

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A 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 March 18, 2015 at 12:30 p.m.

Members Present:

Deputy Presiding Officer Jay Schneiderman - Chair
Legislator Kara Hahn - Vice Chair
Legislator Thomas Cilmi
Legislator William Lindsay III
Legislator Kevin McCaffrey

Also in Attendance:

Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory - District No. 15
Jason Richberg - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature
Dennis Brown - County Attorney's Office
Robert Lipp - Director/Budget Review Office
Massiel Fuentes - Budget Review Office
Jill Moss - Budget Review Office
Jason Hann - Aide to Legislator Schneiderman
Bill Shilling - Aide to Legislator Calarco
Alyssa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn
Greg Dawson - Commissioner/Suffolk County Department of Parks
Lance Reinheimer - Executive Director/Vanderbilt Museum
Ron Beattie - Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum/Board of Trustees
Stephen Faber - Managing Director/PFM Asset Management, LLC
Bob Oggeri - Director/Second Track Project/Long Island Rail Road
Tim Mooney
Alice Young
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Gabrielle Severs - Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:

Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary

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

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good afternoon. I'd like to call this meeting of the Parks and Recreation Committee to order this eighteenth day of March, 2015. Please rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator McCaffrey.

Salutation

If you would remain standing just for a moment. I just would like to offer a moment of silence. I just learned a little while ago that Jim Stark, former Supervisor of the Town of Riverhead, but also the father of Catherine Stark, who is a Legislative Aide to Legislator Krupski, formerly a Legislative Aide for myself, her father, Jim Stark, passed away I believe it was either this morning or last night. If we could bow our heads in memory of Mr. Stark and send our prayers to the family.

Moment of Silence

Thank you. We do have a presentation, but we normally start with Public Portion. I have a couple of cards. If you wish to be heard by the Parks Committee you do need to fill out a yellow card if you haven't already done so. They can be obtained at this front table.

Our first speaker, and each speaker has three minutes to make their comments known, is Lance Reinheimer. Lance, if you'll come forward and identify yourself at the podium for our records and then you can begin.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Thank you. Lance Reinheimer, Executive Director of the Vanderbilt Museum. I'm just here to talk in general about some of the things that are going on in the museum and I gave you some handouts: Our calendar of events for 2015, our new education brochure that we sent out this spring to all the schools, our annual report and a letter announcing the Robert David Lion Gardiner Foundation Award of \$135,000 for the restoration of our marine artifacts. We're real proud of that. We received that last month. So I just wanted you to have some of that information.

Related to that, I also gave you the press release that we sent out and I'd like to read an excerpt from that because this is something that I think we should all be proud of. Jennifer Attonito, Executive Director of the Robert David Lion Gardiner Foundation Grant said, "The Vanderbilt Museum is a Long Island gem and a major anchor of local history. We're proud to help preserve this valuable collection to benefit museum visitors and help raise awareness of Long Island heritage." So we're real proud of the support that we're receiving from them, and I just want to share that with you.

Another issue -- I received a letter yesterday afternoon from the Department of Veterans Affairs. And again, this is something that I think we should all be proud of and I'll read the letter to you. "On behalf of Recreation Therapy Service, veterans and staff at the Department of Veterans Affairs, Northport, I'd like to take this opportunity to thank you for your generosity for providing the museum's guided tour of the mansion on Saturday, March 7, 2015. The veterans thoroughly enjoyed the trip and appreciated the opportunity to visit the museum. Your staff at the entrance greeted the veterans with much warmth and kindness. Jerry, your tour guide, was very thorough in explaining the museum's history and artifacts. The veterans were captivated by all the museum's exhibits. They especially enjoyed the Marine Museum and the Vanderbilt Memorial Wing. Thank you for enhancing their visit with such warmth and enthusiasm. Your commitment and dedication to the Medical Center and the well-being of all our veterans is greatly appreciated."

I think that's something Suffolk County should be proud of. We're a member of the Blue Star Museums that allows active veterans to come to the museum between Memorial Day and Labor Day free of charge for general admission. The Vanderbilt Museum extends that policy year round. We're dedicated to our veterans. All groups that come from the Veterans Hospital come to our property free of charge. We do everything we can to help our veterans. I just wanted to bring these to your attention because I think it's something that we should all be proud of. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions for Mr. Reinheimer? How many people did the -- does the museum see each year?

MR. REINHEIMER:

We see 100,000. Thirty-thousand children through our school programs, probably another 30,000 children with their parents; 100,000 total.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Some of that's planetarium, right, that aren't necessarily going through the regular museum piece? Can you separate out the two for me? How many people go through the museum itself.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, when you enter the grounds during the day you purchase a general admission that provides you free access to our grounds and many of our exhibits. The only thing it doesn't include is the guided tour of the mansion, and we do that for security reasons. So visitors coming during the day stroll the grounds and go down to the mansion museums also. So, you know, the planetarium was built as a driver to bring more visitors in. That was the concept in 1970, and that's still what happens today. Ninety percent of our visitors go to the planetarium, but by going to the planetarium they're exposed to history and the estate.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So 90% go to the planetarium. So there's 10% that go not to the planetarium, but just to the main museum?

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, 90% of our business is driven by the planetarium. They come because of the planetarium.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MR. REINHEIMER:

But while they're there they go on the grounds and exhibits also.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

How many do the house tour a year?

MR. REINHEIMER:

I would say 10, 12,000 a year. I'm really reaching for that number. I know we have roughly around 1,000 during most months. During the dead of winter we'll have 500. During the three days after Christmas we had 667 people go through a special night tour. So I would say 15, possibly 20,000 go through the mansion. Individual guided tours, groups of 15 or less.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, but then you also have the main exhibits in the main house, right?

MR. REINHEIMER:

In the estate, yes. Part of the mansion -- where the mummy is, is part of the mansion. That's free access with a grounds pass.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So they can just kind of walk through it.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Walk through that. The veterans, when they mentioned the Memorial Wing, that's open with general admission. The Habitat Room, the Stoll Room, the Marine Museum, which is what we received the grant for from the Gardiner Foundation, that's all part of your general admission. We haven't raised general admission probably -- I don't recall the last time it was raised, and I'm going back with Budget Review for 15, 20 years.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And that general admission does allow them to enter the planetarium?

MR. REINHEIMER:

The planetarium show is five dollars above your general admission.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Above the general admission.

MR. REINHEIMER:

General admission is seven dollars, free parking. The planetarium show during the day is five dollars.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MR. REINHEIMER:

So they have access to all the grounds.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And is that general admission, the seven dollar charge, is that waivable if somebody can't afford it or is it a mandatory seven dollar fee? Is it a suggested donation or?

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, it's our fees, but our policy, and I'm very firm with our admissions people, that people leave here happy. If they have a problem with a fee in the winter, if it's snow on the ground and the planetarium is open and it's not reasonable to walk the grounds, we don't charge that fee. Veterans, as I said, are welcome any time. We have a lot of programs. We have a Bank of America Program, Museums on Us, which provides free general admission one weekend a month, so there are ways for people with limited means to visit and that's why we haven't raised our fees. I have been in position with children, you have a family of four come, it can be a lot of money and it can be a hardship for some people. So we're trying to keep our fees reasonable and have access for as much of the public as we can.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's the same fee adult versus child?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, no. Seven dollars is the adult fee. Children are six, under five, I think, are free.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Seniors?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Seniors is six. So we do have discounts, absolutely. And our membership is very reasonable. Ninety-five dollars a year gives you complete access, 100% free. Come back as many times as you want.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Does anyone else have questions for Lance? Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Good morning, Lance.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Good morning.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I just had a quick question for you. You still have the mobile museum?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes, we do.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Have you thought about moving that to some of the other County museums that we have, specifically like the Maritime Museum during special events like the Pirate Festival?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Sure, we could do that. We've got a great staff.

LEG. LINDSAY:

It's just a way that you might be able to reach some people, especially given the geography that you're probably getting some folks on the South Shore that may not be aware of all the benefits of the museum.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Two things. Thank you, Ron. Ron Beattie, President of the Board of Trustees, reminded me that we have a program called Check Us Out through our libraries. If a library becomes a member, members of that library get a pass to the Vanderbilt Museum and they are treated as if they had a family membership, which means they have free access to planetarium shows and grounds. We have a lot of people come through on those library passes. We track them. Ninety-nine percent of the libraries, the benefit they receive from that pass far exceeds what they paid for that pass. It's six hundred dollars. We have 68 libraries that are members. We stretch Nassau, Suffolk and we are talking to Queens about getting libraries in Queens to join. Queens has a little bit different library system. It's all or none, where Suffolk and Nassau, each individual library joins. In Queens they are part of a consortium where they don't act independently. They would have to buy a pass for all 60 or so of their libraries. But we're talking with them about what we can do to try to get them to try us out. So that's another program.

And getting back to the traveling classroom. This is really the first year that's running on 100% cylinders. We've got an excellent staff. We received a \$20,000 grant from National Grid Foundation. We'll see over 2500 -- we'll see close to 3,000 students in that traveling outreach program. We haven't made the next step to go out and do outreach programs such as you mentioned, only because of limited resources and ability to go out and promote it, but that's

something that is -- anything we can do to promote the museum, make people aware of what we have, certainly helps all of us.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Agreed. And if I could just make a suggestion, and it's just purely a suggestion. If you maybe reach out to Commissioner Dawson and maybe Steve Jones from the Maritime Museum, they run three events a year, the Pirate Festival, the Seafood Festival and the boat burning where they get several hundred people, if not a thousand or more. I just think it would be a great opportunity for the museum to promote itself while those events are going on.

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's a great idea. I'm aware of the Seafood Festival. I know that gets a tremendous response there. That would be great. It would be a good way to promote the museum and to spread the word.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Great. Thank you.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

A quick question as I'm looking at the annual report that was distributed. Under insurance it looks like from '13 to '14 the expense tripled. Was there a reason why insurance went up so much?

MR. REINHEIMER:

One is an actual amount and one is a budgeted amount. I'll be happy to talk to you about the budgeted amount versus the paid amount. I think that's something we should talk about person to person rather than discuss it here in open forum. And I'll tell you the whole story, but I think this is not the right forum to do that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's fair. Okay. Thank you. Anyone else for Mr. Reinheimer?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Next speaker is Ron Beattie, also on the Vanderbilt Museum topic.

MR. BEATTIE:

I don't have anything to add.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. A card was filled out, so. Anyone who has not filled out a yellow card who wishes to be heard? Okay. We will move on. We do have a presentation also on Vanderbilt. This is Stephen Faber, Managing Director of PFM Asset Management LLC, who is in charge of the Vanderbilt Endowment Trust Fund and he'll be talking about the performance of that fund. Take it away.

MR. FABER:

Thank you and good afternoon. It's a pleasure to meet with this committee again. As I have or as we have for the last number of years, we have met with this committee to present an update, an overview of performance on the trust fund, the Endowment Trust Fund for the calendar year, in this

case calendar year ending 2014. I just want to start briefly with kind of a quick overview and recap of the markets.

There was some volatility in the markets this past year, certainly led by the Federal Reserve and the deliberations ongoing amongst -- at the Federal Open Market Committee with regard to the future direction of interest rates. In fact, they're concluding a two day meeting today at which the markets are eagerly awaiting news about the potential direction of interest rates.

The U.S. economy continues to recover at a moderate pace. Internationally we saw continued challenges in the Euro Zone and the far east, notably Japan, which, you know, led to a significant underperformance in the international equity sector. Oil was a huge story in 2014 with prices falling significantly. Inflation was probably overall the key dynamic in 2014. Inflation continues to remain at a very low level and well below that of the Federal Reserve's target of two percent. With inflation continuing to fall in 2014, it took interest rates lower, which I think that if you asked many of the so-called experts, ourselves included, in December of 2013 where interest rates would be in December 2014, the vast majority would have said higher. In fact, they were lower, and that was caused by many reasons, largely because of the inflationary position that I just referenced. As interest rates fell there was a negative impact on credit, on the credit sector. It conversely had helped the Treasury sector and helped the emerging market sector, which had had a challenging 2013. And I'll talk a little bit more about that in a moment.

You know, on the unemployment and employment front, labor front, you know, we saw continued fall in the unemployment rate. Labor markets picking up wages not necessarily where the markets would like to see them, although continuing a somewhat positive trend. In terms of the equity markets, I mentioned the International Equity Market being down about four percent as measured by the MSCI Index, which is a major international index. The S&P 500 Index, which is a broad measure of the U.S. domestic equity market, was up 14%. You know, down somewhat from the year prior, and certainly down from 2012, but still on an absolute basis, you know, returning 14% in 2014 was very positive. And the Dow Jones somewhat less positive, but nonetheless up 8% on the year.

The next several slides really just tell the story that I just summarized. I think can you can see it was a tale of swings in the quarter as measured by the S&P 500 and/or the MSCI, which is the international equity index. We saw the first quarter certainly here in the U.S. somewhat slow, and a lot of that was the winter woes. We had a significantly difficult winter cycle at the end of 2013, early 2014, which had a result of compressing, you know, economic activity. And then we saw, you know, the swings as you can see, just measured by returns for the quarter -- the fourth quarter here in, you know, in the U.S. is measured by the S&P 500, was a very positive quarter. We also saw during that period interest rates fall sharply during the fourth quarter of 2014. I'm not going to speak to the sectors. It's really there for your information if you have any questions.

I mentioned earlier, turning to the next slide, that we saw significant pressures in the Euro Zone, in Japan. As you can see here, the bars in orange, that's what that color is, demonstrates the pressures that we saw in the markets, particularly in the Euro Zone and the UK. Japan is shone at a -4% return in that light blue. Interestingly, the outlier here is Europe, excluding the Euro Zone, had, you know, a very, very strong 2014. But nonetheless, the focus is on the Euro Zone, Greece and all of the, you know, kind of, you know, resulting issues from those ongoing challenges in those markets.

The bond market was a huge part of 2014. Overall the Barclays Aggregate was up 6% on the year. You can see as measured by the corporate -- the bar chart -- the bar showing the corporate sector that credits. High grade, investment grade credits perform well, while the lower quality or high yield sector struggled party as a result of, you know, low interest rates. So that just kind of positions the

story for how the Vanderbilt Trust performed for the year.

The Trust ended 2014 with a market value of \$11,752,000, approximately, up about \$650,000 year over year. It's about half of the total market value appreciation that we saw in 2013. In 2013 the fund returned approximately 12.5%, I believe. In 2014, as equity sectors were less robust and we saw the portfolio generate a total return of roughly six and a quarter, 6.26%. The fund did outperform its benchmark by 21 basis points so we were pleased to see that.

I know one of the issues we discussed last year was the waiting of the portfolios, vis a vis the target policy. This committee and ultimately I believe the Legislature, approved going to a wider range, which we adopted, if you will, in the middle of 2014. Our Investment Committee remains, as you can see in the opening line here, we remain at a 5% percent overweight to equities. It's certainly not near the 20% overweight that we are allowed to go to under the policy, and that's largely as a result of being -- our Investment Committee being somewhat concerned about the possibility of a correction. We'd rather be a little bit more conservative and protect the value of the portfolio than reach for additional earnings or additional return and be impacted negatively if the market does correct. We're not necessarily calling for a correction, but we remain concerned that, you know, as we've seen several years of significant run-up in the equity market, you know, we remain concerned that there may be something in the not too distant future, particularly as and when the Federal Reserve begins to tighten on the interest rate front.

In terms of the portfolio performance in the sectors, recall for the committee that the target policy has a 50-50 waiting, so 50% to the equity sector, 50% to the fixed income sector. We're at a 55-45 currently. The domestic equities sector makes up 40% of the overall portfolio. That for 2014 was overweighted, its particular target percent. And it was a good thing it was, because those managers, all of which are passive managers, they're not active managers. In other words, they're index funds, low cost institutional index funds, that track the market, you know, generated returns in the 12 to 14% range during the year. Vanguard total stock and Vanguard 500 did very well as noted in the second bullet here. And the performance, I'm sorry, you have the handouts. The actual performance by managers is shown on slide 11 if you want to turn to that while I'm speaking to it.

The Dividend Growth Fund underperformed its benchmark, although it did return a gross return of just under 12%. It underperformed -- it's what I would call a defensive fund that will dampen volatility in a falling equity environment, and so we remain high on that particular fund. Again, it's a low cost fund. There's only about a five and a half percent allocation to the fund, so it's small. And while it did underperform its benchmark, it still added to the overall return by producing a return in the neighborhood of 12%. I'm going to speak to the small and mid-cap terminations momentarily, but if you were looking at the lineup of managers in the portfolio, at the end of 2013 you'll notice several of those managers are out, and that's really just about, you know, concerns about valuation of small and mid-caps.

We were underweight, slightly underweight, the international equity sector, and while the manager, the one manager in that sector performed well and tracked its benchmark, the return was negative. As I mentioned earlier, the MSCI Index, the international equity index, was -4% for the year and so that definitely detracted from overall returns.

And turning to the fixed income portfolio, I would say with, again, 45% of the portfolio allocated to fixed income sector, these are virtually all, if not all -- yeah. Now currently they're all in active managers. Active managers in the fixed income sector definitely outperformed and were worth paying for active management. I mentioned the Barclays Aggregate, which is kind of the broad, longer duration fixed income sector returned 6% on the year, or just under 6% on the year. Each of the active managers outperformed, in some cases fairly significantly outperformed the benchmark

by all measures added to the value of the portfolio.

The Pacific Life Floating Rate Fund was a fund that we had added in 2013 on the expectation that interest rates would begin to rise. Floating rate funds benefit from a rising interest rate market. Obviously with 2014 not seeing interest rates rising and the prospect that rates are likely to kind of remain somewhat muted in an overall trading range for the balance of 2015, we actually terminated the Pacific Life Floating Rate Fund in 2014. Likewise, we terminated the Vanguard Total Bond Index because of the interest rate, our views on interest rates. Those proceeds were reallocated to, in the case of the Vanguard Total Bond Market Fund, to the Baird Core Plus Fund, which had about 60 basis points of outperformance versus the market last year. The Pacific Life Floating Rate proceeds were reallocated to the Alliance Mercy and high income to take advantage of the credit sector, which has begun to perform well. Again, small allocations, five percent, four and a half percent, to each of those funds. The real driver was Met West, Baird and DoubleLine, which collectively are approximately 25% of the portfolio where we saw, you know, either inline performance with the benchmark or 60 to 80 base points of outperformance versus the benchmark.

A couple of things that I would just comment on in terms of recent developments in the portfolio, certainly not reflected on slide 11, but I mentioned the termination of the Pacific Funds Floating Rate and the Vanguard Total Bond Index because of the challenges in the interest rate market. We recently reduced the U.S. equity, domestic equity overweight, and removed the underweight to the non-U.S. developed markets. Again, that's the interest in the non-U.S. developed markets is really -- U.S. equities have performed very, very well the last number of years. Non-U.S. developed markets, not emerging markets, but developed markets have performed well but less well in the U.S. sector. Because of that trail in performance, because of what we think, believe to be the outlook for the foreseeable future, we think the valuation is more favorable to the non-U.S. developed markets sector and those valuations are much more favorable to the portfolio, and so we reduced -- I think the swing was maybe two percent, two and a half percent. So not a big shift, nonetheless a shift.

And then lastly I would just add that we are considering adding an international small-cap active manager into the international space to take advantage of what we see to be opportunities in the developed -- in the developed international space.

The last slide I will just touch on briefly, it's really there for your information with all the pretty colors, is just our outlook by asset class for 2015. I think most of these I have touched on during the course of this presentation. I'm certainly happy to address any of them in more detail or answer any questions. So I will take a moment to pause and see if there are any questions from any of the members.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We'll start with our Presiding Officer.

P.O. GREGORY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Mr. Faber, for your presentation. As far as the termination as to the portfolio, how is that reviewed? Is it an annual review, quarterly, weekly, monthly? How does that work?

MR. FABER:

As far as the termination?

P.O. GREGORY:

Well, as far as the review of the portfolio. You made, you know, decisions as to how well or not a certain portfolio is going and to proceed forward with that portfolio or not, that fund or not.

MR. FABER:

The portfolio itself is looked at by the portfolio managers on a daily basis. The -- our Investment Committee meets formally on a monthly basis and informally on a more frequent basis. At the formal meetings the Investment Committee, which is comprised of a Chief Investment Officer, Head of Research, Portfolio Managers themselves, both from the fixed income area as well as the equity sector, and certain senior members of the PFM Asset Management Leadership Team. They set the targets for various strategies, so for a 50-50 weighting for a 60-40 weighting, etcetera. They will set overweights, underweights, based on our view of which sectors are performing well, which sectors are undervalued, which sectors are over-valued, and then set the constraints. The individual portfolio manager, so in this case the portfolio manager for the Vanderbilt Endowment, has the latitude within the constraints of the Investment Committee, and more to the point, within the constraints of your investment guidelines, investment policy, to make changes with regard to weightings.

Terminations or the additions of managers are done at the committee level, not the portfolio manager level, so if a manager has shown several quarters of underperformance, it's likely that we will put that manager on watch or on probation, and that will signal to us and to the client that we may take action and either not put any additional funds with that manager or terminate that manager and reallocate those proceeds. Those decisions are communicated to the clients. So when we make a portfolio decision, a termination, a change in weighting, that is communicated same day to, in this case staff, you know, by e-mail. It's a one or two page, you know, written communication, and obviously if there are questions staff follows up.

P.O. GREGORY:

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Cilmi, you're up next. No? Okay. I got then Bill Lindsay and then Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Good afternoon, Mr. Faber. Thanks for your testimony. Last year when we changed the mix of the funds and gave you more latitude in how to do that, do you remember or recall what time of the year -- was that about halfway through the year?

MR. FABER:

I think it was April.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. Have you looked at any figures as to what or how much more or less the fund would have performed had it been sooner? Like had it been the entire year last year.

MR. FABER:

I have not.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. But as an assumption, wouldn't you think it would have been higher? You would have had a higher return had you not had those same restrictions from the start of the year?

MR. FABER:

Well, recall what I said a bit earlier in my presentation, that even with the broader range, you know, the plus or minus 10 to 20 versus the prior range, which was plus or minus five to 10%, even with

that broader range our Investment Committee has kept the overweight at 5%, plus 5%, which was about where it was last year at this time when I met with the committee. So I think without taking a look at the numbers or trying to reinvent what could have happened, I'm not so sure that our Investment Committee may have made a different decision, even had this body made that change earlier in the year. I don't know that for certain, but that's kind of my inclination.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Thank you. Nice to see you again. I just want to go over the fees, and I think I remember last time it was 40 basis points for your fee as the consultant.

MR. FABER:

It's a sliding scale. Again, it may be in --

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Because I didn't see it. It's based on assets under management?

MR. FABER:

Yeah, it's a sliding scale based on -- so it's 40 on the first five and then there's break points on each -- on the next five, and then so a lower fee on the second five million, and then a final fee on anything above \$10 million. What it nets to is probably in the, I would guess, 36-ish.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Okay, that's what I'm talking about.

MR. FABER:

I'm guessing.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

And you mentioned that the equities are all in index funds?

MR. FABER:

Currently they are, yes.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Okay. What are the fees on that for the --

MR. FABER:

I don't have those with me. I would think that they would be anywhere from I want to say ten to 40 basis points.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

On the index funds. Okay. But you did say on the fixed income side, though, that you had -- you went to more active managers there?

MR. FABER:

We've been -- even last year at this time we had a significant bias to active management and the fixed income sector. And if I know where your next question is, the fees for active management are

much higher because we're literally paying somebody to try to outperform the markets. And as you know, you know, kind of a, you know, rising tide lifts all boats is really where we've -- where the equity markets have been these last couple of years. So to pay somebody to outperform when it's very, very difficult for 90 plus percent of the funds or managers out there to outperform, we just feel that that wasn't the right decision for our clients.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Okay. But you mentioned that you thought you got the outperformance on the fixed income. I didn't see it.

MR. FABER:

I said the fixed income certainly added to the outperformance. The active managers, Met West, Baird and DoubleLine, I think Met West was in line with the Barclays Agg, which is its benchmark. Both Met West and -- I'm sorry. Both Baird and DoubleLine, I believe, outperformed the benchmark by, in the case of Baird --

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

You know, I don't want to pick it apart. The only point I want to make is I just want to feel confident that the extra money that we're spending in fees for active management, that we're getting return we're hoping to get.

MR. FABER:

We believe very strongly that that is the case, yes, sir.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Just lastly, and we appreciate you coming here today and answering all our questions. It sounds like the fund is doing well. We didn't have to -- the Vanderbilt Museum operations did not have to take anything out of the fund, right, for the last couple of years, so everything that's made has stayed in the fund.

MR. FABER:

That is correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Anybody else have anything else? All right. We appreciate your time.

MR. FABER:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you so much, Mr. Faber. Okay. So we will move on, then, to tabled resolutions.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 1029-15 - Authorizing use of Smith Point Park property by Getco Company, between the Ports and Event Power, Long Island, for a triathlon (Browning). Maybe I'll bring Commissioner Dawson up. I had some questions on this. Was this amended, this bill?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It has not been yet. We have a meeting scheduled this afternoon with the sponsor and I believe you're in that meeting as well, at four clock, to go over the fee structure.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Will tabling it -- what's the date of the event? Oh, it's August second. It shouldn't present a problem.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No. We're well within the timeframe.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay, and the sponsor is asking for that tabling? Do we know?

MS. SIMPSON:

I believe this one was amended. It's 1043 that we're going to be looking to table with the sponsor's approval.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So this one is ready to go, yes?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

My apologies, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. All right. So I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Lindsay. Any questions? Discussion? All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1029 is approved. ***(Vote: 6-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Gregory is included in the vote.)***

IR 1037-15 - Authorizing a License Agreement for the use of buildings at Montauk County Park with Camp SoulGrow (Schneiderman).

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Commissioner, we met the other day out at this facility, so this is allowing one cabin and the two motel units. The two motel units, do we have any confirmation that they can be used in this fashion?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct. We have not.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We don't.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We're still looking at that, but we had discussed at the meeting the possibility of them using office space within a third house that does currently --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So there's a section of the building that has a CO --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It could be used for classroom space.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Arts and crafts kind of things.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So then I will reach out to Camp SoulGrow and ask them to contact your office because they could then use those two classroom spaces through a permitting process?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I believe we can certainly do that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We need to do this through legislation per se, so why -- I'll table it for now and we'll sort that out. As well as the cabins can be -- there's a procedure to go through your office?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We do that on a permit basis and there's a fee established within the fee guidelines that we can utilize.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. All right. So I'll make a motion to table. Second by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So tabled. ***(Vote: 6-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Gregory is included in the vote).***

IR 1043-15 - Authorizing use of Smith Point County Park property in 2015 by the Mastics-Moriches-Shirley Community Library's Family Literacy Project (Browning).

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

This is the one we're going to ask to be tabled. We have a meeting this afternoon on this particular case.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And tabling it won't affect the -- it's a September event date. Okay. I'll make a motion to table. Second by Legislator Lindsay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1043 is tabled. ***(Vote: 6-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Gregory is included in the vote).*** Moving on to Introductory Prime.

Introductory Prime

IR 1125-15 - Establishing a Parks Passport Program for Children in Suffolk County (Hahn).

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve by the sponsor. Is there a second? Second for the purpose of discussion? I will second.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm sorry, Legislator Lindsay is seconding. Okay. On the motion.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

If I could ask that this be tabled until I have a chance to sit down with the sponsor on this. We really haven't had a chance -- an opportunity to discuss it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Maybe I'll have the sponsor tell us a little bit about what she's trying --

LEG. HAHN:

Sure. So the idea here is to build on the Parks Prescription Program which we passed recently and we're going to have a committee -- a committee is being established to help implement that. And this is for children. So if you think of an autograph book, a passport book, something like that, and the children will get stickers or stamps when they visit individual parks throughout Suffolk County. So I can see this being promoted by the doctors through the Parks Prescription Program, pediatricians obviously, specifically. And they would pass out the passport book to the children who need to get exercise and children can collect. It's sort of like almost could be a competition or kids like to collect things. So you can collect stickers or stamps when you go to individual parks throughout Suffolk County and it's a way of encouraging kids to get out there, families to see the different kinds of parks that we have, what's available at each park, and then there'd be a specific sticker for each park so that they could collect them as they visit the parks in Suffolk County.

We spoke to the print shop, we know that this could be done in-house. There's really, you know, it would be a negligible cost. It would take a little bit of planning to come up with the stickers and things like that, but I would hope it could be done through the Parks Prescription group and/or maybe a special subcommittee within that focused on the, you know, the children aspects and how to get it out beyond doctors, pediatricians, but also get into schools, etcetera.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Questions for the sponsor. So this would, I guess, only be at parks where we have attendants and they have ticket booths?

LEG. HAHN:

No. So I think there can be creative solutions to that. You know, if it's a County park they could go to their local County Legislator's office who would have the stickers. You know, they take a selfie of themselves in front of the park sign and then go and talk to the Legislative office and get a sticker or go to their town council person if it's a town park or go to the town Parks Department and they could get a sticker, you know, showing that they had been there. So that it's kind of accessible, clearly we're not going to put a staff person in every park handing out stickers.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, some parks already have staff people where if you're paying your admission you could ask for a sticker.

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, that's the real easy one.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Somebody has to design the sticker and the book that they're putting their sticker into. It just takes work.

LEG. HAHN:

Which is what I just talked about. So clearly there will take some planning on developing a little passport book and developing the stickers, and we can get as creative as you want with an individual sticker designed in some special way for each park, or it could be a little less creative if it needed to be where, you know, there is one logo for all Suffolk County Parks and then you have a name underneath. The more creative the better, I think but, you know, the committee will work, you know, will work on that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Go ahead, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It's not my objection, my only concern about this is that it doesn't direct the committee to do this, it directs the department to do this, and within 120 days, and this is actually -- the division within my department that would handle this is currently implementing a new reservation system. We're taking reservations, the golf courses are getting ready to open up. It's kind of a very compressed timeframe. I mean, this is not the time of the year that I would be designing and developing -- implementing a new program. This is more something we would do kind of in the off-season. Again, it directs the department.

LEG. HAHN:

So would you -- if I did table and directed it to be part of the, the other committee, like establish a subcommittee of the Parks Prescription group that we established, that would be okay with you?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Could we table it and we could have a further discussion on how we are going to implement?

LEG. HAHN:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN DAWSON:

Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

As long as I know we have a path to an end goal here. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are you withdrawing your motion to approve?

LEG. HAHN:

Sure. Then I will withdraw my motion to approve and I will make a motion to table for one cycle to have this discussion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. He doesn't need to withdraw his second, I'll just second the tabling motion. So the only motion we have in front of us is a motion to table. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? The bill is tabled. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Lindsay).**

IR 1128-15 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Fencing and Surveying Various County Parks (CP 7007)(Co. Exec.). Just, Commissioner, real briefly. Is this generic?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes, it appropriates \$50,000 into our fencing and surveying funds. We're not looking for it for surveying, we're actually looking for it for fencing. We use this account to --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are we taking the money from somewhere else?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No, it's not amending, it's appropriating.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It says amending, so. The title is amending.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I'm sorry. Yeah, we're moving from construction to planning. From Planning to construction.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. It's within the same project.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We're moving from construction to site improvements. Okay. I'll make a motion. Second by Legislator McCaffrey. Oh, a question. Let's get a second on the motion to approve and then we'll discuss it. Is there a second?

P.O. GREGORY:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Presiding Officer Gregory seconding on the motion. Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Commissioner, can you just clarify this? It appears from what I saw that it's bonding \$50,000 for the fencing. Are you saying that it's a transfer from another fund that's already appropriated or?

MR. LIPP:

What it's doing is it's the same capital project. The money is in construction now and they're moving it over to site improvement. So you are changing the financing. You can't, as George would know, the Bond Counsel wouldn't allow it, the site improvements to be borrowed under previously adopted resolution that said construction.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Is this part of an overall plan for the parks? Where is this, by the way.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

This is general site improvements. This is the purchase of fencing. We're repairing fencing in parks across the County. If we purchase the fence outright it's generally for things like snow fencing, which we need to build up the dunes at Smith Point and Cupsogue County Park and whatnot, so.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

So this is more along the lines of, you know, repairing fencing?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's exactly what it is. Repairing fencing and purchasing fencing.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is this an actual bond attached to this or has already been bonded or?

MR. LIPP:

It hasn't been bonded yet, no.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So there will be separate vote, a companion resolution on the floor then.

MR. LIPP:

I believe we need 12 votes to pass this where you are changing the source of funding.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

On the floor. No?

MR. LIPP:

That's not true.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, not to get it out of committee certainly. So there's a separate vote, though, on the actual bond.

MR. LIPP:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think that's what Legislator McCaffrey was asking about. This is just basically within the capital program changing how much is in each category on the project. Does that answer your question? All right. So let's have a vote on it then. Oh, I'm sorry. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

So, Commissioner, we're bonding to buy snow fencing?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We're bonding to buy fencing. Snow fencing is included in that, yes.

LEG. CILMI:

Can you breakdown for us a little more of, you know, what the money will be used for exactly?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It gets put into our fencing account and we make purchases off that account.

LEG. CILMI:

Well, what I'm getting at is it seems to me that snow fencing and the like would be something that we should be paying for out of our Operating Budget.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, snow fencing in general, when we purchase money for snow fencing out of this account, it's generally used for dune replenishment at places like Smith Point and Cupsogue County Beach. Last year we put almost five miles of snow fence out along Smith Point to help restore the dune system. So it's kind of serving a dual purpose.

LEG. CILMI:

And how often does that snow fencing have to be replaced?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It never gets replaced. It gets buried. The sand buries it, raises the dune, and then you put another layer and you just keep moving it higher and closer towards the ocean. So it's there, independent of a catastrophic hurricane or storm, it's there in perpetuity.

LEG. CILMI:

And this would fall into, I guess this is a question for Budget Review, through the Chair, this would fall into how long of a bond would this be?

MR. LIPP:

Well, the fiscal impact says five years, but the way we've been doing things, perhaps it would change with the new Comptroller, I don't know, is we've only the last two years moved off the level debt service partially approach. The average for the level of debt service, depending upon a particular issue, has been 18 years. The last I'll say year or two we've selectively borrowed for three to five years for select items such as settlements and car purchases. But otherwise the rest of the bond has been including something like this for 18 years.

LEG. CILMI:

And, Commissioner, what is the average, you know, check amount that you would write out of this account to pay for fencing? Are we talking about a couple of thousand dollars?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I mean, it's on a case by case basis. I mean, we could spend 20, \$30,000 on snow fence, we could spend five, \$10,000 on repairing fence in a certain park. We could spend \$5,000 buying stockade fence, you know, to put around our temporary parking areas. I mean, it's all inclusive. Any time that we do fence work within a park we take it out of this account. I mean, I could -- I'm not prepared to tell you at this point, but I could give you breakdown sometime in the future of how that money was allocated in the past.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So this is our fencing account and there's no other account for fencing, and this is what we use.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Fencing and surveying, correct.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I just, for the record, don't disagree with you. This is the kind of thing that ought to be an Operating expense but the money is not available, so. We have to get back to the days where we have a pay as you go allocation, which we don't have anymore, you know, to take care of those kind of things. Why pay debt service on a small amount of money that is a predictable, routine expense.

Okay. So let's vote on it. You'll have another opportunity to vote on the bond at the General Meeting. So IR 1128, I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1128 is approved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Gregory is included in the vote).**

Moving on to **IR 1129-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Heavy Duty and Other Equipment for County Parks including Vehicles (CP 7011)(Co. Exec.)**. I'll make a motion to approve. Second. Commissioner, do you want to add any more information on what we're buying?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, actually. We're looking in 2015 to purchase a new garbage truck, three new containers for our Roll Off that we purchased last year with heavy -- the year before with heavy equipment and a trailer for our excavator. The reason for the containers is we're trying to get away from a dependency on private contractors to cart our garbage away from our parks, places like Smith Point and Cupsogue. We have those 20-yard containers. We're moving more towards doing that in-house. With the garbage truck -- we did that with our container truck. With the garbage truck we're going to look to -- move towards picking up the smaller three yard containers with this truck to try to save additional funds.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Will this help us at all with situations where people have dumped into our parks garbage? I know I've had several situations like this where, you know, I get reported that at a particular park somebody has illegally dumped garbage. Of course we always try to find out who did it, but you can't always find out who did it. Is this something that will allow us to better ease in cleaning up a park that may have experienced illegal dumping?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Absolutely. Large scale cleanups, absolutely. We could also -- you know, we also work with a lot of groups that when they do park cleanups we can, you know, we drop these roll off containers and we can, again, pick them up inhouse and not have to go out to -- I mean, we do have a contract in place for our roll offs and for our three yard small dumpsters, but we are trying to get away from that and do more with in-house staff.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Any other questions? I'm sorry. Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

What's the length of the bonds on this, do you know?

MR. LIPP:

So that's with the Comptroller and the same story line as before. Typically we do a level debt service bond issue, which would be for various years averaged over the long run, about 18 years. It's possible they could do a five year bond on this, but that probably would break the past practice, but it's up to the Comptroller.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Didn't we, when we approved those police vehicles and for the Sheriff's Department, we were told that those were five year bonds, correct?

MR. LIPP:

Correct. And as I said earlier, the last year or two, I believe two years, we did make some exceptions. Like, so for instance, the last bond issue what we did is we or the Comptroller broke out some three and five year bond issues for purchase of public safety vehicles, number one, and I

believe settlements also, and the rest of it was packaged together as a level debt service bond issue, which actually happened to be relatively low compared to past practice, was for 14 years.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

No matter how low the interest rate is, if we're paying for vehicles for 14 years, which we don't have that reasonable expectation they're going to last that long, that just seems kind of absurd.

MR. LIPP:

So you want to hear what the logic is then?

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

No, we're beyond the logic, I think, at this point. But I would like to know --

MR. LIPP:

There is a logic.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

There is?

MR. LIPP:

Yeah.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Okay.

MR. LIPP:

So the logic is twofold. Number one, as Legislator Schneiderman mentioned, we don't have the money upfront. What it does is it saves in the early years and there's extra cost or interest in the later years. So short-term gain, long-term pay, number two. Number two, since it is a weighted average maturity, even those this is a, perhaps a shorter lifetime, it's mixed in for an average for all of the bonds. So, for instance, you could get, for instance, sewer construction, which has a period of probable usefulness for 40 years, ditto with land, that gets mixed in with like these five year bonds and comes up with an average that, as I said, over the long-term has been like 18 years.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Right, but we were able to do it with the police vehicles, but we can't do it with any other type of vehicles?

MR. LIPP:

Can't is not the right term. We could legally do either way, and the determination since, I'll say 2004, we moved from having blocks of five year, 10 year, 15 and 20 year bonds to doing a weighted average maturity, which gave us like 18, 20 years, 16 years depending upon the bond issue.

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

I came from a different world. We did it a little differently. We actually bonded things that we saw a life expectancy of them. So I'd really have a tough time supporting a bond -- you know, I know we need these, this equipment, but I can't see bonding something for 18 or 14 years that we don't expect to last that long.

MR. LIPP:

That would be a good conversation to have with the Comptroller.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah, I would agree. We don't set the life expectancies. And this is, in contrast to the last one where this is clearly a piece of heavy equipment, it's typically bonded, that's not unusual, but also this wasn't a Capital Budget, the approved Capital Budget. There's not an amendment here. We're just appropriating according to the adopted budget. So we anticipated this expense when we approved that budget. So I'll make a motion to approve 1129. Oh, we already had a motion and a second, right?

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Still, on the motion, one more. Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you. Commissioner, you indicated that the purchase of this garbage truck, which is the bulk of the expenditure here, \$220,000 is the overall, 150,000 is the cost of the garbage truck, I believe. You indicated that that garbage truck would allow us to do more removal of waste in-house as opposed to contracting it out, and yet two resolutions down the list here on the agenda we have a resolution appropriating \$75,000 for the removal of toxic and hazardous materials from County parks. So how do you reconcile the two?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We have people on staff that can drive a garbage truck and pick up garbage. We don't have anybody on staff that can do asbestos removal, lead abatements and --

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So this is not -- IR 1163 is not, it's not the carting away, necessarily, of those materials, although I suppose that would part and parcel of the work that those companies do. But you have to remove those hazardous materials, asbestos and whatnot first from the buildings or whatever they may be.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct. And just so you know on that note, and we'll get to that a little bit later on the agenda, we're moving more towards taking buildings down with the excavator that we purchased in-house.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. Is 1129 absolutely necessary today, this year?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes. I mean, we need a new garbage truck. We'd like to start moving in the direction that we remove our own, you know, of picking up our own --

LEG. CILMI:

Do we have a garbage truck now?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We do, but we have 50,000 acres -- I think we have two garbage trucks. One of them may be on its way out, and this garbage truck is going to have the ability to remove the containers. I don't believe the old trucks have that ability, the mechanisms to pick up the dumpsters.

LEG. CILMI:

All right. It sounds like it's a nice thing to have, but I am a little concerned. I mean, we have to start conserving in some places.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We've debated the bill. This is 1129 and I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Two opposed, Legislator McCaffrey and Legislator Cilmi. Four in favor of the bill. It passes.

(Vote: 4-2-0-0 - Opposed: Legislators Cilmi and McCaffrey; Presiding Officer Gregory is included in the vote).

IR 1160-15 - Authorizing use of Blydenburgh County Park by the Care Center for its Annual Walkathon Fundraiser (Co. Exec.). Do I have a motion? Motion by Legislator Lindsay. Second by Legislator Cilmi I believe. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. *(Vote: 6-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Gregory is included in the vote).*

IR 1162-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with Improvements and Lighting at County Parks (CP 7079) (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Lindsay. I will second. Commissioner, this is also a generic appropriation?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes. This a for general park improvements and lighting in our parks.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

How much is this?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Two-hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's typical?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Typical for -- yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Any discussion? Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

So I guess it breaks it down, 50,000 for planning and 200,000 for lighting.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

General improvements. I mean, lighting is just a catchall phrase. It's general improvements to parks, of which lighting would be.

LEG. CILMI:

When you say improvements, are they, you know, what type of improvements are we talking about? Is it fixing things?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It could be improvements or repairs. Generally we only use this account if we -- we had some damage in Hurricane Irene and Hurricane Sandy. We'll use this account to go to to fund the repairs before we get our reimbursements.

LEG. CILMI:

And why is it -- why is there a distinction between planning and I guess actual construction. I'm not sure how the other money is expressed in the bill, but it specifically says 50,000 for planning and 200,000 for I guess lighting and other things.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, depending on if, you know, if we have a project up and coming and we need planning funds to come up with any kind of design work, that's the fund that we would take it out of. We can't use construction funds for planning purposes.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay, but what would we need to plan for that wouldn't come to us in its own separate resolution.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Let's say a roof blows off one of our buildings in a hurricane. We need to repair it and we need to put it out for bids and we need construction bids. We would use the planning money to come up with the designs specs and we would use the construction money to make the repair.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And here, again, is this something that we should be paying for out of operating expenses but we just don't have the money to do it, or have we ever paid for this sort of stuff out of operating expenses?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I guess it's a combination of both.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Is there anything that's pending now that we don't have money to repair, replace, that this would be allocated towards?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I don't have a specific list with me today but, again, this is a general park improvement account that we put it into.

LEG. CILMI:

So this generally just replenishes an account.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Existing account, and we collapsed a number of other capital accounts. We collapsed the newly acquired account, 7145, 7184, water supply, and 7188, energy efficiencies. We kind of collapsed all those accounts into this one. It's kind of a catchall. I mean, generally when we have specific park projects we earmark capital funds to those but, again, we have a very large park system and everything can't be caught up within certain funds.

LEG. CILMI:

If can you answer this or if Budget Review can answer this, so are we actually in this case, are we bonding this money and literally depositing it into an account or are we not bonding it until --

MR. LIPP:

So we don't bond until we're ready to go. So what happens, typically, is we almost always borrow twice a year, in the spring and fall, and that's administered by Audit and Control. What they do is they contact the different departments, DPW, Parks, whatever departments need funding, and the basic question asked is how much you need for the projects that were adopted by the Legislature

over the next six months, so they'll bond for that. So for instance, right now --

LEG. CILMI:

But this is its own project, so even though the specific projects that this would fund are not described in CP 7079, there is a specific project, and therefore I suppose the Comptroller would call the Parks Department, the Parks Department would say, "Yes, we need the money". They would borrow the money and deposit it into an account and it would sit there until we use it for whatever it is we use it for.

MR. LIPP:

That's not the way it usually works. The question is how much do you need over the next six months, because they borrow every six months, and then whatever money is -- like let's say, for instance, they say \$20,000. So there's a project in the next bond issue for \$20,000, it goes into the Capital Fund and it sits there, and if they have it sized right the money gets spent over the next six months.

LEG. CILMI:

So we're authorizing a quarter of a million dollars here, but what you're telling me is that we won't go out and borrow a quarter of a million dollars. The Parks Department every six months will say, "Okay, we have these repairs that we have to do, and therefore we need \$40,000", and that's how much will be borrowed?

MR. LIPP:

Yes, and it's possible --

LEG. CILMI:

But they won't have to come back to us for an individual authorization at that point because we'll already have authorized this?

MR. LIPP:

Right. So it's possible that they might need it all and then they would issue bonds for all of it, but you could say hypothetically the first bond issue for this will be, let's say not this spring but next spring, and they might do it say over three periods in terms of need for the money. Then it shows up in the Operating Budget under debt service the year after the bond is issued typically.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. This is 1162. We've got a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Lindsay; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote).**

IR 1163-15 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Removal of Toxic and Hazardous Materials in County Parks (CP 7185)(Co. Exec.).

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Again, this fund is utilized for the removal of asbestos at --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We talked about it a little bit earlier. Is there a motion? I'll make a motion. Second by Legislator Hahn. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Lindsay; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote).**

IR 1171-15 - Authorizing use of Blydenburgh County Park by the New York Blood Center, Inc., for its Hike for Life Fundraiser (Co. Exec.).

LEG. CILMI:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion by Legislator Cilmi. Second by myself. No discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. ***(Vote: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Lindsay; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote).***

IR 1172-15 - Authorizing use of Blydenburgh County Park by the Curvy Girls Foundation, Inc., for its Straight Walk with the Curvy Girls Fundraiser (Co. Exec.). Do I have a motion, a motion for the curvy girls?

LEG. CILMI:

I don't know anything about this one.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The guys are avoiding this. Legis Hahn, do you want to make a motion for the curvy girls?

LEG. HAHN:

Motion for the curvy girls.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I believe it's a scoliosis group.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. We have a motion. I will be bold and second. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved.

(Vote: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Lindsay; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote).

IR 1174-15 - Authorizing execution of access agreement with the MTA in connection with the LIRR Second Track Project at Lakeland County Park (SCTM Nos. 0504-018.00-01.00-064.000, 0504-018.00-01.00-066.000, and 0504-019.00-01.00-001.000) (Co. Exec.). I believe the County Attorney is present. Dennis, we may have some questions for you. I will make a motion to approve. Is there a second? At least for discussion purposes?

LEG. HAHN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Hahn. Okay. So, Dennis, tell us what's going on here. They're trying to get a second track in, right, within the right of way?

MR. BROWN:

That's correct. So as you know, the Long Island Rail Road has had a long-term project with respect to adding a second track on the Ronkonkoma line. Their track runs through Lakeland County Park, which is in Islandia. They do have a right of way. All of the work will be constructed within the right of way. But as far as the right of way is concerned, there is some freshwater wetland and

approximately .1432 acres of freshwater wetland within --

LEG. HAHN:

One four three two -- point one four three two.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But who's counting.

MR. BROWN:

A very small amount. But in any event, so there will be a small loss of wetland, freshwater wetland, within the right of way due to the creation of fill needed because of the culvert and because of the retaining wall. And so the Long Island Rail Road, and there is a whole team of Long Island Rail Road people here if anybody has any questions. The Long Island Rail Road had to get a permit from the DEC and the Army Corps of Engineers. The Army Corps of Engineers has a nationwide permit with respect to wetland construction projects and mitigation measures that have to be implemented when wetland is lost.

So in -- as a condition for getting the DEC permit and the Army Corps of Engineers permit, the Long Island Rail Road has to perform mitigation measures in the park, not within the right of way, in Lakeland County Park, of .15 acres. So we did make out a little bit better. And that mitigation measure includes a 345 foot boardwalk that's five feet eight inches wide, that would create a walkway to Honeysuckle Pond in Lakeland County Park. And also, there are plantings in other areas of the park that have to be made and maintained by the Long Island Rail Road. The plantings have to have an 85% survival rate and be monitored for five years to ensure their survival rate. That's the mitigation measure as part of the access agreement.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So it's their right of way. There's no alienation issues, first of all.

MR. BROWN:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They're in their right of way. They as of right can do this, but because of the wetland issues they were forced to provide mitigation and that mitigation is some improvements to our parkland in the vicinity of where this second track is going.

MR. BROWN:

That is correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And that has all the DEC permits necessary or is that something that has to be reviewed further?

MR. BROWN:

No. Everything has been signed off on by the DEC and the Army Corps of Engineers.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. There's a couple of questions. I'll start with Legislator Cilmi and then Legislator Hahn.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you. So as I recall in the initial discussions about the double track project, I think it was always anticipated that we're going to need to use parts of Lakeland County Park in some way,

shape or form for this project. Right, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That is correct, but only as far as they need access to get to their piece of property. They're not doing any work within ours but they're going to need access from back off of Johnson Avenue so, we are giving them, you know, temporary access.

LEG. CILMI:

And it's that temporary access that they're in turn agreeing to do some work in the park and maintain some --

MR. BROWN:

It's actually the reason, the exchange for -- the access isn't what's related to or linked to the mitigation measure. The mitigation measure is required by the Army Corps of Engineers as a condition of issuing the permit, that due to the loss of that small amount of wetland, a little bit less than .15 acres, that the Army Corps of Engineers would only grant the permission to do the work provided that there was an offsetting mitigation measure. And that offsetting mitigation measure is the boardwalk to Honeysuckle Pond as well as plantings and seedings.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's what they need the access for, to do that work.

MR. BROWN:

They need the access for both, actually. So there will be some access to their access road, to their right of way, through existing access points at the park, but to do the mitigation measures they will have to create some access. As far as creating that access for the mitigation measures, that all has to be restored, and if there was any disturbance with respect to access to do the track work, that would have to be restored as well. But all of the track work and all of the environmental loss is within their right of way.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

And all the work has to be done under the direct supervision of our environmental crew, so we'll be out there monitoring what's going on.

LEG. CILMI:

Would we or the Long Island Rail Road have any reason to contact the Village of Islandia on this?

MR. BROWN:

There are two aspects to that. One is with respect to the County, the mitigation measures are being reviewed by CEQ on Monday. And the Village of Islandia, to my knowledge, along with any other interested parties, have been put on notice or will be put on notice so that would include the Town of Islip and I don't really -- I don't recall if the Town of Brookhaven was one of the parties that the CEQ, the -- staff at Planning was going to put on notice. But my last conversation was that as far as CEQ is concerned and our review of the mitigation measures, our environmental review of the mitigation measures, all of the interested parties would be placed on notice.

Now, as to the Long Island Rail Road, I can't speak for the Rail Road, but I can tell you what I have read. Two things with respect to the track project in general, not just the Rail Road, not just the work for the Rail Road on the right of way. A, that they are exempt from SEQRA under Section 1266 of the Public Authorities Law, but aside from their exemption, they did do an environmental analysis and their environmental analysis for the project in general found no significant adverse impact, and I know that municipalities were notified. I do not know if every single municipality was notified, such as Town of Brookhaven, Town of Island, the Village of Islandia.

LEG. CILMI:

I'd like to get a description of the work that's being done, particularly the retaining wall, how large that is, how long it is, etcetera. Is that something that we can ask the folks from the LIRR, through the Chair? Maybe somebody could come up to the podium?

LEG. HAHN:

Yes, please. Come right up to the podium. Just press the button on the microphone and make sure you see the green light. State your name and title for the record.

MR. OGGERI:

Bob Oggeri. I'm with the Long Island Rail Road. I'm the Director for the Second Track Project. If I could just jump into the previous question, we had contacted the Village of Islandia and we do have an agreement with them right now. Johnson Avenue, which is the road we're accessing from is an Islandia road, so we have been in contact with them. And the same for Town of Islip, Town of Brookhaven.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. OGGERI:

Regarding the walls, Mr. Cilmi, we're in the process of putting them up right now. They're precast concrete retaining walls. It's the same wall we've just installed along Suffolk Avenue in the Town of Islip near the Central Islip station. It's going to be the exact same type of wall. The walls that were --

LEG. CILMI:

Are they permanent or temporary?

MR. OGGERI:

They are permanent walls. The Rail Road sits on a plateau more or less and we have to widen the plateau, they have to widen the plateau and fill in areas to create a wide enough space to put two tracks.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And so the loss of --

MR. OGGERI:

The loss of the wetlands is, again, about 6500 square feet within our right of way. It's about six and a half feet by 1000 feet that is currently wetlands. As they are impacted we're going to create new wetlands. It has to be in a contiguous waterway, which is Honeysuckle Pond, and we're creating new wetlands in two locations within the park. One right alongside Honeysuckle Pond and one a little bit farther north right at the entrance of the park.

LEG. CILMI:

So the .14 or so acres is outside of your -- oh, is within your right of way, but it's wetlands. Now, do the wetlands compose the entirety of your right of way or is there part of your right of way that's not wetlands in the area that you're going to be working?

MR. OGGERI:

Could you give me that question one more time?

LEG. CILMI:

In other words, it says the Rail Road will need to fill in .14 blah, blah, blah acres of wetlands within

the right of way due to construction. So the wetlands are within your right of way.

MR. OGGERI:

Correct.

LEG. CILMI:

How much more -- but the right of way is --

MR. OGGERI:

Only the wetlands --

LEG. CILMI:

-- straighter than the .14 acres.

MR. OGGERI:

Only the wetlands within the Long Island Rail Road right of way, which is the .14 acres, one-four-five acres, will be impacted. Those will be filled in. We will create new wetlands.

LEG. CILMI:

Right I get that, but what I'm trying to get to is how much more of the right of way is going to be impacted that may not be wetlands now. Do you follow?

MR. OGGERI:

No, I'm not following.

LEG. CILMI:

So part of your right of way is wetlands, part of your right of way is not wetlands.

MR. OGGERI:

Right.

LEG. CILMI:

You're disturbing some of your right of way.

MR. OGGERI:

All of our right of way.

LEG. CILMI:

All of your right of way.

MR. OGGERI:

Five miles basically.

LEG. CILMI:

And so how much property are talking about in total?

MR. BROWN:

A mile through the park.

MR. OGGERI:

Yeah, it's approximately a mile through the park area. The park is -- Lakeland County Park is approximately 2,000 feet wide. There's another 3,000 feet that's Town of Islip property. So, again, the second track goes through that whole area, which is approximately a mile. The whole project

itself is basically 18 miles long.

LEG. CILMI:

I'm trying to remember exactly where the tracks go through that. It's really right on the edge of the park.

MR. OGGERI:

It is.

LEG. CILMI:

So it's not really going to disturb, from a practical point of view, the utilization of the park itself.

MR. OGGERI:

Correct. It is on the south edge of Lakeland County Park. Lakeland County Park is our neighbor. The State park and preserve is our neighbor to the south side. Lakeland is the neighbor to the north side.

LEG. CILMI:

Right. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

So I think my questions got answered. Of course I'm supportive of the Second Track Project, but the mitigation items that you mentioned were the boardwalk, which was how long and what did it connect?

MR. OGGERI:

It's about 300 feet long. There is a beach area alongside Honeysuckle Pond which used to be wetlands. Over the years kids, residents have used that for a fishing area and have trampled down the wetlands and created a beach front. We're going to reestablish the wetlands in that area. However, even reestablishing the wetlands it will get trampled over again because it's a fishing pond. So we're going to extend the existing boardwalks through the park for about 300 feet, create a couple of fishing piers so the mitigation area can remain, you know, wetlands and now we'll have some new fishing piers for any residents of the park to use or residents in the area, the inhabitants of the park. It will be handicapped accessible like most of the other boardwalks.

LEG. HAHN:

And what methodology are you using to recreate the wetlands?

MR. OGGERI:

It's some specific plants that both the Army Corps and the DEC have required that are noninvasive species and so forth. I couldn't tell you the whole list, but it's within the report that's attached. I'll circulate this, consisting of annual ryegrass, fox edge, giant bur reed. There's a number of species here, probably about 20 of them, a lot of names that I can't really pronounce. But, you know, I'll distribute this. Again, it's all part of the DEC and the Army Corps requirements.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. And we have an invasive species list. I'm sure it would check against our list, correct?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah. The Long Island Rail Road has been working very closely with Nick Gibbons on our

Environmental staff, so.

LEG. HAHN:

Right, and he's very familiar with our -- he's part of that invasive species --

MR. OGGERI:

In fact, part of the mitigation is to remove some of the invasive species in the area and replant.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Excellent. Thank you very much. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anybody else?

MR. BROWN:

Mr. Chair, I'm not sure, does anybody want to see a copy of anything in writing with respect to the actual plantings or any of the mitigation measures? I know that Legislator Cilmi did make a request, but not really sure if you'd like anything.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I would personally just like the Commissioner to review them, so if the Commissioner has had that opportunity I'm confident in his determination.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Absolutely. We have had the opportunity to review.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And you're comfortable with the plan?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Very comfortable.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The walkway, it's ADA?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The walkway is ADA compliant. It's going to tie in with the current existing ADA compliant trail that we have through Lakeland County Park.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The materials, recycled lumber, no toxins leaching into the ground, all of that?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yes, I assume so. Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Anybody else? Is there anybody else who needs to see the plans? Legislator Hahn, into the microphone, if you would.

LEG. HAHN:

Is there more than what was just handed out?

MR. BROWN:

Mostly everything should be attached to the resolution as an exhibit, including the DEC permit and the Army Corps of Engineer permit. The Army Corps of Engineer permit contains much more detail about the mitigation measures, but there was also a technical report which was just read to you by the representative from the Rail Road. Those types of items are attached to the EAF that will be reviewed by the CEQ on Monday.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. If everybody is satisfied I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1174 is approved. Thank you, Dennis. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Lindsay; Presiding Officer Gregory is included in the vote).**

MR. BROWN:

Thank you very much. And I would just like to extend thanks to the staff at Planning, Andy Freleng and John Corral, and the Law Department, Marisa Schifano and Jenny Kohn, on their work, because a lot of work was set aside to do this. It's only an eight month agreement and the contractor's ready to go to work April first. So thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good work. Thank you. All right. **IR 1183-15 - Authorizing use of Southaven County Park for the Kara's Hope 5K Run/Walk (Browning).** Motion by Legislator Hahn, a second by Legislator Cilmi. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? That is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Lindsay; Presiding Officer Gregory is included in the vote).**

IR 1185-15 - Designating a "Discover Suffolk County Parks Day" on June 20, 2015 (Schneiderman). I'll make the motion. Seconded by Presiding Officer Gregory.

LEG. CILMI:

Why are we doing this again?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

On the motion. I had a why, but let me just -- Commissioner, first to you. This would be the third year in a row where we're trying this. What it does is basically it slashes the prices of admission to our parks by 50%, roughly 50%, and it hopefully entices people who don't normally come to the parks to discover our parks and hopefully they'll come back as full paying park visitors. So we have some data now on this from the last year and the year before, and my understanding is basically it's cost neutral. We're seeing twice as many people at half the price. We're not losing money, we're not making money, but we are getting some new visitors.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's what the data would suggest, we're getting twice as many nonresidents.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think we can do, I don't know if I want to say a better job promoting it, but I think the more we get this out, and one of the things this bill does is task your department with sending out press releases. I have spoken with my staff. We are also going to send out press releases as well on this to try to get as much notification to the public. Maybe the Administration, if you're listening, can also help with this, because I think it works well when people know about it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

And we worked closely with the Communications Division of the County Executive's Office last year to get the word out, so.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Legislator Cilmi, you had a question?

LEG. CILMI:

So you said that's what the data would suggest.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's what the data states. I mean, it's kind of difficult to pick one day out of the year. Just so you know how we did this, we looked at the last Saturday -- the next to last Saturday in June for the three years prior, and we took the data from last year, and what the data from last year shows that the number of residents was greatly reduced, but the number of nonresidents kind of stayed the same. So it wasn't -- it wasn't a nicer day. So it would indicate that the number of nonresidents should have been reduced in half and it was and so we're still seeing about 1200, 1300 nonresidents for that day. That's the way I interpret it.

LEG. CILMI:

And that's throughout our parks system.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, that's in the parks that we had in this program. I think we only did for the beaches last year, so.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. So the number of residents utilizing the park on that day was cut in half?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's correct.

LEG. CILMI:

So once people already knew about our parks they decided not to go? What does that tell us? What does that data show?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It wasn't a nice day that day. Again, it's very difficult to pick a day out of the year and figure out what happened. You know, was it cloudy that day, did it rain that day. I mean, this is something you got to look at over a long period of time.

LEG. CILMI:

Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Pulling one day out, it really is difficult.

LEG. CILMI:

But we do keep track of residents and nonresident visits.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We do, and we can take that cumulatively over a year, but to pick a day, you know, to pick a day it's very difficult to do. We have the data for that day, but I mean, I don't know if it really tells you -- gives you as much information as you'd like to have on it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You know, if I may. You know, doing this one more time may actually help establish a baseline to

see if it's working or not. This kind of thing maybe takes a certain repetition for people to get used to that once a year there is this half price day. I mean, I know when we did the analysis on cutting the fees for veterans on golf courses in half, that was probably a surprise, remember, because you came back with the report that we'd actually make more money charging less because more people would use it. More people would use it more than twice and we'd actually yield a greater -- I don't know if that proved to be true or not, but that was the analysis.

MR. LIPP:

We didn't look to see if that was proven out. That was basically we look at national studies about the price elasticity of demand and we came up with that conclusion. What this does is we're just looking at the actual park data and what happened is if you look at the past three years what the average was compared to what happened actually last year, there was big decrease last year, probably because of the weather, but who knows, and in residential uses of the park whereas there was either a much smaller decrease or an increase in nonresidential users, so you assume that the difference is clearly related to the discounted price, then you wind up with a perhaps slight increase if not push in terms of the revenue impact.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I want you to understand, too, that I wasn't per se attached to do this again. I went to the Commissioner because I know it's work, you know, we have to get all these, you know, the employees need to know this is going on, we have to get the word out. So I didn't want to put this bill in unless I had some reasonable data suggesting it's going in the right direction. It appears that it is, so if it's a failure I'd be the first to admit it, but it looks right now like it may be working, and the hope is that these new people are going to come back. We have no evidence of that but hopefully they'll come back on other days when it's full price or they'll get their green passes and then they can continue to get that discounted rate.

Okay. So there's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present: Legislator Lindsay; Presiding Officer Gregory is included in the vote).**

Again, thank you, Commissioner, for working with us on this. That gets us to the end of the agenda. Legislator Hahn has one other matter she wants to address so I'll turn it over to her.

LEG. HAHN:

Commissioner, I don't know so much if this is to you or if this is to IT, but as I was trying to pull up a map of Lakeland County Park I got to our Parks Department website and there are no maps. I just think it would be very useful to have a map -- you know, we have a parks link that lists parks, it doesn't list all of our parks. I don't know how you select which ones get listed there. There are many that are missing. But I just think it would be really important and valuable to have maps of each park and of course things like trails, you know, if they're there. It would have been nice to be able to pull up a map of Lakeland County Park as we were discussing this, and I'm surprised to find out we don't have visuals of our County parks and details about them like a map.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I would tend to agree with you.

LEG. HAHN:

I hesitate directing you guys to do anything, but maybe IT, you know, if we can write a letter to the IT Department, you know, requesting that they work on this. You know, folks want to come and utilize our parks and we can't even offer them a map.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

An interactive web -- a more interactive website certainly would be helpful and we could certainly work towards that. It's budget driven and as you know, we do have maps of our campsites and whatnot on the reservation system, but I agree with you.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you. I just want to make sure it was on your radar and any way I can help I would be happy to.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. I'm all done, Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anyone else? All right. Seeing no other business, we are adjourned. Thank you.

(The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.)