

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A special joint meeting of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee and the Parks & Recreation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on May 15, 2013 to discuss the Capital Budget.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Kara Hahn, Chair of Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee/member of Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. DuWayne Gregory, Vice Chair of Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee
Leg. Sarah S. Anker, member of Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee
Leg. Al Krupski, member of Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee
Leg. Lynne C. Nowick, Chair of Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. Lou D'Amaro, Vice Chair of Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. Wayne R. Horsley, member of Parks & Recreation Committee
Leg. Steven H. Stern, member of Parks & Recreation Committee

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Presiding Officer William J. Lindsay
Terrence G. Pearsall, Chief of Staff/SC Legislature
Robert Lipp, Director/Budget Review Office
Leg. Robert Calarco, 7th Legislative District
Lance Reinheimer, Director/Vanderbilt Museum

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:08 PM

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Okay. Can we all stand for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator D'Amaro.

SALUTATION

Thank you. Okay. We're here for the joint Capital Budget Committee hearing for EPA and Parks Committees. Is Lynne here? Terry, can you get Lynne? Just make sure Lynne's coming in.

Okay, do we have any cards? We don't have any cards. Okay. Is there anyone here from the public? Lance.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I didn't fill out a card.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

You did? Oh, come on forward.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Just come up and speak?

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Yes, please. You can do it and then fill out the card because I'm pretty sure we have your information. (Laughter)

MR. REINHEIMER:

Thank you very much for seeing me without a card. I'm Lance Reinheimer. I'm the Director of the Vanderbilt Museum and Planetarium. And I'm here to speak about the Capital Program. And I've done a lot of thinking during the past couple of days after I read the BRO report and saw the mountain of debt on the cover. I think I'm one of the few people in the world that understands that mountain. And that's a real, you know, that's a real concern. You know, due to borrowings and everything, this -- you know, whatever we do today in the Capital Program certainly hits the Operating Budget.

And Suffolk County, like many municipalities, is dealing with some real budget problems. So it's a delicate balance between what we need to do today to take care of our assets; what we have to do with the budget in order to go forward; and then what's the implication down the road in terms of costs.

The Museum put together a very realistic request for 2014, \$1.4 million. There's millions that we could do on our wish list, but this is more of what we think is important to do today. And then out of this 1.4, what can we defer? So I understand the position you're in. The recommended budget included \$100,000 for the museum in 2014. This is 43-acre estate with hundred-year-old buildings. It's hard to keep our own homes in good repair with little funds. So with all that being said, I just, you know I understand your position, but I am here to advocate for the museum for history and for preserving what we have on Long Island.

So I just have a couple of projects I want to go over. One of them is the restoration the seaplane hangar. That building is failing, does need work, but the permits that we need in order to go forward have expired. And I'm requesting and would like to see if you find it to -- in your hearts to restore the \$100,000 that was requested for 2014 for permitting. We can't do any work down there unless we have the environmental permits. According to Public Works, they don't have the staff to do that themselves. I guess when you're dealing with water front and environment in this situation, it's a long process and that would have to be contracted out.

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

The second project is the septic system for the Planetarium. And I've done a lot of -- I looked at the septic system the other day. That's one of the glamor parts of this job, pulling up the manhole cover and sticking my head down there. And I was surprised what I saw. I didn't see as much as I expected. And thinking about this system, it's been open for a month, we've had some heavy rains. And it wasn't as full as I thought.

So what's the downside? The downside is we have to keep our eyes on that. We pump it out on a regular basis and just keep monitoring it. We have \$75,000 in this year's budget for planning. I'd like to appropriate that to look at the septic system. As far as I know it's the original septic system or it's in the original position. The rings and the catchment basins -- base -- basins are -- seem to be in good shaped except for one has some problems. But I think if we appropriate the funds and see what we need to do, I don't think -- or I'm hoping it doesn't need to be totally reconstructed.

So I would, you know, the 600 -- the recommended budget discontinued this project. It's in the Planetarium. We can either see what the assessment is by appropriating the 75,000 and not include any additional funding in subsequent years; or, if you want to show possibility of repairs, you could put some funds in there. But I think right now as long as we appropriate the money for that project, that's 7437, the \$75,000 for planning, we'll assess and see what we need next year and go forward next year. And I hope it's not as great as I thought.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

We have questions. Legislator -- oh, are you -- I'm sorry.

MR. REINHEIMER:

So the last project that I'd like to talk about is 7439. And that's the project that the County Executive did include \$100,000 in 2014, but that's -- and that's for roofing and waterproofing the mansion and the other historic buildings. The Museum had requested \$700,000 in 2014. We have funds appropriated this year, \$100,000 which Public Works is using to do some immediate work that needs to be done and also to assess what is needed in the future. The 700,000 probably is not enough to do everything we'd like to do, but the best way to proceed with this in order to work quickly is time and materials. So this helps us fund what needs to be done immediately for waterproofing in 2014 without it having being a big full-blown project that could take a lot more funds.

So with all that being said, let me just summarize for you: The recommended budget includes \$100,000 for the waterproofing in 7439. I'm requesting \$100,000 in 7428 for the seaplane hangar for permitting. So that when we have the permits, we can start to secure that building before it falls down. Improvements to the planetarium, I think, we can just leave that the way it is. So it comes down to really we requested \$1.4 million in 2014. It's critical the waterproofing. If you find a place in the budget to include \$700,000 in 7439 for the waterproofing, which is a \$600,000 increase, that would get us through next year.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Thank. And we have questions from Legislator Krupski.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I'll answer any questions you have.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You have -- you know, it's a wonderful facility there. And it is a real asset; however, I do have a few questions. What's the condition of the seaplane?

MR. REINHEIMER:

The seaplane hangar --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No. The seaplane.

MR. REINHEIMER:

The seaplane? We have no seaplane.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

All right. I guess that answers my question.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Okay.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So why do you have a seaplane hangar?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, originally the estate -- the seaplane hangar was there when Kay Vanderbilt owned the seaplane. He purchased one and had it on his yacht and did keep it in that seaplane hangar. That's one of -- I'm told -- last privately owned seaplane hangars in the country. It's a very -- in my opinion -- it's a square box, but it's historic. It is part of the original state. It is failing. The building -- even a layman like myself can see that the front wall is collapsing, the steel girder that goes along the front in that corner is falling.

So we have a choice. We can think about preserving that building for future generations. For what? I don't know. At this point there are no plans for that building. There's been talk in the past, but that's, you know, that puts pressure on the budget. Advocating for history and the Museum, if we let that building fail, there's cost in carting away the debris. And then the building is gone for future generations. My concern is that decisions we make today, by not doing anything, leaves future generators without the choice to do something with that building.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

We are -- and as you see, we did get this book that was very well -- well written about the Capital Budget. And you're right about preserving history. However, you know, really we do have to make a lot of difficult choices. The County has a tremendous amount of infrastructure that it has to maintain, that it's struggling to maintain, as you documented here. This is just -- this is just one corner of the County that's struggling to maintain the County resources. So, I don't know if you're going to be surprised that there's not a great deal of support to restore the seaplane hangar.

MR. REINHEIMER:

That would not surprise me.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

And who is going to -- who would you pay \$75,000 to evaluate a septic system?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Okay. Our projects -- these are all County-owned buildings. So all our projects are supervised by -- and the contractors are let by Public Works. So Public Works, you know, I'm acting -- this is -- when I mapped out the Capital Program, that was after discussions with Public Works. So when I say "we," I'm talking County. And when I'm saying "County," it's the Department of Public Works.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Legislator Anker.

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

LEG. ANKER:

I wanted to mention, you know, being a past board member of the Vanderbilt, you know, we -- when I was on the board, the Vanderbilt's doors were ready to close. That's it. We were ready to mothball it. And I think it was going to be \$700,000 a year just to keep it, you know, keep the things in storage, the valuables, because there's a lot of valuable property there. But I stopped by yesterday on my way back from Nassau County. And Lance gave me a tour of the new Planetarium; first time I had seen it. And I was -- I was in awe. It was great. I mean, new carpet, new seating, new projector and new revenue. And I think that's going to be the best part of having the Vanderbilt continue its legacy; and not only historical education, but also bring revenue and being self-sustainable.

So you're on the road. I am so happy to hear the corpus is no longer at risk. I think that was 8.2 million.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Correct.

LEG. ANKER:

You are now -- we're now up to 10?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Over ten. Last I heard was 10.3. Budget Review probably has more recent figures on that.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. And, again, having your expertise, you know, being part of the Vanderbilt's financial undertaking, I think, is very important. Because I know you are conservative. You -- but you're also -- are understanding of what it takes to maintain this type of property. And like you had said, it's a very old piece of property. And I think one of the main issues we need to be concerned about is the water damage. And you showed some slides of some of the areas where there is water damage in -- on some of the properties. How much do you think that would cost at the minimum to keep from creating more damage to those structures?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, that's the several million dollar question. What we're doing this year is we appropriated \$100,000. Public Works is assessing the building, again, through time and material and to address some critical needs as money allows. The money was appropriated for construction. 700,000 is probably a low number, but I think it's a number that will help us address some of the immediate concerns where we do have walls in the mansion crumbling.

You know, I emphasize the mansion because that's where we have tours and that's what people think of when they think of the Vanderbilt Museum. We have the powerhouse, which is the administrative offices. And it's called the powerhouse, not because we have a lot of power, but that was the original generator for the estate. And we're in less than glamorous rooms. That roof leaks also. And that building is probably, you know, 80 to 90-years-old also. Even our maintenance sheds that have thick, slate roofs, the slate on those roofs is probably almost three quarters of an inch thick. Those roofs are leaking. But it's critical that we concentrate on the mansion.

Again, the way we're looking at this, Public Works being aware of budget problems, too, is not to look at it and say "well, you need \$5 million to fix the whole mansion." It's better to look at time and materials, appropriate 700,000. They have -- the roofers that they have that did the Planetarium and the stall wing and the Hall of Fishes this year did a phenomenal job. I assume that they would continue with that contractor. They basically will say time and materials, they'll do what they can as far as that money takes them; sort of the way the rest of us maintain our houses, you do what you can and you make choices, what is critical to fix today and, you know, what can we get by with.

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

LEG. ANKER:

There was a recent article in -- I think it was Newsday about the State putting money -- you know, millions of dollars towards historical structures and parks. Are you looking into that?

MR. REINHEIMER:

If you're referring to today's Newsday, yes, we worked -- Gold Coast Mansions, Nancy {Miliias} from Oheka Castle, I'm part of -- the Museum is part of that consortium of Gold Coast Mansions. I went to one of their meetings, one of their planning meetings. That's for marketing and promoting historic sites throughout Nassau/Suffolk. That's a million dollar grant for all of New York State. New York State was carved up into ten regions, Nassau/Suffolk County being one region, mean \$100,000. That's for promoting. So that has nothing to do with actual physical fixing of historic sites and buildings.

LEG. ANKER:

All right. I think in the article, it mentioned \$2 billion is what the -- the amount that is brought to -- is it Long Island or New York State? I think that was from Kevin Law from LIA.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, that might be local -- local economy. But, right, they're looking at this as a economic generator to promote the -- aside from beaches, which they, you know, most people come to see, but promoting the other -- you know, heritage and historic sites we have on Long Island for people to come here and visit, which is an economic generator for our economy, which shows up in sales tax.

LEG. ANKER:

Right, right. And this is why I feel it's very important that we, you know, as the Legislature, support the Vanderbilt until you guys get fully on your feet. You're almost there. And I an looking forward to the Vanderbilt being fully sustainable. And, again, you're doing a wonderful job, especially in these economic times.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah. And I would say that we're on our feet, you know, we're holding the budget. We are expanding staff, but we're paying our bills on time. And with the children that are coming for the Planetarium, we have probably on average 150 children a day, usually 200, coming to the Planetarium for school trips. And what we've done in the Planetarium, we've brought -- since the Planetarium opened, revenue has been about \$150,000 from admissions. Our store, which we total renovated on our own, with our operating -- with funds we raised for the Planetarium privately, has brought in \$15,000. The store, it's beautiful. It looks like a little boutique and has something for everybody.

LEG. ANKER:

So basically I just want to make sure I'm on point here, you're day-to-day expenses are being met at this point; it's just this is the capital that you're addressing right now.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Correct. And the capital is, you know, that's a County obligation, County buildings. And I know it hits the County Operating Budget. So I'm fully aware of the, you know, everybody's coming in here saying they need more money. I understand that. And I'm not asking for what I'm wishing for; I'm asking what, I think, we can get by with. And I'd be happy if you can at least find the 700,000 for water intrusion. Because postponing water intrusion today makes it a larger project tomorrow. And that's the balance I spoke about in the beginning. You got some hard problems to deal with right now. So do we postpone \$700,000 and -- we know it's going to go worse. And that's a delicate balance. And that's, of course, what you have to wrestle with.

LEG. ANKER:

Could some of the private funding help fund some of those repairs?

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

MR. REINHEIMER:

The private funding was raised for the Planetarium. And I'm either happy or sad to say that most of that has been spent for the -- like you mention, the chairs, the carpeting, the painting, all those -- our computers and the kiosk that we built. So that's -- my bookkeeper's very -- she's very good at telling me when money's getting short. And she's warning me that funds for those construction -- for the planetarium is pretty much done.

LEG. ANKER:

Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Legislator Horsley.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Thank you, Legislator Hahn. Lance, hey, you know I'm a history guy. And we do have these hard choices to be made and stuff like that. And I have toured the seaplane hangar. To say that -- I question, you know, I look at it as, you know, it is a historic artifact, it is clearly one of the last seaplane hangars about. Was it ever nice? Even -- do you have pictures of it in its initial -- when it was around? Was it -- did it have woodwork or, you know -- because to me it looks like a cement box.

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's what it looks like to me also. But I have seen pictures of it when it was operational. From the sea side, it had large glass doors. It has vestiges of art deco design on the front.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Boy, you really miss that.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah. But on the inside it was -- basically is was a cement warehouse; had an apartment upstairs for the pilot; had a hoist, I guess, for the engine and/or the seaplane. Inside is basically a cement warehouse.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah.

MR. REINHEIMER:

With the outside facing the sea.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And, frankly, that's the way it looks.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Would it make more sense to -- if we're going to save something there that is outside of the main building, and the planetarium, that you go to the boathouse? I mean the sculling boathouse?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, the boathouse --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

That to me seems a much, you know, more historic -- of historic nature.

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

MR. REINHEIMER:

You're correct. And the boathouse, that's a whole 'nother set of problems. The boathouse right now is closed for anybody. Public Works is monitoring the front of it. There's some structural problems that they're monitoring. Years ago the Legislature appropriated funds to shore that building up and make it usable again. Unfortunately, the bonding resolution failed to pass. And, you know, not rehashing history, but it was collateral casualty. It wasn't specific to the Vanderbilt. It was just a time when the Legislature decided they were not passing any capital bonding resolutions. And we never got back to having that reconsidered and passed. So there's some appropriations but no bond to do that.

That building, it's cleaned up, the outside. If you look over the columns, my staff has cut back the vegetation, cleaned it up, planted around it. From the outside, it looks great. That building from a practical perspective to use, it's a strange building. The floor plan, the stairways are substandard.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

I was in it. I remember it.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

But to me it's seems like a more -- if you're looking for restoring historic artifacts, that seems to be a much -- much better bet to me than that hangar. That's a bomb.

MR. REINHEIMER:

You're right. Although it's in disrepair, it's not in any immediate danger of failing.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay.

MR. REINHEIMER:

There is some water intrusion, but nothing crazy. It's okay. We can let that sit. I don't think it's ever a building that you can have the general public go in because --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, I see.

MR. REINHEIMER:

You know.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Because of the floor plan. So that building is okay the way it is right now during these budget times, to just let it sit.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Just as long as -- I just wanted to see if you're thinking about those types of things.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you.

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Any other questions? Okay. Thank you, Lance.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Thank you very much.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Okay. Robert, do you want to -- you were going to do a little overview for us. Thank you.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. So we did this presentation a couple of times to other committees but we're still going to do it in this Committee, too. So this is a brief overview of the Capital Program review; not specific to any particular Capital Project. But one thing that wasn't included in the review that I have listed here were what some overall -- to give you a feel for the overall size of the Capital Program. I'm going to go in reverse order here.

There are about 217 projects that are included in our review. So there's a lot of stuff. It's a thick book, okay. So it's sort of mind-numbing, if you will, but there's a lot of information. There are 170 projects that had funding changes or a reschedule so the majority that was true for. There were 58 different projects that BRO recommended changes for, 29 projects that were the same in the 2013 to '15 adopted program, that was also scheduled the same, as requested and as proposed. There were 20 new projects in the proposed program. There were 18 projects that were not included that were previously. And there were 13 -- I'm sorry -- 13 projects that were discontinued so there's a lot of stuff there. So no wonder why it's a large document.

At the end of the day some of the stuff that we talk about in the review is that we have some large Operating Budget deficit problems. What's exacerbating that is a large increase of over \$30 million in debt service projected for next year, which doesn't necessarily directly relate to the actions that this body has taken in recent years at all, but rather -- other than it relates to the loss of aid or relief, I should say, from tobacco securitization that's coming off the books. That money paid -- from 2008 to 2013 paid for debt service. And that's coming off the books so there's a large, over \$30 million increase coming up next year in debt service, which is exacerbating our problems.

Our recommendations were meant to be as modest as we could but yet there are a lot of needs that the County has. We have a population of -- in the neighborhood of 1.5 million people. We have a very large dispersed geographic area and we have lots of needs. That being said, we probably made fewer recommendations than we would of if times were -- we definitely did -- than if times were better. We did not feel the need -- well, I shouldn't say need -- we did not feel that it was our job to say, "okay, we have a really bad fiscal problem and, therefore, here's our debt policy and here's what you should do," simply because there's a long lead or a lag time between what actions we take in terms of adopting a Capital Program and issuing bonds and then it showing up in the Operating Budget as a debt service cost.

So, even if you had a moratorium on the Capital Program and adopted a zero, that impact will not be felt for a few years more or less. So what you're doing now is laying ground work for a few years down the road, not for solving next year's budget problems. So I think it's an important point to keep in mind.

What we did focus on in our review in terms of an analysis, is we looked at what were local costs in terms of serial bond issuing for non-sewer districts since they have capital -- they have their own captive funds, but rather for General Fund and other countywide funds. And we observed that for those particular types of funding, the good news is that the proposed Capital Program was \$21.5 million less than what was adopted for the current year's Capital Program. So that's a decrease.

And at the end of the day, what we're talking about is that the actions we take in terms of adopting the Capital Program, the only thing that you're going to be able to -- with very limited alternatives is

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

to act on the 2014 portion of the Capital Program. You won't be acting on '15 or '16 or subsequent years; you'll only be acting on the 2014 piece. So the amount of money you put in 2014 will affect your actions next year. And then, of course, next year then you would consider what's going to happen for '15.

The three-year proposed Capital Program is up substantially 132.8 million; however, you could argue that if you took out -- I just wanted to take a look at it -- if you took out the phase II of the jail, that's 100 million right there so it would be a lot less. We did not recommend taking out phase II of the jail. Why didn't we do it? Actually we recommend moving around the funding.

There was an article in today's newspaper that I think was -- had the sort of view that maybe there was some sort of a disagreement with, you know, the County Executive. There really is no disagreement. We were recommending scheduling -- rescheduling monies, moving it around a little and adding another 13.8 million just to be more in line of what we thought the costs were. That being said, we push back or defer the funding. We wouldn't recommend taking it out of the program simply because the Commissioner of Corrections wants to see that in the Capital Program. And there's the possibility if we did take that out, that they could pull variances on us and that would have a detrimental effect on the operating budget. We'd have transport, move out more prisoners. So we wouldn't advise doing that.

Some good news is that there's a downward trend finally in pipeline debt. And probably the two biggest pieces there are we already issued all the debt that we were on phase I of the jail, which is substantial. And also last year we authorized by resolution less bonding than we did in prior years. So that's a good thing.

Where am I here? Okay. We did recommend some advancing of money. As I said, we did have some recommendations to increase funding, in particular, a total of eight-and-a-half million dollars in '14, which is not a large number. And you may or may not agree with all of our recommendations and you may want more, too. Part of the problem was that we didn't make recommendations on a lot of things because of the funding issues that we had. And then if we net out the impact of our moving around money for the jails, there was an increase of 11.6 million in 2015 that we recommended and a decrease of two-and-a-half million in 2016. And we recommended reducing subsequent years by 14 million and change. I think I can go on and on and perhaps --

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Is there anything that you can -- can you direct any items you'd like to highlight from the Parks Department and/or Planning Division?

MR. LIPP:

Well, I think perhaps maybe with Parks, we could have Mr. Dawson come up. And the other issue was --

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Planning. You know, planning; environment, planning.

MR. LIPP:

Well, the only obvious thing I could say -- well, one thing I could say about --

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Like 447 or --

MR. LIPP:

There were a few water quality related projects that were included or not. And the view that we took in our review of the program was we didn't want to recommend advancing funding using serial bonds or general fund monies, instead -- because of our financial difficulties only. That was the

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

main reason. And that instead we said, okay, there are limited water quality funds from the Quarter Cent Program. And we didn't feel comfortable saying which project is the best projects or not, but rather that we would defer to the Water Quality Review Committee as to what they thought should be advanced. So that's the approach we took. Whether or not you agree with that or not is another issue.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

And remind me about what was put in for projects for 477?

MR. LIPP:

Okay, there's 8710, 8715 and 8713. And we recommended taking funding out of -- any of those that were -- that had funding to defer first to Water Quality Review Committee. Part of the problem is putting money in the Capital Program if you're funding it out of Water Quality Quarter Cent monies, that those projects are supposed to go in front of Water Quality Review Committee first as advisory before we act on it. So we didn't feel comfortable sticking those things in the --

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Right. But isn't there usually an amount that's set for the year to spend on the projects or is there an amount that's remaining in the --

MR. LIPP:

The problem is --

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

-- in the fund?

MR. LIPP:

The problem is the amount remaining in the fund. There's about three-and-a-half million remaining in the fund.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

And we've used it.

MR. LIPP:

And there's no additional monies being generated only because the expenses are approximately equal to the revenue coming into the fund. So we're actually starting to drawdown on the three-and-a-half million dollars. And we may actually be in deficit on the operating side. You know, the year's not over yet so it's hard to tell, but we have some serious issues to consider with moving forward with water quality funding.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

May I?

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Is that because salaries were being used for water quality instead of water quality projects?

MR. LIPP:

So, there are some water quality projects in Operating. As a rule we consider them through Capital, but that rule is not 100% so there are a bunch of projects there also. But there's about -- I would say maybe half of the Operating expenses are associated with salaries. Some of that was in lieu of layoffs last year that we transferred some people that had functions that would mesh with water quality into fund 477 so that's drawdown on the balance.

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Any other questions for Robert? Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

I'm looking through the budget, 8730, now this is -- this is water quality and you got \$141,000 as part of the 477. What exactly is that? Page 474?

MS. HALLORAN:

That's for restoration of wetlands, which the Department kind of indicated to me that they don't really need it right now anyway, pending their confirmation on that. But that project actually never went through the Water Quality Review Committee either as far as I can tell. So to be consistent with our other recommendations, we're leaving it in their hands what to recommend, the limited dollars that there are for which projects.

LEG. ANKER:

Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Presiding Officer Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, is there -- which project is it, do you know?

MS. HALLORAN:

Restoration wetlands is 8730. And the other two that use water quality funding or would -- you know, that were in the -- is 8710 and 8715.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay, but I'm interested in is there a specific project attached to either of those three?

MS. HALLORAN:

The name of the project? Yes. 8710 is the Nissequogue Tributary Headwaters Restoration. Water quality Protection and Restoration Program Nissequogue Tributary Headwaters is the whole title. And 8715 is Restoration of Canaan Lake. And then 8730 is restoration of wetlands. I think that's more of a general category.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Okay. Any other questions?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Lynne, do you have any questions for the Parks Commissioner? Do we want to bring him up and ask -- -

CO-CHAIR NOWICK:

Greg, did you have anything that you wanted to ask us about?

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

No, I think we're good. Just if you have any questions.

CO-CHAIR NOWICK:

Okay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Get on the record.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Good afternoon, Legislator. No, we're good. We're good with the proposed budget. I'm just here if you have any questions for me.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

I think we do. Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I don't know if you know, but there's a big demand for trap and skeet in Suffolk County.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I've heard.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Oh, good. I don't know if you -- if you have any suggestions, either existing -- because I've heard a lot of suggestions in the last few months for different locations. And, of course, you would be the one to ask if you have any suggestions for either county-owned property or property that can be acquired for that purpose.

CHAIRMAN GREGORY:

I do not at this time.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

CO-CHAIR NOWICK:

That was fast.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Presiding Officer Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

If someone puts up a bill again, Greg, about closing it again, we're going to take you and hang you up here in front. And the skeet's a little bit bigger to aim so I'd be worried.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

(Laughter)

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Legislator Horsley.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

That's good to hear. On trap and skeet, which reminds me, I've had conversations with my fellow Legislators -- some of my fellow Legislators, as well as Bill Hillman over in Public Works, that there are innovative methods of sound remediation that could be a lot less expensive than -- and we talked about the sound wall -- than a sound wall and maybe wouldn't get into the ecological issues involving the Pine Barrens, etcetera. Have you got any thoughts on that?

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

There was a study done. And they made certain recommendations changing the way the -- the way some of the targets are set, putting some sound remediation in between where the targets are launched from. And the Department took those recommendations and did what we could do. If there's other recommendations, I'm not aware of them. I mean, I could always speak with Bill Hillman.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, okay. Yeah, some of the recommendations that I've been hearing, and this is again just local chatter, and we're considering looking at this issue in the Capital Budget; not to the extent what a sound wall with cost or whatever. In fact, the thought was maybe \$250,000 for innovative sound remediation issues.

And let me explain some of the things that were suggested. That where the shooters are located, that maybe they would be -- they'd actually be placed in ground, that they'd actually be below ground so that the walls of the, you know, of the shooting thing will actually have -- you know, be two or three foot above -- above where the person is standing, having small barriers on either side. And they say that they've done things like this in other trap and skeet ranges across the country; and that there are things out there that could -- that may not be very expensive, but would help the situation as far as noise abatement to the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Like a blind.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, like a blind. Yeah, I guess, like a blind. Thank you. That was good.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We certainly can look at that.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

If we put that in, that \$250,000 -- now, again, it's in the courts and stuff like that, whether they're going to ask to close it or things like that, you know, maybe we wouldn't spend the monies next year. But if -- but if for some reason that the Trap and Skeet is open and the courts decide that it will remain open, we maybe should look at those types of issues. So if we put that in the Capital Budget this year in 2014, would that be something that you would buy into as a project to look and research and to help Public Works figure out what's the right thing to do with there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think anything to remediate the issues out there, we'd be in support of. But if you're going to put funding in, if you could put some money in for planning as well because --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah. And I don't think -- and it could a combination of both. I mean, that's -- because I don't think it's -- I'm not sure planning is a heavy dollar figure for this. This is something that, you know, at least Bill Hillman and others led me to believe that they could consider in-house. You know, I'm sure at some point they'd have to say, you know, will the thing work or not work, you know, maybe they might need some sort of planning, but at least kick it off that, you know, get that out from under it so it could be a win/win situation for both the shooters as well as the neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, I think we need to do an assessment of any ideas that anybody had.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Fair enough. That's always a good thing.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Okay.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

I just wouldn't want you out there with a backhoe start digging holes.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Right. That's why I was suggesting using some of that -- whatever funding you want to put in, make sure some of it's earmarked for planning purposes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. All right. All right, thanks.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Legislator Anker.

LEG. ANKER:

Again, I guess relating to this topic, have you -- has the County contacted the Sportsmen's Association out in Calverton to see if there's maybe a partnership that we could work out with them for additional trap and skeet?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I don't believe so.

LEG. ANKER:

Is that something maybe, you know, Sean Walters -- again -- (inaudible) I guess we'd need approval from, you know, the different stakeholders. But, again, I think that might be something maybe we can look into. Because we are getting quite a few e-mails and constituent write-ins about this Trap and Skeet at Southaven.

The other question I have for you is, you know, again it was mentioned \$2 billion is being made from the tourist pertaining to parks, historical structures, beaches. How is the County doing with revenue regenerating sources, like sponsorships pertaining to the county-owned parks?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It's funny you should mention that. Legislator D'Amaro brought that up at the last Parks Committee meeting and I'm due to give a presentation at the next meeting regarding that. He passed a resolution back in -- I think it was 2009 -- directing the Department to look at those issues. And we're currently working on a report now that we should have ready for the end of the month.

LEG. ANKER:

I'm assuming it's a positive report? In other words, the County is making -- it's regenerating revenue for the County.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The resolution calls for us to look into revenue-producing ideas for corporate sponsorship and naming of parks.

LEG. ANKER:

So we don't do that at this point? That's not being done currently.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

The resolution was passed back in 2009. There was a -- an RFEI went out -- I'm sorry -- an RFP went out identifying a certain number of parks and the types of activities we'd like to see advertised there. They didn't receive any responses to that RFP. And Legislator D'Amaro has asked that we renew that -- not necessarily renew the RFP, but come up with ideas on how to market that idea.

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

LEG. ANKER:

I think with the Duck Stadium, there's a lot of sponsorship. And, I guess, the County's connected with that stadium.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's not Parks, but that is.

LEG. ANKER:

Okay. Thank you.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Robert.

MR. LIPP:

Just as a point of personal privilege, I would like to wish happy birthday today to George Nolan and Gail Vizzini.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Happy birthday day to George and Gail if they're listening. Thank you.

Okay. Anyone else have any questions for the Parks Commissioner? How are we doing with equipment? I know that there was a lot of storm debris in our parks and things like chain saws and other kinds of equipment. How are we doing?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We're fine. We're moving right along. Parks -- a lot of our campsites opened back on April 1st; golf course opened on March 15th. And our beaches are scheduled to open Memorial Day and we're good to go.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Thank you. Sure, of course. Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:

Hi, Greg, how are you?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Good. How are you?

LEG. CALARCO:

Good. How are we going with the dunes out at Smith Point? I know that I should have asked Commissioner Anderson this morning at Public Works but are we doing everything you can to get them replaced? Because honestly they must impact our ability to reopen the campgrounds out there and everything else.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Actually the campgrounds aren't impacted. The current campgrounds are actually in relatively good shape. It might impact the outer beach access, but I think that's more of a product of what the piping plover do, we'll have a better -- we'll have a better answer. But -- and you're right, Commissioner Anderson's probably the right person to ask regarding the re-nourishment of the dune system. But just so you know, in-house we put up over five miles of snow fence. We are rebuilding the dunes as we can with the resources that we have. And they are building up there about four, five feet now.

LEG. CALARCO:

The beach is coming back a little bit now that we're out of the nor'easter season?

5/15/2013 Capital Budget re: EPA and Parks

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I'm sorry, I didn't --

LEG. CALARCO:

I said the beach is coming back a little bit now that we're out of the nor'easter season, we're seeing sand accumulate?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah. The beaches are getting wider by the day, but again the dune system is another issue.

LEG. CALARCO:

Were we able to replace the T wall and the concrete that was buffering underneath the pavilion there?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yep, everything's been taken care of. The sidewalk's been repaired. Three out of the four walkways are done; the crossovers from the campsites and from out onto the outer beach. And they're finishing up the last one probably this week. So we should be in very good shape for Memorial Day.

LEG. CALARCO:

Great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

You're welcome.

CO-CHAIR HAHN:

Okay. Any other questions, comments, information you'd like to share with us? Okay. Thank you very much. I think we -- something else, Commissioner? No? No. Okay. I think that -- are we adjourned? Is that how it works? We're adjourned. Thank you.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 3:02 PM
{ }DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**