

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Parks and 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 February 25, 2009.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Vivian Vilorio-Fisher, Chairperson
Leg. Lou D'Amaro, Vice Chair
Leg. Cameron Alden (excused absence)
Leg. Lynne C. Nowick
Leg. Steven H. Stern

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Legislator Kate Browning, Third District
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel
Ben Zwirn, Deputy County Executive
Terrence G. Pearsall, Chief of Staff
Barbara LoMoriello, Deputy Clerk
Lance Reinheimer, Assistant Director of Budget Review Office
Jill Moss, Budget Review Office
John W. Pavacic, Commissioner of Parks
Tracey Bellone, Deputy Commissioner of Parks
Richard Martin, Director of Historic Services
Emily Lauri, Director of Community Relations
Steve Tricarico, Aide to Presiding Officer
Dennis Brown, County Attorney's Office
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Leader
Greg Moran, Aide to Leg. Nowick
Steven Gittelman, Vanderbilt Museum
Carol Hart, Vanderbilt Museum
Debra Alloncius, AME Legislative Director
Brian Amico, Bank of America
John Lawson, Bank of America
Deborah Harris, Aide to Leg. Stern
Ginny Suhr, Aide to Leg. Vilorio-Fisher
Thomas Ryan, Aide to Leg. Vilorio-Fisher
Michael Pitcher, Aide to Presiding Officer
Ginny Munger Kahn, LI Dog
Robyn Verspoor
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:10 PM

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

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

SALUTATION

And can you just remain standing in memory of Glen Ciano who suffered a tragic car accident and died.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

PUBLIC PORTION

We have one card, Ginny Munger Kahn.

MS. MUNGER KAHN:

I am Ginny Munger Kahn, the President of the Long Island Dog Owner's Group. LI Dog is a none profit New York State Corporation whose mission is to increase access to public parkland for Long Island dog owners and their dogs.

We would like to thank the members of this Committee for their support of dog parks. Many of you were co-sponsors of the five new dog parks bill which Legislator Steve Stern introduced. And all of you have voted in favor of it. So we want to thank you very much for supporting this forward looking initiative that will impact the lives of thousands of your dog owning constituents.

As the County's experience at the Blydenburg and West Hills Dog Park shows, there is tremendous demand for dog parks. The first weekend that Blydenburg opened 50 people showed up. And it's been that way ever since. But we need more dog parks. For too long dog owners have an underserved community. Forty percent or 200,000 Suffolk County households own at least one dog. By contrast only 25 percent of Suffolk households have children under the age of 18.

We have worked with Legislator Kate Browning since early 2006 to find a suitable location for a dog park for her constituents. We have been helped in this search considerably by the local neighborhood group there, the South Yaphank Civic Association, whose president unfortunately could not be here today.

Among all the locations we have researched, Southaven Park is clearly the best place to create a dog park in this area. And the field cited in this bill is particularly attractive. First, it is a large area, more than two and a half acres which is bigger than both the Blydenburg and West Hills Dog Parks.

Second, it is an established field so the site does not require cutting down trees or otherwise damaging the environment and the dog park won't take years to develop. The foundation, the field, is already there. There are no homes nearby so local residents will not be disturbed. And in fact the South Yaphank Civic Association supports this location. And it is located well within an already established park with all the infrastructure already in place. Parking, water, other facilities so you don't have to spend a lot of money developing the support structure for this facility.

We understand there may be plans for the use of the now vacant stables by the SPCA and some objections have been raised to our use of this field by people who access nearby riding trails. The last thing LI Dog wants to do is displace people or organizations that care as deeply about the welfare of animals as we do. And I'm sure they feel the same way about us and our dogs. There's

no reason we can't coexist with these other users of the park. The park is big enough. It's like -- it's more than 1300 acres to accommodate everyone's needs. If Legislator Browning wants it, we would be happy to sit down and help work out an arrangement by which we can all enjoy the park.

We urge you to support IR 1104, Legislator Browning's bill. It's a simple way to make a lot of people happy. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you very much. And you timed that perfectly. I hate to have to tell people their time's up.

Our next speaker is Robyn Verspoor.

MS. VERSPOOR:

Hi, I thought I would be asked questions regarding Southaven. I am a past boarder of when the Parks Department last had it open prior to it closing. I boarded there for a year. The building does need to be redone. It leaks. The water system totally has to be redone. And us as horse people would like to see it redone so it could be used again. And we can bring more money back into the County.

We also need the Bohemia and Recreation Center to be improved, also. If you have any questions regarding the building or anything or -- because I know there was money from --

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Did you want to ask a question of the speaker?

LEG. BROWNING:

No, but I guess the Parks Commissioner --

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. All right. I'm sorry.

MS. VERSPOOR:

The roof leaks. I don't know if you know but the indoor arena was brought in when they moved the original stable from the pond over to where its location is now. It is the old Suffolk Farms indoor arena that was located on the southeast corner of Sunrise Highway and Nicolls Road. So the indoor arena is old. It leaks. The whole thing needs to be torn down and put back up. There was two estimates done on what it would cost to be repaired and replaced. We heard that things were going to happen. Nothing has happened. We feel -- I feel personally that the horse people and the dog people could work together. There's enough property there that it could work.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you very much.

MS. VERSPOOR:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Third speaker Carol Hart.

MS. HART:

Thank you. First I just want to clarify a statement I made at the February 3rd meeting of the Legislature in discussing increases in the services and associated salaries. I'm in the record saying, *for example just this summer we will be running a full day summer camp. We expect substantial revenue but we're also going to bump up my salary \$20,000 maybe so I have to reflect the salaries are not netted.*

I didn't announce an "s". I meant my salaries, meaning the salaries of the Vanderbilt Museum would go up about \$20,000 because of the increase programming. So I just wanted to clarify that. And thank you, Barbara, for bringing that to my attention.

I just also want to say I just spent the last four days in Washington DC as part of a museum advocacy group. Over 300 museum directors from all over the country came together to meet with senators and congressmen and lobby some of the bills that are of interest to museums. So that was a wonderful opportunity to find out what's going on with other museums and how it is relating to our federal government.

As part of that the AAM, American Association of Museums did produce some museum facts. I'm not going to go through all of them but museums serve the public, museums are trustworthy, museums are popular, museums serve every community, museums partner with schools, museums educate our communities and museums are economic engines. I just wanted to give you a full -- a few bullet points from that economic part. Museums employ more than a half million Americans and certainly in Suffolk County they employ quite a few people.

The US museums spend more than 14.5 billion a year encouraging economic growth in their communities. Again, we do spend money in Suffolk County. Museums rank among the top three family vacation destinations. Trips including cultural and heritage activities comprised one of the most popular and significant segments of the travel industry accounting for over 23 percent of domestic trips according to the US Travel Association.

Visitors to historic sites and cultural attractions including museums stay 53 percent longer and spend 36 percent more money than other kinds of tourists. That's from US Travel Association. Quality of life issues contribute significantly to decisions businesses make in choosing to relocate including access to cultural resources that include a dynamic museum community.

The US Conference of Mayors has found that the arts, humanities and museums are critical to the quality of life and livability of America's cities. It's been shown that the non-profit arts and culture industry generates over 166 billion in economic activity annually, supports over 5.7 million full-time jobs and returns over 12 billion in federal income taxes annually. Governments which support the arts on average see return on investment of over seven dollars in taxes for every one dollar the government appropriates. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you very much.

Okay. Next we're going to have a presentation by John Lawson and Brian Amico from the Bank of America. As you know, they're the investment managers of the Vanderbilt trust fund. And they will be updating us on where we are right now and give us a presentation on what our options are going forward.

Currently the value of the fund is 8.3 million. Okay? Which is right at the point of the corpus with 6.8 million in cash and money market funds and 1.5 million in bonds and bond funds. Okay. The yield right now is at 1.3 percent with a projected annual income of \$110,000. But I'll let you gentlemen go ahead with the rest -- with your presentation and then we will ask you questions. All right. Thank you. Make sure your mikes are on.

MR. AMICO:

Thank you very much for having us. Couple of things we want to accomplish today, you know, we know the endowment and the future of the endowment is very important to the Vanderbilt Museum. That being said we're looking to adjust the investment objectives that is currently held via short term objectives into more longer term.

We're looking to accomplish three things. One to maximum income for the museum. The second

thing is to minimize volatility. And the third thing is to continue to add a small percentage in the equity side for a growth component so that the endowment can continue to grow.

What I'd like to do is hand it off to our senior portfolio strategist John Lawson who will talk about the implementation of the recommendations for the portfolio.

MR. LAWSON:

Thank you. As you recall from the last time we were here the reference to the corpus that you had in your opening comments, we had been operating previously on a more balanced type of asset allocation guidelines, 50/50 equity and fixed income in nature and then diversified within those categories. And with what's gone on with the financial markets in the fall, second half of last year, what's continuing to go on, instability and financial crisis that we're in the midst of, we made the decision with respect to not wanting to threaten, going below the corpus, to get much more conservative in the fall, we, you know, liquidated the riskier assets following the October meeting. And had the portfolio in a mixture of cash and short term fixed income investments.

And with respect to another couple distribution requests towards at the end of the year, earlier this year, we weighed the allocation more heavily towards cash just wanting to be on the very conservative side given this very volatile environment.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Right. And if I could, we made that decision to be very, very conservative because at that time we were looking at hitting the ceiling. We were at the corpus. Wayne, if I could just get your attention just a minute.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

We made that decision really to just have the money as cash because we didn't want to risk going below the corpus level or invading the corpus.

At this point we have had opportunities to research this with Counsel. And we've decided that we can't have this amount of money \$8.3 million not working for us. And so we want to put the money in a more aggressive -- not aggressive but in a position where it can work for us.

And when we considered this, we went to Counsel to ask about what issues we would be facing were the corpus to fall below the 8.2. And, George, can you just speak to that very briefly? Because before we look at the numbers, we want to get this piece of it on the record. It's critical because of the decisions we're going to make right now. And actually I put it on the record at the General Meeting.

MR. NOLAN:

Well, just for a little background for the Committee members, I became involved in this issue because right now the maintenance fund is being invested very, very, very conservatively. It's generating little or no income and that has consequences for the museum's operations. We've been very mindful and vigilant about protecting the corpus.

So the question at this point when we're about \$100,000 above the original principal amount is could we theoretically pursue a slightly more aggressive investing strategy to try to generate income to aid the museum's operations. And if we did that, and the amount went below the original principal amount, would that be a problem?

My research indicates that we're going to be governed by the prudent investor rule which is set forth in the state law. If we act prudently, we can pursue a different investment strategy for that money. And that is why these folks are here today to talk about a different strategy but ultimately it will be

up to the Legislature to decide if we're going to pursue that.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

LEG. HORSLEY:

So we can go below it and that's prudent?

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes. If we're not withdrawing the money, if it's through the shifts in the market that we were to fall below that, not because we're withdrawing money --

LEG. HORSLEY:

That's prudent.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

That's prudent.

LEG. STERN:

Madam Chair, that may or may not be prudent; that remains to be seen. That's going to be a conversation that we're going to have to have along the way.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Right.

MR. NOLAN:

Right. That's what --

LEG. STERN:

Not necessarily that anybody in this Committee or the Legislature is deciding or not deciding to do at this time.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Right. I wanted you to hear the opinions so as we make the decisions you know what is before us.

Okay, Mr. Lawson, I'm sorry for the interruption. I just wanted to set that ground work so that you would know --

MR. LAWSON:

No, I think, that's -- I think that's appropriate. It's a good launching point for discussing what we want to do, what we recommend going forward. On the premise that there is a latitude for the value of the assets to dip below the corpus by virtue of market fluctuations, we want to take an approach that's a little bit more aggressive than basically a pure cash approach and introduce what would approximate about a twenty percent equity, eighty percent fixed income strategy with the fixed income. That's for a long term asset allocation goal with the fixed income being managed with individual securities by one of our portfolio managers who's a colleague of mine, but he'd be a specialist managing the fixed income segment.

We have a set of investment criteria and guidelines that would govern what he'd be allowed to buy. It would basically be a high quality intermediate term gov credit portfolio meaning it would own, you know, treasuries, US agencies, incorporates that would be, you know, subject to credit quality criteria and other restrictions which we've actually laid out on page 15.

And for the purposes of moving from where we are today which is essentially cash with very low yield and low expected return given where short term rates are and also with a nod to how unstable the environment and the markets still currently are, we would recommend starting off with, you

know, the move to be more aggressive, be just, you know, a hundred percent fixed income at this stage and then inch into the equity allocation later in the second half of this year as things, you know, are projected to stabilize a little bit more, do it in a incremental dollar cost averaging and diversified type of approach.

So what we would have is, you know, a shift from the portfolio as it's currently composed into one that's in a high quality fixed income portfolio that's focused on income and preservation of capital, perhaps a little more so than total return. You know, there's two approaches to investing. Total return and income in orientation.

We think that using an individual portfolio of securities managed by a manager who's treating it in a customized way for the portfolio is better than using a mutual fund. We have the ability to, you know, micromanage the individual holdings, the individual criteria that he'll be investing by and to, you know, make incremental and marginal shifts as we see opportunities to get a little bit more aggressive.

The idea would be to have the income generated by the fixed income portion of the portfolio, have the growth come off the smaller equity allocation initially; and then as we rebalance back to a set of asset allocation guidelines, we'll be taking from hopefully a growth on the equity side, reintroducing it to the fixed income side. And we'll be, you know, increasing the ability of the portfolio to throw off income by hopefully growing the -- growing the corpus.

This is a very conservative approach. It's much more conservative than the 50/50, you know, allocation that we had previously. And it's a way of managing the risk of the portfolio on multiple levels, you know, the overall level, 20/80, the individual sublevels of the areas you'd have exposure to fixed income, and then the tactical level which is really more my responsibility which is how incrementally and at what pace would we introduce the equities into the portfolio. And the way we would do it is have, you know, a longer term set of guidelines and then ranges around it and, you know, do it very carefully and in a measured way.

We laid out these guidelines on page fifteen of the book that you have here just as a frame of reference. And if I take just a moment, you had mentioned, you know, managing the portfolio prudently. And so one of those -- the key concepts of that is to -- the concept of prudence with portfolio management is to look at a set of investments on the portfolio level, not in each particular sleeve of a portfolio. So, for instance, you know, if you have a small allocation to -- just for the sake of argument, a small allocation to a merging market which on its own is a very risky asset class as everybody I'm sure is aware, in the concept of a broad portfolio where maybe it represents one or two percent of a broader asset allocation, that's considered prudent because it's diversifying, its more exposure to different uncorrelated areas perhaps.

So that's the kind of concept that we think about when we manage portfolios for clients, is being being well diversified, have exposure to multiple areas without any overlap among areas; have, you know, certain subareas. And we've describe it here, you know, there's fixed income, equity that's diversified by market cap and by style. And then there's a small allocation that would be allowed to liquid alternative investments meaning, you know, a reed fund or a passive exposure perhaps to a commodities index or a tangible asset investment. And the purpose for those is to minimize the volatility of the portfolio because they're very low correlations historically to conventional asset classes.

And so we think this is a very prudent way of increasing the income that could be thrown off the account increasing the expected yield of it. And ultimately as the market stabilize, reinjecting a longer term strategy that would be geared towards growing these assets.

As I understand it, there wouldn't be much need for distributions in the near term. And so it give us an opportunity to build up that corpus as we can, you know, rebuild the portfolio to allow for further distributions that would be well above the corpus.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, thank you Mr. Lawson. Any questions. Where do you begin?

LEG. NOWICK:

I can't help thinking as we are listening none of us being financial experts, this almost reminds me of listening to Rick Santelli every morning because I don't what he's saying either. But I know you know but it's very difficult to -- I don't know about the rest of you, I found it's very difficult to grasp all this and make these decisions so have patience with us.

MR. LAWSON:

Sure, no. I hope I didn't use too much jargon. I try not to. It's sometimes hard. I mean the main thing we're trying to do is get income, you know, as you said earlier, have the money work for you versus sitting stagnant, you know. Short term rates are very close to zero. And so if it's invested in cash, it's really not earning anything for you. And that's what the point of it is.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Right. Okay, Legislator Horsley has a question.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Good afternoon. Thank you for your report. The -- as you said, and I guess this is maybe the first I had heard we had made a \$103,000 as de minimus as that may sound. And we're not going to be using that? Is that what I understand for any expenditures this year?

MR. LAWSON:

Well, I don't know what the expectations are. I know that there had been a much higher draw down policy or rate --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Oh, absolutely.

MR. LAWSON:

-- from the portfolio. And I think following the last meeting that was curtailed in recognition of being very close to the corpus, you know, the -- probably the policy of that is up to the legislature. The -- I don't think, you know, with what you were saying earlier about the -- for distributions purposes, the corpus is still a benchmark that you wouldn't want to go below; that it would affect what we're recommending here. You know, we still think that the portfolio should be invested to generate income and in this environment very conservatively so -- and, you know, hopefully with this, you know, very conservative structure, the market movements wouldn't throw it below the 8.2 million on their own anyway.

At 8.3 million if the, you know, expected yield goes from 1.3 percent to, you know, about 5 percent, that increases, you know, the estimated expected annual income from about 100,000, 110,000 to, you know, 400 to 450,000 a year. So to the extent that you don't take any money out of that in the first year, that's money that accrues to the portfolio versus if, you know, you earn all that money and then take it out we --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. Yeah, I thought that's what -- I misunderstood what you said. I thought you were saying that we would be using that \$100,000. And that we needed it for other expenses or something like that. So, okay, so the -- basically we're talking about that you're satisfied with this plan, that we're going to remain conservatively until we get to about 5 percent is what you're thinking? Is that what --

MR. LAWSON:

Well, we'll remain conservative. And I think, you know, use our discretion opportunistically at the end of the year to start building into the equity allocation.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Is that the break off point is the end of year; is that when you're going to look at this again to --

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, I hope not.

MR. LAWSON:

No, we'll look at it all the time, of course. In this environment, you know, I think to introduce an allocation to equities today, you know, I'd be comfortable waiting a little while and then doing it slowly, just, you know, maybe during the second quarter start to -- if we want to ultimately build into a 20 percent allocation, do, you know, 5 percent and then maybe re-visit it a couple of weeks later, do another 3 or 4, 5 percent.

LEG. HORSLEY:

So you're saying be prudent, wait 'til 5 percent, take a look, monitor it and --

MR. LAWSON:

Yeah. I think right now we want to just get the portfolio towards more of an income focus for generating the return and, you know, help prop it up and then, you know, they'll be a more opportune time to get more aggressive with equities. With good fortune we could be back here in a year, two years and talk about going from a 20/80 profile to a, you know, 30/70 or 40/60 or something like that where hopefully the portfolio can start to sustain itself with, you know, just draw downs or distributions taken out of it. But for right now we think prudence is a better course to be, you know, conservative and income focused.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Right. And I see you basically have it in bond funds and -- which is as conservative as you can get.

Let me just ask you, if we were to put the \$8.3 million in euro money market account at the Bank of America or just keep it in the bank account, would we have done any better or worse than 1.3?

MR. LAWSON:

I don't think you would have done any better. The money market portion of the portfolio is currently yielding point three percent. So the 1.3 percent is the overall portfolio and that's by virtue of that smaller allocation to shorter term actual fixed income. So there's a mutual fund and a couple of bonds that were left in there.

LEG. HORSLEY:

And if it was at a savings account or in a savings account, what would we have received?

MR. LAWSON:

It would be very low. It would be less than --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay.

MR. LAWSON:

Well less than 1 percent.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. Just double checking because wanted to see where the benchmarks are here. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Are there any other questions? Okay.

Gentlemen, thank you very much.

MR. AMICO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And we'll be in touch.

Is there anything that Budget Review wanted to ask on the record on this or --

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, I don't think so. I think it was well covered and, you know, we're looking at this in conjunction with approaching the corpus and with the current market volatility that we need to do something to try to maximum the income and preserve the principal of the account.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Question, Madam Chair.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Lance, did BRO have any intentions of that additional \$100,000 where you're not looking at touching that over the next short run, are you?

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

No.

MR. REINHEIMER:

No. We've already distributed \$87,000 this year in January and February. We can't distribute funds and be prudent and be more aggressive in investments. So at this point if we decide to go into fixed income and try to increase the income portfolio, it wouldn't be prudent to make distributions because even though you're in bonds, there's still some volatility in that market where the principal could be eroded, you could go below 8.2 million,.

So for the near term, if we increase the income portion by going into fixed income, we would have to suspend distributions for the Vanderbilt from the account until we get a large enough cushion. And this is what Bank of America is saying.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Which makes sense.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Which is -- and you like that 5 percent mark; bench mark? You think that's --

MR. REINHEIMER:

You have to look at it in the context of the current market. You can't really set an amount at this point in time. You really have to look at it in the context of markets. The stock market being the way it is, you know, if this was another time and it wasn't as volatile, we wouldn't be having this discussion. It's difficult to go in stocks because they're obviously all over the place. So we would look at it in the context of whatever that market is and the needs of the Vanderbilt, the needs of the

County, the whole picture.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Lance. Thank you, gentlemen.

Okay. The second part of our agenda is a presentation by the Parks Commissioner on our historical structures. And I believe you'll be joined by Mr. Martin; Richard Martin. And it's a huge book, but he's not going to go through all the pages; correct?

LAUGHTER

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Unless somebody really wants me to.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

No. I have the Chair of the following committee sitting to my left so --

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Thank you very much, Deputy Presiding Officer Viloría-Fisher and members of the Committee. As was mentioned I'm accompanied today by Richard Martin, who is our Director of Historic Services in the Parks Department; and also behind me Deputy Commissioner Tracey Bellone and our Director of Community Relations Emily Lauri.

This is basically -- this presentation is basically a synopsis of the report which was released last year.

SLIDE SHOW PRESENTATION

In the Parks Department we have over 200 historic structures on 30 separate sites. These are administered primarily by our Historic Services Division. And as you note an RFP process was utilized in order to obtain a qualified consulting engineering service to conduct this historic structure's review. This was administered and aided by the Department of Public Works.

In this report a total of 49 of the -- more than 200 historic structures were surveyed. And they considered a range of possible appropriate uses, everything from the simplest being purely residential all the way up to possible office space.

In addition for each of these uses there was a determination of what the cost of achieving that use would be. Sites were all chosen due to the matter of whether or not they were being used by the public or would be used by the public; and their status on the national and historic registers of historic places and Suffolk County Historic Trust.

Survey serves as a good planning tool and a base line for us to use in going forward with any future management and restoration of these structures. The structures were prioritized by both historic significance and conditions. And it will be utilized as a base line for future restoration and use of those structures.

And I would also ask Rich to just touch on the prioritization process as well.

MR. MARTIN:

Okay. We created two lists from this survey that are in the introduction of the book. And the first was just based on condition of the buildings that the engineer created.

The second list is based on historic significance and the condition. And that was created by the Parks Department. And the two phases have separate lists for those categories. And you can see on phase one the buildings, like the first three, let's say, the New Mill at Blydenburg, the home in Gerard House at Southaven County Park and the boathouse at Coindre Hall were listed as having the most historic significance and in the most need for restoration funds. And since this has come out, we have targeted funds to those sites.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Thanks, Rich.

And in addition besides looking at potential future uses for these structures, the survey looked at everything from simple stabilization to full fledged restoration and provided a cost estimate for those.

Pictured here is the Elwood School House, which is also known to some as the Little Red Schoolhouse in Elwood in the Town of Huntington. This format here provides for you a frame work that was utilized for every structure in the report. First a general profile about the building including dimensions, the basic floor plan and foot print for each level, first, second and third levels if there's a third level. Other data including the history on the structure, cost estimates.

As I mentioned before ranging from just securing and stabilization through total restoration, recommendations on how to proceed with restoration. And then below you'll find a series of photographs on subsequent pages indicating those structures which were surveyed in the report.

Here we have the North Shore Horse Show Grounds which is also known as -- this one, Rich, is? Old Field Farm, formally known as the North Shore Horse Show Grounds, the New Mill at Blydenburg. Other structures at Blydenburg, a list of other structures throughout the County that were surveyed in this. Pictured here (indicating) is the Farmingville School House, the Bald Hill School House in Farmingville, I should say.

Deepwells in St. James in St. James, Town of Smithtown, Black Duck Lodge at Hubbard County Park in the hamlet of Flanders; a host of other structures. Pictured here is Meadow Croft, which is the Roosevelt Estate on the West Sayville Bayport boarder. Below that are the green houses at West Sayville.

Sagtikos Manor County Park in West Bay Shore. And, yes, George Washington, did sleep here. Southaven County Park pictured here as the Suffolk Lodge, which is now the headquarters of the Suffolk County Park Police. Theodore Roosevelt County Park in Montauk pictured here as Third House, West Neck Farm Coindre Hall, also known as Coindre Hall picturing both the mansion and the boathouse.

And as stated before just to sum up, Parks will be using the survey and planning its subsequent historic preservation and interpretation work. The intent in the Parks Department is to do similar surveys for all the historic structures that are managed by Parks.

And we're free try to answer any questions the Committee may have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner, I'm going to go to the short version. And I just have a couple of questions. When I looked at the charts, I wondered, we have on the first page the recommendation whether to preserve, restore or rehabilitate. And I was just wondering about the order in which these were placed in this chart. Is this a priority order or random or chronological? I wasn't sure. It started with Farm Cottage; and then the farm house, Miller's House, New Mill workshop. It's a page that looks like this (indicating). The highlights are mine because I highlighted what was in my district. It's actually the first full page.

MR. MARTIN:

The numbered?

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

It's in the memorandum that you sent before this?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Lance is saying that's from Budget Review.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, that's from Budget Review. I'm sorry. Sorry.

Budget Review, do you know what that list is? Is it priority or -- I'm sorry, I didn't even realize that. I had everything together.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, I don't think it's really clear on whether it's priority.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I think it's a list of the structures that are in this survey and what the recommendation was, but not necessarily by priority. It's by location.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, all right. By area.

Commissioner, I noticed that --

MR. REINHEIMER:

And the following charts have it by priority.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

All right. There are also some big numbers. Legislator Horsley just commented over my shoulder these are big numbers. Which Capital Programs do you anticipate that these will be in?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

There's a number of them. There are several properties that have their own dedicated historic line. West Neck Farm also known as Coindre Hall is one of them. The Blydenburg historic district has its own. That's CP 7507, for example. There are several that have their own stand out ones. The Scully Estate is another. But we have a single stand alone that is -- CP 7510 that is utilized for all other historic structures which do not have their own dedicated line.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And which years would they be in? Would we be spending money on these?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Well, as you may recall, last year the 2008 monies in the 2008 Capital Budget were appropriated for Blydenburg 7507, which will be used for the New Mill; restoration of the New Mill. And also for the Coindre Hall Boathouse, that line was also appropriated last year. And we're proceeding with the restorations of both of those.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Are there any other questions? Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Good afternoon everybody. Just quickly, I presume that you've spoken to or at least you've heard of the issue relating to the increase in the hotel/motel tax with a possibility of some of those monies going towards renovations of the historic structures. How do you guys feel about that?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Well, we have -- all I know is what I read in Newsday. Have not seen any separate paper work on that or resolution on that. We currently do get a percentage. I think it's 15 percent or -- it might be 15 percent or 16 percent of the County's -- the complete amount that goes to the County does go to Parks and is used primarily for those sites, historic sites which are open to the public. So certainly those monies would be utilized if additional monies were forthcoming through that, would be utilized for those historic sites that are open to the public.

LEG. HORSLEY:

So you would have no objection to this increase and the possibility of it?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Again, I haven't seen -- I haven't seen all the details so I can't -- I can't say one way or the other what -- not having seen the details of how that would actually work.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

My guess would be it wouldn't be something they'd turn away. Budget Review, was that percentage -- pardon? The percentage that comes out of the hotel/motel tax, that goes to historic structures?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes, there's a portion of that that does go to historic structures. And primarily, I think, funds their general project 7510.

MR. MARTIN:

There's a separate account.

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's right. There's a separate fund for that because it's separate accounting based on the distribution of those funds. And then there's a reconciliation the following year. And Parks uses it for their historic structures. So they would end up, if the formula stays the same, with additional funds for additional historic structures.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Right, okay. Okay, thank you very much. Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

You're welcome. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. We have a third presentation, which she promises will be very brief. And that is Barbara LoMoriello who will wear a different hat for this. She's a member of the Vanderbilt Oversight Committee. And they just had a hearing -- a meeting this past week. Ms. LoMoriello.

MS. LOMORIELLO:

The meeting was held on the 18th. And I'm going to go over some of the discussions and outcomes.

Regarding the cell phone tower, I understand that Verizon is going out to the Vanderbilt tomorrow to look at a place for the cell phone tower, evaluate a place for it.

We also have a board member and the executive director will be meeting with neighbors to solicit donations. Regarding the dinosaur exhibit, presently it is owned by the Dinosaur Society. The Dinosaur Society hasn't filed taxes for a number of years. And they're looking into whether -- Mr. Gittelman is looking into whether the Dinosaur Society can transfer the dinosaurs to the Vanderbilt and then be sold.

They also started a Sea Star Program which they're selling sea stars for one dollar throughout the community to raise funds for the Vanderbilt.

The museum has received \$10,000 donation from one of the Vanderbilt family members.

The board is working on a brochure to solicit corporate funding. A few of the new board members are working on a presentation to the Legislature which will outline funding objectives.

And the Vanderbilt has completed a commercial for channel 55 which will be aired next month.

In addition I'm sure you all read about the 15th century della Robbia that has been found in the walls of the Vanderbilt. And they're hoping that that will generate revenue this coming month.

LEG. NOWICK:

What is that?

MS. LOMORIELLO:

It's a terra cotta Madonna and baby that has been uncovered in one of the walls of the museum. And it's dated back to the 15th century. And they believe that one of the artists were from the della Robbia family which was a famous family during that time.

LEG. NOWICK:

May I?

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Sure. Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

Barbara, I was just curious. They found it in the wall. What made them dig into that particular part of the -- you know?

MS. LOMORIELLO:

They had heard rumors over the years that it was there. So they went and lowered a camera, took a look in and they uncovered it.

LEG. NOWICK:

Very good.

MS. LOMORIELLO:

And I believe lastly I just want to say that for the new board members that are now there, there are a number of them. They'll be holding a retreat. Okay?

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. I just wanted to clarify something that although you didn't say it, I didn't want it to be inferred by members of the Committee, that although Mr. Gittelman answered the question could the dinosaurs be transferred and is there a possibility that they could be sold, he wasn't recommending that they be sold. He was just stating the fact that it was something that he would look at. Isn't that correct?

MS. LOMORIELLO:

I believe my understanding -- Terry was there also, I think -- was that they were going to look into the possibility of having them transferred and then look into the possibility of sale. That was my understanding.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

The point I'm making is he wasn't recommending the sale of --

MS. LOMORIELLO:

He wasn't, right. He wasn't.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Yeah. He was just answering a question.

MR. PEARSALL:

The museum does not recommend the sale of the dinosaurs.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Right. I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. That wasn't a recommendation. You don't have your mike on, Terry.

MR. PEARSALL:

Oh, I'm sorry. The question that the Oversight Committee had was whether these dinosaurs were costing the Vanderbilt money having them there. And at this point it's been determined that they have not cost the Vanderbilt any money, that they may have produced some revenue to it. And we had a rather -- half hour discussion about the dinosaurs.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you.

MS. LOMORIELLO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay, to the agenda. Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner if could come forward? Thank you.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

IR 1949 (naming the fishing pier at Smith Point County Park as the "John Fritz Memorial Fishing Pier") (Viloria-Fisher) I am going to table. I'll offer a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? IR 1949 stands tabled. **(Vote: 4-0-0-1. Leg. Alden not present)** We do have one more month and I've asked Counsel about this siting committee, I don't think it has met. And we'll get more information when their next meeting will occur. Next month it'll be six months.

Okay, **2170, amending the 2008 Capital Budget and Program appropriating funds in connection with renovations at Historic Blydenburg Park. (Kennedy)** Is there a motion?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to table by Legislator Horsley. I'll second it and ask the Commissioner any comments on this?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

No, I think this -- sorry. As I mentioned before CP 7507 was appropriated late last year. I believe Legislator Kennedy had introduced his simultaneously.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

That's right, yes.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

And I believe he had asked it be tabled.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes. Thank you. I had forgotten that this was the one that was a duplicate.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Right, that's correct.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

That is right.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. We will be changing that motion. Legislator Stern is making a motion to table subject to call, seconded by Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Sure. Do you want me to withdraw my tabling motion or -- is that necessary?

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Do we need to withdraw? Yeah, okay. Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I'll make a motion to withdraw the tabling motion.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

And. And I'll withdraw my second. So we now have a motion to table subject to call, Legislator Stern. Seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Okay, tabled subject to call. **(Vote: 4-0-0-1. Leg. Alden not present)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

1066, requesting legislative approval of a contract award to renovate, operate, maintain and manage a food catering concession with Coindre Hall located at West Neck Farm in Huntington. (Co. Exec) And I understand, Commissioner, that this was the one respondent; was Lessing?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And if anyone has a question? Okay. I had a representative who attended the presentation, Ginny Suhr from my office. And I've looked at the materials. It looks like it was very ample, quite a big presentation that they had there. Are there any questions about this? I'll make a motion to

approve.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? IR 1066 is approved. **(Vote: 4-0-0-1. Leg. Alden not present)**

1067, approving a license agreement for Jenine Vella to reside at West Sayville Gatehouse at Charles R. Dominy County Park, West Sayville. (Co. Exec) Okay. I'll make a motion to approve, second by Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And just to put it on the record regarding the rent, Ms. Bellone? This was reappraised.

MS. BELLONE:

Yeah, it was just reappraised. The fair market value was 1125 a month. And that's what she's currently being charged.

LEG. NOWICK:

Question.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Sure. Question, Commissioner, from Legislator Nowick.

LEG. NOWICK:

This just reminded me of my own district. Is it difficult -- do you find it's difficult to get people to lease these premises? I know we have a few of them that are not occupied which is always a bit of a liability for us.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Well, based on the resolution that was sponsored by Deputy Presiding Officer last year that changed that formula, we're going out and reappraising the historic structures. In fact Deputy Commissioner Bellone is the Chair of the Committee now that oversees the reappraisal process and the establishment of what should be the proper rent for those facilities. So we're confident that after we finish that process we'll be able to get all or most of those vacant structures occupied by people.

LEG. NOWICK:

That's good news. Good. Great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

And we've almost finished all of them with the review.

MS. BELLONE:

Probably another meeting or two.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

We've been really going through them. I think the Mill House has other issues before we rent it, doesn't it?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Which one?

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

The Mill House in St. James. That beautiful Mill House --

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

The Isaac Mills House.

MS. BELLONE:

You're thinking of the Isaac Mills House. It's a large structure.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

MS. BELLONE:

So we asked the appraisal -- real estate to appraise it in three different areas, you know, making an apartment in it, apartment with the dining room area -- and the whole house. So I haven't received that appraisal back but we're hoping that sectioning it off and offering a small apartment in there is going to make it so that we have somebody to rent it. So I'm just waiting for that appraisal.

LEG. NOWICK:

And I don't mean to put you on the spot, I was just curious as to how that was going. Thank you.

MS. BELLONE:

No, we're anxious to get that occupied..

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. We called the vote on that already, didn't we? I'm sorry?

MS. LOMORIELLO:

There was a first and a second.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. All right. So there's a motion to approve. All in favor? Opposed? IR 1067 is approved.

(Vote: 4-0-0-1. Leg. Alden not present)

IR 1076, (establishing an Equestrian Task Force) (Eddington) Counsel has just informed me that there was a change so we have to table it because there was an amendment made after the deadline. So I make a motion to table.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? IR 1076 stands tabled. **(Vote: 4-0-0-1.**

Leg. Alden not present)

1101, authorizing use of Makamah Preserve in Northport by Northport Running Club.

(Cooper) Motion to approve by Legislator Nowick.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? 1101 is approved. **(Vote: 4-0-0-1. Leg.**

Alden not present)

I was just informed that Legislator Alden has an excused absence from this meeting. Thank you, Tom.

IR 1104, authorizing the Department of Parks, Recreation and Conservation to plan and design a dog park at Southaven County Park. (Browning)

LEG. STERN:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Motion to approve by Legislator Stern. We'll have you speak on the motion. Is there a second? Well, I'll second it for the purposes of discussion. And Deputy Commissioner Bellone.

MS. BELLONE:

The department is opposed to IR 1104. We understand that Legislator Browning is, you know, wants to have a dog park within her district. And we have been working very hard with her and members of LI Dog to find a suitable location -- to find a suitable location.

I think as of today we probably looked at four different locations within Legislator Browning's district. The area proposed in this resolution is actually our overflow parking area for Southaven County Park. And after discussing it in depth with the prior superintendent and current park supervisors, they need that area for park use.

As you know, Southaven County Park is heavily used by picnic groups. Office of the Aging has their huge parking. Picnics there -- many school groups use it. This body, you know, supports many fundraising activities within that park. And that park is used as our overflow parking area.

If you did put a dog park in there, the addition of a dog park taking up that space, parking for that dog park, we wouldn't have suitable location to hold those large events within that park.

We have proposed another location to the Legislator within her district at the Robinson Duck Farm. We are proposing a one year pilot program for a natural borders park there. I know there are some concerns about -- neighboring concerns but we are meeting with those groups in trying to work that out to have a one year pilot program because we think that's a more suitable location for a dog park within Legislator Browning's district.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

There are no ducks any more. I thank you, Tracey. I know I've been a thorn in your side for the past couple of years.

MS. BELLONE:

Never.

LEG. BROWNING:

But I'm going to keep going. Not that I'm enjoying it, but, you know, I did -- the lady that came and spoke about the equestrian site and, you know, this is in the core preservation area, the equestrian site, the equestrian center. And I kinda like you to respond on what would be entailed to do any kind of reconstruction, remodeling of the equestrian center being that it's in the core preservation area.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

Basically from preliminary review, we don't have any detailed plans at this point, but preliminary review, reconstruction, renovation of existing structure would be grandfathered and would be

allowed to occur. There's no proposed to increase the foot print or the -- enlarge the structure. And that would be something that would not require a hardship approval from the Commission.

LEG. BROWNING:

Even though it's been -- how many years has it been abandoned and neglected, left alone? It's about five, seven years, I see.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

No, it hasn't been that long. And it's --

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER

Actually we can't entertain comments from the audience after the audience portion.

LEG. BROWNING:

And, you know, the other issue is this bill is not saying you have to put it here. It's looking at the locations. I know what you're talking about. It's 2.6 acres. I've been there. There was an organization that I was joining them for their event. And the overflow parking area was used, but it was by know stretch of the imagination 2.6 acres. I would say maybe not even half an acre that they used for overflow.

I do go to the park frequently for different events in the district. And, you know, that's 2.6 acres. We also have the 1.7 acres. And I have the map here by the equestrian site. And, you know, this resolution is basically just saying, you know, to plan and come up with some design and location for the dog park.

I know that I've spoken with the Post Morrow Foundation on the duck farm. And I know that there's a lot of opposition to the duck farm. And I would like to see that we can continue with some conversation with them and maybe be able to have that open borders dog park. But, you know, at this stage of the game I do have a commitment from Assemblywoman Eddington to work with me on coming up with the money to do this so it would be at no cost to the County to create the dog park if we do it in Southaven. So like I said this resolution's basically just design and to make plans.

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

If I may just address that a little bit further. As you know, back in 2007 in response to a requirement and a resolution that year Deputy Commissioner Bellone provided a listing of five potential sites. We were required to develop five additional dog parks in the County. And I believe this year we are making progress towards that. We're looking at several sites in central Brookhaven. And we also have plans for additional sites that we're looking at in western Suffolk in order to meet that mandate.

But I think one of the things that the Legislature has to keep in mind that if it -- it directs us to do a site at a particular location, that will in some cases tie our hands. We are displacing other uses here there. And that's what is happening on some of the other sites as well, Blydenburg and West Hills. We did establish dog parks there. But there were existing facilities there; picnic areas and other areas, fields that were utilized for that purpose. And I think we would prefer that we have the freedom to pick those sites that are most suitable for dog parks without being forced to find these locations.

I would have to agree with our operations folks, the past senior superintendent of Parks who was in the -- started with the Parks Department back 1967, very experienced with the events at Southaven County Park. And I would defer to his years of experience in regard to the need for that overflow parking area there and would request that we not be directed and required to come up with a dog park there.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Stern has a question.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. Madam Chair.

Commissioner, I just don't recall, maybe you can refresh my memory, do you recall what parks -- what county parks were on the list that were identified for possible dog parks?

COMMISSIONER PAVACIC:

I'll ask Deputy Commissioner Bellone to address that.

MS. BELLONE:

Yeah. We proposed Peconic H property which is right across the street from the entranceway here at Southaven County Park. It's actually across the street from the Trap & Skeet. We had proposed Cherry Avenue site in Islip, which is one that we're pursuing this year. We had proposed possibly a park -- an extension of Indian Island County Park in Riverhead. Coram -- it was called Coram Avenue County Park. It was an open field. It's not used for anything else. Let me just think. Oh, and Gardiner's Park -- Gardiner's County Park in Bay Shore was the fifth one.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. And I just want to get a better understanding of the area that we're talking about here. You have this map.

MS. BELLONE:

I don't have that.

LEG. STERN:

This is the old equestrian structure, the bottom, I guess, left. There's 1.17 acres going off this way (indicating). That's vacant right now. And then there's the 2.6 acres. The 2.6 acres is also vacant. It doesn't have any particular use although I understand that it's there for potential overflow parking, but no set specific use at this time.

MS. BELLONE:

Yeah, if you look at what is the stables, that point eight acres, the area behind that is not as clear as it may look on this map. It's an outdoor riding rink so there's a fence for an outdoor riding rink which SPCA will use in part if they are -- SPCA is looking to use Southaven Stables as their new home. They're also looking to house horses, you know. And they may use that riding area for the animals.

The area that Legislator Browning is proposing is the area to the east that's not as clear as this picture shows but that is the overflow parking area that operations needs and would like to remain on our list of things to use.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Legislator Browning, Deputy Commissioner Bellone mentioned Peconic Park that's across the street. Is there an objection to that?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah. Peconic was not -- it's said Southaven Park, designating Southaven Park initially. And Peconic H is next to residential directly across the street from the Trap & Skeet range. And here we go again. I'm getting many complaints about the Trap and Skeet Range on a daily basis with the noise of the guns. And now you're saying you're going to put a dog park so now we have to listen to barking dogs. So it's not a good location.

We actually sent out letters to the residents that live around Peconic H. And they were adamantly opposed to putting a dog park there. They said *what are you trying to do to us?* So I think it's unfair to them.

And a lot of the residents who actually live right there next to Peconic H, next to the Trap and Skeet Range would love to have a dog park nearby. And they said this is something that we would like to see and fully support. I know that Ginny mentioned the Yaphank Civic Association, that they are very, very supportive. Many of them are dog owners.

And, you know it amazes me how difficult it is to get an open space to let dogs run. You know, here they are, they live next to the park but they can't take their dogs to the park. You know, they can take their dog to the park but you better keep him on a leash. You can't let him run loose. And, you know, we have a beautiful big park, nowhere for them to go. I just think it's not fair that, you know, it amazes me my daughter lives in Colorado. She's telling me I was up in the mountains yesterday with my dogs letting them run and, you know, she's telling me about all the dog parks they have. We don't need water. They bring their own water. It's open spaces. The dogs, they have designated areas for them to run. And it just amazes me how difficult it is here to provide what the dog lovers need.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

I just wanted to ask another question. Now would this be a fenced park or a natural boarders park if it were there?

LEG. BROWNING:

Well, that would be determined.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Oh, that's part of what would be explored here?

MS. BELLONE:

No, we would only -- I mean, no, we're opposed to it but we would only support a fenced in dog run in a park that's used by other users.

LEG. BROWNING:

And I understand because of the fact that there's, you know, other people would be using the park, that they want to make sure that the dogs are not running loose.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

There are a lot of ticks there.

LEG. BROWNING:

There's a lot of ticks, yes.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Are there any other questions for the sponsor? Okay, there's a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed? 1104 is approved. **(Vote: 4-0-0-1. Leg. Alden not present).**

APPLAUDING

1115, authorizing the transfer of property to Suffolk County Department of Parks, Recreation and Conservation and creating a new Suffolk County Park. (Beedenbender) Is there any problem left with this?

MR. NOLAN:

My understanding from talking to the sponsor --

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Wait. He wants it to be tabled, I'm sorry.

MR. NOLAN:

Because of an amendment.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

That's right. There's an easement issue.

MR. NOLAN:

There are a couple of issues that he's exploring right now.

CHAIRMAN VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Motion to table.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON VILORIA-FISHER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? IR 1115 is tabled. **(Vote: 4-0-0-1. Leg.Alden not present)**

If there is no further business, we stand adjourned.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 2:19 PM
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**