

PARKS & RECREATION COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE
MINUTES

A meeting of the Parks & Recreation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislature Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on June 12, 2013.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Lynne C. Nowick, Chairwoman
Leg. Lou D'Amaro, Vice Chair
Leg. Kara Hahn
Leg. Wayne R. Horsley
Leg. Steven H. Stern

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Leg. Thomas Cilmi, 10th Legislative District
George M. Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Robert Doering, Budget Review Office
Greg Dawson, Commissioner/Parks Department
Greg Moran, Aide to Leg. Nowick
Deborah Harris, Aide to Leg. Stern
Justin Littell, Aide to Leg. D'Amaro
Deborah Tinnirello, Aide to Leg. Hahn
Michael Pitcher, Aide to Presiding Officer
Thomas Vaughn, County Executive's Office
Marie Berkoski, Aide to County Executive
Paul Perillie, Aide to Leg. Gregory
Rick Brand, Newsday
Robert Kessler
Don Dailey, AME
Richard Martin, Historical Services
Peter W. Leis, appointee/Parks, Recreation & Conservation Board
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 12:22 PM

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay, we'll start the Parks and Recreation Committee with the salute to the flag led by Legislator Horsley.

SALUTATION

Good afternoon and welcome to the Parks and Recreation Committee. Good afternoon, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Good afternoon, Madam Chair.

PUBLIC PORTION

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

All right, we do have two cards from the public. One would be Don Dailey.

MR. DAILEY:

Good afternoon. My name is Don Dailey. I represent AME. I'm also the President of the Suffolk County Parks Department. I appreciate the opportunity to be able to speak before this meeting.

I just wanted to call some attention to a situation that exists in the Parks Department. A while back we had an incident with one of our members. The progressive disciplinary -- the progressive disciplinary procedure was not carried out. We had a member that was suspended prior to having a hearing. He was brought into a Supervisor's Office and handed three reprimands labeled "first warning", "second warning", "final warning". Basically the signature on that would have put him in probation and put -- his next strike would have put him on the unemployment line.

I reached out as a union representative to Commissioner Dawson to request a meeting to discuss this situation. Commissioner Dawson then forwarded my e-mails to then -- excuse me -- Paul Margiotta at Labor Relations. I was then directed to cease my correspondence with Mr. Dawson because of my unfounded accusations.

The accusations, or the alleged accusations that I was making, had to do with contractual obligations, getting the guys work shoes, a situation where I was told that somebody had worked without being compensated. They worked overtime and they didn't want to put the slip in because it was not worth it to put up with the problem that they were going to get for putting in that slip for an un-approved overtime. Okay. We had that situation.

And this situation with this suspended member, the third incident that was labeled "final warning" was due to a construction accident whereby the member cut his hands with a razor knife while he was working on a roof at Meschutt Beach. If anybody has any connection with construction work or has ever done any type of work around the house, we know that accidents happen. When people do roof jobs and when people work with razor knives, it is very easy for there to be a mishap.

The accusation or the charge on that last write-up was "negligence in the use of your knife." Okay. I just wanted to -- excuse me, I turned off the mic. I just wanted the Legislature to know what's going on in the Parks Department. I've tried to reach out -- I tried to reach out again this week to Commissioner Dawson and that hasn't yielded any results either.

This member is facing what basically amounts to a kangaroo court of a Suffolk County hearing.

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

They're not seeking termination. They want to demote this member for 18 months for a probationary period. The member is a grade 12. He's a father. He's recently divorced. And basically a demotion for 18 months' time would put this guy in the poorhouse. It would basically push him out.

So what I -- the way it looks to me is that they're trying to push this guy out. They're making it unrealistic for him to be able to stay and for him not to be able -- for him not to be able to afford to live, to let him quit rather than wait for them to be able to throw him out. I think they're going after this guy. I think there's a situation that's prevalent in the Parks Department where anybody that has a problem with supervision is then targeted for reprisal. We've had grievances where people that have filed grievances are then targeted and it's going on and on. So I would like the Legislature to step in, if it's possible. And I would like Commissioner Dawson to do what he's supposed to do as a supervisor.

The various commissioners around the County are very quick to jump into the disciplinary manual to determine what is right and what is wrong. But in every disciplinary manual it says that the responsibility of a supervisor is to provide a situation where there's good -- where there can be good morale in the workplace. That hasn't existed in the Parks Department in a longtime. And that's something that needs to change. People are afraid in the Parks Department. They're afraid for their jobs. And we're creating a situation here where people will choose to do nothing rather than make the mistake of doing the wrong thing and possibly have some kind of reprisal. Thank you for your time. Have a good day.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Just a quick question. Did you say that this gentleman received three notices at one time?

MR. DAILEY:

That is correct.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay. Does anybody have any questions? Legislator Hahn, did you have a question? Excuse me. Counsel?

MR. NOLAN:

I would just, you know, advise the Committee that this sounds like it's a disciplinary matter, a personnel matter; so any questions on this or comments, I think, would have to be very circumspect for the Committee.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay. So that's a no. Thank you very much.

MR. DAILEY:

Thank you for your time. Have a good day.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Robert Kessler.

MR. KESSLER:

Hi, good afternoon. My name is Robert Kessler. I'm President of the Yaphank Historical Society. And I'm here to -- today to speak on resolution 1430-2013, which is appropriating money for the historic restoration of the Homan-Gerard house in Yaphank.

First of all, I would like to thank -- I'd like to thank Legislator Browning for all of her support in the Yaphank Historical Society. She has been a true friend of the Society and without her help we

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

couldn't be -- we would not be where we are now. I've come to you to ask for your continued support of the restoration of the Homan-Gerard House. The project is now in the stabilization phase and we need money to go forward with the restoration phase.

The house is a pre-revolutionary war house and was very close to falling down. With Legislator Browning's help, the money was secured to stabilize the house. And I also want to thank County Executive Bellone for support of this project. He came to our historic district and pledged to help us restore this house and he has done so.

The house is number one on the County list for restoration. And we need your help to keep this project moving. I urge you to please move forward with resolution 1430 to help in the restoration of this very historic house.

We are working closely with Richard Martin of Suffolk County Historical Services to turn this house into a museum. And that would also complement our other houses, the Mary Louise Booth House, which we just finished two years ago as a museum; and the historic Hawkins House, which is also in our district. This would be for all of the Suffolk -- all of the people of Suffolk County can be very proud of this whole district.

Thank you very much. We just urge you to pass this resolution. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Thank you. Excuse me, sir. Sir? There is a question by Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Hi. Thanks for coming down today. I just -- what organization are you representing, did you say?

MR. KESSLER:

Yaphank Historical Society.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. And the legislation that you're supporting is resolution 1430.

MR. KESSLER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah. It doesn't specify what -- "appropriating funds in connection with the historic restoration and preservation." What site are you targeting?

MR. KESSLER:

Homan-Gerard House, which is a millhouse in Yaphank on the Carmans River.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And so that house is targeted for restoration by the County.

MR. KESSLER:

By the County. It's number one on the County list.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It's number one on the list.

MR. KESSLER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And this bill is seeking to appropriate or bond \$1,025,000. Do you know if that amount is for just this one structure?

MR. KESSLER:

We would like to have a lot of it going toward that structure. And County Executive Bellone also, when he came to our district, he did indicate that a lot of this money would be going to that.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right. I am not familiar -- what's the name of the structure?

MR. KESSLER:

The Homan-Gerard house.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Homan?

MR. KESSLER:

H-o-m-a-n.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Homan-Gerard House. I'm not familiar with it. Can you just tell me what type of house -- I mean, it's residential?

MR. KESSLER:

It's a pre-revolutionary war house.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

MR. KESSLER:

The early part -- the foundation -- the early part of the house is probably from about 1760. And then the addition was put on a little bit later, probably just pre-revolutionary war.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Who owns the structure? Does the County own the structure?

MR. KESSLER:

County owns it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is it operated by the County or is operated by your organization?

MR. KESSLER:

It's not open now because it's under construction right now.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Has it ever been opened to the public in the past?

MR. KESSLER:

No. No, it was always a private residence.

LEG. D'AMARO:

How has it been maintained over the years then?

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

MR. KESSLER:

The County has maintained it. They've put roofs on it. They put a couple of roofs on it. And we just -- we had some money appropriated last year. \$450,000 was appropriated last year.

LEG. D'AMARO:

How big is this residence?

MR. KESSLER:

It's probably about 1500, 2000 square feet; in that range.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And we did 450,000 in repairs last year?

MR. KESSLER:

In stabilization only.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Stabilization only.

MR. KESSLER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And now we're doing a little over a million this year? What are we getting for a million dollars? Are you familiar with the plans?

MR. KESSLER:

Well, the house is going to be restored and rebuilt into a museum.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Oh, a museum.

MR. KESSLER:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

County-owned museum. We don't know who would operate it at this point.

MR. KESSLER:

Right. The County will -- the County owns the building. We just did the Mary Louise Booth House, which is right around the corner. It's a very historic structure also.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. KESSLER:

The house was moved to this -- you know, to this site, the County site. Was donated -- the house was donated to us. We moved it to a County site. It's right at the north end of Southaven Park. We -- the Yaphank Historical Society did a lot of work inside the house. We finished it all and now it's a museum open to the public. We finished out about a year-and-a-half ago.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Does the Historical Society operate that facility?

MR. KESSLER:

Yes, it does.

LEG. D'AMARO:

It does.

MR. KESSLER:

And we manage the Hawkins House; the Robert Hewlett Hawkins House.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And you would like to see the same thing eventually happen with this new site?

MR. KESSLER:

The Homan-Gerard house, yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Is the Yaphank Historical Society contributing to the renovations as well?

MR. KESSLER:

Yes, we do.

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'm sorry, yes?

MR. KESSLER:

Yes, we do.

LEG. D'AMARO:

To what extent?

MR. KESSLER:

We do a lot of the work there. We do all of the work there. We get grants. We've gotten a couple of grants. The Hotel/Motel money, we've used it to restore the property.

LEG. D'AMARO:

This particular property.

MR. KESSLER:

Not this particular -- we haven't started on this property yet.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

MR. KESSLER:

It's all -- the County, DPW has been working on it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So right now this is the jump off point, the starting point?

MR. KESSLER:

Exactly.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But does the Historical Society -- when you say "we do most of the work there," what do you mean?

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

MR. KESSLER:

On the inside. We will help restore the inside; we will raise funds to help restore the inside of the building. Right now it's just stabilized. There are old beams inside the house.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

MR. KESSLER:

All those beams have to be put into a wall and it has to be, you know, made safe for --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Well, I have to tell you my impression is that putting aside the merits of restoration and preservation, which are all positive, a million dollars seems like an awful lot of money given the state of our economy and the County's financial position.

MR. KESSLER:

Right.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Can you justify that amount of money?

MR. KESSLER:

Well, we certainly don't want to see this house deteriorate any further than it has. It's really been -- it was in really bad shape for a longtime. It was in jeopardy of falling down. Last year when County Executive came, he actually saw what was going on there and he was very supportive of this project. So I hope he was going to continue his support --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, I understand that. My real question was -- I wasn't clear. My question is, how do we get to a 1,025,000? The County Department of Public Works came up with that figure?

MR. KESSLER:

Yes, sir.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. I really appreciate you answering my questions.

MR. KESSLER:

No problem.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Thank you, sir.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Excuse me, sir? You don't by any chance have any photos of the house, do you?

MR. KESSLER:

I didn't bring any with me, no.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Do you know when the County acquired the house?

MR. KESSLER:

I'm going to think it was in the '60s; '62, '66, something like that.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

And since the '60s it's been vacant?

MR. KESSLER:

It's been vacant, yes.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

What, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think we acquired in 1963.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

All right. Thank you. Excuse me, Legislator Horsley.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes, hi, good afternoon.

MR. KESSLER:

Hi.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

I appreciate what you do, your historical preservation interest and the like. I just -- one of the concerns I've had about historic homes is that we often -- they're often in wood settings, parks, park-like settings.

MR. KESSLER:

Right.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And they're set back and they're often in their own little world. Let me just ask you, how do you -- how do we secure the house? I mean, once we've put the dollars into the -- say, the Booth House, is that what you mentioned before?

MR. KESSLER:

That's right.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

The Booth House, is it protected, is it alarmed?

MR. KESSLER:

It's alarmed, yes, sir. And it's right on the road. It's right on --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

That one's on the road, okay. I've probably seen it; I just didn't know the name of it.

MR. KESSLER:

And also the Robert Hawkins House, which is right across the street from the Homan House is on County Road 21.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, so these are on major roads so they are visible.

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

MR. KESSLER:

Yeah. And all the buildings are alarmed. And we do take care of them. We're there almost every day. We're checking on the houses and we take care of them.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And we have a municipal agreement with your organization.

MR. KESSLER:

Yes.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And you are responsible for --

MR. KESSLER:

And we take care of the buildings.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right. Okay. Okay, thank you very much.

MR. KESSLER:

The same thing with the Homan House.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

And so you'll have three County locations at the conclusion of this.

MR. KESSLER:

Yeah, we hope so.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. Good luck to you.

MR. KESSLER:

Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Legislator Stern. Excuse me, sir. Sorry.

LEG. STERN:

I do have questions, but I'll hold those questions for the Commissioner.

MR. KESSLER:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay. So we'll wait 'til we get to the resolution and then we'll bring Mr. Martin up. Is that okay with everybody?

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

Okay, so we'll go to Tabled Resolutions. **2228, Authorizing Montauk Chapter of the Boy Scouts to enter into a License Agreement. (Schneiderman).** George, this seems to have been tabled a few times. Is this, like, too late?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion to table.

MR. NOLAN:

This is the last go-around before it is stricken.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Motion to table.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Motion to table by Legislator D'Amaro; second by myself. All in favor? Opposed? **2228 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

Tabled Resolution 1411, Appropriating funds in connection with fencing and surveying various County Parks (CP 7007). (Hahn) Legislator Hahn, this is yours, I think?

LEG. HAHN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Motion to table by Legislator Hahn; second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? **1411 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1418, to Appoint a member to the Suffolk County Board of Trustees of Parks, Recreation, and Conservation (Christopher DiGregorio). (Krupski) I'm going to make a motion to table; second by Legislator D'Amaro. And what we're going to do with this, Mr. DiGregorio cannot possibly get to a Wednesday meeting because of his job. On Tuesday when we meet in Riverhead, we're going to -- when we break for lunch at 12:30 just to have a -- Mr. DiGregorio can make that meeting. We'll just have a quick meeting interviewing him right there and then we can go to lunch afterwards. And then we can send it to -- after we do that -- can we send it that day to the regular Legislature?

MR. NOLAN:

We can discharge it.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

We'll discharge it and it'll be eligible to vote on. And this way he doesn't have to stay around all day. Is that okay with everybody? So there's a motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed? **1418 tabled. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

Introductory Resolution 1430 -- Mr. Martin, if you want to come up. Appropriating funds in connection with the Historic Restoration and Preservation Fund (CP 7510). (Browning) Legislator Stern, you had a question. This is the historic building.

MR. MARTIN:

Maybe just to explain this fund a little bit further, this is in a certain way our General Fund for the Historic Trust Preservation Program in Suffolk County Parks. We have over 200 buildings that we maintain. And from this fund we're able to, of course, restore the roofs as needed, which is our priority so we don't lose these buildings. And we are targeting now the Homan House in Yaphank, which is our number one project to restore so we can open it to the public. So from this fund, we're looking to take possibly the majority of the funds; but the funds would also be available for other County historic buildings.

LEG. STERN:

So it's not a million dollars necessarily for this particular project, although you're saying, and that was going to be my question that perhaps the majority of that number will be applied towards this particular project.

MR. MARTIN:

Exactly. I need a cost estimate from DPW. We started the stabilization project last year, which we had 300,000 in construction. And we need to hire a restoration architect that'll do a full set of plans and then I'll be able to get a cost estimate from that, but this would be the fund that I would take that money from.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

So this is just from the Hotel/Motel?

MR. MARTIN:

No. This is County capital funding.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

County capital funding. Does anybody have any further questions on this? Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Hi, Mr. Martin. Thank you. Sir, are you familiar with the capital -- the full Capital Program or project -- Capital Project that the County has in the budget presently?

MR. MARTIN:

For the Historic Program?

LEG. D'AMARO:

For historic preservation and restoration.

MR. MARTIN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right, and -- so, do you know offhand how much is actually funded into that line?

MR. MARTIN:

We don't have any additional funds in that line right now. I do have existing funds for the Homan project to do the planning that we appropriated previously, but otherwise there are no additional funds in that account now.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right.

MR. MARTIN:

In this Historic Preservation Fund.

LEG. D'AMARO:

So in the Historic Preservation Fund, which is a Capital Project --

MR. MARTIN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

-- which we're bonding, this would appropriate the balance of that line?

MR. MARTIN:

Well, it's new funds. We haven't received new funds into this account, I think, it's the past three or four years. So this -- we ask for actually every year about this amount. And it's really to maintain and to continue our restoration program, for like I said, the over 200 buildings that we have. And because we haven't received any funding in the past few years, you know, we don't have anything left. We've spent what we've had.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right, you've spent what's already been appropriated, bonded and funded.

MR. MARTIN:

Yes. There's -- there's some projects -- once we decide where the money's to be appropriated to --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. MARTIN:

-- we do have some funds in existing projects. But there hasn't been any new money added to this account in the past three or four years.

LEG. D'AMARO:

To the Budget Office, do you have handy Capital Project 7510? Can you tell me what's the total funding in that line?

So this is number one on the list.

MR. MARTIN:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, while they're looking that up, just if we could continue.

MR. MARTIN:

We had a survey done by an architect firm in 2006. The priority at that point was the New Mill in Smithtown in Blydenburg County Park, which we have restored the structure.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What did that cost?

MR. MARTIN:

That was about -- I think we spent \$700,000 on that building.

LEG. D'AMARO:

All right.

MR. MARTIN:

And this building, like I said, we stabilized as Bob explained.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

MR. MARTIN:

But the restoration needs to continue. The exterior of the building is still deteriorating. That we weren't able to get to. And so the funds, of course, would restore the whole exterior of the building and then the restoration of the interior.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. So I'll ask the question, who is Homan Gerard?

MR. MARTIN:

It's hyphenated. It's two family names.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Family names, okay.

MR. MARTIN:

Mr. Homan built the mills in Yaphank in the 1760s. And this was his house that he built adjoining to his mill complex.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

MR. MARTIN:

And Mr. Gerard was the last owner when the site was still operating as a mill.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Why is it important to preserve this house?

MR. MARTIN:

For our Historic Trust Program, this is for the Historic District that we've created in Yaphank. It's very significant to the history of Yaphank and obviously for -- I mean, for Suffolk County and for Yaphank. The mill home is a very high-style, federal-style home that's on the National Register of Historic Places. We've already lost three out buildings; the barn and two shed buildings that were also on the National Register. We really don't want to lose a building that's on the National Register and dedicated to our Suffolk County Historic Trust Program. And this -- as we look at all of our buildings, we look to see which has the most historic significance and the condition that it's in, where we target the money.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Do you know if the County funds this restoration, are there any other source of funds going into the restoration?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes. As Mr. Kessler mentioned, the Historic Society contributes funds as well as sweat equity. They will go in and help paint the interior and do whatever kind of work that they can provide. We also have the Sheriff's crew from --

LEG. D'AMARO:

How much funding would the Historical Society provide, do you know?

MR. MARTIN:

I don't have a dollar amount.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What's the total cost of the restoration, do you know that?

MR. MARTIN:

I don't have an exact number.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay.

MR. MARTIN:

Yeah.

LEG. D'AMARO:

To the Budget Office, did you have an answer to that question by chance?

MR. DOERING:

It looks like there's approximately 2.3 million unexpended in that project.

LEG. D'AMARO:

And this would take 1,025,000 from that number?

MR. DOERING:

No, this would appropriate an additional 1,025,000. This project covers many, many different projects within it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

MR. DOERING:

These 200 structures. So some of monies have already been earmarked and encumbered and whatnot. But the unexpended balance currently is approximately 2.3 million.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Everything else is spoken for?

MR. DOERING:

I would have to defer to the Commissioner as far as that goes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Well, what's the total with the encumbered funds? What did you say was left; two million?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Two million dollars.

MR. MARTIN:

I'm not sure about that number.

MR. DOERING:

Well, this is based on our year-to-date capital expenditures as of June 2013. They have \$414,000 encumbered out of that 2.3 million balance.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

And I believe a lot of those projects that he mentions are earmarked for certain -- like we have \$400,000 in for Third House out in Montauk. That's the only place that that money could be utilized.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

On that point line.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. I understand that. All right. All right, thank you.

MR. MARTIN:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

You know what I think the problem was with this particular resolution, we -- I think we went off -- because of the testimony from Mr. Kessler, we went off on a tangent that it was just that one house. But if you read it, it's Historic Restoration and Preservation. But, you know that -- but, Commissioner, if we pass this, that house that we just saw a picture of -- by the way, that house, are there any close neighbors around that house?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

You're talking about the --

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

The Homan-Gerard House?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, the Booth House is right around the corner. And Hawkins House is directly across the street. That is historic --

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

What about -- are there neighbors that can look at this eyesore? Because we just saw pictures of it. Are there neighbors close by? Or is this in a park?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

It's right on Yaphank Avenue, almost on Main Street. It's predominantly -- there's a lot of vehicle traffic that goes through there. I don't think there's many residences around.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Yeah, that was acquired years ago. What a shame that we didn't have the money to fix it.

Legislator Horsley, I think you had a question.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, I did. And you probably know where I'm going to start talking about. You could see the rationale why -- finding that we have 200 homes or locations that are of a historic nature and we don't have any monies to fix them, and how expensive they are to keep up and the like. One of the reasons why I put forth my legislation to semi-privatize the -- some of our historic locations so they can be repaired, how are we doing? I know we've been out to bid. Any bites, any interest; what's the conversation?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We went out for -- we advertised it last week. We've had four perspective people pick up packages as of to date; as of yesterday.

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okays. Is there a deadline on that? What is it?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, I'm sorry, I don't have that off the top of my head, but I think we gave him six weeks to respond.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Six weeks to respond.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

There'll be a question and answer period. There'll be an opportunity for any perspective applicants to go take a look at the facility on a certain date and then put in any questions or thoughts in writing so we can respond to everybody with the same answers.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Are they broken out by the locations? Was it just for the school or is it -- we have also the Black Duck Lodge, right?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

There were two facilities, Black Duck Lodge --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right. Which is a favorite of Mr. Brand's back there. I know that he once reported on it when we first got it. That was when he was a young man. (Laughter)

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Black Duck Lodge?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Black Duck Lodge, that's exactly. So we don't know if there's anything that was picked up on that particular location; or do you, by chance?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I can -- all I can say for sure is that four --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Four, okay, all right.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

-- interested, so.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okeydoke. Keep me in touch.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Will do.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Thanks.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay, Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. Commissioner, maybe for you or maybe for Rich, I'm still not clear on what we think the overall number is going to be for this particular project, for this particular location. We went through some of the numbers. I understand that there are monies that are in the line item. Some of that amount are earmarked for particular projects. Other dollars are not necessarily geared to a particular project and now we're going to be, if this is approved, adding to that line item.

I understand we say that perhaps the majority of this particular dollar amount will be allocated to this particular project. Do we have an idea as to what -- at this point do we have an idea as to what the overall cost is going to be, the appropriation that's going to be necessary to fully restore this particular building? Or do we not have that information at this point? What are we looking at?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think the estimate is anywhere from 1.7 to \$2.1 million for a complete restoration, soup to nuts, you know, top to bottom. And that was based on a 2006 report by the Historic House Register.

LEG. STERN:

And so, Commissioner, based on that estimate at this point, this appropriation that we're talking about here today, before us here today, this is the dollar amount that would be necessary to then fully allocate that estimated number? Are there other monies that have already been set aside that if this is added to it, then, we're at the number that we need?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Well, I think the money that's -- the way I understand this particular account, the general account, could be used on any historic structure. It's dry. The money that Bob was speaking about earlier is in general accounts throughout other historic sites in the County. So that those funds cannot be used at this particular facility.

LEG. STERN:

So if this dollar amount is the approximately one million dollars and you're suggesting that it would cost anywhere between 1.7 to two point whatever, we're saying that this allocation isn't going to be enough; that you're going to need additional monies down the road in order to complete that restoration?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I don't know. I think those were general estimates. And the Department of Public Works needs to hire a consultant and go in there and do a complete estimate. And we do have \$120,000 in planning money to get that number that you're asking.

LEG. STERN:

But regardless of what the final number is, where it falls within that estimate, it would seem pretty clear that this dollar amount is not sufficient.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think these projects are done in series. And, you know, you can get the building where it's habitable. But, again, not replace every window in the place, every door in the place, heating, electric. So the funding will get -- the best I understand it, the funding now, the \$1 million, will get the facility so that it can be utilized for a museum.

LEG. STERN:

Is that true? Because a million dollars is less than \$2 million, which is what we're saying, this -- the total expenditure might fall. So if we're a million dollars short, I don't know if this is going to be enough to get it to where the Director is saying that it might need to be in order to provide all those service. Is that true?

MR. MARTIN:

I thought I'd just add a little bit to the conversation. Because of -- that number is very high, obviously. Because of the contribution of the Yaphank Historic Society, we try to bring that number down. And they've -- Bob Kessler has done a lot of work and actually's done some work already on the foundation there that saved us some money. And by their group going in doing fundraising, doing the work themselves in the sense of the painting and whatever, say, working on the floors, refinishing and things like that, we'll try to bring that number down so we can accomplish it with the existing fund.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

That's not inclusive of the money that's already been spent on the structural -- to stabilize the facility is a little over \$300,000.

LEG. STERN:

So there's already been \$300,000 that's been expended just for the bare minimum of maintenance that's been required keeping it from running falling down.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Stabilization.

LEG. STERN:

So now we're talking about a million dollars. But the million dollars here, as you said before, isn't necessarily all going to go towards this particular project. In fact, you said that perhaps maybe the majority, but that would mean that some other dollar amount unspecified at this point would go towards other projects within that line item. So where -- it would seem like a moving target at this point.

MR. MARTIN:

The additional funds, we always have to keep in mind, like I said, the 200 buildings. If I have a building that springs a leak in the roof, needs some repairs, that's the fund I would go to. So that's why we might not be able to fully fund the restoration from this account as other issues come up in the Parks Department.

LEG. STERN:

Which then goes back to the question from before, does it seem likely that as you proceed with this particular project, that there's going to be a need for additional monies in order to get it to where you want it to be in order to offer the services to the public.

MR. MARTIN:

If I do have to take some funds out to safeguard another house, yes, that could happen.

LEG. STERN:

Well, it would seem -- it would seem likely that that is the trajectory at this point. If it's going to fall somewhere around 1.7 to \$2.2 million dollars and we're only allocating a million dollars here, but in fact less than that because it's only going to be maybe the majority and the other dollar amounts you're going to need to be able to spread out through all of the other historic sites throughout the County for maintenance over the next year, it would seem that that's the direction that this would be headed in.

MR. MARTIN:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Legislator D'Amaro wanted to --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, just very quickly to follow up, for me to support this bill, I need a line item listing of the total and how it's broken down and where it's going because -- and I appreciate Legislator Stern's questions, but I don't -- I don't have a -- you know, we're funding projects ad hoc. And so I don't know, as Legislator Stern is pointing out, what's my total cost into this particular restoration that we're talking about here today.

Also, what I'd like to know is once I have the line items, who's deciding to what extent are we restoring? I mean, you know, we're dealing with a financial crisis here. So, you know, again, like everything we talk about at this horseshoe, if we had unlimited funds, we'd be buying \$5 million computer software. We'd be doing all this. We wouldn't even be debating it. You can always make the case that you need to do something. The question is can we afford to do it.

So what I would like to know is not only where's the money going, instead of this general, evasive -- or not evasive but elusive kind of allocation of a million dollars, where's it going? And then who's deciding to what extent we're doing the restoration? I want that justification made to me for me to support the funding. To me. Because, you know, maybe in these tougher times, we don't do, you know, the class A restoration compared to class B, class C. I'm not saying that you're not mindful about this, but how do I know? I'm not going to sit here and just vote a million dollars, and then another million dollars for ongoing projects. And then the argument the next time you come back is you tell me, "well you already put 900,000 into it, we can't stop now."

So I want to know a little bit more about who's making the decisions, to what extent are we restoring, where is the money going. Okay? And I speak for myself, not for the members of the Committee, but that's what I would need to know to support this bill.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

And I think one of the things that we as Legislators have to deal with is that it is so much money in a bad economy. And having laid off workers, it's real tough to be putting money into this, although I know one has really nothing to do with the Capital Budget, but I think that's what we are grappling with. Thank you.

Oh, I'm sorry, Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay.

LEG. HAHN:

I just -- I'm pretty sure that we have seen a fairly comprehensive list of all the different projects that need to be worked on and that we have upwards of \$58 million worth of restoration work to do. And that we're sort of in this triage situation where, you know, as roofs fall in, we have to patch them. And that's fairly unfortunate but I think -- I'm actually pleased to see that we're working on -- off the priority list and we're taking, you know, the number one priority first and we're trying to fix that. And, you know, I understand wanting to be reminded of that information, but correct me if I'm wrong, we have a very extensive list of projects that's in a binder and -- okay.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. I haven't seen any accounting with respect to this bill where these funds are going; nor have I heard any definite testimony here today about the extent of the restorations, who's making those decisions, how much is going to each line item and what projects are we talking about. Okay? So if some of my colleagues have seen other listings, that's fine. But with respect to this bill, I would like the breakdown. I mean, is that something that we can get?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I really think we should -- we do have \$120,000 in planning money that is appropriated. And I think the next step is to get exactly what you're asking for.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Motion to table.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, I'll offer --

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, Madam Chair, thank you. With the planning money that's already been allocated, where are we at in that planning analysis? Where are we at with that study; how long is it going to take?

MR. MARTIN:

I'm hoping to complete that this year. DPW will need to put an RFP out, Requests for Proposals, for a consulting architect. And that hasn't been done yet.

LEG. STERN:

All right. So would you agree that we'll have a much better idea as to how best to proceed on this particular project at the completion of that analysis?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Other than the obvious, is there any particular issue as to timing that we need to be mindful of on this particular site?

MR. MARTIN:

Well, we'd like to continue the restoration obviously, but also I just want to point out our overall issue with all our historic buildings is maintaining the roofs at the buildings. At Sagtikos Manor in Bay Shore we have some issues with the roof now that I'm going to have someone take a look at and see when that needs to be replaced. But we've had leaks that -- we had water coming down through the museum site, museum rooms. So these are the kinds of issues we grappling with at all our historic sites. And even at our main office we just -- a leak just established itself over the past weekend with the storms that we've been having. So this -- we can spell out some of the sites that will need attention in the near future as well as continuing this restoration.

LEG. STERN:

Well, I think that would go a long way to the concern that we all have that was articulated by Legislator D'Amaro, getting that very specific information on how you plan to allocate this particular appropriation.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. And Legislator Stern is exactly right. You know, no one is saying we don't want to fund, you know, fixing a leak in the roof and preserving the structures. We have a substantial investment in it.

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

But this bill doesn't tell me that. This bill -- the testimony I heard today is a majority of this funding is going towards one project. And there's no RFP out on that project yet. There's planning funds. We're still in the planning phase. So I'm not quite sure why we're appropriating that funding now but --

MR. MARTIN:

Well, this is how we've normally proceeded. We, you know, had the planning money and then we work on that; and then hopefully next year we'd start with the restoration.

LEG. D'AMARO:

But, sir, my point is that if I vote today to appropriate the restoration funds without the plan completed knowing the extent of the restoration and whether we can afford it -- I mean you're asking me to make a decision on giving you \$800,000 and the plan's not even in place yet. I don't know if we can afford that. All I'm saying to you, and I'm speaking emphatically because I'm frustrated that, you know, let me just write the check and hope -- and hope that the plan that ultimately comes out is within that cost and is something that I would hopefully agree to, yeah, that's the extent -- you know, maybe we shouldn't do a full restoration. Maybe we should just secure the structure, you know, given the fact that it's so expensive right now. And I know there's a whole debate to be had on that.

So it's very frustrating to me to be asked to allocate this kind of funding for an historic structure when we're not even finished with the plan yet. I don't approve the plan because there is no plan yet; so how can I fund it? I don't mean to be -- I'm not upset with you. I'm just emphatic about it because we are under tremendous financial constraints here. And like I mentioned earlier, we're having all kinds of debates about funding different things. And I want to preserve historic structures, but I want to go in with my eyes open and make sure we're spending our money the way I believe it should be spent and, of course, my rest of my colleagues believe it.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Do we have a motion to table? Legislator D'Amaro makes the motion to table. I'll second that.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

On the motion.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Legislator Horsley.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, I just wanted to -- before I vote on this, the dollars you said were the difference between the monies that were going to go into the Gerard-Homan House -- Homan-Gerard House, that -- are those dollars -- were you anticipating to fix the roof?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes, that's always our priority.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Do you have any other dollars that are left over in any other items that you could fix Sagtikos Manor's roof? Or is this the money that you were counting on to fix those roofs?

MR. MARTIN:

This account is where I would have to take the money from. And since it hasn't been funded in the past few years, I do not have any additional funds to tap into.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

That's a big deal.

MR. VAUGHN:

Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman. I would just offer the following: First of all, this resolution was not sponsored by the County Executive's Office. We haven't brought it forward. If there is concern about parts of this entire appropriation, such as what would be used to dedicate or restore full structure and then what would be used to make essentially emergency repairs, I think that would be a fair way to classify roof repairs.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah, absolutely. We don't want to deprive them of fixing the roof.

MR. VAUGHN:

Right. So I think that the middle ground here would be for the Executive's Office to have another conversation with the Parks Department, find out what it needed to shore up things such as roofs and possibly do a partial appropriation of that amount for where we need -- where we need something and maybe we can lay that on as a late starter if this bill were to be tabled today.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Legislator Stern had -- okay.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Mr. Vaughn, I appreciate those comments, but, you know, let's not get into the habit of saying, "okay, we have general emergency repairs that need to be done and that's going to cost 250,000. Let's tack another 750 into this bill to start the restoration on a project where the planning isn't complete." You know, they do that kind of stuff in Washington.

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, sir.

LEG. D'AMARO:

They amend bills. We're not going to go down that road. If we have specific structures that need to be addressed immediately, I'm all for that but -- and I understand it's not your bill. And I guess I would address the Commissioner as well. But, you know, it's almost like this -- you have that need and then tacked onto that is the beginning of this project, which seems, in my mind, premature. I'll defer to you on process, but it seems to me that how can I vote on the funding, like I said before, without knowing what the full extent of the restoration is going to be.

LEG. STERN:

Madam Chair, if I may?

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. Let me direct this also to Mr. Vaughn and perhaps you can work with the Director and the Commissioner on this. I would also like to see an analysis going back to what BRO had said before. There are line items, there are particular projects that already have funding that are allocated to those particular projects. We are making in conjunction with the Administration -- all the time making decisions on what projects are ready to go forward, which are not, where we can find offsets from, because the work just isn't going to get done for some particular reason.

So, I would like to see as a part of this, an analysis on which of those projects are going to be ready

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

to go forward and perhaps where we can find offsets from those projects first in order to meet our more immediate needs like fixing the roofs, rather than making a blanket allocation for that purpose. If there's money sitting in a line item that we're not going to get to, perhaps we can re-shift our priorities.

MR. VAUGHN:

May I respond to that?

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Yes.

MR. VAUGHN:

Thank you. I don't think that's an unfair request at all, sir. And, quite frankly, one of the things that we do look at very often when we are getting ready to lay pieces of legislation on the table, because we do take this responsibility that we've been entrusted with very seriously, is exactly what you've said, what is left in that account. And we had not moved this bill forward for a host of reasons, but we had not laid this on the table yet because we did also have some questions that were yet unresolved. And the Commissioner has his responsibility to, you know, discuss the projects that are before him, but this was not something that the Executive's Office had laid on the table or made a decision one way or the other about, quite frankly.

So we would be more than happy to go back, take another analysis of what is that account and what are the emergency projects that need to be funded and where we go from there; and what the timetable is, for example, on a full restoration and whether or not what a full restoration's going to cost or what a partial restoration's going to cost or what it's going to cost to not have the building fall down.

So it's certainly a fair and valid point.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Question.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah. Tom, on that, then what you're doing is you're committing to us today that you're going to figure out how we're going to deal with the situation of the roofs. That to me is critical. I mean, we have a responsibility for the historic homes that we have under our jurisdiction. And we've certainly -- the bottom line is you got to fix the roofs; otherwise, they're just not going to be there anymore. And we're not going to -- we're going to lose our historic heritage. So let's figure out -- can we figure out a way to get the money to them so that they can fix the roofs?

MR. VAUGHN:

Legislator Horsley, so I see this as --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

George Washington stayed at the Sagtikos Manor. I mean, that's --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Longtime ago.

LAUGHTER

MR. VAUGHN:

Legislator Horsley, as I see this, this is actually a two-part question. So, the first part is to determine exactly what is in the account and if there's any money --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yes.

MR. VAUGHN:

-- in that account currently allocated --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yep.

MR. VAUGHN:

-- to take care of things such as roof projects.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Fix the roofs.

MR. VAUGHN:

And then if there is not enough money in the balance of that account currently, we need to figure out what that amount is and introduce a bill that allocates a portion of that that would be appropriate to take care of those repairs and not have these structures deteriorate.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yep. That sounds like it summed it up.

MR. VAUGHN:

We will our do best to see what we can do to develop a bill and hopefully be able to lay it on as a late starter by Tuesday.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Right. And make sure that Rich has got the money to fix the Sagtikos. That's -- if we don't, the walls will fall down.

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes, sir.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

All right. We have a motion and a second. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Thank you. I mean, I'd like us to see -- to go a little bit further, I don't think it's enough to triage and only patch roofs. You know, this is the number one. This has been determined to be from a historical standpoint, from a number of other standpoints, the number one priority in terms of our historic structures to restore. And so whether -- you know, we can decide that maybe we can't do the full restoration this year, but I don't think all we should do is say we're only going to patch roofs. I think it's important that we move forward on some of this restoration beyond just patching roofs. And so I'm disappointed that that's all that the Committee is willing to commit to, but I look forward to hearing from the County Executive's Office on what they recommend.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay. We have a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. HAHN:

Opposed.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

1430 is tabled. (VOTE: 4-1-0-0)

1431, Amend Resolution No. 118-2013 to include active military in Golf Fee Pilot Program. (Schneiderman)

LEG. D'AMARO:

I will -- what is this, 1431, pilot program. I'll offer a motion to approve for discussion purposes.

LEG. STERN:

Second for discussion purposes. I have questions for Counsel.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay, we have a motion to approve by Legislator D'Amaro; second by Legislator Stern. And it is before us.

LEG. STERN:

Through the Chair, Madam Chair, to George, do we know -- do we have an idea as to what the definition of active military would entail? Do we know whether that would include Guard and Reserve or not? That would be important to know the answer to that question.

MR. NOLAN:

The resolution doesn't define -- doesn't include a definition of Armed Forces; it doesn't go beyond that term to answer the question you just posed.

LEG. STERN:

Do you believe that that could potentially be an issue? Is that something that perhaps we need to define more specifically in the legislation so that there's no question going forward?

MR. NOLAN:

You might want to pose that to the Commissioner if he'd have a problem implementing it as drafted.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I have no objection. No objection. To redefine it, to narrow the parameters on what we're going to consider -- what we're going to consider active military.

LEG. STERN:

Okay, so for going forward, it would be better in your opinion, Commissioner, then to have it maybe more specifically defined as to what active military service would entail.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, I don't think that could be -- I don't think that can hurt.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

But here's the issue with that: And I agree with you, but we don't meet again until after the golf season. No? Okay, so July 30th. All right, so do you want to withdraw your motion? Who made a motion?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yeah, I'll withdraw my motion.

LEG. STERN:

I think, Commissioner, you obviously are well aware of the intent, I'm sure you've spoken with the sponsor so you know what this legislation would seek to accomplish. I'm wondering if there is a way for us to be able to place on the record as to what the legislative intent is and at the same time be able to amend the provision so it kind of follows it; this way we don't have to hold up those that, you know, want to utilize our golf courses. We don't want to, you know, have something enacted halfway through the season. Maybe it's possible to proceed. You know with the intent is. And then we can have language that follows up.

My concern would be, you know, for the next Commissioner and the next Commissioner and the Commissioner after that, not necessarily having been part the conversation; so, I think, we should have something more specific in the language, but at least if we want to keep things moving, you'll know what -- you know, what was meant by this initiative.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I'm going to defer -- I'm going to defer to Counsel. I think the rates are set by -- are set by the Legislature. If we can do that -- I certainly don't have any objection.

LEG. D'AMARO:

No, the question is, though, who falls within the classification of active duty? That's the issue we think would be discretionary with you.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Wouldn't that be anybody that's activated by the United States government to serve in the military? I mean, is that pretty clear or not?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I believe so, but, I think, where the gray area lies is on reservists and whatnot. I don't think it -- and right now reservists are not -- I don't believe they're --

LEG. D'AMARO:

Right. And I think in fairness to those that would be affected, they would deserve a clear definition of who's included and who's not included as well. You know, we're just trying to clarify. We're not in opposition to this, but we're just trying to clarify.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Well, just let me say one thing. And we should clarify it. But this is a pilot program that ends in March. So if it doesn't go into effect until -- say we pass it July 30th, it goes into effect, what, August 1st automatically? Or -- yeah -- no, no, that's why I'm saying that that would be a good idea if we could do it that way. Yeah, I agree.

LEG. STERN:

Follow up with the language.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Tom, you look like you want to say something?

MR. VAUGHN:

The suggestion was made to me -- offered that perhaps this was something that the Committee

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

though unanimously that they wanted to adopt but for better language; then perhaps we could work on getting a stronger definition and add that to the -- maybe discharge the bill without a recommendation, add the language by a CN on Tuesday.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

That would be a good thing. Legislator Hahn.

LEG. HAHN:

Could we just leave that up to the Department, like, you know, does it have to be in the bill, the exact definition? Can't we --

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Well, I think what happens is then there's no room for error.

LEG. HAHN:

I mean, obviously the Department can be real specific when they implement it.

LEG. D'AMARO:

The Department only has the power and authority delegated to it by the legislation that we pass. And if it's not clear, then, some folks may be excluded that shouldn't -- the intent was not to exclude. We're trying to be inclusion.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Counsel wants to, I think, answer your question.

MR. NOLAN:

I was just going to state that elsewhere in the section on Park Fees, it talks about the spouses and children of active military. It talks about people who have been deployed or mobilized and they have to present proof of that. So maybe -- I don't know if that's what you -- if we don't change the resolution, is that what the Parks Department would go with, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

We certainly don't object to giving discounts to active military or members of active military who are deployed overseas. I mean, that's what we do in all of the other parks. The only place that it's not taking place is on the golf courses. And the intent is to take the provisions that we follow at all the other park locations and bring that into golf courses.

LEG. STERN:

Would this then be important language to include if we're -- we're really not just talking about the golf courses, but we are talking about the definition of active military service for all of the other services that we offer. This would seem to be an issue that goes beyond just -- just this bill and the golf courses. That's probably something that we should make very clear that applies throughout.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

I think it is clear for the rest of the courses. I thought you were asking if we needed to specify just for -- just for this bill.

LEG. STERN:

Only as I read it.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Okay.

LEG. STERN:

Which is why I ask the question. If it's not specified anywhere else, then, I would think it would -- it would have to be specified elsewhere.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

So, would you agree, Committee, we'll discharge without recommendation. We will clean up the language. And, Tom, come in with a CN and then we can get everybody out on the golf course.

MR. VAUGHN:

Yes. Because we all know how much we love doing CNs. But, yes, we would be happy --

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Yes, we do. And I think Legislator Cilmi had a question.

LEG. CILMI:

I just wanted to add -- I don't know this from firsthand experience, but my Aide tells me that when you're a military person, the ID, the military ID that, I guess, you would show to the Parks Department doesn't really distinction between reservist and non-reserve, you know, active enrolled members. So, there may not be any way for us practically speaking to distinguish between -- I don't know that that's, you know, firsthand whether or not that's true, but that's something that you can look into.

LEG. STERN:

Well, I think that's important to know from an administrative perspective. I guess, the concern that I would have is that might be true on our end, but you might have members of a particular part of the service that might not consider themselves as qualifying under the law unless we do make that kind of distinction; how we perceive it might not be the same as how they do.

LEG. CILMI:

All right.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

I believe we have a motion to discharge without recommendation. We have a second; correct?

LEG. D'AMARO:

I'll withdraw my motion to approve and offer a motion to discharge without recommendation.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Second by Legislator Stern. Is that okay?

LEG. STERN:

Sure.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

All in favor? Opposed? And **1431 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1461, Authorizing use of the Long Island Maritime Museum by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation for their annual "Sayville Run/Walk & Barbeque" fundraiser. (Co. Exec.) The fees are in, right? Okay, I'll make a motion.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Second.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Second by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? **1461 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1463, Authorizing use of Smith Point County Park property by Mastic Beach Ambulance Company for "Help Us Save You Program". (Browning). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? **1463 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1471, Appoint member to the Suffolk County Board of Trustees of Parks, Recreation, and Conservation (Peter W. Leis). (Pres. Off.) Mr. Leis, would you like to just come up here and tell us about yourself?

MR. LEIS:

Good afternoon and thank you for considering me. Yes, I'm a Physical Education teacher for 27 years at the Connetquot School District. I've worked for the Town of Islip for 47 years as the chief lifeguard; working my way up, again, as regular lifeguard, senior lifeguard and chief. I've also been the President of the Long Island Swimming Association and coached swimming for many years. And that's pretty much where my whole background is. So, thank you for having me.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Does anybody have any questions for Mr. Leis? Did you say yes?

LEG. D'AMARO:

I do.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Legislator D'Amaro.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Yes. Mr. Leis, welcome. Good afternoon to you. Thank you for coming down. Have you served on the Suffolk County Board of Trustees of Parks Recreation and Conservation in the past?

MR. LEIS:

No, sir, I haven't.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Have you familiarized yourself with what exactly this Commission -- this board does; what its jurisdiction is?

MR. LEIS:

No, sir, I haven't had any information at this time. Just basic understanding.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What's your basic understanding?

MR. LEIS:

My basic understanding of the job is that it's a committee that we're going to be meeting once a month. And, yeah, we'll probably decide on some of the policies and fees happening in Suffolk County; and also about the historical -- again, the Historical Societies and helping them out and getting their funding for the societies. Also, looking at the beaches and see how we can find funding for the beaches and help them out.

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. And this is, I believe, an advisory board, has advisory authority to advise on matters that affect exactly those areas -- some of those areas that you're talking about, parks, etcetera, beaches. I would defer to the Commissioner on the full jurisdiction. But you mention that you previously were employed -- what did you say -- as a lifeguard; is that what you said? I'm sorry.

MR. LEIS:

Yes. I was -- for about ten years I served as a chief lifeguard for the Town Beaches in charge of staffing; and also make sure the facilities are in operation and also fixing them up.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. And beyond that, do you have any other qualifications you want to present to us today with respect to advising us on parks' matters?

MR. LEIS:

No, sir.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Are you retired now from the Town of Islip?

MR. LEIS:

Yes, I'm retired; and also a retired teacher.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

What was -- oh, you're a retired teacher.

MR. LEIS:

Yes. One thing I would like --

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Did you say you were in Islip, though? You worked in Islip Town? Did you work in the Town of Islip; is that what you said?

MR. LEIS:

Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

As a lifeguard?

MR. LEIS:

Right.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay. And that was a -- a lifeguard is a Civil Service position?

MR. LEIS:

Chief lifeguard for the whole -- for the Town, which was in charge of three pools, seven beaches and Lake Ronkonkoma.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Right. That's a Civil Service; correct?

MR. LEIS:

Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay. Any other questions?

MR. LEIS:

The one thing I want to add, too, is also that I'm with the Red Cross. And I have a basic certification for Lifeguard CPR AED and instructed trainer. And also I'm an employee of Red Cross, too, part-time.

LEG. CILMI:

Madam Chair, I might add that Mr. Leis' appointment stems from discussion that your Committee had a couple of cycles ago where I happened to be present and heard the Commissioner say that Islip was lacking an appointment to the board. And so I reached out to the Town Board in the Town of Islip and that's where Mr. Leis' appointment comes from. I believe Mr. Dawson having worked for the Town of Islip Parks Department for some time has some experience and is pleased with the suggestion.

COMMISSIONER DAWSON:

Yeah, I've known Pete for probably close for 15 years now. And he actually worked with me as my Chief Lifeguard overseeing all the lifeguard operations. And on a personal note, he's actually in my child's school district so I've known him for quite some time.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay. Thank you. And thank you, Mr. Leis, for volunteering. Are there any other questions? Is there a motion?

LEG. D'AMARO:

Mr. Leis, so you really want to jump into this and start looking at all the County parks and policies and all of that? I mean, you're ready for this? Did you say you are retired, sir?

MR. LEIS:

Yes, sir.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You said you retired from -- as a school teacher; is that right?

MR. LEIS:

Yes.

LEG. D'AMARO:

What grades did you teach?

MR. LEIS:

It was elementary Phys Ed.

LEG. D'AMARO:

Elementary Phys Ed, did you say?

MR. LEIS:

Right. Yes.

6/12/2013 Parks Committee

LEG. D'AMARO:

Okay. That's great.

MR. LEIS:

Yeah, I guess I'm ready.

LEG. D'AMARO:

You ready for that? Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Okay. Then I'll make the motion; and second by Legislator Hahn. Is that okay, Legislator?

LEG. HAHN:

Sure.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

All in favor? Opposed? **1474 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)** And, Mr. Leis, you do not have to come on Tuesday to Riverhead to spend the day with us.

MR. LEIS:

Again, I'd like to thank you for accepting me. And I hope I can do you proud.

CHAIRWOMAN NOWICK:

Thank you. Thank you.

Okay. I guess this meeting -- if there's nothing else on the agenda, this meeting is adjourned.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 1:30 PM
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**