

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 November 18, 2015 at 2:30 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:

George Nolan - Counsel to the Suffolk County Legislature
Jason Richberg - Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature
Greg Dawson - Commissioner/Suffolk County Parks
Gil Anderson - Commissioner/Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Laura Halloran - Budget Review Office
Alyssa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn
Bill Shilling - Aide to Legislator Calarco
Katie Horst - County Executive's Office
Lance Reinheimer - Director/Vanderbilt Museum
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Gabrielle Severs - Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:

Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide

*(*The meeting was called to order at 2:37 p.m. *)*

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good afternoon, everybody. I'd like to call this meeting of the Parks and Recreation Committee to order. All please rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Cilmi.

*(*Salutation*)*

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Please be seated. Okay, we'll start with Public Portion. Are there any cards? Yes, there are. All right. Lance Reinheimer.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

Lance, you know the routine.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Okay. And you haven't seen much of me this year; I saved the best for the end of the year. I have three resolutions that are laid on the table. This is the whole Capital Program for 2015 for the Vanderbilt Museum. This is -- we had no -- no programs or projects prior to this point. This is the whole enchilada. It's 300 -- it's \$485,000 for three separate projects. The first one is \$50,000 for wiring of historic buildings. Obviously, you know, these buildings are 100 years old, wiring is a problem and we've upgraded the wiring, we've done a lot. This really is the last piece of wiring. We're looking to do the glass floor in the Habitat room, which is backlit with lights and that's all -- that has not been upgraded. Not asking for any additional funds in future years for electrical use or electrical upgrades. This would be it.

The second one is ongoing waterproofing. Water intrusion is our biggest enemy. It does tremendous damage when left unrepaired and this is just ongoing projects for the mansion and for whatever buildings need waterproofing, which includes the Marine Museum, the mansion, which is the Habitat, the Memorial Wing and all the parts of the mansion.

The third resolution is planning funds for restoration of the seawall, \$35,000. This would be for preliminary surveying that's required for permits for the Department of Environmental Conservation and to get the permits to work on the waterfront. So this is preliminary planning and surveying that would be required.

Those are the three projects. I also left for you, this is a brochure that we did this year for our education programs. We've seen a big response. We've had a good fall so far with students coming to the museum on a daily basis with their schools, and I just wanted to give you this brochure. It's a little bit different than what we've done in the past and it's something that we're real proud of. I'll be happy to answer any questions if you have any.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

I do, but let me see if any of my colleagues have any first. All right. I, you know, I've raised questions about capital projects at Vanderbilt before. I understand it's a County facility, I know it costs money to maintain. I know in the past, you know, traditionally the capital stuff is -- we pay for and the operational stuff we don't, but we also give you quite a bit of money for operational expenses --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

-- through the hotel tax, approximately a million dollars. You know, I just want to talk about the seawall. I've already talked at length about some of these others in the past, you know, the waterproofing. Just on the seawall, because we have another bill that relates -- can you turn the timer off -- we have another bill that relates to seawalls. You know, seawalls are controversial, just ask the folks in Montauk. It's been on the news a lot. You know, this doesn't seem like, you know, I've been there, it's not a highly erosive area, I know there's some tide there. But yeah, I know it may be a historic seawall, but we've also learned that, you know, seawalls in general can tend to accelerate erosion, they remove shoreline habitat, which is important for filtering sediments and pollutants. You know, loss of habitat. You know, there's been a real move to restore shorelines to natural condition. This is crumbling, the seawall, and I don't see that without the seawall there's any threat to any buildings or, you know, any use of this park.

You know, I know in a bill that will come up later out by our golf course in Riverhead, you know, the County's looking to do some shore stabilization but try to move away from shore hardening and use alternative methods, which we'll hear more about later, but if there -- and I know this is only 35,000. That to me indicates that there's a capital project that's going to be in the neighborhood of 350,000 that's going to follow it and, you know, maybe speak to like how historic is this seawall and how important is it and why -- I wouldn't feel much better about spending the money to study alternatives, including the possible archiving of it, you know, photographing it and then do an environmentally responsible shoreline restoration project there. And, you know, that's going to cost some money too, but maybe enlist the help of groups like the Nature Conservancy or Office of Ecology. And, you know, and that could be part, you know, this is a museum that has a huge focus on biology, you know, there's a huge collection. Here you could have a living area that kids could learn about our natural environment. Instead we're just, you know, kind of maintaining a hardened shoreline. It doesn't make any sense, but I'll let you speak.

MR. REINHEIMER:

You asked a lot of questions in that question, so I'll try to address them the best that I can. And I'm certainly not an expert in shoreline and after reading about Montauk, I know the controversy out there, and we've done other things in the County with jetties and things that, you know, alter the shoreline and has long-term problems.

The one question I can answer is how historic is the seawall. This seawall was built in the 30's in lockstep with the boathouse. So it's been there since the 30's. It's granite block, it is collapsing. Your statement about that there's no building in danger is, the best I could say not being an engineer, is probably correct. It does -- behind the seawall is a -- along the whole seawall is a large sloping hill that does go up to where the museum proper is, for lack of a better term, so there is, I assume, some pressure and there is some slope that's being held up by that seawall. I'm not an engineer so I can't say, but there's no eminent danger to any of our buildings because of this.

I think your suggestion of looking at alternatives and possibly what we can do has merit also. You know, that would be, I guess, a capital program or capital study, and I'm all for what is the best alternative for the museum, what's the best alternative for the shoreline, what's the best alternative for Northport Harbor and Bay, and so those are good points.

So, you know, I don't know what else I can say. This is for restoration of the seawall.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

You know --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Perhaps part of that can be -- we can direct Public Works, who's going to be letting the contract, when they retain the consultant to have the consultant look at the condition of the wall, survey the area and come up with alternatives. I'm fine for that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

I'd have to check to see if the way this is written would even allow that, you know. But I was going to say, in terms of stabilizing a shoreline, we have a lot of experience. I mean, even out at the lighthouse, you know, years -- I think her name was Georgina Reid.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I'm aware of what she did out there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

You know, and, you know, they built these terraces and they used vegetation, you know, to dewater the area and form these root systems that would hold everything in place, and they're still out there and it worked.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I would --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

In a case like that, this might work -- that kind of approach might work really well, but I would like to hear from, since we have so many good environmental people in the County, to get that kind of input, to make sure before we go out and spend 35,000 in planning and another 350,000 on construction --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

-- that we're doing the right thing.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, and I would say from looking how things are written restoration -- planning for the restoration of the seawall, I would think that that possibly under the scope of that would be to look at the restoration and what does that involve and what could be alternatives. But I asked the Commissioner if he would speak to that because obviously it's his department that would be doing that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Appreciate it. Gil, I know you're familiar with these issues. It's not the first time we've discussed it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. Certainly, you know, in doing the study we would look at the alternatives and if that -- what you're requesting is something that would be looked at or desired, we would look to see whether the regulatory agencies would let that. They're really, you know, to a certain extent they're driving the bus here only because we have to get their permits to do any work along the shoreline. I don't think anybody has any necessary desire to rebuild a seawall there, but a seawall was what was there and that's what we, as a department, what we looked at. We could look at alternative shorelines, things like that, as part of the study.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, I guess it depends on how the bill's written because, you know, the title of it clearly is to reconstruct the seawall.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, and that's the way -- that's the title under the Capital Program. So in the Capital Program that's what the title is. It certainly, when we do the study, you know, that may be the initial intent, but at the end -- the end product could be something totally different. So to change the title just to facilitate a seawall or a living shoreline or anything else I don't -- I think you're taking semantics a little bit too far. I would say, you know, let us do the project, we'll get the best product at the end of the day, and whether it's a seawall or it's --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You're telling me that 35,000 is going to be to study various alternatives including potential removal of the seawall?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I feel better about it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If that's a Legislative directive, certainly, we can do that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, I, you know -- you know, as much as I'm an environmentalist, I also believe in historic preservation. If somebody convinces me that the historic nature of the seawall outweighs the environmental benefits of removing it, you know, I could support that. I won't be here to make that decision, but if at least you guys with this planning money are going to look at those things, I'll feel a lot more comfortable with it. But I know there's other Legislators who want to -- I think Legislator Lindsay had a question as well, so I'll turn the mike to him.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Good afternoon. I guess my question would be for Gil. Do the adjacent properties have seawalls as well? Because I don't remember seeing that when I went down there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, I don't recall any.

LEG. LINDSAY:

So is the seawall really for functional purposes or was it aesthetic purposes, or do we -- could we even know that at this point?

MR. REINHEIMER:

I would think part of both. Functional, because it does hold up the slope of property behind it. The property to the bay -- to the Sound side, so if you're looking from the museum it's to the left of the museum property, has a large dock, 60, 70 foot dock that goes out. I assume with that dock that there's bulkheading. I've been out there, I just can't say for sure. I don't think there's a lot of natural soft shoreline on that side of the museum.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'm looking at it on Google Earth right now and it doesn't look like, it looks like it's just a gradual

slope and maybe the topography of that property is a little bit different than the museum's. But does the wall, I don't remember from when I was there, does the wall run the entire length of the property?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes, it does. That granite wall runs from that end of the property to the seaplane hangar. From the seaplane hangar towards inland of Northport Harbor is a seawall that was put -- was restored by the County probably 15 to 20 years, that's a plastic wall, it's in excellent condition. I think what they did is they backfilled the original seawall that was there and put in this plastic bulkheading.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

MR. REINHEIMER:

And that's -- it looks brand new today and it's at least 15 years old, probably closer to 20.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Do you know how many feet that we'd be looking to --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Oh, that's a couple of hundred -- 250, 300 feet, that's a significant length and same with the granite wall. The granite, you know, I don't remember the exact length of the shoreline of the museum, but it's -- it's as far as you can see. When you're standing at the boat -- the seaplane hangar and you look towards the inner part of the harbor, the wall, you don't see the end of the wall.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Right now nobody -- the public doesn't go down to that area. Correct?

MR. REINHEIMER:

There really is no access to the beach area through the museum. The only way down is through the boathouse or a gate by the seaplane hangar.

LEG. LINDSAY:

So really what we should be looking at if we're going -- is to replace it for functional reasons, not for cosmetic.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, I -- yeah, there's, you know, obviously if you're looking historic restoration the granite seawall is a nice way to go. Logistically, cost-wise, is that the right way to go? You know, part of the problems with that is it hasn't been repointed, so over time the water gets in there, freezes and busts it apart. The wall that we have by the seaplane hangar is not historic and is not, you know, it's functional. That might be the way to go. That would be all covered in this study.

I'm not advocating one way or another. I'm advocating something has to be done with the -- should be done with the seawall because it is collapsing. Whether we take the route that maybe after the study it'll say just let it collapse, let the granite sit there and it's kind of a soft shoreline, maybe it's better to put in the plastic or maybe it's better to restore it. I'm not advocating one way or the other. This was severely impacted by several storms we've had during the past few years. Sandy did a number to it, Irene did something to it and since then this past year just gravity has done some damage. So it is failing each year. So this is the time to think about what should we do. So I'm not advocating any one way.

You know, I think Commissioner of Public Works said it, it's what the regulatory commissions are going to allow, what they feel is the best and their viewpoint I would think is what's best for the environment and the shoreline.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Not what's best for the museum.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Lance, while I have you up there, I have another question not related to the seawall. But the property across the street we redid the roofing and everything on that?

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, we haven't done any roofing on that.

LEG. LINDSAY:

We haven't done that yet. So the roof is still leaking like it was prior or is it --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes. And there's rot in the eaves and we have some birds in there. Luckily we haven't had any raccoons or anything go in there, but that's a matter of time.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Do we still have a tenant in the house?

MR. REINHEIMER:

No. It's been empty since August 31st of 2014.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And are we not trying to re-rent it because of the leaky roof?

MR. REINHEIMER:

We had electrical and plumbing work done. The infrastructure of the house, when you had a -- if you have a family in there full-time it wouldn't have supported the family. The wiring was not up to code and parts of it was pretty scary, and the plumbing, we had plumbing issues with waste lines cracking and all sorts of plumbing issues. That's all done. So the electric and plumbing is done, but we haven't done anything on roofing.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. Because last time I was there, there was an umbrella over the TV set.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, the TV set is gone. That left with the tenants.

LEG. LINDSAY:

That, you know, the 400,000 in CP 7439, is that to repair the roof?

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, that's for general waterproofing throughout the properties.

LEG. LINDSAY:

We're not even -- we're not even looking to address.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Not even looking to use those funds for the Normandy Manor. That's Marine Museum and the mansion primarily are the two buildings that need continued funds for waterproofing.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. So I had similar questions to Legislator Lindsay about access to the water from the museum. Is there a master plan for the museum property?

MR. REINHEIMER:

There was a master plan for the waterfront, but that's probably 15 years old. They were going -- there was talk of developing the waterfront with interpretive walkways and rest areas that was part of the William and Molly Rogers waterfront. There's no talk of that at this point in time. And, you know, that would be a nice thing to have, but right now we have other things that are more pressing, I think, for the -- the mission and the operations of the museum that would result in improving visitation. So that would be nice, it's a lot of money, but, you know, my concern is the historic buildings and we're doing a lot of the grounds work ourselves.

We've done a tremendous amount this past year. About two weeks ago I had a tree crew in there for a week to trim trees and to take dead ones down, and especially where the public walks for safety issues and we have a lot of wind there. There's a lot of dead branches where people walk down towards the planetarium. So we're cutting back brush, we're reclaiming areas that were all overgrown and improving the views. So we're doing a lot with the property and part of it will -- there are some walkways we can put in without using capital funds. So we're kind of doing that without having a full-blown development of the waterfront, but there is really no access to the beach.

LEG. HAHN:

Right, but so my point of asking the question is, and I tend to agree with what I believe must be the -- the waterfront plan, that increased access to the water would increase visitation to the museum. That's why people love being here, coming here, visiting spots that we have along our waterways, our waterfronts, beautiful views there of the harbor. I'm not saying it's something we have to do now. Clearly we're struggling to -- to replace things and save things that are failing. But the point of the question was is that seawall critical to the master plan being achieved whenever -- whenever we can achieve. You know, if we have a vision, and I think we should have a vision for the waterfront that will improve access of visitors to the water, that will improve and increase visitation to the museum itself, we may not, you know, have a -- a financial vision at the moment to get it done, but I don't think we should do anything that would make it harder for us in the long run to implement that vision.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, I think you're right, that if you were to develop the waterfront in the future you need some kind of shoreline stabilization. What that is I think this study could determine whether it's soft or whether it's replace it with the same type of bulkheading that we have by the seaplane hangar or we restore the granite. You know, if, you know, if I had a menu of options and cost was no issue,

which, of course, cost is an issue for government, and it should be, the granite's historic, it's -- you know, it just fits better but, you know, I also believe in being realistic in what we need to preserve the property with the available resources we have and what's the most efficient and economical way to go is what we have to choose with government. You know, we don't have unlimited funds, so.

But the heart of your question's correct, you know, we should also have an eye towards the future and make decisions that are important for future generations so that they have options. And I can get in a whole discussion about the seaplane hangar with that, but I don't want to do that.

LEG. HAHN:

No, no, and I agree, I think it's a shame to let the seaplane hangar --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, we want to do something that preserves and protects the property so that future generations have the option of expanding or doing something with the waterfront.

LEG. HAHN:

And there's a master plan for the waterfront, you know, it's something that --

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, we have plans. We have, you know, that's all been done. It probably should be updated, but we do have that.

LEG. HAHN:

Right. And I just think it would enhance visitation. It would, you know, I'm not suggesting it gets done this year, but, you know, I -- I do think we need to consider that as we move forward on the seawall.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anyone else before Lance gets to sit down? All right, have a seat.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

All right. Any other members of the public who wish to be heard? All right, seeing none, and no presentations, Commissioner, do you want to -- I know we have more than one commissioner -- but our Parks Commissioner, if you'll step forward.

All right. Starting with Tabled Resolutions.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 1767 - Improving wastewater treatment at County Parks. (Krupski) Is there a motion?

LEG. CILMI:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

All right, motion to approve, Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. HAHN:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

Second by Legislator McCaffrey. On the motion, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

George, can you explain wastewater treatment at County parks? We want all wastewater to be improved, but can you just explain exactly what this does?

MR. NOLAN:

I should note that the bill was amended earlier today and it directs -- now directs the Department of Parks to install alternative wastewater treatment system at County park facilities where their septic system fails, where there is need for a significant improvement to same, but now it's limited to areas that the County has deemed priority for wastewater upgrades. So that amendment was made, I think, at the Planning Director's request, so I'm assuming the Administration is now supportive of this.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Do we have a map of where the Planning Department deems?

MR. NOLAN:

No, I just got -- no, I didn't get -- I do not have a map. I just got new language to put into that resolved clause.

LEG. HAHN:

Is there a -- okay, who would know this? Maybe Gil? Is there a map that exists right now about priority areas for wastewater?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe there is. The Planning Department has done a lot of mapping, you know, similar to this, whether it's through the Water Comprehensive Plan or in the County Executive's initiative for, you know --

LEG. HAHN:

So do we know how many of the Park's septic systems lie in that priority zone?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No. To answer that question today, no, but we do have a list of all of the septic systems within County parks and we can overlay it on, you know --

LEG. HAHN:

Yeah, if you could have that for the General Meeting, if we get it out of -- if you can have that number for us, what we're talking about. I think there's, you know, some concern. We don't want -- some of us don't want just there to be a blanket use of the septic funding stream to replace failing septic systems when there may be higher priority areas that can utilize them, but I just want to under -- I want to make sure, you know, I have some sort of sense of numbers that we're talking about in the parks and where. And are there different zones of priority, you know, like a highest priority and a, you know, seeing that, having that map and having those numbers would be valuable at the General Meeting.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We can certainly sit down with Director Lansdale.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I have the same concern, Gil maybe. So I know we have a fund for alternative wastewater. I think it's like \$2 million a year but then it rolls back unfortunately into the -- we should probably fix that, into the General Sewer Fund. And the concern is that rather than using regular capital borrowing whenever a County park needs a new sanitary system that will go to this fund, the way we've gone to the 477 Fund, which was intended for water quality to fund positions that we were already were funding. Suddenly there'll be no money left for advanced wastewater because it'll all go to repair sanitary systems that we would have been already repairing and aren't necessarily in an area where we couldn't have done conventional systems. You know, obviously we want to do advanced wastewater in sensitive areas where we're close to groundwater, where we're close to surface waters, and a lot of our County parks are, but some are not. Some are in the middle of woodlands in very deep areas, recharge areas, where conventional systems are fine in terms of, you know, the nitrogen levels for drinking water, but we're more worried about marine environments with these advanced wastewater systems.

So that's basically the concerns and the bill was amended to address that concern. You're comfortable with it the way it is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, we are.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Gil and Greg?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, we all met on it yesterday so we're comfortable with it as written.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

Okay. All right. We had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0)

IR 1793 - Amending the 2015 Capital Program and appropriating funds in connection with Construction of a Sea Wall at Indian Island County Park Bluff (CP 7192). (Co. Exec.) This was just amended too, I believe, today.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah, we just got it. It's -- change in the title to reflect appropriating funds in connection with erosion mitigation at Island -- Indian Island County Park bluff. So I think that was a change that was requested at the last meeting of this committee. It also increases the amount of funding from 100 to \$130,000.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So Greg, I know that Legislator Krupski had had some concerns about this. I had some concerns about this bill and are similar to the Vanderbilt seawall, the concerns about, you know, hardening the shoreline rather than seeking a more natural solution. Is that what we're doing now?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We're not settled on one path or another. Right now the engineer's report gives a -- a menu of options to consider in moving forward. It's a draft report, it's preliminary. Again, we have to go to the DEC and maybe even the Corp. I don't know whether or not we have to get it to them. But this is just part of the process. We have some alternatives in what we've looked at, now we go a little bit farther into it. The -- you know, and come up with a preferred alternative, if you will, and then go into a design permitting everything else.

So the additional funds -- pardon me -- that were mentioned were due to meetings that we've had with the DEC on this matter. They're looking for comparisons, tidal wetland, before and after the project, potential adverse impacts of the project, including modeling, design of the level of protection from the project will provide, including modeling, and demonstration that the proposed project will significantly decrease the frequency of current remediation, which is placing fill to restabilize the shoreline. So that's the need or the request for the additional funds.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Where are the funds coming from? Are we taking from another capital?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, we're taking it out of our park reservation system, we're amending that -- that Capital Budget. We have enough money in that -- in that fund right now, and the reservation system's up and running, so.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And if it's not approved by the end of the year then we lose these monies.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yup.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, and this project is critical. We're seeing an awful lot of erosion on that bluff. As you may be aware, there is Native American burial ground on that site that was subject to some erosion some years back. We had to reinter some of the cremains and we have the roadway that runs around to the picnic area back there, so it's critical that we do this. We have a permit from DEC to put 1000 yards of sacrificial sand out there every year, which we do, but we can't continue to -- we can't continue to do that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You know, maybe -- let me just ask George. The changes to the bill, because I just want to make sure if we're going to discharge this. I know that Legislator Krupski had some real concerns, but I don't know that he had -- he knew that the bill was amended either, so if you could just take us through the changes. I just want to make sure they allow us to look at alternatives to shore hardening, you know.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Just so you're aware, the Legislator asked for a copy of that draft report and I forwarded it to him this morning. I know that he got it because I received a confirmation from one of his Aides, so we did send him that draft report on that alternative solution.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I saw him around -- I want to say around 11 o'clock and he asked that it be tabled.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah, this was just amended, we just got this. And that changes are, as I said, instead of talking about the construction of a seawall, the resolution talks about erosion mitigation, engineering for

erosion mitigation, so wherever there was seawall before, now it's erosion mitigation. And the other change I can see is the increased amount of the level of funding from 100 to 130,000.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But erosion mitigation -- changing the construction of a seawall to erosion mitigation does seem to cover the -- my concern that we have other options to look at.

MR. NOLAN:

I think that was the intent of the change.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

And just to be clear, that was the name of the capital project as written in the budget, so that needed to be changed through -- through budget as well. So that's why it was originally titled that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there anyone else who has questions about this? Okay. Do we have a motion yet? I'll make a motion to -- I'll make a motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'll second.

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll second on the discharge without recommendation and we have a motion to table. Do we have a second on the motion to table? No? Okay. So it's just a discharge without recommendation. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, one abstention. **DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION (VOTE: 4-0-1-0 Abstention: Legislator Hahn)** Okay. We are -- it's still Tabled Resolutions.

IR 1822 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Charter Law to increase oversight of park violation determinations. (Hahn) I think we have to table this for public hearing. So motion to table by the sponsor, Legislator Hahn. I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1822 is tabled. **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0)** Moving onto Introductory Resolutions.

Introductory Resolutions

IR 1883 - Appropriating funds in connection with rewiring of historic buildings at Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum (CP 7439). (Pres. Off.) Do I have a motion to approve?

LEG. HAHN:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion by Legislator Hahn, second by Legislator Lindsay. Any discussion? I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1883 is approved. **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1884 - Appropriating funds in connection with waterproofing, roof and drainage at the Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum (CP7439). (Pres. Off) Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0)**

IR 1885 - Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of Vanderbilt seawall (CP 7453). (Pres. Off.) Motion by Legislator Hahn. Is there a second?

LEG. LINDSAY:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Lindsay. We discussed this in the Public Portion. You know, there was some testimony that they would use this capital money to look at alternatives, not just to reconstruct the seawall, but possibly other approaches to stabilizing the shore, if it even needs to be stabilized or possible removal. Is there any discussion on it? All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0)

IR 1922 - To amend the user fee schedule for Suffolk County Parks (Co. Exec.)

Commissioner, sorry, but I need you to take us through the -- the fee changes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Okay. Well, generally it's a fee change to all the fees in Suffolk County Parks. Generally, it's a 10% increase aboard the board. I don't know if you have, I mean, I don't know if you have any questions on individual fees.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Take me through any one that goes up more than 10%.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I don't think any of them go up, maybe it goes up 10.2%. Again, we tried to keep it --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I thought a couple of them were doubling.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No, that's -- no. Some -- let's say boat fees were \$54.00. You know, we weren't going to raise it \$5.40, we raised it \$6.00, so that might be slightly higher than 10%. Some of the other ones might have just gone up a dollar and they should have gone up 1.20.

LEG. HAHN:

It looks like there are two new fees, is that possible? Replacement, limited parking pass, replacement for limited parking pass?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, that's administratively, we were charging that anyway. That's if somebody loses a pass we have -- we do it for the outer beach sticker, but we didn't have one for the annual -- we were actually charging it and we realized that it wasn't in the fee structure so we added it.

LEG. HAHN:

Okay. Fire circle is something looks like it's new?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I see why I thought some were doubling because of the way it's presented. It can be confusing. So one of the numbers is bracted.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Right, one is a deletion and one's an addition.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So the Green Key resident goes from \$24 to \$26.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Rather than a 2.40 increase, it just went up \$2.00. So again --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Daily goes from 11 to 13. All right, well.

LEG. CILMI:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me just quickly, I have all of them in front of me. Let me just see if any one is a bigger increase.

LEG. CILMI:

While you're doing that could I just ask a general question to Budget Review, please?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Sure.

LEG. CILMI:

Could you tell us in total, in the aggregate, what these fee increases are supposed to fetch in terms of increased revenue annually.

MS. HALLORAN:

Well, there was a fee increase implicit in the '16 Adopted Operating Budget, which totalled approximately 857,455.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay. And we don't -- we don't segregate these fees into an account that's specifically allocated towards parks; correct?

MS. HALLORAN:

No, generally not.

LEG. CILMI:

It goes into the General Fund.

MS. HALLORAN:

It goes into the General Fund, yeah.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm looking at one that seems to be going up quite a bit, the nine hole weekday annual pass for senior citizen veterans, going from 400 to 480?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, I can tell you probably how many of those we sold last year. It's probably negligible.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, if it's limited to adults who served in World War II, it's a small crowd at this point.

Okay. Commissioner, can I can ask you what were the comments of the Park Trustees on these fee increases?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The Park Trustees are meeting tomorrow on this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You know, there used to be a -- a procedure where we couldn't even raise the fees without going to -- without an approval, explicit approval by the Park Trustees, and now we're going -- we're ready to vote on raising the fares and they haven't even had a chance to comment on them? That seems quite premature to me.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, this meeting --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's a big departure, I mean, we put these people in place, I know we passed the budget that have these, you know, the revenues from these fares, but I think it's to me an insult to the Trustees if we vote on this without having gotten their input. I mean, maybe we could discharge without recommendation, but I think to approve it without their input I think is a -- sends a very bad message. But Legislator Lindsay had a question.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Commissioner, my question was on the consolidation of the fees. I know we had talked in the past about how it's so confusing from one fee structure. Did we do that at the same time? Did we consolidate some of these?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We did not consolidate, that's going to be a longer term process.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

They all need to be evaluated and looked at. And to go back to your other question, we sold two of those -- two of those permits, those \$400 permits last year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm also being told, too, that we originally had this meeting scheduled for after the Trustees --

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That was going to be my next point.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

-- and we moved it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We moved the meeting from Friday to Wednesday, so I thought we'd have time to --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.

Go there first.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

-- take it in. But -- and again, they only are recommending.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They're advisory, I understand that, but it's insulting to me to -- we could discharge it without recommendation perhaps, yeah.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

And I will make that point at tomorrow's meeting, that they were supposed to get it prior to the committee meeting, but the committee meeting was moved up at the last minute.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Anyone else? All right. Do we have any motions so far?

MR. RICHBERG:

No motions.

LEG. HAHN:

Discharge without recommendation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Legislator Hahn is making a motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator McCaffrey.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

It was your idea.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, honestly I don't -- honestly I don't like raising the fares at the parks, I prefer not to be raising them period.

LEG. McCAFFREY:

So would I. Jay, that's not the world we're in.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. I'll support the discharge without recommendation. I'm not sure I'm going to support the fare increases, though, at the floor. Fee increases, fare increases, same thing. All right. So all in favor of discharging without recommendation? Any opposed? Abstentions? Okay.

DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION (VOTE: 5-0)

Commissioner -- any other business for the Commissioner? One thing, Commissioner, and this is really more a Vector Control issue, but at the last Tick Advisory Committee I had asked that they develop a plan for putting 4-Posters in some of our County parks and how much that would cost. Are you aware of that? I'm not sure if Nick was at that committee meeting. I don't think he was at the last one, but, are you aware of that? They were going to come back to me within two weeks

with a plan. I don't know that they have at this point done that. But the 4-Poster system is a way of putting an insecticide directly on deer that kills ticks and has shown to dramatically reduce the incidence of Lyme Disease. We have a lot of park users and it seems like we have a couple of parks that we have fairly controlled populations of deer where this could really make a difference for our park users. I was trying to get a cost, I don't know if the County has some money to do this, but perhaps we can make a pitch to New York State to provide some assistance. Do you know, Greg, Commissioner Dawson?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think they wanted to give this a little bit of additional study. There are issues with, you know, applying pesticide applications without going through the CAC. Also, we had some concerns about the locations like -- a place like Cedar Point, where these 4-Posters are encouraging deer to come on to our property because we're feeding them, so we're not so sure that's a great idea. Cedar Point is surround by, you know, thousands of acres of parkland -- of woodland that's not particularly ours, so we're concerned about drawing --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's areas using these 4-Posters and they're growing, you know, a lot of the environmental impacts have been fully studied. They're approved now by the DEC for this use, so it sounds like you're creating concerns that have already been addressed. All I was looking for was a plan in terms of how much it would cost. We know that one 4-Poster basically takes around -- it's about \$5,000 to maintain it to, you know, equipment, feed and labor. We know one per 40 acre is what's needed. It shouldn't be that hard to develop a cost estimate for doing it.

I get frustrated because I feel like we have not done enough to reduce tick borne illnesses, and it's just not Lymes Disease, Ehrlichiosis. There's all these new tick borne illnesses that are emerging. It's hard to find anyone on the East End who hasn't been affected either personally or somebody they know closely, a family member. I always hear like just another few weeks or we want to study it more, here are some of the problems. We know on Shelter Island they're doing this and they're, you know, they've seen really dramatic decreases in ticks containing the spirochete that, you know, the Lymes Disease virus. So what are we doing? It's not unreasonable to come back in two weeks with a plan. That's all I ask for, and now -- Jason, how long has it been since that request was out? About three or four weeks ago? Oh, four weeks ago? Come on. All right. Anyone else?

I know it wasn't -- you weren't tasked with it, Vector Control was, but, you know, we have a real problem. It's an epidemic out there and the County Parks are a perfect setting to do it, I believe a perfect setting to do this. Without that specific number I can't make a request to our State delegation for funding.

So anyway, anyone else? All right. Thank you, Commissioner. We are adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 3:24 p.m. *)