculture.

Okay, if we could rise for the Pledge to the Flag led by Legislator Lindsay.

SALUTATION

Welcome. This is a joint Committee of Legislature's Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee and the Parks Committee for a hearing on the Capital Budget. Do we have any cards this afternoon? Well, we have one willing speaker who is going to fill out a card, Lance.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Thank you very much. Lance Reinheimer, Executive Director of the Vanderbilt Museum. I don't know how much time I have to speak? Three minutes, okay. I have a very short PowerPoint presentation, which they're trying to get up there now. And paper copies are distributed to you. So while they're getting that up, I can speak.

Basically -- I know this a difficult time for the County financially. It's a difficult time for all governments. But the thing that, you know, my perspective from the Museum, what do people see in government is quality of life. Why do people stay on Long Island? Quality of life. Education opportunities, beaches, museums, Vanderbilt Museum. So for the dollars that you invest in the Vanderbilt Museum, you're really helping the quality of life for Suffolk County residents.

We see -- 100,000 people were there last -- came to the Museum last year. We see between 40 and 60,000 school children each year. We had a school from Remsenburg that was there this morning in the Planetarium. So we do reach out into Suffolk County throughout Suffolk County. We have the traveling classroom. Is it all right if I move over? You know what, I'll just stay on this. You've got the paper. We have a traveling classroom that goes out throughout the County. That program's just starting. Introduces children to discovery of space and how we explore space and how scientists really explore space without having to fly through space.

Getting directly to the Capital Program, we have a couple, you know, we're really -- our capital requests is really based on trying to maintain what we have to prevent further decay. Water quality -- water intrusion, I'm sorry, is important. The stabilization of the Sea Plane Hangar, I know we've talked about this over the years. The building is -- you know, structurally has some problems. Eventually they're either going to be dealt with or, you know, the building could have some problems structurally and become totally unsafe.

At this point, you know, I'm not speaking for the Board, but there are no definite plans on what to do with this building. My concern as Executive Director of the Museum is to try to stabilize it so that future generations have a chance to make a decision on what to do with this building. So this is just to keep it, you know, from further decay.

And to that end we're requesting that funds be advanced from subsequent years; $100,000 be advanced from subsequent years; an additional $100,000 for planning; to provide $200,000 dollars in 2015 so that we can start the permitting process, the planning process and how to stabilize this building.

Another issue, again, just to prevent further decay is the seawall.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Keep going.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:
Keep going.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Okay. Our seawall -- this is original seawall. This section of the seawall is granite that was original to the Museum. It's failing in several places as you can see. We're asking to advance planning funds, again, for the permitting and the plan to start to fix the damage that was done from really not repointing it and from storm damage.

The Recommended Budget includes the construction part of this project in subsequent years. At this point, you know, we're just -- that's fine. You know, we're not asking for that to be advanced. It's the planning. So in conjunction with the seaplane hangar and the seawall, we're looking to start the planning permitting process so that we can down the road see what we need to do to stabilize those two structures.

And then, you know, our biggest enemy to the Vanderbilt is water intrusion. This Recommended Budget includes $400,000 in 2015 as requested. And that's really consistent with what Budget Review suggests and recommends. And that's critical to just maintain our buildings. We have ongoing water intrusion problems. These buildings are approaching 100 years old and they have water problems, whether it's leaching through the walls or it's coming through the roofs. And we're working on that today. I mean we have contractors through Public Works that are doing work today on waterproofing. But it's an ongoing project. And it continues. And this is just a couple of examples of the water damage that's in the mansion, that's there today.

So I know you a have a lot to consider. So in summary what we're asking for, we're happy with the budget as recommended by the County Executive. What we're looking for is $200,000 to be advanced; 100,000 from subsequent years; an additional 100,000 for planning for the seaplane hangar to do the planning and permitting; and then to advance the $35,000 from subsequent years to 2015 to start the permitting process for the seawall. I understand these are difficult decisions for you. Critical to the Museum is really waterproofing and starting to develop a plan for preserving these structures from further decay.

I'll answer any questions if anyone has questions. I really went through that pretty fast, but I know time is short for you.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:
Thank you for doing so. Does anyone have any questions for Lance? Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you. I know you've got a great facility there. And all my colleagues speak very highly of you. I have a question on the seawall. Now who would reconstruct that?

MR. REINHEIMER:
Well, all our projects are supervised and the contractors are retained by Department of Public Works. So they would go out and find the qualified contractor to do the actual work.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So why would you need money for planning? Wouldn't they just put it out for bid and -- wait. Wouldn't they just put it out for bid and have a marine contractor come in and get the bids and select one and have them rebuild? I mean it obviously needs work. Wouldn't they just go ahead and do that?

MR. REINHEIMER:
Well, the Capital Projects, there are several funding sources for Capital Projects: The construction part and planning. From my discussions with Public Works, they're a limited staff. They would

retain a consultant to go out and get the permits that we need -- the environmental permits to start the work or plan the work.

Planning is also for the supervision of the construction. So it's not planning in the sense that you're thinking, you know, developing blueprints or things like that; it's supervision and permitting would be for the planning portion of this. These numbers, the $285,000 was after consulting with Public Works Highways and Bridges. They're the ones that work with waterways.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Just looking at the pictures, they pretty much have to take this apart and completely reconstruct it.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Parts of it; and then parts it just need repointing. You know, there are three areas that, you know, collapsed from that -- you can see one of the areas in that picture. The wall is probably somewhere around a quarter mile long. So there are parts that just basically need repointing. And if we don't repoint them, eventually what's going to happen to the wall is what's happened in some of the sections.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Sure. Once it opens up, it's just going to completely open up.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Right. And some of this was a result of storm damage Irene, Sandy. And, you know, I alerted the County Executive's Office in the past -- right after Sandy that there was some damage. I think they had so much damage in other areas, this -- you know, compared to other parts of the County was not as significant.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Well, because of their nature, that's where they're going to take the abuse. So that's pretty normal.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Correct.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
As far as the seaplane hangar goes, I mean I'm reluctant to, you know, support planning money for that because I'm not sure we should be committing the -- basically, then, you're committing $3 million to reconstruct. I'm not sure if that's the best use of our limited resources. But the water damage in the Museum, I understand that's very important. Where does that -- is there a separate entity that administers a lot of the programs and whatnot at the Museum, right?

MR. REINHEIMER:
That's the Museum Board. That's -- I'm Executive Director so that's -- right, that falls under the -- we have a Board of Trustees. There is 15 Trustees. Right now we have 14 on the Board.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And I know there's money that's -- the museum has there that's being managed. And it's $9 million or something like that?

MR. REINHEIMER:
Yes, we have an endowment. It's probably around $12 million right now.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Is there -- does any of that money get used for maintenance of the Museum?

MR. REINHEIMER:
Okay. Right now we are trying to grow the endowment. Maintenance, in terms of the endowment,

provides funds for the Operating Budget. This year we haven't used any funds from there yet because it's really -- it's two thirds of what it used to be. Prior to 2001 it was around 17, $18 million. Right now it's at 12. In 2008 it went down to 8.6 which is the corpus of the endowment. And the museum is able to use capital appreciation and income from the endowment. It's an original bequest from William K. Vanderbilt II and another Vanderbilt family member donated another 6.2 million. So Vanderbilt left $2 million for the maintenance and operations of the Museum. And then another Vanderbilt family member left 6.2. So the corpus is 8.2 million.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So who makes the decision when that endowment money is enough to start to use to actually maintain the facilities?

MR. REINHEIMER:
The endowment is really administered under the will of William K. Vanderbilt that said that the income from that can be used for the maintenance and -- maintenance of the Museum. And part of the maintenance is staff to operate it. So those funds are used -- in the past historically have been used for operating funds.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:
Legislator Schneiderman.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
The seawall, I saw the picture of it. I'm just curious, the coastline in that area, is it generally hardened or is it not hardened?

MR. REINHEIMER:
It's a sandy beach.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
It's a sandy beach. So this rock seawall or block seawall is unusual to that water body? Most of it natural shoreline or --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Adjacent area.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
The adjacent areas?

MR. REINHEIMER:
You mean are there a lot of rocks and boulders?

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
No, no. In terms of bulkheading, this is basically a bulkhead.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Right.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Is that -- what's the water body it sits on?

MR. REINHEIMER:
That would be Northport Bay.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Northport Bay. Is the Bay in general, as you go around the shoreline, is it hardened or is it mostly a natural shoreline?

MR. REINHEIMER:
No, it's -- I would -- mostly hardened. It borders the Village of Northport. That's where they have their gazebo, their dock. There's docks, Brittania --

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Is it a highly-eroding area in terms of stormwater? I mean is it -- because I don't know if that area has its own local waterfront revitalization plan. I could tell you that in general there is a movement away from these types of structures and to have a more natural vegetative shoreline that provides buffering, some filtration of potential contaminants to the water. A lot of these structures have been removed. So before we go and rebuild it, have you looked at the -- I don't even know what's behind it and what it's protecting. Is there some physical structures that's in any danger? (Inaudible)

MR. REINHEIMER:
No. It really -- I think it acts also as a retaining wall. You know, I'm not an engineer. Behind it, it looks like concrete. The slope of the Museum or the terrain of the property is probably about an 80-foot drop. So there -- right behind that seawall is a hill that goes up to the main portion of the property. So behind that is -- to me it almost looks like it's -- acts as a retaining wall in that area.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Because these types of structures in many areas have been found to actually accelerate erosion. You know, they reflect the wave energy, end up scouring out the beach, removing the beach and affecting neighboring properties. So it's -- I think when we look at, I know typically we want to keep everything at Vanderbilt and everything is historic, etcetera. This may be one structure, though, that we should remove and allow for a natural shoreline.

MR. REINHEIMER:
You know, I'm not opposed to, you know, protecting the environment and the shoreline and consistent with the way people think, feel that the environment should be managed. My recollection is I think that Huntington Town, Northport Village and Asharoken, I think it developed some kind of waterfront committee.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
They likely have a LWRP. I wonder if it's consistent with what you're proposing here with that plan.

MR. REINHEIMER:
I think they just started that committee. I don't know. You know, maybe that's where we should look into planning funds and say what is consistent with the area?

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Maybe we can just ask rather than spend the $35,000 on planning funds, ask that committee what direction they're heading in. And then we'll at least know if it's consistent. But if this weren't done for -- let's say if it was postponed for a year, there's nothing that's being threatened right now.

MR. REINHEIMER:
No structures, no. The only thing that's being threatened now is the seawall itself.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. REINHEIMER:
I don't think there's any -- I'm not an engineer -- structural problems with the hill, with erosion or anything like that. I think everything is pretty stable. It's just the seawall itself that is --

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
I appreciate your candor. Thank you.

MR. REINHEIMER:
I give you the straight answers.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
I like that.

MR. REINHEIMER:
And I invite you to come out and see so that -- see what I say. And I don't want to misrepresent anything. And I think you have a valid point on asking that local committee what their program is, what their stand is. I look at it, too, as erosion, you know, I know you don't want erosion in land being washed into the water. I don't think that's happening now. Because, again, we have the cement behind there. My concern is if we do go forward with the seawall, it's better to do it now than later because every winter it's going to get worse as it needs repointing. But I can reach out to that -- to that -- those municipalities that surround Northport Bay.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
And, Lance, if there's something about this seawall that is historically significant, I think I'd want to know that as well, too.

MR. REINHEIMER:
The significance is it was built in the '30s by Vanderbilt. So it is -- and the property does have two bulkheads. This piece that was built by Vanderbilt; and then if you go farther along the shoreline past the seaplane hangar, the County put in bulkheading many years ago, plastic, which, you know, looks brand new today. And that was probably done 10, 12 years or more.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Behind that bulkheading, there is a little bit level area and then a hill.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. So there's several questions: One is whether we need bulkheading there.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Right.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
And if we do need bulkheading, would it be better to tear out what's there and put in something new that was less maintenance, you know. I think, really, we need several questions answered. You need to talk to that group that's looking at the waterfront. We need to assess the historic significance of this, but also look at the impacts of it and then make a decision moving forward.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Yeah, I think that's a good recommendation, to talk to the waterfront group and see what direction they're going in, absolutely.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Does anyone else have any questions?

LEG. ANKER:
One more question. I just wanted to -- I know this is question session, but I just wanted to thank you again for all of the leadership that you've provided for the Vanderbilt. I know when I was on the Board it was in really bad shape. And you run a very tight ship. And we really appreciate it. And, you know, we will look into your suggestions. But, again, you know, we're in fiscal straits here but we really appreciate what you've done to bring it back to life. So thank you, Lance.

MR. REINHEIMER:
Thank you very much.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
One more question.

LEG. TROTTA:
How old is the seaplane hangar? Approximately.

MR. REINHEIMER:
I think it was built in the late '20s. It is -- has some vestiges of art deco design to it. When the doors were on it, I guess -- 85 years old so it's somewhere around 1930.

LEG. TROTTA:
It's built out of cement?

MR. REINHEIMER:
Cement with -- brick is under it. It's like the rest of the Museum, it's a stucco. If you were building today, I don't think you'd select that material. It doesn't hold up in this harsh winter. So it's a stucco overlay of brick and, I guess, I don't know if they're cinder block -- if they had cinder block back then. But where the facing has chipped off, it's regular brick behind there. So, yeah, it looks like a big cement box.

LEG. TROTTA:
Is there any historical significance to this other than --

MR. REINHEIMER:
Original building to the estate. I'm told, I don't have any documentation, and even to find out how many private seaplane hangars there are in this country, I don't know, but there aren't a lot. So it's a last remaining seaplane hangar of that era around that, you know, that we know of. So I'm told.

LEG. TROTTA:
If you had, you know, unlimited money, you would just redo it and leave it there as a--

MR. REINHEIMER:
No, if I had unlimited money -- I'm looking -- you know, the decisions you're making today in this financial situation are very important. I'm coming in from the perspective that a decision to not stabilize this building is a decision that future generations don't have to make. What do we do with this building? I would like to see it preserved so that future generations 50 years from now, maybe this building will have more historic significance than it does today to us; maybe it would be more important to have. I just want to stabilize it so that we have the building there for the future. A decision to do nothing, we won't have that building in the future. And then that decision is done.

So I'm not looking to do anything to develop it. I'm not speaking for the Board because I know the Board has discussed ideas in the past and they're probably discussing ideas or will discuss ideas for the building in the future. But my -- as the administrator and understanding the County finances

and where you are, I just think it's -- from a historic perspective, it's important to preserve that building so that future generations have a choice as to what to do with it, if anything.

LEG. TROTTA:
It doesn't fit in with the rest of the building.

MR. REINHEIMER:
No, it's not. Right. To me?

LEG. TROTTA:
It looks like a box.

MR. REINHEIMER:
It's a box. Now when it had the doors, apparently it's very attractive. It was an interesting building. But what's left there and the way it looks now it's a cement box.

LEG. TROTTA:
All right.

MR. REINHEIMER:
On the inside -- there's nothing on the inside either. It's like a giant vast warehouse. But as I said, I'm looking at it as the Director of the Museum and preservation of the museum for future generations. I understand where you are. I understand the financial decisions you're making. And I abide by your decisions. Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:
Any other questions? Okay. Thank you, Lance. Do we have anyone here from the Department of Environment Division? We already went to Parks.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No, no.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:
So there's no one here from Planning? Tom Vaughn, do you want to talk at all about planning and open space funds in the Capital Project? Or if BRO wants to. No. Go ahead, Tom.

MR. VAUGHN:
I really don't have anything to add to this conversation. I'm sorry. Director Lansdale could not be here today. I apologize.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:
Okay. And, you know, Commissioner is the Commissioner for this Committee, too. Okay. Thank you. Does B -- I mean we have your review and we have your -- is there anything you'd like to specifically pull out?

MS. HALLORAN:
I didn't have anything planned.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:
No problem. Anyone have any questions for BRO about what's in the review? Okay. Parks. Jay, take on over.

PARKS & RECREATION

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
I know there's -- there's no speakers' cards. But maybe, Commissioner, do you want to say anything? If I could just pull you up for one second so I can maybe ask you a question or two, there are a number of BRO recommendations here that differ from the County Executive. And I noticed in several -- several capital items for Parks where the County Executive did not provide the requested funding. So, are you comfortable with what the County Executive proposed? Do you have any issues with the changes BRO made? Have you had a chance to review any of those? Maybe start with that last question. Have you had a chance to see BRO's recommendations?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
I have. We have no major objections to any of BRO's recommendations.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
So you could live with BRO's recommendations as well as the County Executive's?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Yes, we can, understanding the fiscal restraints that the County's under.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Let me see if I have specific questions. For fencing, BRO's recommending a little bit less money than you had suggested. I know some of that's Public Safety. There are some areas where fencing probably needs to get removed. I just want to make sure you have adequate funding there.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
We do. There's still $320,000 left in the account.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
So you're comfortable --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
We should be okay with the $25,000 reduction.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. There's some park improvements, campground improvements, you had requested 850. The County Executive in '15 didn't provide anything. BRO's recommending 450.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
And we still have $2 million left in that account so --

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
You have existing money.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
We have existing, yes, we'll make that work.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. So you could live with the County Executive's recommendation on that one? You probably prefer BRO's but either way, right?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Either way.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Lighting, they agreed with. West Neck Farm a minor change. We can skip that. North Fork Preserve is the same, at least one aspect; Smiths Point the same; the Meschutt sand, Bureau saying it's -- I guess there's enough money available in '15 that you don't need the 50,000?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
We will have 100 -- we put $50,000 in because you have that maintenance permit with DEC to put 5,000 cubic yards. We still have $177,000 in there. So we should be okay.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
So you're okay with BRO on that. Sagtikos Manor, BRO's recommending delaying the 100,000 and doing it all in '16. You're okay with that?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Yep, that's fine.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Golf courses, they're -- Executive and BRO are the same; same with the computer systems. Let's see. We're almost to the end here.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Can I ask a question while you're --

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Sure, go ahead.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I got a question about the golf courses.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Sure.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
The Indian Island Golf Course, is that -- I see that irrigation's going to be expanded and improved. Is that going to take into account the Riverhead expansion next door to be able to use that effluent to irrigate the golf course?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Actually we're working on that proposal now from Riverhead. I think we have a meeting scheduled for next week to go over -- the County Center -- so we can meet with the Sewer District from Riverhead.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
On the North Fork Preserve, the major improvements, BRO's recommending advancing planning money 200,000 into '15, whereas County Executive has it in '16. Are you okay with that delay? I believe it's planning money.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Yeah, we really need to get the planning out of the way first. We can live with pushing the construction money out a little bit.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh, you have the planning. You have the 100,000. So that 200,000 you don't need in '15 that BRO --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
No. That's additional planning money.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Do you need it or you don't need it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
We can push it out to '16.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
'16's okay. Okay. That's it for those parks projects. So, Legislator Kennedy first and then we'll take --

LEG. KENNEDY:
And Legislator Browning has a question as well. Mine is simple: Greg, just talk to me a little bit about Blydenburgh and what we have in the recommended with BRO. You're midway through the process with the Millers House. I know the mill is sitting there. We all have the works or the wheel in there but it's stabilized. It's stable on the foundation. It's buttoned up. It's watertight?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
That's correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:
It's sound inside?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
That's correct. We've asked for $500,000 on top of this 675,000 or thereabouts to move forward with the actual Millers House.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. And so will that be enough basically to go ahead and get the renovations worked on and get it opened up?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
For the Millers House, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. The wheel and the works I realize will have to be something that's, you know, further down the road. I get that. I understand that. But in the grand scheme of things, the Millers House is -- of the three structures the one that's most at risk; right?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
That's correct. We've already taken care of the Mill itself. That's been stabilized. Now we're going to move onto -- now we're moving onto the Millers House problems.

LEG. KENNEDY:
One of the other things we've talked about off and on is the spillway itself there. And we do have that border parks capital project associated with spillways. But that one in particular there at Stump Pond, has anybody looked at that or assessed it recently?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Not that I'm aware of. I'd have to check with Commissioner Anderson but we do have money in spillways in both 2015 and in subsequent years. We have almost $800,000 left there now so --

LEG. KENNEDY:
All right. I'll jot you a note on that, then. Okay. Thanks. I think Legislator Browning's got a question.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:
Sure, thank you. I know due to some family issues we haven't been able to meet. And we were going to talk about the Smith Point Marina. I know RFPs have gone out and no buyers, no takers. But we got an estimate from New York Rising, the CRZ planners figured there would be -- to do construction of boat slips, bulkheading, to try and bring in some kind of attraction and do something with that marina. They estimated about $5 million. Have you guys looked at anything? I mean it just seems to me it's a piece of county property that's just sitting there and it's doing little or nothing. And we absolutely should be looking to see what opportunities there are to generate some revenue.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
As you're aware, we do have the Master Plan and we're going to be meeting on that. I think it's next week.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
So we'll talk about -- I mean there are a lot of recommendations in that Master Plan.

LEG. BROWNING:
However --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Marina being one of them, so.

LEG. BROWNING:
Right. But the issue is, there's nothing in the budget at all to even to talk about it for the next, you know, three, four years. And, you know, I would certainly like us to try and consider something. I know it's going to be a heavy push and a heavy lift for you to try and come up with something by Friday, you know, to come up with something.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Well, we do have existing funds of three-and-a-half million dollars for Smiths Point.

LEG. BROWNING:
But that's for the entire Smith Point. That's not just for the marina.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
That's correct.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah, but you know how quickly that three million can go just at Smith Point Beach.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
I do.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah. So, you know, I'd like to follow up with you a little bit, you know, at some point maybe this week. I don't know where my time is, but before Friday to see if we can consider something that would help create some kind of revenue for the Marina.

Second question I have is there's a Capital Program 7097 innovative sound remediation at the Suffolk County Trap & Skeet. I'm curious to know what innovative is and, you know, as you know, there's a lawsuit at this point in time which Brookhaven so far has been successful. And I think we had a conversation this morning about doing improvements on properties that we're possibly going to be offloading. We had that discussion this morning with Public Works. So my question is, what is this innovative sound remediation? Because I can tell you I'm about 4 miles south of Trap and Skeet Range. I heard it loud and clear on Saturday. And the Saturday before. So what fantastic sound mitigation could be done and not have to go through the Pine Barrens Commission?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
I think that's a question, again, for Commissioner Anderson. But that money was put in -- the Department didn't request that $250,000. It was put in by the Legislature. I think we could use the money for some kind of planning to -- I know we've studied it to death, but again that's -- I think you should talk to Gil about that.

LEG. BROWNING:
Maybe it'll pay the fines (laughter). But, again, you know, I'm looking at putting $250,000 into something that we could potentially wind up having to close. And, again, government at its best, spending money on something that they're not going to keep, you know, because of the lawsuit. So I never thought to ask DPW about it, but I guess I can do a follow-up question with them and ask them what this innovative sound mitigation is or remediation, but my guess would be is anything that you would want to construct there would require Pine Barrens Commission.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
That's correct.

LEG. BROWNING:
And I know Jay and I've had the conversation. And he had said moveable; even with a moveable type sound wall or whatever, I would assume it would still have to go through the Pine Barrens Commission.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
I think any structure that you put up would absolutely need to go through the Pine Barrens.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
They were talking about sound remediation walls, a number of ideas.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay. I thank you. That's it.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Greg, I actually have one question to you on CP 7510 which is the Historic Restoration Preservation Fund. BRO didn't make any differences in terms of what they recommended, but there is a jump of about $200,000 available. This is like the roof repairs and things like that of the

historic buildings. I know you had requested the additional funds. So it is available. I just want to make sure we'll be able to move forward. One of the targeted projects is that Cedar Point Lighthouse. And I think something like 50,000 or so was needed for that. I can't remember exactly, but I want to make sure that that's one of the projects that you'll be progressing.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Yes, right after the Homan Gerard House, the Cedar Point -- the roof on Cedar Point is one of the next priorities. I don't want to commit to the $50,000 number.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm not sure what the number was, but, you know, I had also requested the County Executive up this line so that we could take care of that project. So it is -- that's in that $500,000 number is, at least that one building was part of the thinking.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
It is. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Could I ask a question on that?

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, sure.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So what's the -- so why does the County own the Lighthouse?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
I'm sorry?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Why does the County own the Lighthouse? What are your plans for it?

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
It's within the County Park. It's a historic building.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
What are our plans for it?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Well,we have an agreement in place with the -- with the US Lighthouse Historical Society. They have an agreement with us. They're supposed to raise funds to put into the facility and then -- I mean long-term plan is to have that facility open to the public.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
They're raising funds and they're going to do exactly what? What's their -- so they're going to raise funds and repair it. And then what's going to happen to it?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Well, they're going to open -- they're looking to open it up to the public, public use. I mean we're years from that obviously, but we do have some responsibility to contribute to the facility itself. Like I said, the roof is in really bad shape and the rest of the facility is deteriorating because of that.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
How are they doing with their fundraising?

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
I mean I can answer that a little bit. I mean they're looking at raising over a million dollars -- or their goal, I think, a million and a half to redo the interior of this building. They're looking, though, to have a public use, but also to have like a bed and breakfast type of use that will help generate revenues to maintain the interior of the building. But they're trying to raise private funds.

We're just trying to shore it up now, because right now there's a tremendous amount of water that is getting to the interior, and position this building better so that we can have a not-for-profit step in and try to fix up the interior, so. It's a big Capital Project if we did the interior as well. So we're kind of hoping for other people to raise that money.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Is it storm proof? How was it affected in the last hurricane?

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Outside's strong.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
Yeah, I mean --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
No, but is it flooded? Does it flood?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
(Shaking head no) I mean there's not much inside to flood.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Were it restored, would it have done a lot of damage to the interior? If you had a million dollars and restored it, would Sandy have damaged the interior?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:
I mean that's difficult to say. I mean, it's a lighthouse. It's built to be out on the water. And it's built raised. I mean, Sandy was a 100-year storm. But I would imagine it's built to withstand a 100 -- you know, anything other than a 100-year storm.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

CO-CHAIR SCHNEIDERMAN:
Any other questions for the Commissioner? Okay. Anyone else on anything involving the Parks Capital Budget? Seeing none, we are adjourned. Thank you.

THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 3:17 PM
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY