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THE CHAIRMAN: Today is the first meeting of 2008. I'd like to wish everybody a Happy New Year. We have minutes that we can review.

I know Mr. Machtay has. I'd just thank Rich for being instantaneous to go through all these minutes.

Does anybody have any additions or corrections other than Mr. Machtay?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I gave Christine a couple of corrections. Also, Rich picked up a bunch of them, too.

CHAIRMAN: Very good.

Anybody else?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion to approve the October minutes?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion.

MS. RUSSO: Second.

CHAIRMAN: We have a second by Ms. Russo.

All in favor?
All opposed?

Motion carried. Now we have minutes from the 21st of November.

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?

MS. RUSSO: Second.

CHAIRMAN: We have a second by Ms. Russo. I'd just like to make a point of clarification in the notes; it says page 132, NOAA. It could very well be that that was meant to be the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. And if so, if it's NOAA -- I just want to check to see if that's correct. So I have a motion and a second. All in favor? Motion carried. And also a December 12, 2007 --

MS. SPENCER: Motion.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

MR. MACHTAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Machtay. Any discussion?

(No response).

CHAIRMAN: All in favor? Motion
carried. Historic Trust. Mary Ann, is there anything that you wanted to start out with?

MS. SPENCER: Rich is going to give the report. I'm very pleased that there will be an update at each meeting of these things, such as, the rentals that are ongoing, and I appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN: Very good.

MR. MARTIN: Good morning. The housing situation I'm going to discuss first, and we're still having people move out of the homes and County housing as the rents increase. There's another rent increase plan, at this time, for March 1st. The final increase is September 1st, which will bring all units to the full market rating. At this point, as of today, we have 13 vacancies and 15 of what we call units or apartments, and houses are full out of a total of 28. So we're approaching the half-way mark for the number of vacancies.

CHAIRMAN: And it's getting worse.
MR. MACHTAY: It's getting worse. I checked. To report on, there are two additional vacancies since the last report. And the Commissioner of Parks John Pavacic is very well aware of the situation, and he is discussing it right now with the County's Executive Office to see what can be done about this.

CHAIRMAN: Rich, before the meeting we were discussing this issue with Mr. Machtay, and, I think, he had some very good suggestions. And if he doesn't mind, would you share them with us so that, maybe, you can pass them on to the Commission of Parks.

MR. MARTIN: Sure.

MR. KAUFMAN: Not only the Commissioner of Parks, but the Economic Development. With all the talk today about affordable housing, pricing people out of housing that the County owns, seems a little eschewed. And if they're worried about corruption or conflicts, and they don't want to give it to
County employees or relatives of County employees, they can do a lottery through a neutral agency which has been done before and it's been done successfully.

And I don't say they should give the housing away for free, but, nevertheless, to keep people in it so it's, sort of, maintained and also to provide a housing opportunity for people who can't afford housing. May be it should be brought to Legislature's attention that they're talking out of both sides of their mouth and they should do something a little more creative.

Mr. Martin: I'll bring the ideas to the Commissioner. I know his point of view is that part of running the County Parks Departments is to have people at these parks, provide for them a sense of security, and he's pushing that point. The Legislative Resolution that we now work under requires that everyone be a County employee, so that would have to be changed.
MR. MARTIN: I understand that, but you have Jim Morge in the Executive's Office now. Lisa Brown is in Economic Development. And Lisa used to be my Economic Development Director under my supervision. And I know these people, what they're talking about, and I know what they'd like to accomplish. And here's an opportunity, not only now for the Parks Commissioner to go to the Legislature and for you to go to the Legislature, but for the Economic Development people to go to the Legislature and say "hey, what are we doing?" Here's an opportunity.

MS. GROWNEY: Rich, I know you've been working very diligently since I've known you over the past few years on this matter. And I know it's a very sore point because so many of the historic buildings have been brutally vandalized. And I know that we're working with you, the DIA, with the Parks, with the Commissioner.

One of the Parks tried to come up
with some possible ideas, but what occurs to me is that there must be other partnering that could happen or that, I think, needs to be explored. And these are our treasures, and so many of them -- they did take me on a tour, several of them, a couple of years ago. So many of them have been horribly vandalized. So I do think that there needs to be some other dialogue for partnering and other kinds of venues; specifically, the Economic Developing aspect and opening up to other people. I think it has to be looked at first.

MS. SPENCER: I think it's important to reiterate that the issue here is of the County owned properties. The ones that are dedicated to the Historic Trust, are the ones that Richard is pointing out now. And the manual stipulates that these properties not be left vacant, that's primary for security.

And the problem that's been ongoing, because of the way the Legislature has stipulated this, is that they have to be
market rents. And our argument on the
Trust, for several years now, has been
because of the importance of these
properties. That is a mitigating factor
because of the importance of security for
these properties. We have been asking
that this idea of market rent be
revisited.

MS. SQUIRES: Isn't the core problem
that it still has to be County
employees? And --

MR. MARTIN: I don't see that, to be
honest, as a problem.

MS. SQUIRES: It's not? Oh --

MR. MARTIN: Well, some of these rents
are quite high. We have some rents now
that are based on $3,000 --

MS. GROWNEY: -- plus utilities.

MR. MARTIN: -- and they can only be
given to County employees. Most County
employees can't afford that.

MS. GROWNEY: I think that it's
something that needs to be completely
looked at again, and there has to be
relief there in some capacity. I don't
know in what way, but I think that --
you know. I live out on the East end,
and rates out there, you know -- you
kind of expect to see that maybe out
there, but not on the rest of the
Island.

MR. MACHTAY: We do have housing at
Cedar Point County Park in East
Hampton. And all thought it is market
rate, it does relate to the areas the
houses are in. And the Parks
Department's point of view is that we
need a park staff person on site to
just take care of the everyday needs
that might arise since we don't have
regular staff at these parks on a 24
hour basis.

MS. GROWNEY: I completely support that
idea that there's somebody in the
buildings, because that's the only way
that there is protection. I witnessed
it, so I agree with that.

CHAIRMAN: Rich, I think you've got the
way of the land from this Committee, so I
want to move on. But I do want to ask,
we have a representative from
Legislator Schneiderman here today. Would
you say your name.

MS. Delisi: Christina Delisi.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Christina, would
you also bring this to the attention of
Legislator Schneiderman so, maybe, he can
begin to address the problem in a
Legislature's point of view?

MS. Delisi: Yes, and I know he also
has a lot of interest in the Workforce
Housing or Affordable Housing; so
that's one of the things I was going to
bring up to him.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Richard, next.

MR. MARTIN: The status of the contacts
that we've been working on for our
Historic Society to move into these
sites and start giving towards the
programs. The contract for the
Farmingville Schoolhouse -- which it is
being worked -- the elevation there.
The Farmingville Historical Society,
that was sent over to the County
Attorney's office January 30th for
their review.

The contract for Brookdale County Park, which the there would be the Great South Bay Audubon Society, was also sent over to the County Attorney's office January 30th for their review.

The Babylon Town Historical Society contract, which is for the Van Bourgondien House in Babylon, was also sent over to the County Attorney's office for their review.

So those three contracts have been completed by the Parks Department and our County Attorney's office. The Scully Estate contracts, which is with the Seatuck Association, there's additional legislative resolution that's needed for that contract. That is a unique contract that is for all of our sites to establish an enterprise fund, which will be funds for all the program fees and fundraising from that site, would go into and then be supervised for the County and then be given out for the expenses at that location. So these are the unique
situations that a resolution should come
up in the legislative review in the end of
March.

MR. KAUFMAN: Rich, if I may.

Regarding Seatuck, do they have a
contract in place right now for the
group itself?

MR. MARTIN: No, this is part of what's
needed to finalize and sign the
contract to establish this fund. That
was part of the enabling resolution
that the Legislature passed to approve
Seatuck that went into the site.

MR. KAUFMAN: Is there any sense of
urgency on this one?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, I have independent
knowledge that Seatuck has been worried
about the lack of a contract for quite
a long period of time. The last I
spoke to Enrico -- and this was months
ago -- they were saying where's the
contract? Where's the contract? They
need a contract. And it's just
worrysome that this issue has come up,
and also it's worrysome that it
couldn't have been handled, maybe, in a separate aspect for the separate contract. But, hopefully, it will get done. Like I said it is a unique contract. And it's been held up for quite some time, and they are very eager to have a contract signed so they can go ahead with their programing and their fundraising on site.

CHAIRMAN: Richard, I'd like to bring up a slight variation of those that we've been talking about, and that is maintenance of our properties. I think, in addition to not having people living in all of them, that there's just a plain lack of maintenance, resources to keep properties, that we do have, up. I'm wondering, is there a way that when a property is purchased, that there also be some provisions made that maintenance funds be appropriated to keep them up? In some cases, we're probably buying properties that are already protected in other ways, either through zoning, and so
forth. And if that's the case, then it's probably just a waste of County resources. I know we are not supposed to be concerned what it costs to do these things, but if we're concerned with preservation, we need to be first concerned about are the resources truly available to maintain them.

MR. MARTIN: That has been discussed in part at our Structural Committee meetings. And it is a concern, as the County continues to buy historic properties, that we do have the funding necessary to maintain. I don't have the answer to that, but it is a growing concern.

MS. SPENCER: I think that this is the most pressing issue for these properties. There isn't enough funding or staff for the properties that the County currently owns. The other thing that we need to bear in mind is, very often when one of these properties is acquired, it's acquired in order to save it and it's acquired -- it's not
in particularly good shape. Every now
and then, our properties acquire that
it is in good shape. Even if it's in
good shape, the maintenance of a
historic property, at the time, is
extremely expensive.

I couldn't do anything more. I
really wish that the County would make
that commitment to the properties that they
already own -- the historic properties
that are already dedicated to the Trust
and going forward. You know, the FEDS do
that. If the FEDS put some -- if they
accept a gift or acquire a historic
property, they also put the funding aside
to maintain it.

CHAIRMAN: So we should seek to do
something like that. So when Lauretta
comes to us with a proposal for
purchase of these properties, there
ought to be -- or, maybe, at least the
County ought to consider, that they are
some add-on that would say -- an early
continuing commitment, of a certain
percentage, of the cost to maintain it.
MR. BAGG: If I may point out, every resolution is supposed to have a Financial Impact Statement with it. And, technically, that Financial Impact Statement should clearly identify the cost of maintenance of those structures because they are buying a piece of property to preserve; in some instances, a historic structure. And the financial impact says no cost to us. That's not really true. If you're going to buy an existing historic structure, then, technically, there will be a maintained cost to ensure that that property stays in a good state. And I think the legislature, up to this point, really hasn't discussed those Financial Impact Statements and what the costs of maintenance are.

MS. GROWNEY: Has there been any discussion of a study to see what each property needs?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. In the past two years, we've been working on a study that's shown us what -- actually a time
period of ten years -- to maintain the buildings in their current state and also to fully resolve them.

MR. KAUFMAN: That study, has it been presented to the County Legislature and County Executive?

MR. MARTIN: Presented to County Executive's Office. We're actually meeting with them next Tuesday to go over the funding in the report and to explain it further.

MR. KAUFMAN: One of the reasons I asked that question, is to the extent that the Legislature is the allocating body, in terms of funds. Once you got this coordinated with the County Executive, it might be an intelligent way to go to bring this kind of stuff before the legislation itself. And, specifically, for example, rather than a letter from CEQ, an apparent sponsor may be head of the Historic Trust; may be sitting right next to you, for all I know.

And, you know, someone going into the
Parks Trustees and lobbying, somebody appearing before the Parks Committee at the Legislature and lobbying and saying this is what we need done. This is what we need allocated. We can get some support from the Exec, but we also have to carry the ball here. To the extent that we are the Historic Trust of the County of Suffolk; it's within our preview and within our responsibility to try and push these kinds of things. These kinds of issues and whatever conclusions you have.

Obviously, you have to respond first to the County Executive -- your Executive branch. But once that's done and once a coherent plan is, possible -- established -- I think maybe it would be a good idea to bring some of that back to us and then we can start, maybe, our own lobbying. We've talked about this kind of stuff in the past. The Legislature is the key to all of this, if you will -- or one of two keys, to getting anything done.

CHAIRMAN: Rich, is this report going to be presented to the Historic Trust
as well?

MR. BAGG: I've talked -- well, we've
gone over just the buildings that were
surveyed with the Structural Committee
but they haven't gotten a full report
at this time. We have talked with the
Commissioner about doing that, and I'll
bring also a suggestion of distributing
reports of the county legislature.

MS. SPENCER: Richard's brought all of
this forward at the -- this all started
under Commissioner Foley, and has been
ongoing for several years. And as each
portion of the survey was completed, it
came forward to the Trust. Richard
also presented to the Trust, the issues
as they unfold. And I think all of us
are very aware of how deep the need is.
It's -- you start to react because
another property is purchased, it's in
bad shape, and where are you going to
get the money for that?

But, it goes back to all the
dedicated property. The original --
correct me if I'm wrong -- Brighten...
And when you look at the needs of that original property -- the very first property in the Trust, the financial needs on that property alone are staggering and are unmet. It has never been restored, it's barely maintained, parts of it are falling down; and that was the first of over the sixty and the County is still buying more property, and some of them are also in terrible shape.

So, Michael's right. There's a deep need and we should be helping Richard, and we should figure out how to help Richard. We have a new Parks Commissioner whose both attuned and sympathetic, and he is going to the Executive Office. But, it may well be that a subset of us and myself and Richard -- whatever -- go forward to the Legislature to present some of this.

CHAIRMAN: I think it would be good. Also, Mary Ann, I would recommend that some time in the relatively near future, if you and Richard can get Mr. Pavacic to come to a CEQ meeting and we can get -- let him know how serious the
CEQ takes its duty and responsibilities with regard to the Historic Trust and try to start a dialogue with him. I think it could be helpful.

MS. SPENCER: I have begun that dialogue, and I think John would welcome the opportunity to come up and meet all the rest of you and understand that it's not just Richard and I.

MS. SQUIRES: I just wanted to go back to something that you said (indicating). You said there were a lot of things -- of properties we should look at. Where is the maintenance going to come from? And I think Lauretta can address it better than I currently can, but that's a problem because the funding is allocated. It is for acquisition, and it is not for maintenance. And that is true in the towns, also. I think -- I only speak for Huntington, but we have the same problem and we have agony over everything we purchase.
And as you look at a bond and people say to you "you're buying more, but how are you maintaining?" All you can say is "in my best judgment, if we don't acquire now, it is lost forever". But we almost have to have something separate. Wouldn't it be lovely to have a bond dedicated to the maintenance of what we have purchased. And I think it is very separate. And the money has to come from some place, and I think it's going to be a big chunk of money that comes from a very large place.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Joy. Jim, you had a comment that I think would be helpful.

MR. BAGG: Well, when a Councilman reviews, you know, both acquisitions with Historic Properties and buildings and -- historic structures and properties are considered part of SEQR's process. And I assume that the Council for the Compete...
As part of the Negative Declaration, you could stipulate that you would want these buildings maintained and restored in order to mitigate impact on the environment. Because Historic Structures are considered part of the SEQRA's process and the Environment.

MS. SQUIRES: But where is the money going to come from?

MR. BAGG: I think that's up to the Legislature and County Executive.

CHAIRMAN: So are you saying that we could reject a purchase until maintenance funds have been somehow identified?

MR. BAGG: I wouldn't say reject it. Basically, you put in a Negative Declaration. And, you know, these buildings have been maintained -- the structure has to be maintained, and the County should allocate maintenance from over the life of the structure. And that, technically, if the County doesn't do that and they acquire it, then, in essence, they're in violation
of the Negative Declaration.

I mean, you're simply making a recommendation. The Legislature could chose to ignore that and not put it in when they adopt it. However, at least the conflict goes on record.

MR. MACHTAY: Some of these organizations that want contracts with the County to use these properties and other buildings, do they have a responsibility to do the maintenance or to raise money to maintain the structures?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, that's part of the contract. Traditionally, it breaks down that the County does maintain the exterior of the building, and heating, air conditioning, electric, plumbing, the basics to run the building. But the organizations raise additional funds to do the interior restoration.

Deepwells is a good example. Their contract was signed. They have raised funds and now refinished all the floors in the first floor and are now restoring all
the original shutters.

MR. MACHTAY: So money could come from the organizations?

MR. MARTIN: Oh, definitely. It does on a regular basis. Also, they're eligible for State plans for restoration purposes that the County is not eligible for. The Sagtikos Manor Historic Society has been working with them, around $250,000 they planned and that they acquired; and while I say, traditionally, the County maintains the exterior, the majority of those funds are going to the exterior of the main house at Sagtikos Manor. It's not that they won't raise funds for the exterior, but that, traditionally, the County at least maintains the exterior.

MR. MACHTAY: So then there is another source of funds that we're not talking about here now.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, that's, of course, the issue with holding up the contracts for all these sites, because we're actually holding up the restoration
funds and the fundraising to be
started. And some of these are over a
year old and --

MR. MACHTAY: And that's another reason
to light a fire under the County
Attorney's Office and the County
Legislature to make these things happen
a little quickly.

MS. SPENCER: That's why it's a running
item on the agenda because of these
custodial agreements. Given the
quantity of funds and staff, these
funds for particular Historic
properties are a real boom. They
provide security, they ensure use, and
in many cases they help fund or restore
that property.

MR. MARTIN: Just to explain, we do not
have any county park staff to open
these historic sites to the public.
That is all done by the volunteer
organization. Our staff all resides at
the Timber Point office and we just
supervise what the volunteer
organizations do at the County Historic
Sites, but we do not provide the tours
or the programming at these Historic
Sites. We rely on these volunteer
organizations to do that.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Rich. Can you give
us a brief status report on the Bavarian
Inn?

MR. MARTIN: I don't know the status.
Maybe Lauretta can speak to that.

CHAIRMAN: We'll move on. Just to
remind everybody that it is a public
meeting and if anybody is here that
would like to speak, they should let us
know and they're certainly welcome to
do so.

Jim, what do you have for us under
the Recommended TYPE II Action?

MR. BAGGS: Basically, the list -- the two
packets before you -- one of January 2,
2008 and February 5, 2008. They're all
either Type II Actions or SEQRA --
instantaneously completed and the
projects are on the way.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have any questions for
Jim? Do we have a motion to accept
staff recommendations?

MR. KAUFMAN: I'll make a
recommendation to accept staff
recommendations.

MR. MACHTAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Any further discussions?
All in favor? Motion carried.

Unlisted Actions, proposed
acquisition for open preservation purposes
known as the Carlls River County Park
addition. Lauretta, Happy New Year.

MS. FISCHER: I have one acquisition
before you today. The Carlls River
County Park Addition and the Napoli
Construction Property. It's two
parcels consisting of approximately a
third of an acre to the west of the
headwaters, actually, of the Carlls
River and the hamlet of Deer Park and
the Town of Babylon.

As you can see we're trying to
acquire a number of low-lying wetland
parcels in this watershed and Masterlists,
too. However, these two were put in by
separate resolution, by a local
legislator, Horsley. And I'm before you
to review this and wish your acceptance or
rejection.

CHAIRMAN: Any questions?

MR. KAUFMAN: Lauretta, first off, good
morning.

MS. FISCHER: Good morning.

MR. KAUFMAN: The corridor seems to
appear on there on the north-south
axis, that's the headwaters itself?

MS. FISCHER: Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN: And they stop right at
the -- whatever road that is over
there.

MS. FISCHER: Pretty much. It's
intermittent wetland along that north
south property that's outlined in
green.

MS. RUSSO: Good morning, Lauretta.

MS. FISCHER: Good morning.

MS. RUSSO: On the photo, it looks like
a very small parcel outlined in grey
has structures on it?

MS. FISCHER: It doesn't have
structures, it's just a little off. If
you pole the boundaries of the yellow
lines -- just a little south -- it will
show that it doesn't include the
structures.

MS. RUSSO: And then the long corridor
wooded area that runs parallel to the
long axis, that, I'm assuming, is like
a PAPER ROE 2344.

MS. FISCHER: Yes, so once we acquire
this and we own the properties on the
other side, to the East, then we can
merge that and abandon the road.

CHAIRMAN: My question is should we be
buying properties that aren't
identified on Masterlists two? And my
second question is, since this was
owned by an apparent -- a construction
company, what was it used for and what
was the environmental conditions that
may be a problem on the property?

MS. FISCHER: It's a vacant wooded lot
at this time, so as to uses in the past,
you know -- I don't know how far back
we want to go -- but, obviously, the
woodland has been there at least 20 to
30 years. I would imagine that it was
disturbed some time before that. I
wouldn't know, specifically when that
had occurred, but it is a low lying
area. And I'm sure that there are
issues with its development -- I don't
know what they are, particularly, with
this specific site, but it's low lying
and wet enough that it would be part of
this watershed.

My recommendation would be to acquire
it so that we don't see any further
development in these watersheds. We do
have issues with other watersheds and
flooding of residential homes near and
around those watersheds, so it is part and
parcel of our effort to protect this
watershed as best we can. And, obviously,
we have sites in and around here that
we're trying to acquire as well. So it
fits into our goals to protect this
watershed, this specific property.

CHAIRMAN: I don't want to belabor the
point too much, but I find it very
interesting that that piece of property
was excluded from the Masterlists; but
yet if you go to the north and the east
-- in the area that's outlined in
yellow -- there is a smaller place and
the fact is. So I'm curious as to why
the fact is and this isn't.

MS. FISCHER: Actually, that's a
problem that we've come across when we
put the list together. Subsequently,
they develop and they'll be taken off our
acquisition list. That's part and
parcel of what we do when we do our
initial review of the property.
Obviously, that property would be
omitted from further acquisition.

MS. GROWNEY: The question I have has
to do with test holes; are test holes
ever done on these properties to see
what there might be?

MS. FISCHER: Not that I'm aware of.
It could be part of our environmental
assessments, but I don't know if it was
actually, specifically done on this
site.

MS. GROWNEY: I think it's something to
be considered.

CHAIRMAN: Certainly, I think we have a series of environmental reviews on some properties. I'm not sure we've ever gone through the extent of having to drill, but Jim feels that, I think, that this property has not been disturbed in quite some time, so it's probably problematic.

MR. BAGG: I reviewed the assessment. And, basically, when the Environmental Assessment for potential contamination and toxic and hazardous substances comes in, properties get reviewed and evaluated. There is a 50-year aerial photograph reconnaissance. Technically, if any - what is termed - environmental conditions are noted at the site that is when you go to a phase two for something of that nature. But just looking at this particular site, wetness of this site, and the proximity to the, you know, river or whatever, stream and it hasn't been
developed probably because it is
constrained from the wetlands point of
view and, technically, couldn't be
developed. And it's probably been in
that state for forever. I don't know
how some construction company came
to own it, but that's not ours to
reason why. It's clearly in a
residential section, so, therefore,
being owned by a construction company
doesn't necessarily mean they're going
to develop it for commercial or any
other reason.

MR. KAUFMAN: Just to let you know, the
name of a corporation usually doesn't
mean anything. I've dealt with a
number of corporations, and I've got
crazy names on properties that are
owned by these corporations. You know,
you can name a corporation anything you
want to. If somebody has a
construction business and sees a piece
of property that they want to buy and
just hold on to for a while, they'll
often use the corporate entity that's
out there and maybe later on they'll change the name or form a separate entity beyond that to preserve or perform certain corporate purposes.

CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Any motions?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion.

MR. MACHTAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second by Mr. Machtay. All in favor? Opposed.

CHAIRMAN: You have a comment on the Bavarian Inn status?

MS. FISCHER: I believe it was approved by the Legislature as an override to County Executive Levy's veto of last year. That indicates that we can move forward doing appraisals and reaching out to see if we have a willing seller. So, it's in the process.

CHAIRMAN: This piece of property, I think illustrates extremely well the concerns that we have been talking about earlier in the program. Apparently the basement is under water, for all practical purposes, and the
question is how are we going to deal
with it? Are we going to tear it down?

    MS. FISCHER: Well, our recommendation
to the Legislature was to acquire this,
actually, as a restoration site. And
what we suggested is that the buildings
be demolished, and the cost of the
demolition of those buildings would be
part of the cost of the property. So,
that will be taken into consideration
with the value of the -- and the offer
to the owner.

    MR. KAUFMAN: Just to add on to
something that Lauretta was talking
about. Legislator Kennedy has been
talking about, I think, forming some
sort of task force or looking into the
planning process to do exactly what
you're talking about, Lauretta, in a
little more detail. I know there's a
lot of specific interest in the area in
terms of restoring it possibly to a more
natural condition.

    MS. FISCHER: That's what we suggested
to them, and they supported that.
Initially they were thinking of using
the building for some community center.
We felt that was not appropriate based
on the condition of those buildings and
the cost associated with that, and
because of its strategic location
between the extensive wetland to the
north of the lake and its location
directly on the lake and adjacent to
all the County properties, we felt that
restoring the structure to a more
natural state was the best
recommendation we can make for that
property.

MR. KAUFMAN: One further question:
Has anyone done any recognizance over
there to see what might be on the
property?

MS. FISCHER: I mean, yes, we've gone
over there with the Parks Department,
with the Department of Public Works,
and with the Health Department.

MR. KAUFMAN: Have you seen
environmental issues in terms of clean
up or anything like that? Obviously,
there's septic systems on the property?

MS. FISCHER: Yes, there are two septic systems there. They will have to be addressed and remedied. And we'll have our Department of Health Services overseeing that. We've had them involved -- already involved in assessing the property and if we move forward -- first, we have to see if we have a willing seller. So, if we don't have a moving seller, then we're not moving forward. If we do have a willing seller and this process moves forward, they will become part and parcel of the review of this as well as doing our phase one and, most probably, a phase two of our process of the property.

MR. SWANSON: This is one of those properties where you definitely want to see some sort of toxic and hazardous materials review. Issues with the septic systems -- you know, they probably use degreasers and all sorts of things like that.
MS. FISCHER: Yes.

MR. SWANSON: So it could be a potential hazard, I would suspect.

MS. FISCHER: Yes, we're aware of one of their septic systems deals with the kitchen waste, specifically. So those issues are already on our radar.

MR. SWANSON: Thank you.

MS. FISCHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Now, moving on to other business. We were supposed to have elections of officers last month. That was postponed because of the meeting. Those were postponed or cancelled, so if you'd like to speak, we'll do it now. Do we have any motions for officers this year? Anybody want to -- desire to run?

MS. RUSSO: I would like to make a motion to nominate Larry for Chairman, again, and Mr. Kaufman for Vice Chairman.

MR. KAUFMAN: I second that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anybody else that wants to take nominations? All in favor?
Motion carried. Thank you for your vote of confidence.

Jim, do you want to comment on what we've been talking about where you were appreciating some of our past members?

MR. BAGG: Well, you have discussed with me possibly getting a certificate of appreciation for the people that have served on the Council for many, many years. Two of them; Terry Elkowitz who was Chairperson for the CEQ for over 10 years; Thomas Cramer has been around, again, for over 15 years. And when we check the records, Nancy Manfrandonia was on the CEQ for many, many years -- probably for as long as Tom. So, we'll bring it before the CEQ -- if it's what you desire to have -- the necessary Certificates of Appreciation drawn up, and you can, possibly, invite these people to the CEQ to present them their certificates.

MS. SPENCER: That's a good idea.

CHAIRMAN: Any other discussions? I might have to say, having served on the
Board with all three of these people
for a number of years, they were
completely devoted to the CEQ. They
did an outstanding job, and -- you
know, with the County's loss. And in
fact, they all decided that their time
had come to leave the Board. So I
formally believe we owe them gratitude.
Do we have a motion to --

MR. KAUFMAN: I'll make a motion.

MR. MACHTAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN: We have a second. All in
favor? All opposed? Motion carried.

Now this is probably a record. I
forgot Joy.

MS. SQUIRES: I don't really have
anything to say, but interesting enough
Nancy Manfredonia is now Chair of Islip
Conservation Board. So, she could, in
fact, if we can talk her into it, come
back and sit here. I don't think she
will, but -- unless it happens to
involve something regarding Islip. But
-- no, I don't have anything specific.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion to adjourn?
Do we have a second? All in favor?

Meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon the meeting was concluded at 10:37 a.m.)
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