

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE
MINUTES

A meeting of the Parks & Recreation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislature Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on May 28, 2014.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Jay Schneiderman, Chairman
Leg. Kara Hahn, Vice Chair
Leg. Thomas Cilmi
Leg. William J. Lindsay III
Leg. Kevin McCaffrey

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George M. Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel to the Legislature
Lora Gellerstein, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Robert Doering, Budget Review Office
Greg Dawson, Commissioner/Parks Department
Lance Reinheimer, Director/Vanderbilt Museum
Christina DeLisi, Aide to Leg. Schneiderman
Jason Hann, Aide to Leg. Schneiderman
Alyssa Turano, Aide to Leg. Hahn
Bill Shilling, Aide to Leg. Calarco
Robert Lipp, Director/Budget Review Office
Tom Vaughn, County Executive's Office
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Gabrielle Severs, Court Reporter

*(*The meeting was called to order at 12:34 p.m.*)*

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'd like to call this meeting of the Parks and Recreation Committee to order this 28 day of May 2014. Please rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by our legislative counsel, George Nolan.

(Salutation)

Okay. If you wish to be heard by the committee, please fill out a yellow card, available at the front table. I only have one speaker card. Each speaker is given three minutes to make their comments known. Our first speaker is Lance Reinheimer. Lance, if you'll come up to the podium.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Thank you very much. I'm here to speak on behalf of two resolutions. The first one is **IR 1378, Appropriating funds in connection with waterproofing, roof and drainage at the Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum (CP 7439)(Spencer)**. The second one is IR 1503A, which is **a bond resolution authorizing the issuance of \$475,000 bonds to finance the cost of restoration of the boathouse at the Vanderbilt Museum (CP 7438.311)**. I'd like to address the boathouse issue first because that's a little bit more complicated and you had some questions the last time I was here here concerning was \$475,000 sufficient to stabilize this structure and finish the work. You also wanted to know what the scope of the work was and the permitting process, did we need permits, and if we did, how long would that take and would the appropriations expire by the time we got the permits. I have an e-mail here from Jim Ingenito. I asked him those questions. Jim Ingenito is Department of Public Works, county architect. I can read his e-mail into the record, and I think that'll answer the questions the best we can from Public Works. Jim is aware that I've got the e-mail and that I was going to address it here at the meeting.

This is the e-mail. "This project has been abandoned for well over five years now with significant structural work left to be completed. Our last official structural monitoring visit was back in the beginning of 2009 when funding ran out and the then newly-appropriated funds were not bonded, we were left with no choice but to abandon the project. At that time, we made arrangements to protect the site, building, and temporary structure as best we could with the limited funds that remain. Funds were also set aside to periodically monitor the site and structure for a limited time.

"Since then, monitoring visits have been made but none have been officially made in the past couple of years due to the fact that that general contractor's foreman and the consulting engineer have since moved on from the previous employment. These two gentlemen were in charge of monitoring sessions and had set up a complicated set of benchmarks to aid their monitoring analysis.

"Over the years, I have personally made my site visits and to the boathouse in particular. It is my opinion that since the capital project was put on hold, the building has continued to deteriorate. Unfortunately, the building has suffered leaks and a massive animal infestation. The animal issue is currently being dealt with by this office, but I fear without proper maintenance, the problem will not go away. It is difficult to answer your questions without an extensive analysis of which we do not have time to do quickly. The quick answers are the \$475,000 is most likely not enough --

(Timer sounds)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If I ask you a question, you can finish. What does the rest of the letter say?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Thank you very much.

"It may be enough to complete most of the structural work, but it's difficult to know. The project was originally progressed by utilizing county annual contracts and DPW staff. It is unclear if we would use the same course of action if new funds were released. If the project needs to go out as a full standard type of public bid, then we would also need to hire a structural consultant to review the existing drawings and make up dates to them. At this point, I'm not sure if there's funding for planning consultant. My staff is not able to prepare structural drawings of this nature. If we go this route, then we must obtain a waiver to prepare and administer and RFP for consulting, review the RFP, obtain a consulting contract, work through new design, bid the project, and then procure a contractor for the work. None of this can be done hastily and could take up to 18 to 24 months.

"If we go the other route with preparing purchase orders for county annual contracts, we would need special approval because of the amount of funds being spent. If approved, DPW would still need to do an extensive onsite review of the current conditions along with a general contractor to devise a proper course of action. This may be quicker than the first option, but, again, this cannot be done in haste. If we do this, then me and Scott Sinnickson --" Scott is a co-worker of Jim's in Public Works -- "would be involved with the annual contracts.

"As for permits, I would need to check how we did this the last time. If we need DEC or army corp. permits, it would take between one and one and a half years. This must be verified. We may have worked off the permits for the seaplane hangar and waterfront projects. Those permits have expired," and I mentioned that the last time too. "Of course if we need to spend some funds to stop the funds from sunseting, we can do that. The site does need to be re-stabilized with a temporary structure and start installing concrete form work. That would keep the appropriations from expiring and hitting that five-year mark.

"I hope this helps you with your meeting. It's about all I can do for now."

That's a lot that he said. It took me a while to comprehend, but the gist of what the Jim is saying, the county architect, is the building is going to continue to deteriorate without being stabilized. He can't promise, and I agree with him, he can't promise that the 475 will finish the structural work that needs to be done. It will go a long way towards that goal, but without taking the time, hiring structural engineers, and really doing a full-blow assessment can he say for certain that the work can be done with the funds for this bond.

I have also, I have one other e-mail, and this was another issue that I failed to mention the last time I was here. We've had chronic problems with the fire alarm systems. I spoke to Ed Springer. He's the chief fire marshal. And this is really, when I approached and spoke to the county executive to see if he would support a bond resolution, this was really the center issue. We have problems with that building. We've had chronic false alarms. This is an e-mail from Ed Springer to me, and I spoke to Ed this morning, and he was willing to come here to speak on behalf of this, but I felt in the interest of time, I'd read his e-mail. He's aware of this, and he's willing, if you need to talk to him, to please call him. This is Ed Springer's e-mail to me, April 30.

"Once again, Centerport Fire Department responded to yet another false alarm at the Vanderbilt boathouse due to water leaking into the fire protection devices. We can no longer allow this to occur, and a decision shall be made as to the condition of the boathouse and if repairs are going to be made to prevent these false alarms from re-occurring. The fire chief expressed his concerns to me this morning." That was the morning of this false alarm.

"At this point, it is my decision to make these alarms for the boathouse a chief's investigation only. Again, a final decision is required as to repairs. If nothing is going to be done, I suggest the power be shut off to the building and at that point, the fire alarm system be placed out of service. I've included DPW in this e-mail. A reminder is that these fire alarms are extremely expensive and are there to protect the county's assets. It will not be my decision alone as to the final outcome."

I spoke to Ed now. The building is on chief's investigation, you know, to take -- cut the power off to this building. The building is being heated to protect the building. To cut the power off, to have no fire protection obviously puts this building at risk. Where it's located, no one can see this from the property. It's down on the shoreline. It's below a cliff. It puts that building at risk. I know this is unusual to ask for a bond resolution five years after the funds have been appropriated. The funds were appropriated in January of 2009, so they do expire at the end of this year. From Public Work's e-mail, they can start to spend funds to do the basic work needed to revalue or to rework the temporary structure that's there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You're over time, but I know this is important. You had said the funds expire at the end of this year. I know the charter provides a five-year clock between the authorization, the approval and the bond. When did the clock start?

MR. REINHEIMER:

January of 2009, so this would be the last year, would be 2014, would be five years.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let's just make sure because I want to make sure it's technically okay. So January of 2009 was when the resolution was approved?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah. It was a veto override.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The authorization was a veto override?

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's correct. It was a 2008 capital project. The veto override was in 2009.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That was the date it became effective or it was the date it was passed?

MR. REINHEIMER:

That was the date it was overridden, so that's a legal question as to -- I assume if you override a veto that it's passed as of the override.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, let's assume January of '09, so you'd have until January of '14 or '15?

MR. REINHEIMER:

My understanding is it would expire at the end of '14.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Sounds like it would be January of '14.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I think the practice -- that's a question for County Exec--

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's a legal question.

MR. NOLAN:

The language -- the controlling language is "Any capital project authorized and made a part of the county capital budget and program shall automatically expire on December 31 of the fifth year of its

existence unless," and then there's a couple of exceptions.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So is that --

MR. NOLAN:

Well, you know --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So is it this December 31 or last December 31?

LEG. HAHN:

I think it was this December coming up.

MR. NOLAN:

Well, if it's authorized and made a part of the county budget and capital budget and program -- this was part of the 2008 capital budget and program, so it's ambiguous, but if I look at it, I think the best interpretation is it expired December 31 of '13.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So if that's that case, if we want to authorize it, we would have to reapprove the project as well.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I -- you know.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But it has -- would have to be in the capital project. Is it in the current --

MR. REINHEIMER:

No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, it's not in the current capital budget.

MR. NOLAN:

It was in '08.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, and this was a highly unusual case because it was a veto override. My understanding from Budget Review is that appropriations had a five-year clock and the --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So the veto override was on the project itself and then the bond, we didn't have the 12 votes for the bond, so the bond failed?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes. The bond failed in '08 when it first came up, and then it was -- the appropriations were passed by the legislature, vetoed by the County Executive. It came up for a second vote, veto override. They overrode the veto and didn't have the votes for the bond. They had 11 votes. The bond failed with 11 votes both times.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So the issue I have, if Counsel is saying it's not appropriately in front of us, we can't vote on it unless the county executive's counsel and our counsel come to some kind of agreement. We can't approve it if it's technically not in front of us.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Right. You know, I would think bond counsel would have something to say also. I'm not sure --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So we're not debating the bill yet --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Right. And I'm not -- right --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But just be prepared because we may not be able to vote on it.

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's fine. This is, you know, there is no pressing need to pass it today or yesterday, and, as I said at the last meeting, I want to make sure you have all the answers to your questions. This is a legitimate question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's a technical problem.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Whether I support it or not, I can't vote on it.

MR. REINHEIMER:

And I certainly agree with you. We have to answer that question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Thank you, Mr. Reinheimer. Any other questions for Lance while he's up there?

MR. REINHEIMER:

And the other resolution was just the waterproofing resolution that we discussed at the last meeting. If there's no questions --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There may be some questions on that. I had multiple questions last time, but Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Good afternoon, Lance. One of the properties is the new slate roofing for the property adjacent across the street from the museum that is the rental property; is that correct.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Right. That's Normandy Manor, that's correct.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Do we know how much -- is that a combined amount, the 200,000, or is that strictly just for the one of the buildings?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Okay. We actually have \$450,000 for Normandy Manor that's been appropriated previously and has been authorized to be bonded. Those funds would be used to reroof it. This \$200,000 would be used to augment that also. So the bulk of this 200,000 would be also, or it would be used for other waterproofing problems on the property. This is a general, generic capital program where it can be

used for any of the buildings or any of the water intrusion problems that we have on the museum property.

LEG. LINDSAY:

For that specific property, do you have -- is this preventive, or at this point, do you have water intrusion issues that currently exist?

MR. REINHEIMER:

We have extensive rotting on the eaves, the best Public Works can determine, about a third up the roof. We do have rotting and leaking problems on one of the doghouse windows on the back of the property; and then there's also a porch, enclosed porch area that has a flat roof that has leaks, so yes, there's leaking today.

LEG. LINDSAY:

The reason I ask more specific is because we're exploring the option of possibly -- the possibility of selling the property there, as we've discussed briefly, and I'm trying to work with Legislator Spencer on looking at that as an option. I'm not saying that's the way it will go, but I think it's a worthy exercise to explore at least the option of possibly selling that property. I don't know at this point if it would make sense to spend the money on the repairs or...

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, I think if the county is looking to go in a different direction, that's, you know, that's understandable; and I'm not going to speak of the merits of selling or not selling. This \$200,000 is all the money that's in the capital program for the Vanderbilt in 2014. We have one project, 200,000, water intrusion. I came here to tell you what the plan was to use those funds, which was Normandy Manor, but this is an ongoing waterproofing project that's used for all buildings, so we have more water intrusion problems than we have funds to fix, so in this particular case, this particular appropriation, if it were not used for Normandy Manor, Public Works would use it for other water intrusion projects on the property. So although I went on the record saying it's for Normandy Manor, and that's the intent, it's also generic and can be used for any water problems on the property, so it's generic, but specifically, we were looking to use it to fix the roof.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. And I appreciate that, and by possibly avoiding that property at this time, it might free up more capital for you to put into what sounds like you needed money to put into the other buildings that are on the museums.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, I mean, that's, you know, we have in the capital program for 2016, we have money in there for water intrusion. That's our biggest enemy, and as anyone knows with historic houses, that's a killer, and it starts with the roof. I always try -- we work from the roofs down. If you have a bad roof, in time the rest of the building is impacted.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I absolutely agree, and preventive maintenance ends up saving us money in the long run on the rest of the building; so that was my only question, on the house across the street. Thanks.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, Lance. All right. I have no other yellow cards. Anybody else wish to be heard by the committee? Seeing none, we'll go to the agenda.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 1002, Authorizing an amendment to Cedar Island Lighthouse license agreement (Schneiderman).

Commissioner, can you come forward for a minute? Actually, more than a minute; come and stay. Make yourself comfortable. Where are we? We were going to just amend the current agreement; they were okay with that?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Actually, we need to do another resolution because the current resolution calls us for it to enter into an agreement with the Friends of Cedar Island Lighthouse. To be frank with you, I don't think we need a resolution to do it, but if you want one, we need to prepare a resolution indicating you want us to enter into an agreement -- amend the agreement with the U.S. Lighthouse Society, not the Friends of Cedar Point.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

George, did you get that?

MR. NOLAN:

I'll have a conversation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So we're going to amend IR 1002 to make an amendment of the current agreement with U.S. Lighthouse?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

U.S. Lighthouse Society.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

U.S. Lighthouse Society.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, they're a chapter -- I'll work with you --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And then we'll be good to go on. The rest of it's okay?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Great. Okay. Motion to table.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1002 is **tabled**. (VOTE: **5-0-0-0**)

1094, To waive fee for use of the County showmobile for the Amagansett Fire Department's Parade (Schneiderman).

LEG. LINDSAY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Cilmi. Any other motions. All in favor? Opposed? I'm opposed. Abstentions? **1094 is tabled. (VOTE: 4-1-0-0, Opposed: Schneiderman)**

1378, Appropriating funds in connection with waterproofing, roof and drainage at the Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum (CP 7439). I will make a motion to table.

LEG. CILMI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Cilmi. On the motion --

LEG. CILMI:

This is the one we were just talking about, right?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Although Lance said that maybe they could use the money on different buildings, I would want to see what buildings and the cost, so I'm concerned about this one building across the street that is not really being used as part of the park. It's being privately rented for \$60,000, yet I believe it's costing the county in the neighborhood of \$200,000 to get them that 60,000. So to me it's not a good use of funds, and before we go and spend more money on it, I think we really need to have a serious conversation whether it makes sense to continue the arrangement or sell it or put it into public use. But right now to me, it doesn't make any good sense to spend \$200,000 so that we can give the Vanderbilt 60 of it.

LEG. HAHN:

I'm sorry, \$200,000 a year?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, so we have debt service on the building and capital costs, and we pay certain other expenses too, so that's my back-of-the-envelope. It's around 200,000. I think that includes if we do the capital borrowing for the weatherproofing.

LEG. HAHN:

But this--

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They get 60,000. No, this is not the museum. This is across the street from the museum.

LEG. HAHN:

But the resolution that we're talking about is for money for which building?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's the -- what is it, the William?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah, it's the -- Lance, I don't want to speak for you. That was my misunderstanding to begin with on the bill because originally that's how it was presented. It's not just for this particular building. As Lance just said, it's for waterproofing other buildings on the property and maybe at this point it would make more sense to table this for one more cycle.

LEG. HAHN:

I'd like to make a motion to approve because I think it's important that we do this waterproofing work. He clearly had extraordinary justification for the waterproofing of certain roofs, and I'm supportive, so I'm going to make a motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, this was presented, this William K. Vanderbilt, this price -- what is it, 200000, was based on the cost of redoing the roof of the building across the street. That's where that number was arrived at.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah, Lance, maybe you can come back up and clarify, but that -- I don't think that's the intent.

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, this is a regular vanilla capital appropriating resolution. It's \$200,000 for ongoing waterproof work at the museum. It's a generic project. What I said was that, you know, we have a plan on how to attack waterproofing and we prioritize. We have more waterproofing problems than we have funds, so if you cut out Normandy Manor, we still have waterproofing projects all over the museum that need to be done.

This would be used for those projects. This is a generic --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What was the cost of the Normandy Manor roof replacement?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, as I said in answer to Legislator Lindsay, you know, we have \$450,000 approved, appropriated, and bonded for Normandy. This would augment that for the roofing, so this was also being used for that. But if it's not being used for Normandy, it's going to be used for other areas in the museum.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So you already have 400,000 slated for Normandy, approved and authorized for the roof?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Correct, for Normandy Manor, period. It's not specific to the roof.

It's appropriated to maintain and take care of Normandy Manor. It was done several years ago, but the roofing, as I said to Legislator Lindsay, roofing is the most important. If you don't --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So that 400,000, you could go spend tomorrow that you already have?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And this is -- can that be moved to a different project?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes. This 200,000 is for any building on the museum.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But so is that 400,000.

MR. REINHEIMER:

No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's specific to Normandy Manor?

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's specific to Normandy Manor.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

So but, Lance, correct us if we're wrong here, but if we were to approve this resolution, the Vanderbilt has the authority to use this money, then, on Normandy Manor if you wish.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Public Works sets work, does the contracts, and prioritizes the projects. So in consultation with me, with the Vanderbilt, Public Works goes forward with the projects, so it's not the Vanderbilt. It's with Public Works. They're the ones that are in charge of the contracts and the estimates and --

LEG. CILMI:

Right, but there would be nothing legally precluding you or prohibiting you from using this money once we pass it on the roof at Normandy Manor, correct?

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's correct. I don't want to debate. However, if you're going in a different direction, Public Works and the museum is not going to work --

LEG. CILMI:

Go against the wishes --

MR. REINHEIMER:

-- oppose you. You know, as I said, I don't want to debate the merits of selling or not selling; this is not why I'm here.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can you use the 400,000 that was approved for Normandy Manor, can that be adjusted or amended so that that would become the money available to do the other waterproofing? You're saying no but --

MR. REINHEIMER:

No. You know, bond council is very specific and that's why I think this bond --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So this money could be used for Normandy Manor or not but that money can only be used for Normandy Manor?

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's correct.

LEG. CILMI:

But what -- the 400,000 that we've already approved, what specifically is that going to be used for at Normandy Manor?

MR. REINHEIMER:

We're going use that for roofing also. This is a highly, you know, custom 100-year-old roof.

LEG. CILMI:

So at the time that we approve that money, did we know that it was going to cost more than the \$400,000? I mean, why wouldn't we have approved more than the \$400,000 for the roof at that time?

MR. REINHEIMER:

That money was not appropriated specifically for the roof. It was many years ago. It was appropriated for maintaining and working on the -- maintaining Normandy Manor. Since that time, we had \$200,000 worth of work done through private investors through the Show House. They redid the kitchen. They redid things that -- that place three years ago was used for offices. It was a mess. It was not used by the public. The public did not use that building. We did the Show House, which cleaned up the place, improved it, put \$200,000 into it. So now, you know, to protect the building, we -- and I say "we" collectively, Public Works, the museum -- prioritize these projects to do the roof because the roof needs to be fixed. It has leaks, and if the roof goes, the building goes.

LEG. CILMI:

So what criteria was in the appropriating resolution for the \$400,000?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Maintain maintenance of Normandy Manor.

LEG. CILMI:

So it wasn't specific to any one attribute of Normandy Manor; it just said to use it for Normandy Manor?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Correct. It could be used for the mechanicals; it could be used for --

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And so when that was appropriated, while you may have, or we may have envisioned, using some of it for the roof, at that point, we didn't envision using the entire \$400,000 for the roof at least.

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, and I can't say exactly what the thinking was for that 400,000, if they were even discussing the roof. That place had so much work that needed to be done that I'm sure was part of it.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So now we have a leaking roof and you're suggesting that we spend that \$400,000 as well as an additional \$200,000 on replacing that roof?

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's the -- the scope of the work hasn't been fully vetted by Public Works. When I came here, you know, I said this 200,000 is used for Normandy Manor because I know the bulk of it will be, whether all of it, some of it, I don't have -- they don't have the final numbers. I know that the estimates came black greater than the \$450,000. I shouldn't say I know. They indicated that to me. I haven't seen any numbers. They're looking to change the scope or do the work. So right now we're -- it's -- nothing has been finalized. The \$200,000, I know some of that will be needed

for Normandy Manor, and I would think that a significant amount of it would. What's left over can be used for any area to waterproof the buildings on the property. So we've got two projects: one is specific to Normandy Manor, the \$400,000, 450 I think that's already there; and the 200 is a generic project for any waterproofing on the property.

LEG. CILMI:

Through the Chair, if I could ask Budget Review a question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Just a clarification on all of what you have just said, because we've been talking lately about pipeline debt.

LEG. CILMI:

That's exactly what I was going to ask Budget Review. Is this 400,000 in -- what we consider to be pipeline debt?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah. Have they actually borrowed the money? Is this in the account, or they have not borrowed it yet?

MR. DOERING:

I would have to check into the specific bond resolution to see -- typically they only go to actually bond it when they have a need for the money, so we have a lot of pipeline debt where they don't actually go to bonding until they actually have the need for the dollar.

LEG. CILMI:

And so in this case, apparently they haven't really -- they hadn't previously determined what the need really is for the \$400,000, so it sounds like they haven't -- we haven't bonded for it yet, and, therefore, it would be considered pipeline debt.

MR. DOERING:

Again, I would have to check on the particulars.

LEG. CILMI:

But my logic is -- my logic is correct, right?

MR. DOERING:

They may have appropriated -- they may have bonded some of that money for some type of improvements in Normandy Manor already and not the whole amount.

LEG. CILMI:

At this point, I'm loathed to approve anything so open-ended in nature that they could basically use this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It sounds like the estimates for the roof are coming in higher than what the approved number is of 400,000.

LEG. CILMI:

Which means it should be its own project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They likely have not bonded yet because they don't have the actual cost, and when they do, they would bond the whole thing which would be the 400 plus probably the bulk of this 200. So probably the number is somewhere 500,000 or more to do this roof. But I'm with you; I'm not ready to

commit to spending that kind of money, they old money or the new money, on Normandy Manor until we decide whether we're keeping it or selling it, and if we're keeping it, what purpose we're going to put it to, whether it makes sense to rent it for \$60,000 if we're spending hundreds of thousands a year to maintain it.

LEG. CILMI:

Yeah, I mean, at this point we just can't afford to write a blank and say, you know, Here, fix whatever you need to fix.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, it would be cheaper to just give the Vanderbilt \$60,000 a year than to get them 60,000 through having them rent Normandy Manor, which costs us 200,000 or more.

Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Just to that point, I think it makes more sense to table at this point. The other buildings on the property, though, I think we need to revise the bill to address that because for those buildings that we do want to repair and do want to maintain, a little bit of money now might save us a lot somewhere down the road, so, you know, I want to go back to the original motion to table and revise the bill just to be more specific to those other buildings and other properties.

LEG. CILMI:

I think that's what the motion is, anyway. I don't think there's any other motion. We have Kara's motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You know, one other point to at least looking at declaring it surplus and disposing of it would be that -- would be under tax rolls so the school district as well as the county with property taxes. That also has to be looked at in terms of the economics of the equation. But, all right, so, Legislator Kara, you made a motion to approve. Legislator Kara -- Legislator Hahn, sorry.

LEG. HAHN:

I did.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Hahn made a motion to approve, and there was a motion to table by myself and a second by Legislator Cilmi, so the tabling motion would come first. There's no second on the approval. Okay. All in favor to table? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. HAHN:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Hahn, Kara Hahn, is opposed to tabling. **(VOTE:4-1-0-0, Opposed: Legislator Hahn)**

IR 1388, Authorizing beach fee waiver during extreme heat events (Schneiderman). I'll make a motion to approve. Is there a second?

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Hahn. Now this has been amended. So now initially it had heat advisories, a whole host of possible times when the County Executive could waive the fees. Now it is limited to

only extreme heat events. George, do we have that language?

So now it says, "The County Executive shall have the authority to waive the fee for parks with lifeguards when the National Weather Service has issued an excessive heat warning," so it has to be dangerous conditions. Some people were concerned that it was just too much latitude and it could have a cost impact, but now it's extremely narrow. Any conversations, comments? Tom, did you want to weigh in on this?

MR. VAUGHN:

Just to say that we really appreciate working with your office on this. We had, in conjunction with your office, we'd done quite a good bit of research on this. Under the new language of the law, excessive heat warnings, there have only been two excessive heat warnings issued in the last five years. And on those two days, one of them was July 21 of 2011, the total intake at the park for that day was \$9,974; and the second one was issued on July 19, 2013, and total park revenue for the three beaches that would be impacted -- that's what I mean by "total park revenue" -- was \$17,241. So we do think that it is that given the new language of this resolution that it's limiting enough to be helpful and needed and limited in scope to be not overwhelming or not putting --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I bet you'll find that the state park on those days waived the fees, Jones Beach and Robert Moses.

MR. VAUGHN:

I would not be surprised by that.

LEG. CILMI:

Jay?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Cilmi. A lot of more revenue at Jones Beach, I think.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm sure Budget Review put out a fiscal impact statement on this. Sorry; I don't have it in front of me.

MR. DOERING:

Initially, we did put out a fiscal impact statement; however, it said the impact would be related to the number of times a county exec opted to waive the fees at the beaches, and under that circumstance, there was multiple conditions previously.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So I guess my question would be to the commissioner, then. We would have a, looks like, probably not a huge loss of revenue associated with this, but what about the additional cost associated with it? I mean, theoretically, you could have, you know, thousands upon thousands of people show up at a beach. What do you do about extra security, extra cleanup? There's a fiscal impact of that. What if our own residents get closed out of the beach as a result of other people, you know, coming to the beach?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think that cause to be indeterminate. We have -- I mean, Smiths Point has six to eight park police officers on any given day, and especially when we reach these high temperatures, we increase the staffing regardless. As far as the cleanup, they're seasonal employees, eight-dollar-an-hour park attendants. I think the cost to our operation would be negligible.

LEG. CILMI:

What about the literal capacity of the beach or the capacity of the parking lots for that matter? You

know, who controls who gets in and who doesn't get in, or is it just a factor of whoever shows up first or?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It's going to be first come-first served. I mean, Smiths Point, we have well over 3,000 parking spots. I've never seen that, even on the hottest of days, I've never seen that parking lot to its full capacity.

LEG. CILMI:

I may be being overly cautious here, but I'm just trying to think of the potential unintended consequences. So cleanup, you don't see as an issue.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Or security, for that matter. That's not to say we're not going to add security, but we would do that regardless of whether --

LEG. CILMI:

On the hottest of days that we've experienced, you know, talk to me about the attendants at, say, Smith Point on weekdays versus weekends.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I mean, I don't have the numbers, per se. We did do the research on how many cars we had in on heat advisory, heat warning, and heat emergency. At Smiths Point, we had 965 cars on a Monday, and the other date that Tom alluded to before, the \$7,000 figure on 7/19, we had 1157 cars come through the gate.

LEG. CILMI:

How does that compare to other -- you know, your typical summer day?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Without looking at the numbers, I couldn't tell you. I mean, it's oversimplifying it, but to say when it's hot, it's crowded; when it's not, the attendance is down. Weekends tend to be a higher usage than weekdays; Friday, a little bit more than Monday or Thursday.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm just wondering if there's ever a situation where our capacity is tested.

MR. VAUGHN:

Well, Legislator Cilmi, just as a brief aside, actually. So as the commissioner pointed out, the two excessive heat warnings, which is the highest degree and the days covered by this, just anecdotally, looking at the numbers, so Smith Point was at 965 on the 21 -- on July 21, and was at 11:57 on July 19. If I look at the heat advisories, which there are more of, Smith Point on July 6 of 2010 actually had an attendance of 1260 vehicles, so it was actually higher than the two hottest days. That trend also holds true the next day when it was again would have been a heat advisory, and it was at 1100 cars again, so only 57 cars less than on the excessive heat warnings. So it does not appear, if I look at 724 of 2010, it was -- Smith Point had almost 2,000 cars there; again, significantly more than the two excessive heat warnings. I would wonder that if in such extreme heat conditions that the general thought is to, maybe, just stay home.

LEG. CILMI:

Have we had any complaints about the cost of our beaches? I mean, how much does it cost somebody to go into Smiths Point Beach?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

If you have a green key, it's \$15. I'm sorry. With a green key, it's \$8; without a green key, it's \$15.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So you have to be a Suffolk resident. I know you do to have a green key.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

You do to have the green key.

LEG. CILMI:

But otherwise you don't have to. For \$15, anybody can --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It's a \$15 fee. I mean, independent of -- we have a number of discounts for -- senior citizens, veterans don't pay Monday to Friday. The fee schedule is quite complex, but in general, it's -- for full freight, it's 15 and 8.

LEG. CILMI:

All right. I mean, I could look at this two different ways. On the one hand, it doesn't look like it's costing us much money; on the other hand, it doesn't look like it's costing residents much money, either.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me weigh in on this as the author of the bill. It wasn't so much about money. It wasn't a revenue bill. It was empowering an executive in an emergency situation to do what he or she felt needed to be done to protect public health and safety. It's as simple as that, just like the state does this. We didn't have this ability, so the county executive had no way to waive the fees without coming back to the legislature, so I crafted -- initially the bill was just, I think, too broad, and so now it's extremely narrowly-constructed. These are like your triple digit temperature days. Not everybody has air conditioning. These are days that it's dangerous to be out in that type of heat, so it just -- and the county executive doesn't actually have to waive the fee. He can if he wants to. He doesn't have to. It just gives them that authority. If you were the executive or I were the executive, you would want as many tools in your toolkit to deal with an emergency as possible. Tom has done his homework here. We're talking about, you know, maybe a \$10,000 cost spread out over a several-year period, so it's minor; these things don't happen every year, right?

MR. VAUGHN:

They do not happen every year; and, Legislator Schneiderman, while I certainly appreciate the credit that you give me for doing my homework, it was actually a young man on our staff, John Marafino, who did an incredible amount of homework to give me the numbers to make me sound like I know what I'm talking about.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But honestly --

MR. VAUGHN:

Much appreciated.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- if the numbers were double or triple that, I'd still think this is a good idea because you're dealing with a public health emergency where people can die of heat stroke and you have to do what you can. We open up cooling centers; we ought to be able to open up the beaches. It's the same kind of thinking.

MR. VAUGHN:

And we agree, and the level of --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What's a life worth?

MR. VAUGHN:

And the level of flexibility, given that it is -- that the excessive heat warnings are not something that does occur every year is, I think, is appropriate.

LEG. CILMI:

So let me just ask this question of counsel, if I could. Notwithstanding -- the sponsor suggested that it's best to stay inside during these excessive heat advisories, but nevertheless --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If you have air conditioning.

LEG. CILMI:

But nevertheless, excessive heat warnings don't rise to the level of declaring a state of emergency, I guess; because under that condition, doesn't the county executive have pretty broad powers about whether or not he can waive certain fees?

MR. NOLAN:

I would have to go to the State Executive Law to see when the county executive can declare an emergency which gives him some extraordinary powers, but I think this -- he could exercise this power without declaring a state of emergency, and maybe that's a good thing.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. Okay. I have no more questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anybody else? Okay. Legislator Hahn. Okay. So let's call the vote All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. LINDSAY:

I oppose.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. It's unanimous. I'm sorry. Legislator Lindsay is opposed. Okay. It's **approved**.
(VOTE: 4-1-0-0, Opposed: Lindsay)

All right. We've made it to the main portion of our agenda.

Introductory Prime

IR 1455, Authorizing Lt. Michael Murphy Sea Cadet Program at West Sayville (Lindsay).

LEG. LINDSAY:

Motion to approve. I'll wait for a second, and then I have another.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Second for purpose of discussion.

LEG. LINDSAY:

To the Chair, I'd like to make an opportunity -- we have several people involved with the Sea Cadets

here today, and I'd just like to make them available to answer any questions that anybody might have in regards to this bill and their project that they're proposing.

LEG. CILMI:

I'd like to be listed as a cosponsor for 1455.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm listed as well, right?

LEG. HAHN:

Me too, please.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You too, Kevin? Okay. So with the entire committee as cosponsors, the chance of approval out of committee seems fairly good. Okay. So the entire committee is cosponsoring. Legislator Lindsay, do you want to bring up anybody representing the Sea Cadets?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yes, if I could ask them to come forward, and, Steve Jones, if you could come as well just to answer any questions. I've been involved with this project for the last few months and trying to put it together, but rather than hear me talk about it, I'd rather you hear directly or speak directly to the source and the people who are actually going to be doing the work down there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Steve, do you want to come forward, or anybody? And, Commissioner Dawson, you guys are okay with this, right?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Absolutely. We had a very productive meeting with the sponsorship of Legislator Lindsay and the Sea Cadets. We're actually very excited about it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. You guys don't need to make a speech. It's about to be approved. But if you want to put anything on the record.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

No, sir. We're just here if you have any question, and we appreciate the fact that you're all in favor. We're leaving here with smiles.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good. You guys are planning on investing a substantial sum here, too, through your not-for-profit, right? What's the capital cost that you're planning on putting in.

MR. JONES:

Right now, we're in preliminary investigation of the project. It's based on, I guess, it comes back to what you will approve as far as the size of that training facility. We presented a conceptual drawing, and the footprint approximately 8,000 square feet on the first floor. It would have a second floor that would house the classrooms to keep everything in that nature high and dry.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You're not looking for capital money here; you're going to raise the money yourselves, right?

MR. VERTICCHIO:

Yes, we have many construction trades that have stepped forward to donate the labor. The drawings are being donated. The septic system is being designed as we speak. The bottom line is

the materials is what we're looking at to fund, and we've been given some indication that we have huge support on that in that area as far as raising those funds. So to me, it's a great opportunity for all of us to do something memorable in the name of Michael Murphy and in the name of the Naval Sea Cadet Program, and my hope is that we can build onto that existing facility for long-term goals, be able to bring in more cadets. We're approaching 100 cadets now that we've been passing over and sending them to other areas just to get them enrolled, so we're missing a huge opportunity to fulfill what the program is about.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other questions?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Just one point that we should put on the record because it may not have been clear on the original proposal, and, Gary, you can jump in and correct me here. Part of the proposal is to have a navy seal museum on the first floor, which is going to be the only one in the northeast, Gary?

MR. VERTICHIO:

That's correct; there's only two in the country. One is on the west coast in San Diego. The other one is in Fort Pierce. They have just indicated that they are planning a huge expansion, looking to raise some \$2.8 million to expand their facility, so it would be a shame if we missed an opportunity to put one here in a perfect location, Maritime Museum Waterfront. I believe we're the only ones that would have a waterfront location, so you can use your imagination what a great advantage that would be for that type of display.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I have no questions. I have two requests. One is that you invite all of us, the whole legislature, to the groundbreaking and again to the ribbon cutting.

MR. VERTICHIO:

Okay. You're in. And I'll put a plug in for our first fundraiser. We joined forces with Suffolk Police Veterans and the Coast Guard Petty Officer's Association and Michael Murphy Cadets to do our first golf outing, so that's going to be June 2, so we'd like to see a lot of you guys. If you don't golf, come out to the after party. It's going to be a great show, and it'll be a kickoff to start some funding.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, thank you for doing this. We all appreciate it and support it. So there's been a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Congratulations. **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

Legislator Lindsay, thank you for your work on this as well.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Thank you. It's a worthy cause, and they do a lot of hard work. Gary and Brian, they spent a lot of hours as volunteers, and just seeing firsthand what they do with did kids, it's phenomenal, and it's a great organization. Thank you all for your support.

IR 1462, Appropriating funds in connection with Beach Replenishment at Meschutt County Park (CP 7163) (County Executive). I'll make the motion to approve.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Commissioner, where -- this is 50,000 for this year. I notice nothing in for next year. We have some already appropriated, right, so?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, we have about \$170,000 appropriated --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

How's that beach doing at the moment?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It's actually in pretty good shape. We built it up. We had some damage last year after Sandy. DPW went in there and fixed the parking lot and rebuilt the dune, so by next year we anticipate erosion, like we have every year. We have a maintenance agreement with DEC to be able to put 5,000 cubic yards of sand, so that's what these funds go to.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So this is additional sand to what's currently out there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Do we get FEMA money for that or?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Not for everyday storms. We did get FEMA money -- well, we will be getting FEMA money for the damage that what caused during Sandy. We had considerable damage to the beach, to the concession stand -- actually, the deck of the concession stand. The building itself is fine. And the parking lot that DPW had just recently completed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And this is on top of that. So that's already been paid for and reimbursed.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And this is just additional sand apparently?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Right, 'cause next spring, we anticipate having to put another 5,000 cubic yards on, just through normal erosion and work.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So this is going to be a cost of doing business for a while.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It will. I think there's a long-term plan to dredge the canal and put the dredge spoils up on the beach, which will advise a lot more time, but we're a little bit away from that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Any questions? Okay. I'll call the vote. I'm sorry. I made the motion. Who seconded? Kara seconded. Legislator Hahn. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1463, Appropriating funds in connection with the Removal of Toxic and Hazardous Materials in County Parks (CP 7185)(County Executive).

Sounds like a good thing to do. So this is, what, \$200,000 in serial bonding?

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'll make a motion. Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is in Islip parks. This is hazardous material in county parks. So there's a motion to approve. Is there a second?

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

I just want to hear what hazardous material we're talking about and what parks.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, this is generally -- this is used for remediation money, like if we need to take down a building, we usually need to go in and do an asbestos abatement. We've got a couple sites that are pending for removal, Tatson's (ph) Marina, Prosser (ph) Pines, Horan (ph) House, so before we can actually demolish the buildings, we need to go in and do remediation, so that's generally what we use this money for.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

So it's not specific site like some other towns are experiencing?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No, that's not the -- theoretically, it can be used for that, but that's not why we set this account up. It's more for remediation again. We do buildings that -- we have at least five buildings on the list that we're looking to demo.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Fine. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's all hazardous materials, right? They're not just talking about chemicals; you're talking about, like, rusted metals, things like that?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, lead paint, asbestos, you know, that kind of stuff, oil.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Did you guys clean up -- I'll ask you after we vote? Any other discussions? Was there a second?

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. The motion was Legislator Lindsay. Second by Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. CILMI:

I actually have a question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

On the motion.

LEG. CILMI:

Commissioner, do we ever do, sort of, inspections of county parkland to ensure that there's no hazardous materials or whatever on those sites?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Every day. I mean, we've got supervisors. We've got park workers that travel through the parks routinely, and I think if something -- if somebody dumped a 55-gallon drum of oil or there was an illegal dumping on a park site, you know, it gets brought to somebody's attention.

LEG. CILMI:

How do you define "parkland"? In other words, you would be responsible for it. Would the Parks Department be responsible for that kind of stuff, or would it be Department of Health, or how does that work exactly?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I mean, it depends on the circumstance. If, you know, somebody dumps --

LEG. CILMI:

Let's say somebody took an old oil tank, for example, and threw it in, you know, some open space that we purchased, you know, somewhere. Would that come under your purview, or would it come under somebody else's purview?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

If you're asking if we'd remove it directly, no; we would hire a contractor to take it out. Is that the question?

LEG. CILMI:

But is that something that you would look into, or would it be somebody else that looks into it?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I mean, I guess the initial inquiry would come to us and we would bump it up to the board -- I mean, depending what it was; the Board of Health, HAZMAT units, whatever it is.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. So let me call the vote. I have a related question after this vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

Commissioner, there were some rusted fence posts that kind of got washed out at that northwest harbor area. There was a lot of change link that was sharp and jagged and rusty.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That was all taken care of last year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's all --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I haven't had a chance to take a look at it. I appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, actually, we had an e-mail to that effect.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So that's the kind of thing that you have to get a container for and that's part of this bonding monies, right?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I mean, that's not really hazardous material. That's not toxic, so we would do that with our general operating funds.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. It was hazardous, but in a different way, not toxic.

Okay. **IR 1464, Appropriating funds in connection with Improvements to North Fork Preserve (CP 7189) (County Executive).** I'm looking for a motion. There's dead silence. North Fork Preserve, anybody want to --

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'll make a motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. There's a motion by Legislator Lindsay. This is appropriating \$100,000 in serial bonds.

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Hahn. On the motion?

LEG. CILMI:

Yep, on the motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

So this looks like planning money.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes, it is. We just acquired the property. It's a 300-acre parcel. We're looking to put in -- we're looking to do a master plan; you know, camping, hiking, horseback riding, hunting, that kind of stuff. So this money is to develop a master plan for the entire parcel.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Why do we need to spend \$100,000 with a -- I guess with a consultant or engineer or something to do what you're suggesting?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I mean, we have conceptual plans that we sent through the Parks trustees and sent through CEO, but those aren't good enough to put out for bid for anything like that.

LEG. CILMI:

What would be the deliverable for this \$100,000 exactly?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

At the end, we would end up having a master plan for the facility identifying certain features that we want to put into the park, and then we'd be able to go out for bid for those particular --

LEG. CILMI:

So it wouldn't be for actual engineering drawings of, you know, swings or whatever it is, golf courses, whatever it is. Would it be the actual -- or would it just be some textual descriptions of what we wanted to do there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I mean, it's a master plan for the facility. We would then take that plan and then develop a plan for -- we want to do camping, so all right, you know, what type of water service do we need to bring in, what type of electrical service we need to bring in and do that kind of design so we can actually get a bid spec in place to send out for construction and we'll come to you from there.

LEG. CILMI:

And then there would be more planning?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, you'll have the master plan and then you go out with planning for each individual feature and then you go to construction.

LEG. CILMI:

Why can't we just develop the master plan ourselves? I mean, why can't we look at the property and say, yeah, we think this will be good here and just do it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, I don't have any architects on my staff.

LEG. CILMI:

But this is a master plan. I don't know that you need architects.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, it's more than what I have on my staff to develop.

LEG. CILMI:

I mean, I just -- again, I'm asking these questions because we just can't keep spending money on things that we really could be doing ourselves.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, I'm not sure the Parks Department's got that ability to do that. We spent millions of dollars on a facility to develop it. I mean, it's just the cost of designing a park.

LEG. CILMI:

Are we going to develop the entire facility?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, it's 300 acres. I think 175 acres are going to be passive recreation, 125 is going to be active recreation.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So this would be a master plan to develop roughly 125 acres of parkland. That's a pretty big --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, 300 -- yeah. Yes, to answer your question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there going to be camping there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

There will be camping, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There is, right? Trailers, too, or tents, or what?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

RV camping, tent camping.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So eventually it's going to be a revenue producing on some -- once those structures are in, there'll be revenues that come in from a park like that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Absolutely:

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, though, there's revenues that come from this project. We don't know quite what they are.

LEG. CILMI:

But the revenues are, you know, off somewhere in the distance. After you do a master plan -- correct me if I'm wrong, Commissioner -- but after you do this master plan, then you're going to have to go out, as the Commissioner said, to bid on whatever the master plan indicates is appropriate, horseback riding, whatever it may be, and then somebody is going to have to design the actual facilities that have to be installed, and there'll be additional capital money that will be required to do, that I would imagine.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Generally, 10 percent of a project, you allocate towards the planning and design and putting stuff out for bid, so, yeah, there's going to be a cost.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So ten percent of a project, and we're being asked to appropriate \$100,000, here so you're suggesting that the overall project itself probably won't exceed a million dollars?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The overall project for the entire development of the 300 acres, it's going to exceed a million dollars.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, ultimately, it's going to be one of our largest county campgrounds, correct?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct. Well, yeah -- I mean (indiscernible) --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The North Fork's a popular place, so this'll be -- Suffolk County residents will be able to go out to the North Fork with an RV or with a tent and go -- what do we have now on the North Fork for camping?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Cedar Point's on the north side of the South Fork. I don't think we really have -- when you start getting out that way, Sears Bellows, but that's not really on the Fork.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's not North Fork. Sears Bellows' also South Fork.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We have Orient County Park, but there's really not a whole lot of features out there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

How many tent spaces do we have out there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We don't have any. It's not camping (indiscernible) --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We don't really have any camping on the North Fork, I don't think. We have a couple places.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, we have --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We have five or six places on the South Fork where you can bring an RV or set up a tent. We have Shinnecock --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's more -- I mean, that's run -- that's 4H camp run by --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Cupsogue. We have a bunch of places.

LEG. CILMI:

Maybe I'm oversimplifying this, but we're going to get a pretty document that has some -- you know, lots of big words in it that basically tells us what we probably could come to a conclusion about ourselves. I mean, we have a planning department; we have a parks department. Why can't they put their heads together and figure something out and then go out to bid on all of the things that we want to do, see what those bids say, and then make a decision as to whether or not we should do it? I just don't understand why we need \$100,000 on this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Depends on what you're looking for. If you're going to go out and spend what might be a million dollars on park improvements, you want to do it based on some kind of landscape design, you know, that -- with some experience in terms of how the public is going to use it, how -- where people are going to park, surveying site restrictions, so a lot -- potentially, there's a lot involved of designing a park of that magnitude.

LEG. CILMI:

Have we done this with other parks?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes, actually --

LEG. CILMI:

A sort of master plan? Give me an example, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We're out for design right now in Hubbard County Park. We have a master plan for Smiths Point County Park. As a matter of fact, I have a meeting this week with Legislator to discuss the

amenities that are listed in that, so I mean we're not talking about designing a playground. I mean, I've been doing this for a long time. When you're talking about designing a 300-acre park, it's involved.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This would be to basically hire like a landscape architecture firm of some kind, right?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, I mean, DPW put it out for bid. I don't know who's -- I don't know -- you know, professional services.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. So let's just vote on it, if there's no other discussion. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. CILMI:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So Legislator Cilmi is opposed. Everybody else was supportive. **Approved (VOTE: 4-1-0-0, Opposed: Cilmi)**

Moving on to **1465, Appropriating funds in connection with the Historic Restoration and Preservation Fund (CP 7510)**. This is 300,000 in serial bonding through various stabilization of historic structures. I'll make a motion. Second by Legislator Hahn. Discussion on this?

Do you have particular buildings that this 300,000 is going toward?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What's going on in my district with Third House? The money is already approved for that.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, we have a half million dollars up there, \$50,000 in planning. Talk about it offline.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So this is -- we're on 1465, right? This is \$300,000?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes, construction.

LEG. CILMI:

Construction. And what sort of work are we doing on this historic structure?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We just finished the stabilization of the property. This one is going to be utilized for exterior windows, doors, soffits.

LEG. CILMI:

So replacing and repairing?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Replacing and repairing, right, the Homan-Gerard House up in Yaphank.

LEG. CILMI:

Holman?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Homan, H-O-M-A-N.

LEG. CILMI:

H-O-M-A-N Gerard House in Yaphank. And what's -- how many folks walk through that house, or is it not -- is it open to the public?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It's not open. We just finished the stabilization. This money will be used to do the exterior. We need to get into the interior so we can open, and we have a custodial agreement with the Yaphank Historical Society. They have the building -- you know, they manage the building across the street, which is the museum. This will be part of the historic grounds, for lack of a better term. There are a number of sites on the property, a number of buildings.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anyone else? Okay. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1465 is **approved**.
(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

1470, Authorizing the determination of just compensation and securing payment thereof in connection with the acquisition of properties by the State of New York to be acquired for New York State Highway purposes, Town of Smithtown, Suffolk County, New York (SCTM No. 0800-133.00-02.00-008.000) (County Executive). That's going to take some explanation. Let's get a motion and a second, at least, for discussion purposes. I'll make a motion.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm sorry. Legislator McCaffrey. Okay. Commissioner, can you explain this?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I'm sorry. Yes, this is a DPW project. They're doing work on 347 up in Smithtown, and they need to come on to the park property a little bit so they take it by eminent domain. What that means is they'll go out to do an assessment of the property, and it's reviewed by our department of public works on the fair market value for the property. So this is compensation for the property that they're going to be taking.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. So we own the property?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We own the property, the parkland.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The state is using eminent domain against us.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, that's generally --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But in a cooperative way.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. We're not abiding, though.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But to do this, we have to approve this so that we could get just compensation for the land.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is that what it is, \$500?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Five hundred dollars. Okay. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

So this doesn't require alienation or anything like that?

MR. NOLAN:

It's a temporary easement according to the resolution, correct?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I don't think this is temporary, no.

MR. NOLAN:

It talks about --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think it's (indiscernible) eminent domain. If they take it under eminent domain for constructions projects --

LEG. HAHN:

No, no, no, no, no. If it's parks property that's dedicated to the state parks system, you know, to our parks system, you can't just construct just because you want to; like, that's the whole point. I'm a little bit confused. I mean, where is this and --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But it's only for temporary work order, right? So it probably is temporary. There's the alienation issue, but it's a temporary situation; is that correct?

LEG. HAHN:

But then why --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They're using it as a staging area for a job?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I believe so. Like I said, this is a DPW project. We put it through because it was coming through parkland, so I wish I had somebody here from DPW to speak on it.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. It's temporary?

MR. NOLAN:

The resolution talks about a temporary easement, that we're getting 500 bucks in compensation for that.

LEG. HAHN:

But where is it? I mean, this is our responsibility as Parks Committee members, to understand what park, what they're doing on the park, how it's going to damage the park. You know, we probably, you know, that's important as Parks Committee members that we understand exactly what they're doing and how it's going to potentially harm our park or not. If they're going to utilize our parking lot and, you know, that's one thing because I'm not quite sure where you're talking about, but if they're cutting down trees, then that's something different that we really need to understand.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Maybe Commissioner Dawson has the answers, but maybe I would change my approval to a discharge without recommendation because I think Commissioner Anderson will be there at the full legislature, can answer these questions and then --

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, that's fine, as long as they come with a map, they show us what they're going to do, where they're going to do it, and we reserve the right to say no.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm not sure if we have the right to say no if the state is using eminent domain.

LEG. HAHN:

No, but if it's temporary, they wouldn't be using eminent domain.

MR. VAUGHN:

I would just say that the resolution does point out that it does, I believe, the fourth Whereas clause refers to a temporary work and it also says in here "taking maps and descriptions." The fifth Whereas talks about taking the parcel as reflected -- I just saw it in here. I thought that it stated somewhere in the resolution that it stated that the purpose of the access was to take maps for the project, but will have --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can you reach out --

MR. VAUGHN:

We will have Commissioner Dawson here on --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah, I was going to say can you reach out and make sure that --

MR. VAUGHN:

Hundred percent.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- the full legislature has everything it needs. I don't want to hold this up because if it is a state highway project, you know, the delay may be problematic, so at least let's get it to the floor, and I will amend my approval motion to a discharge without recommendation.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Hahn, are you okay with that?

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, reluctantly, but I reserve the right, you know, obviously I'm not going to vote for this if I don't feel -- I don't think they can -- you don't eminent domain parkland. That's the whole point of it being preserved as parkland, is that the -- you know, a municipality can't just come in and pave over it. So I mean, am I wrong?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, there are alienation for park lands.

LEG. HAHN:

Right, so the alienation is fine.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I mean, I'm assuming that --

LEG. HAHN:

They go through all the proper --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't know how this temporary easement would work legalistically.

MR. NOLAN:

I will actually talk to the county attorney's office about this. In the resolve clause, it talks about the county executing documents, but no alienation will happen, so I assume that issue has been looked at by the department and by the county attorney's office. Let me talk to them between now and Tuesday and see what their take is.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

And I'll have some answers for you by week's end.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So there's a motion to discharge without recommendation and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. **Discharged without recommendation. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1479, Authorizing use of Cedar Beach County Park by Event Power for its Mighty North Fork Triathlon Fundraiser (County Executive). I'll make the motion. Second by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1503A, Bond Resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York authorizing the issuance of \$475,000 bonds to finance the cost of restoration of the boathouse at the Vanderbilt Museum (CP 7438.311). I'll make a motion to table. Second by Legislator McCaffrey. There's a question of whether this is properly before us because of the five-year limitation contained in the county charter. Tom, Mr. Vaughn, do you have --

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, we have spoken to bond counsel, but in the interest of giving everybody a greater level of

comfort, we would be happy to table it for one cycle and have both the county attorney, Dennis Brown, and counsel, George Nolan, speak on the issue.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, did they say it is eligible for a vote?

MR. VAUGHN:

We believe that it is, but as I said, I don't really want to have that debate right now until everybody has more of an opportunity to further look at it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

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

LEG. HAHN:

Oppose.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

One opposition by Legislator Hahn. **Tabled (VOTE: 4-1-0-0, Opposed: Hahn).**

That brings us to the end of our agenda. Commissioner, is there anything else you want to bring to our attention?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No, we're good. We had a very good Memorial Day weekend. I don't have the numbers quite in yet, but --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good. We're working on that Discover County Parks, publicizing that event?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We are.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Good. Anything else from any committee members? All right. We are adjourned.

*(*The meeting was adjourned at 1:52 p.m. *)*