

**LONG ISLAND COMMISSION FOR AQUIFER PROTECTION  
MINUTES**

**November 18, 2014**

**SUFFOLK COUNTY WATER AUTHORITY  
260 Motor Parkway, Hauppauge, NY**

<b>ATTENDEE</b>	<b>REPRESENTING</b>
Fred W. Thiele, Jr.	NYS Assemblyman
Dorian Dale	Suffolk County Executive Appointee/Dept. of Economic Development & Planning
Brian Schneider	Nassau County Executive Appointee/DPW
Paul A. TeNyenhuis	Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District
Jennifer Mish	Representative - Legislator Spencer
Doug Feldman	Suffolk County Health Department
Sarah Meyland	Nassau County Legislature Minority Leader
Tony Leung	New York State DEC, Region 1
Stephen Terracciano	USGS
Karl Schweitzer	Nassau-Suffolk Water Commissioners Association
Michael Levy	Long Island Water Conference & Garden City Park Water District
Corey Humphrey	Nassau County Soil & Water Conservation District
Jason Hime	Suffolk County Department of Health Services
Jeffrey W. Szabo	Chief Executive Officer of SCWA and LICAP Chairman
Carrie Meek Gallagher	Chief Sustainability Officer - SCWA
John C. Milazzo	Counsel – SCWA
Steve Colabufo	Water Resources Manager of SCWA

At 10:06 a.m. Mr. Szabo called the meeting to order. He welcomed everyone and thanked them for attending. Mr. Szabo stated that we do have some business to get to today. He started with Public Comment and asked Assemblyman Fred Thiele to come up and talk about some of his plans related to possible State legislation that he is drafting. Mr. Szabo welcomed Assemblyman Thiele and introduced himself and each Member around the table introduced themselves as well.

Assemblyman Fred Thiele thanked Mr. Szabo for inviting him. He stated that it is after the elections, so he doesn't have anything else to do than come up to Hauppauge

(everyone laughed). He stated that he does appreciate the invitation to talk about one of the proposals. He stated that he thinks water quality has become one of the biggest or the biggest issues we are confronting on Long Island. There was the legislation that was introduced by Assemblyman Sweeney and Senator LaValle last year, the Water Quality Bill which passed in the Assembly, but did not pass in the Senate. We will be revisiting it this year. There was the announcement that the Governor made just before the election about various projects and initiatives with regard to water quality. He stated that what he was asked to talk about today was really another initiative that is being looked at would affect the five east end towns. A little bit of an outline on that and the reader's digest history of the Community Preservation Fund – the five east end towns, East Hampton, Southampton, Shelter Island, Southold and Riverhead. The five east end towns, since 1998 have had a piece of legislation called the Peconic Bay Region Community Preservation Fund. That legislation institutes a 2% Real Estate Transfer Tax on virtually all real estate transactions and has the usual exemptions from the State Transfer Tax and there is a \$250,000 exemption on all transactions. That 2% Real Estate Transfer Tax was adopted in 1998 and went into effect on April 1, 1999. That is a dedicated fund that can be used primarily for land preservation. The fund can be used to buy land for open space preservation purposes, for farmland preservation purposes, for parks and recreation purposes and also for historic preservation. Those are the four categories and that is what the overwhelming percentage of the money goes for those purposes, just by land. A small part of up to 10% can be utilized for stewardship related to the management of those lands. The Town of Southampton also has the ability to use up to 10% of their fund for payments in lieu of taxes for lands that were taken off of tax rolls in the Pine Barrens. But, overwhelming, the money is used right now for land preservation. If you look at the various categories, one of the intentions was certainly not to just protect the land, but to protect water, protect ground water, protect surface waters. If you look at the open space category, it is to protect underground aquifers, wetlands and surface water and things of that nature. The feeling being at the time, if we protect the land that would protect the water. That has been an underlying policy in mobile government and Suffolk County for a while. That fund has been in place since 1999 and since the 15 years that it has been in place, it has generated approximately \$1 billion, over \$950,000,000 for the five eastern towns, each town has its own fund, it is not one fund, it is five funds and is administered by that town. In the neighborhood of approximately 10,000 acres have been protected utilizing that fund. The 2% transfer tax that provides financing for the fund is due to expire in the year 2030. It is authorized by State legislation, implemented by local laws subject to a mandatory referendum. The votes were better than 2 to 1 when it was enacted. That is the existing program. There have been discussions over the last year that in spite of our best efforts to preserve open space and to protect land on the east end that has not been sufficient to protect water quality and we are seeing that and that's why we are here. That's why this group was set up and why there is so much other activity with regard to water quality and particularly with the issue of waste water. There is a focus, particularly on the east end, there are a few sewerage treatment districts, but mostly its individual septic systems and the County Executive in Suffolk has had a lot of focus on alternative septic systems. We have come to the conclusion in the five east end towns that just utilizing land preservation and zoning practices and land use regulations, by

itself is not going to change the direction of the degradation of water quality and thinks that there is the conclusion that green infrastructure and infrastructure improvements are going to be necessary to actually reverse the trend and improve water quality on the east end. Assemblyman Thiele stated he thinks this is true for all of Long Island, but equally true for the east end. What it comes down to is how are we going to pay for it and bets this is something we spend a lot of time talking about in this group and that is how are we going to pay for this infrastructure, which will be billions of dollars across the State of New York and Long Island. Long Island is property tax sensitive. There has not been any Federal money like there was for sewers and sewer treatment plants under the Clean Water Act in the 1970's. State government is strapped, local government is strapped – how are we going to pay for this? So one of the things we are looking at with Green Infrastructure and wastewater treatment and other water quality projects is the Community Preservation Fund. The concept that we are looking at is really relatively simple. For one, we would extend the fund from 2030 to 2050, for an additional 20 years – we would add a category that would be eligible for tapping into that fund for water quality projects. The initial definition that we utilized, and this is subject to discussion, was to use the same definition of water quality improvement projects as was in State Law for the 1996 Clean Water/Clean Air Bond Act which has a whole list of water quality improvement projects. We are going to adapt that definition because in 1996 there wasn't a whole lot of discussion about alternative waste water treatment systems and the definition is going to be modified to include that and the other part of this is that we are not going to all of a sudden abandon land preservation. We are talking about adding 20 years of revenue, 20 years of the tax and using a portion for capital projects for water quality improvements. There is broad consensus so far that we should be doing that. The debate is about the details and one of those details is about what that percentage should be. The initial proposal talked about taking 10% of the fund for water quality improvement projects. Assemblyman Thiele stated that this would mean in regard to dollar amounts. As mentioned, we generated about \$1 billion with the fund over the last 15+ years. We estimate that if we did nothing and just let the fund run out, it would generate about another \$1.2 billion between now and in 2030. So, under existing law, it generate about \$1 billion, and it will probably generate another \$1.2 billion. If we extend the fund for an additional 20 years, and these are very conservative estimates, it would generate an additional \$1.5 billion and the majority portion of that would still go to land preservation but a substantial percentage, up to 10% and what that would mean is somewhere, at least on the east end, 10% of the revenues from now until 2050 would be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$270 million. In discussions that we're having now, people are thinking that 10% for water quality is too low, that maybe it should be a higher percentage and we're going to discuss that a little bit further. The general proposal is to extend the CPF for 20 years, add water quality improvement projects, capital projects to what would be eligible under the fund – the process that we are going through is really going to be a three-step process. The first step is community consensus locally. There was really a broad-based coalition of community groups that was involved in the enactment of the Community Preservation Fund to begin with and that is why it succeeded – it wasn't just the usual suspects, which was environmental groups, civic groups and local government all wanted this. On the east end, that coalition included builders, real

estate brokers, bankers, the business community – those who had the sense that the preservation of land on the east end was in their enlightened self-interest and they haven't been disappointed in that fact because real estate, in spite of what happened in the recession, real estate has bounced back pretty quickly on the east end. This year alone, we are on pace to generate close to \$100 million just this year, which could be the highest year since 2007. The process first is we're meeting with all of those members of the coalition to make sure that we have buy-in from them to move forward with this concept. It will only succeed if there is consensus locally amongst the environmental groups, civic groups, local government and the business community and we're going to engage in that process – we're going to try to really get down to the specifics as far as this concept – what's the proper percentage, what's the proper cap for water quality projects and once that is done, we'll have to go back to the State Legislature for authorizing legislation to amend that would allow for water quality projects to be utilized. It is our intent to come in with legislation during this legislative session. Then finally, the third part of this is the enactment of the local laws, and again, a mandatory referendum. He expects a lot of activity in Albany with respect to water quality in general. Although Bob Sweeney is gone, he expects that bill to be reintroduced. He expects that this bill will be introduced and then certainly the Governor had a number of initiatives and one of them he's sure everyone is familiar with is the Town of Southampton, Anna Throne-Holst, Stony Brook University and Suffolk County have kind of joined together and the Governor proposed basically a research center for water quality – wastewater research at Stony Brook – he believes that is going to get a lot of attention this year. All of these things kind of fit together and again the amendment of the Community Preservation Fund is going to be one part of that.

Mr. Szabo thanked Assemblyman Thiele and stated that we have appreciated his efforts for many years now in the State Assembly – he has been a leader that this group here can work with – you always look to form coalitions and at the end of the day to move the ball forward and do the right thing, so he should be applauded for his leadership and we thank him for that. One other point Assemblyman Thiele wanted to make was on all of these pieces of legislation, but particularly the Sweeney-Lavalle bill, which was fairly controversial last year, the legislative session starts in January and Senator Lavalle will be back and they will be in the majority there, so he intends to put in legislation in the assembly. So certainly legislation will be put back in, but he doesn't know who the sponsor will be yet, who the Chair of the Environmental Conservation Committee is going to be yet. He thought one of the failures of that legislation last time, in particular, was that all of the stakeholders weren't necessarily involved in the discussion of that bill early on. He hopes with a second crack at it, we remedy that but any input, anybody around this table, but certainly for the broader base of stakeholders, he thinks that it will lead to a higher likelihood of success this time around.

Mr. Szabo then asked the Assemblyman if he is open to questions in which Assemblyman Thiele stated absolutely.

Assemblyman Thiele was asked by Mr. Colabufo if any part of the land acquisition that results from the revenue generated – is it reserved for the Water

Authority or perhaps Riverhead Water to develop well fields on some of that protected land because we found out the hard way that some of these land preservation programs have water supply infrastructure excluded from it. Assemblyman Thiele stated you would have to look at the documents that are involved in each and every one of these acquisitions, but generally speaking the statute does not preclude protected lands from being used for water supply. Mr. Colabufo stated that was good because that is a water quality plan improvement too, to extend water mains and public water to areas that are shoehorned into other existing residential lots that are surrounded by well fields that are unsewered cesspools. Assemblyman Thiele again stated that the statute doesn't preclude that.

Another question was in areas where there are impacted private wells like in the Speonk area and other areas in Suffolk County where from our private well sampling program we do find impacted wells and there are no water mains for the folks to connect to the public water supply. Is there any help from that fund to extend public water? Assemblyman Thiele stated, as far as this issue, that is something we would have to look – the answer to the question is that we have not put a final draft together yet and whether or not water main extensions would be included is something that would be subject to discussion. So, the answer isn't yes or no, it's maybe and something we're willing to talk about – flushing out the details. Assemblyman Thiele stated how does he say the next statement without impugning the profession that he is in and everyone laughed. He stated that when we define what a water quality improvement project is, it is always this balance between being very clear and being very specific without totally hamstringing yourself in the future. But, we don't want to have it so broad and so open-ended that people get creative in what they consider to be water quality improvement projects. We've seen a lot of raids on a lot of funds through the years. One of the things they will spend a lot of time on is redefining that definition of what the uses are and that will be one of them open for discussion.

Another question was that the State Bond Act Program calls for a match, so would this fund work the same way? Would you require the local municipality to match the project? Assemblyman Thiele stated that the local municipalities are generating the fund so we're using the definition so we know what kind of projects we're talking about – that's our starting point. But, it kind of works the other way – the Towns generate the money from the Community Preservation Fund and then they try to leverage that to get money from the County, State or Federal Government; so there's no requirement of a match. This is a funding source for the Towns and they don't have to match it with other dollars of theirs, but they do try to leverage it – certainly with the land preservation program and one of the things that might be possible is not just leveraging funds from the other levels of government because we find that at least in the Community Preservation Fund that when you had local money available for a match to an existing State of County program, it improved your chances of getting those moneys when you're willing to match or leverage with your local dollars. Assemblyman Thiele stated that he thinks that part is important, to be able to get funding from the State or from the Federal level, but this is a local source of funding. It was then asked if any of this money would be available for the upgrade of individual on-site systems. Assemblyman

Thiele responded by stating that that is probably one of the biggest things that we would like to do. We are talking about what would be the best way to do that – with a rebate program or whatever, but on the East end, the upgrade of individual septic systems, the idea of community systems, those are things that he would suspect a lot of this money is going to go to. One of the reasons why Anna Throne-Holst has her initiative is the fact that the technology is available, but tends to be pretty expensive. So, we do need a source of funds to subsidize and incentivize these actions by local homeowners and he thinks this is probably one of the primary focuses for what we would see this fund used for. A member then stated to Assemblyman Thiele that this was clearly inspired on his part because the financing is the gaping donut hole in everybody's concern about water quality and how it gets addressed, so as he is well aware, in Suffolk County the dedicated fund for waste water treatment is something like \$16 million a year out of the SRF and the IBM evaluation of how much it would take to address the 70% of Suffolk that is unsewered, is in the neighborhood of \$8 Billion. So \$270 Million is obviously an exponentially larger amount of money than the currently dedicated amount that he is suggesting and he is sure that we concur that there are probably going to have to be other sources of funding. Assemblyman Thiele responded by stating that he agrees. The member further stated that the County has been working on that and it behooves us to really begin to coordinate a little more effectively because he's right, Sweeney/Lavalle was not well handled as far as outreach was concerned so we don't want repetitions of those kinds of experiences moving forward so we certainly welcome it and would like to continue discussions and might add that there are some specific proposals relative to what the State could conceivably could provide in a rather inspired way – so we might have that discussion. Assemblyman Thiele stated that would be great – one of the things that he did not mention regarding matching funds – one of the things that the Community Preservation Fund was able to do on land preservation which he thinks we could also do with water quality is to work in concert with the Environmental Facilities Corporation and their loan program (a member stated that they have been having that conversation) where you borrow the money up front and then you pay the debt off at interest rates that are "0" or low – the member stated that if you have a county wide district, then you can begin to assign property, spread out the expense over the course of time – the obligation to the next homeowner, it's conceivably tax deductible, there are all sorts of funding that you can work on. Assemblyman Thiele agreed.

Mr. Szabo stated that "you could, in theory, correct me if I'm wrong, expand the original program to not only include the five East end towns, but the five Western towns, for the water quality portion and even possibly Nassau County, if that was something that the powers that be..." – Assemblyman Thiele responded by stating absolutely, he would take State Legislation – the history of the Community Preservation Fund for land preservation is that the five East end towns did it first, we passed authorizing legislation for Brookhaven Town which did not pass, and there have been numerous pieces of legislation mostly for local governments in the Hudson Valley for land preservation. This is something that, as you put a plan together, the most interesting part of it is how to pay for it – your suggestion is certainly a possibility, but it would require State legislation and another member stated that it would also require a referendum in each

town or in each County – Assemblyman Thiele stated that that depends on how the legislation is drafted. We were rather insistent on having the mandatory referendum. What we have here on – it’s on a town by town basis here and it doesn’t necessarily have to be that way, if you were doing something for water quality, but it would all depend on how you did the legislation. It is something to think about he thinks.

Mr. Szabo asked if there were any other questions and hearing none, he again thanked Assemblyman Thiele and stated that he looked forward to working with him in the future. Assemblyman Thiele also thanked everyone.

Mr. Szabo asked if there were any comments from the public. No one wished to comment.

Mr. Szabo then stated that everyone should have received copies of the June 25 and August 13, 2014, Committee Meetings and reviewed the Minutes. He asked for any comments before he asks for a motion to approve. No comments.

Mr. Szabo presented the minutes of the meeting of June 25, 2014 and August 13, 2014, for approval. On motion made by Karl Schweitzer, duly seconded by Brian Schneider, and unanimously carried, it was

**RESOLVED**, to accept the Minutes of the regular meeting held on June 25, 2014 and August 13, 2014.

Mr. Szabo then reviewed some business regarding the Appointment Letters and stated that he’s sure everyone is very sick of us asking for the Appointment Letters but if it’s not me, it’s Maria from the office, or Carrie, but we still need Appointment Letters for Brian, apparently that’s a Resolution by the Nassau County Legislature John – true? John Milazzo affirmed same. We do need one for Dorian (Dorian stated that he would send it up the ladder) and for Paul, correct John? John Milazzo stated “no, but he’ll check it” and then said “yes, they do need it.”

Mr. Szabo stated that he wished he could provide an update on the MOU between Nassau County and Suffolk County. This is also sort of in this endless abyss between the two legal departments. We have not heard from Dennis Brown, who is the point person on our end – I have a relationship with Dennis and was hoping he could work with Nassau County and move that, but we have not heard anything in a while. Mr. Szabo asked if Mr. Dale, maybe Brian, would follow up on that, it would be much appreciated. Mr. Schneider stated that he would ask Chris Ostuni and find out what is going on. Mr. Szabo said “great and appreciates that”.

Mr. Szabo then stated that everyone should have in front of them a calendar of the meeting schedule for 2015 as we look to move into the New Year. It looks like it is basically the second Wednesday of each quarter beginning February 11, June 10, September 10 and December 9, as the formal full Committee Meetings. We don’t need a resolution today, but we want to put the tentative dates on everyone’s radar – if you

know of any conflicts, let us know and we will, obviously try to amend and revise as we move along unless John, do you think we need a Resolution establishing dates wherein

Mr. Milazzo responded by stating if we are not going to meet before then, we should have a Resolution for at least February and then do the ones after that in February.

Mr. Szabo asked if there were any comments regarding the tentative schedule – we tried to stay away from legislative either committee or full-session days and he thinks we've done that.

Mr. Szabo asked for a motion to approve the LICAP 2015 Calendar for February, 2015.

On motion made by Michael Levy, duly seconded by Karl Schweitzer, and unanimously carried, it was

**RESOLVED**, to accept the LICAP 2015 Calendar for February, 2015.

Mr. Szabo then asked for a motion to appoint Michael Levy, the Vice-Chairman of the Long Island Commission for Aquifer Protection, stating that Mr. Levy would replace Dennis Kelleher, who resigned a couple of months ago. Dennis was the appointment of the Long Island Water Conference. Mike is the recommendation to replace him. Mike has been a tremendous asset working with LICAP – he is also someone who has interest and the ability to participate and actively work with the subcommittees and the full committee and it is his strong recommendation that we name Mike the Vice-Chair.

On motion made by Karl Schweitzer, duly seconded by Dorian Dale, and unanimously carried, it was

**RESOLVED**, to appoint Michael Levy, the Vice-Chairman of the Long Island Commission for Aquifer Protection.

Mr. Szabo thanked Mr. Schweitzer and Mr. Dale and congratulated Mr. Levy.

Mr. Szabo then stated that we do have a discussion related to the public hearings. If you recall, we had a public hearing in Nassau County and in Suffolk County, where a group of us allowed the public to comment on the State of the Aquifer. Those Minutes are posted, they're on the website for anyone to review. Moving forward, and we are required to have public hearings and he thinks it's certainly a good thing, but we have had some discussions previously about engaging the public in a more meaningful way. As a public hearing, there was not a dialogue – it was basically comments, the commission members listened, we had the Minutes posted and all that, but he believes moving forward, it would behoove all this group and certainly the subcommittees and all interested parties, if, at some point, we were able to have sort of a give and take, a dialogue with the public – he thinks we can do some things to help

promote the public meetings, maybe we won't call them public hearings, we'll call them public meetings to solicit a greater response from the public, but he wants to open it up for a general discussion about moving forward, where we are presently and try and get a consensus from the group to see if they would be supportive of additional public meetings. A member stated that the County Exec ran a pretty successful Town Hall Call-In which might make for more participation – it's conceivably an alternative to a physical meeting – having a more virtual set-up, which would be more convenient for people, would get more uptake. Mr. Szabo stated that's not a bad idea. We could hold the meeting again at the Legislature in Suffolk, or our office, or someone's office, but we could invite the public, but also have an opportunity for folks to call in or something like that – what do you think? A member stated that we would have to figure out who is paying for it and asked if that was paid for by Rauch – which was answered in the affirmative. Mr. Szabo asked if it was paid for to promote or to coordinate the.....the member answered, "to have the telecommunications technology to allow that many people to be calling in". Another member stated that one idea that occurred to him is sort of a recipe they used in the Harlem River and the Bronx River; now a Day in the Life of the Carmens River, A Day in the Life of the Peconic River, the Peconic Estuary – these events are geared toward the students and typically 8<sup>th</sup> grade or 5<sup>th</sup> grade, whenever they have their Earth Science classes. They usually require someone to meet students in the field and talk about water quality issues, stream water quality issues and ground water quality issues. In any case, the point being in other places, it has been an effective recipe for not only educating the kids, but their parents, because the kids do communicate what they're learned and it does, or we have seen it increase public awareness through actually educating the kids. He doesn't know if there is a way to engage committee to promote that kind of an event – he just wants to throw it out there as a recipe for public engagement that we've used in the past. Mr. Szabo stated he is thinking – how do we make that work and how do we make that effective. We have, we've very proud, I'm sure many of you have heard us talking about the Water Authority's outreach program to students primarily elementary school students – he thinks we teach approximately 10,000 a year with our aquifer demonstration – we do a Q&A, they go home and talk about it with their parents – it is a very good, official program that we've been doing for a number of years now, so he understands the point with trying to reach them, and therefore, contact with the parents, but how could we effectively do that? A member stated that we have to have a public outreach program or a community outreach program built from this committee, whether it's utilizing someone's public relations firms that we all use to help us pro-bono, or whatever it is – to streamline our message and get the message out, particularly to the civic groups – the people you really want to get to, and the schools as well. It has to be a consistent message, something that goes out all the time, almost in your face, otherwise you're not going to – the public meetings we have, they're good, but at least Nassau County, the attendance was low and another member that it was low in Suffolk County too. It was probably the people that were in the legislative building at the time that came in to speak. He just thinks that if we do it, we have to do more outreach – it really has to be built on public relations, whether it's a monthly message, but targeting the right audience. Schools are one of them, but getting into schools, he thinks we've seen it from fire education at one point, it's part of their curriculum and no one really pays a lot

of attention to it. Mr. Szabo stated that he thinks part of that, beyond the official notification, the official posting in Newsday and the websites and things like that, mailings to the Water Conference, civics and other providers, it does need to be more than that and it does need to be over an extended period of time – we know, if we're looking toward 2015, and we know at some point in the first quarter, there will be substantive worthwhile information that the two subcommittees and others—like the State of the Aquifer Report, if there are things that we can share with the public, promote it for a couple of months, invite the public to engage and have a Q&A, he thinks that that may be enough to spark interest. He also believes that depending on the day of the week, what's happening with the weather, what's happening in people's personal life, people get caught up with their day-to-day life and you never know. We see it all the time, even with the public portion of our board meetings, he's not sure if it's the moon, he's not sure what it is, but sometimes you get a group of people who are there to speak and other times no one comes and you move on with the Agenda. If there is a consensus that we need to do a better job at engaging the public and getting public support for some of our initiatives and some of the things that we're working on, and he thinks that's true, and asked if anyone to correct him if he's wrong, we should look for a couple of dates in the first quarter of 2015 and select some dates and some locations in both counties, maybe one in each, and ask our public relations firm, Zimmerman & Edelson, many of us have good relationships with them, I believe we contract with them, if they can work with us to put together a proposal to start soon, to start publicity and to put together a list of the people we want to invite and set up the Agenda and start promoting it, starting it sooner rather than later. Ms. Gallagher stated that it might be worthwhile to plan that around the release of the State of the Aquifer Report, so we're going to talk about that. A member stated that as we prepare to release our State of the Aquifer Report, maybe partnering with a university, maybe a Hofstra and a Stony Brook, one in Nassau and one in Suffolk, where we can have a public meeting. He knows that when you tend to do things at universities, you get more people involved, younger people involved – it seems that when we have these public meetings, whether it's Nassau or Suffolk, or the Water Conference, you get the same core group of people that show up every time. We have to try and expand on how we get the word out and that's a discussion we need to have, but maybe having it at Hofstra University or Nassau Community College or Post or wherever it may be, it seems that if you put something on a campus, you get younger people involved, these are the people of the future, they're involved in this – I think this is an avenue we can look into. Another member stated that going with the premise that you are probably well served being a little less conventional, making a couple of points here – he saw the Bronx River Day in the Life video – when it comes to surface waters, obviously a much more visual, palpable setting to engage then if you're talking about aquifers that are a couple of hundred feet underneath the ground that nobody can actually visualize the same way as you can a dirty river with boots and all sorts of other crap that you pull out of it. If at some point perhaps integrate messaging for the entire water cycle, as opposed to different segments of it, that is something to be factored in, but in terms of straight water quality, drinking water, taking the premise that one out of every six people in this world do not even have potable water, and again, from the standpoint of indirection, we know that people respond to altruistic charitable solicitations, the one being the ice bucket

challenge. When you talk about engaging the high schoolers, the college kids, there is a program called Life Straw where this particular mechanism costs like \$20 and it goes to various locals around the world where they don't have the good fortune and benefit of having pure water that comes right out of their tap and they don't even think about it. It's a way of making conceivably people who are here on Long Island that they are, in fact, fortunate because others are not. You then begin to get a sense of what really the value of good clean water drinking water is that at present we frankly take for granted and he thinks that a part of doing that is making folks aware that this is a privilege that many other people around the world do not share with us. So, it's just an idea – it's unconventional – he doesn't know if Zim Ed would come up with it, but he thinks we're right, we go to all these different gatherings and we have the usual suspects and we're always preaching to the choir. He thinks that somehow we have to think of ways to break out of that kind of cycle because it doesn't move the equation at all.

A member asked what is it that we really want the public to weigh in on? Mr. Szabo responded, that as mentioned at the public meetings, these are comments related to the State of the Aquifer, the state of drinking water, but it certainly has expanded to surface water because of the dialogue at an elevated state to get their thoughts on the State of the Aquifer – where are we today and that is one of the things that certainly Carrie and others have been working on. He thinks it's important that we hear from the general public. Whether they are happy with what the water providers and different levels of government, whether it is the DEC or the County or the State. What is working and what is not working. Ms. Gallagher stated that it may be easier to get input from them. The member asked if maybe we could provide them some kind of a document to outline what we have vs. what we could have, or is the State of the Aquifer going to be doing that for us? Mr. Szabo stated that the reason we held the public hearings relatively early in the process, was because we did not want to dictate to the public, here is the State of the Aquifer, there you go – enjoy; we wanted to try and engage the public, by public it could be civics, it could be professionals, it could be engineers, it could be people from the academic world and have them comment so we can incorporate some of those comments into the report itself. The member then asked if we feel that having four people come to a public hearing is adequate for them to move forward? Mr. Szabo responded “no, that's why we're saying we should do it differently – not have a hearing, we should have a public dialogue, a public meeting. The member stated that we checked off the box saying we'll have a public hearing, but our senses were that that was inadequate level of dialogue? Mr. Szabo responded stating the he thinks there needs to be more engagement. Another member stated that we have not engaged the public – we are a group that was put together and the mechanism is do we engage the general public and outside of the water arena, the environmentalist, those are the people we want to get to. He thinks the environmentalists get it, he thinks the water people get it, he thinks they get the sense of urgency, they understand why we're set up, but he thinks it's the other 80% that don't that we need to get to from a LICAP standpoint. Ms. Meyland stated that she is pretty dialed into the water community and she didn't know about these hearings until the very last minute. So if she is not aware that they are going on, it's pretty clear that virtually no one else is and that is why you have 4 or 5 people showing up. Some of those are people that she recommended

coming. She does think that having more public dialogue is good, but there has to be some point to it. When she was working with Spencer and Judy Bosworth, they had 3 hearings on Long Island in one year and every meeting generated more than 100 people and they got pages and pages of testimony. It didn't just happen, they had to work at it and she doesn't think the showing from the 2 hearings that we held shows that there was a real commitment to getting the public to come and what the point of their coming would be – what the dialogue would be, but it needs to be a little more in focus. Mr. Milazzo stated that the purpose of the first set of hearings, and they were at the recommendation of a member of the Commission, was to say “what are the issues” with the understanding that a State of the Aquifer Report was being prepared and that was going to be released, so the advocate was pretty passionate about making sure we allow people the opportunity to be heard and then we can take their comments in preparation rather than this is the report, this is everything we found. But, it wasn't the end - so they were going to release a State of the Aquifer Report and have another hearing on that which may focus a dialogue on the issues that are presented so that the people can then refine it and readdress the new issues. But it was not something this Commission was required to do, but it was something they undertook at the recommendation of one of its members as a better process. Was it perfect? No, it wasn't perfect. Was it an attempt to engage people and start the dialogue? Yes. The focus of this Commission, and talk about the ice bucket challenge, I'll be the ice bucket here, this was to be on scientific research, a technical working group to address issues using the expertise of the people in this room and whoever else was invited to participate or wanted to participate. That was the focus and we might want to keep that in mind – that these were the scientists, these were the bright lights in this field getting together and trying to prepare just basic research that we could use saying that's a trusted source and there's not a dispute of what this agency or this group finds and how people use it and can use it for that purpose. A member asked if he was talking about the State of the Aquifer Report and Mr. Milazzo stated he was talking about LICAP. That was the charge. Another member stated that its Mission Statement was public outreach. Mr. Milazzo stated that looking at the legislation, it wasn't public outreach and, of course, you should be engaged in that, but it was really to get the bright lights on the issues to talk and to prepare stuff free of politics – this is the science. Ms. Meyland asked if we accomplished that at the hearing. Mr. Szabo stated that he thinks Ms. Meyland is confusing the hearings with the purpose of the Commission itself, and we want to do a better job with engaging the public and soliciting input from them as we move forward, but this group was established by both County Legislatures because we needed a forum to collaborate. We needed consistently to sit and to share ideas and to work together to address the State of the Aquifer. So, that's the mission, public input is certainly something we value and will continue to value, but that hasn't been done in the past. This is a very important first step. Another member stated as a last comment, that we're at a point in time where we're not even a year old this Commission – we've tried to reach out to the public – there are 2 major media rallies, News12 and Newsday, who could really care less about the Commission. When you want to get the message out, they're the biggest avenue to get the message out. They're a proponent for us. We had public hearings – he didn't see much in the paper for them. There was an article in one piece of it, but if they want to help us and truly want to help promote the

message, then promote the message. This member stated that he was at a Community Meeting at Bethpage and they talked about the Grumman Plume and how bad it was – there were 250 people there – why? Because there’s an outcry on what’s going on. We’re here to try and protect the public for future generations, that’s what we’re here for. Let’s get that message out – we need Newsday to step up, we need News12 to step up. We need people to help us get our message out – we’re not reaching people that we need to reach. But, we got the ground work started, we’re less than a year old, it has to take some time to get going and he thinks for the most part, we’re on the right route, we’re just not there yet. Another member stated that he thinks we need to do the work first. We need to prepare the report, we need to come up with solutions, ideas and ways that we’re going to protect the aquifer – that’s the whole point of the Commission. So before we go to public outreach, we need to have solutions. Ms. Gallagher stated that we need products and addressed Ms. Meyland that it’s back to her original point – if you give the public something to respond to, you’ll be better able to engage them. So, we need to have a first set, within our first year of establishment, it’s not to the extent that we would like, but once the report is released, we can have a focus meeting which details what we found, what the short comings are which we’re going to talk about later – things we’ve identified as serious data gaps, which is a goal of the Commission to make sure we can fill those gaps in the future. We are working on the State of the Aquifer Report, but things we have to start working on now because it’s due in two and a half years is the Groundwater Resources Management Plan, which the last time there was a plan for all of Long Island was 1986, which she’s sure everyone is aware. So there’s two things, next year we’ll have a lot more to be able to engage the public on. The first is the inaugural State of the Aquifer Report and the second is an outline of working towards this Groundwater Resources Management Plan and what does that mean and the key will be how do you get people to understand that it’s something that is important to them and they should engage in. That’s where we’ll need assistance and Dorian’s unconventional marketing ideas and your past experience of pulling these meetings together. Mr. Szabo stated that we can jump around a little bit. Mr. Dale stated that on Mr. Schweitzer’s point, the mantra that the Newsday person can back us up, if it bleeds, it leads, right? Isn’t that how it works in the media? When you have plumes and elevated cancer rates, then people’s hair goes on fire and you wind up with 250 and up at meetings. So until you guys get some red food coloring and run it through the faucets, we’re not necessarily going to get that same kind of response either from the people or from Newsday. But it does get to the principle of being unconventional and to date what he thinks we have, at last, discovered is fine for seeing the usual suspects, as we do time after time, but if we’re really serious about taking it to another level, he thinks we need to approach this in several different directions. At the very least because what we’ve done so far, hasn’t attracted much attention, so maybe even if it sounds kind of kooky and out of left field, it can’t be any less impactful than what we had so far. Mr. Szabo stated that he thinks it’s going to take a lot of creative ideas from many folks at this table and other areas who certainly have more expertise than we do when you talk about trying to engage citizens, how do you get them to participate, how do you get them to care and how do you get them to comment? But, as we move into 2015 and look at the draft State of the Aquifer Report, he thinks a lot of the things we discussed today – engaging News12, Newsday, he loves the idea of

having public meetings at SUNY Stony Brook and at Hofstra University, he thinks that's something that could be extremely beneficial. We should between now and the first quarter of 2015, share ideas and talk about how we want to move forward and try to better engage the public. He asked to be corrected if he's wrong, but he thinks we all need to do a better job moving forward. Mr. Schneider agreed and stated that the squeaky wheel gets the grease and we've just been very silent – we've been just going ahead and having our meetings and doing our work, but in the meantime, there's information being released through the paper, an example is a couple of weeks ago it was front page on the Lloyd Aquifer and there was not one mention about this Commission. We weren't even mentioned, it's like we're a non-entity. So that's why it gets back to – we need to make some statements – at least get out in front of these things and let people know that we are working on these issues and it should be important to everybody, but if we're not going to get out in front of these things, we're just going to be a paper tiger at this point until we actually release something. How about the water suppliers and bill inserts and literature that goes along with bills – in Nassau we've got 53 or 54 water suppliers – he doesn't know if they get billed monthly or quarterly – we could be sending information to local groups almost on a monthly basis in anticipation of a public hearing and he likes the idea of rather than going kind of in a global look of Newsday and New12, the local community papers. A page ad in the local community papers he thinks has a lot of impact vs. something in Newsday that people just thumb through real quick so he would like to start on the local level. Another member stated that most people get their water bills online – Mr. Schneider stated that a lot of people still get mailings. A member stated that multiple districts have public relations endeavors, as did the Water Conference, it comes out to funding a lot of it and we're not funded. There's got to be creative ways to get the word out. A member stated that back to the point where Zimmerman & Edelson are available, if they are available, they're a community-minded public relations agency. They have the relationship with the weeklies and with Newsday, so they can be part of our voice in trying to get that message out. Mr. Szabo stated that we keep referring to Zimmerman & Edelson, because we have a relationship with them at the Water Authority, the Water Conference has a relationship with them, so they may be hearing from us quite a bit moving on this topic moving forward, he's sure they'll be thrilled. But, looking towards bill inserts, it's a good point, we're sending out billing 400,000 accounts – we're always looking for messages to try and catch our customers' attention and certainly promoting the things that we're doing here or a public meeting or an open house, whatever we want to call it, he thinks that's something we could consider, certainly the websites and things like that. What he would like to do at this point is speak to the public relations consultants – we have some time because we're looking for the first quarter 2015, and we will try to develop sort of a tentative outreach plan, locations, who do we want to attract, what will we present other than the State of the Aquifer Draft Report and we'll circulate and get everyone else's feedback – fair enough? He thanked everyone.

Mr. Szabo then asked Ms. Gallagher if she would like to talk about the Groundwater Research Management Plan before we go to the updates on the subcommittees? Ms. Gallagher stated sure and further stated that in realizing what an undertaking this is because it's been almost 30 years since a plan was put together and when you look at

that table of contents, clearly it is outdated in terms of – the general issues are similar but we have a lot more concerns now than we did back then or we know more now and can detect it at much lower levels – so we need to get a working group together and the first thing we need to do is figure out what the working contents of that report should be and who we can then assign to work on it. At a minimum she knows she'll need someone from USGS involved, someone from DEC involved, someone from each of the health departments involved, maybe Jason. We'll try and piggyback the work that the two subcommittees have been doing and we're going to hear the updates from them in a minute so kind of focus them in on producing some of that content. Ms. Gallagher asked Ms. Meyland if it's something she would be interested assisting in given her long history in the field, and the idea being at least then, if we could have an outline of what this report or plan would look like to present to the public for input – that she thinks would be very helpful in the Spring and would engage people in terms of trying to think long-term; and maybe putting in the contents some of the news that we've been hearing from, not only around the world but in our own Country, some places like California where aquifers are being seriously depleted so this is why we need to think long-term about our water supply. We can't always continue to take it for granted – it's always going to be there no matter what. Mr. Szabo asked if anyone saw the 60 Minutes segment the other night about California and the aquifer and if they haven't seen it, they should check it out – it's frightening.

Ms. Gallagher stated that she was putting Sarah Meyland down and asked for any other volunteers around this table – Steve – he doesn't have a choice. Mr. Levy stated that he'll see if he can get someone from the Water Conference. Ms. Gallagher stated that Paul Granger helped a lot when she sent out a specific information request for the Aquifer Report, but if you have someone who would be willing to serve like that. She further stated that she has Julie Hargrave from the Pine Barrens Commission also, she got special dispensation from her boss to be involved in this. She will send out an email to, after the holidays, get together and start honing in on what the contents should be, what the outline should be for a report like this and what we really want it to be and what we think we need to accomplish. Mr. Szabo thanked Ms. Gallagher.

Mr. Szabo then started the discussion on subcommittee updates. Mr. Colabufo stated that the Water Resource and Infrastructure Subcommittee, the one that he is chairing, they have had two meetings so far, one on September 11 and October 23 and the next one is scheduled for the 2<sup>nd</sup> of December. They have a hardcore group of six attendees, not a huge participation, but we got the blessing from the DEC to participate in future meetings, and asked Tony if this was right – Tony answered "I'm pretty sure." Mr. Milazzo asked Mr. Colabufo if he would like to say what this group is looking at. Mr. Colabufo stated that that was his next section. One of the things they are looking at, or a couple of things – they sort of decided on scenarios for aquifer configuration you might say for over the next 40 or so years of 2 to 3 foot sea level rise by mid to late century plus changes in rainfall and how that affects recharge to the aquifer based on existing public data that they got from the USGS and some of his colleagues and websites – from climate.gov website. So they seem to have a good outline on what type of scenarios could be expected in this area. It looks like it's fortunate that we're

dovetailing the three existing projects going on out there. One is the USGS' North Atlantic Coastal Plan project where there's a lot of interesting information pertinent not only to Long Island, but to the whole Northeast as a whole. The Health Department also is involved in a comp study update. Both of those projects are basically just about done except for a few details. He is also involved in Suffolk County's Agricultural Stewardship subcommittee and all three of these are providing very interesting and good information that can be used for the Groundwater Management Plan and other activities that this Subcommittee is engaged in. They have also talked extensively about reactivating Nassau's water quality database – trying to reinvigorate data collection, both of water levels and of water quality. In the New Year they're going to pursue that a little bit more earnestly trying to find out where the monitoring wells are, what condition they are in and what kind of data they can be used for in the future. There has been a whole discussion on dozens of other topics, but that's basically the synopsis right now. Ms. Gallagher stated that everyone is welcome to attend and participate – Mr. Colabufo agreeing. The next meeting is December 2<sup>nd</sup> and it will be here, so you know how to get here already. Ms. Meyland asked to be put on his mailing list. Mr. Szabo asked if there were any questions for Steve on how the subcommittees work; no one had any questions.

Next, Mr. Szabo asked Mr. Schweitzer to speak on his Subcommittee. Mr. Schweitzer stated that he has the Water Resources Opportunities Subcommittee which is short-term risk. We've met once and that was on September 30 and we have another tentative date set up for December 16<sup>th</sup>. We had to change venues, so we probably will meet at the offices of D&B in Woodbury, but he'll send out a notice when it's finalized. Ms. Gallagher told Mr. Schweitzer that if he gets us the details, Maria can send it to the larger group. He said "absolutely". He stated that at the first meeting, he had 13 members in attendance. We reviewed the public comments that were similar in both Nassau and Suffolk Counties – looking at the redundant issues that did come up. Initially, we had over 40 different topics that were suggested for the short-term committee to take a look at – what they ended up doing was try and get them to smaller manageable sub-groups to bring it to where they can have a little more focus on some of the issues. They sub-grouped and one was the aquifer quality and quantity and in that group, they are looking at saltwater intrusion, high-risk facility inspections, Geothermal Systems, sentinel groundwater quality monitoring network and regional water quality database. So, some tie into the other committee, but there were other topics they started to talk about – wastewater management was another one that got its own topic, nitrates, pesticides and fertilizers, VOC's, pharmaceuticals and personal care products, underground storage tanks, things of that nature – so the list was quite extensive. They also put in another sub-heading which they call "Customer Sensitive Issues". Maybe a little more politically sensitive, PSE&G use of what the chemical is on the utility poles, the opening of the New York City wells and what the effects may be to Nassau County; the enforcement of the existing regulations by the DEC, the reactivated Nassau County Water Resource Board, conservation caps for aquifer withdrawal air strip treatment for air emissions and so on. There was also another sub-group for water education. They spoke a little bit about water education and what the value of water is and water efficiency. They looked at that as another possible sub-group. So there was

a lot discussed, but at the end of that meeting, when you put it all together, where do we go from here – there's just too much for 13 people to start to tackle. The next meeting is going to be geared toward some of the issues that they come up with and what they think is important that's going to feed the report – what are they going to take on first, whether it's 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5. Whatever that number is and then take the committee and utilize the committee to step up and sub-chair some of those topics that are brought up so that we can at least make some headway. It's such an enormous task that you get nowhere. So, hopefully by doing this process, they can prioritize and hopefully move it in the next direction. Hopefully they'll do that at the next meeting and set up a better focus in 2015. Mr. Szabo asked when is the next meeting, which Mr. Schweitzer answered December 16<sup>th</sup>. Ms. Gallagher stated that ideally, they will be able to tap into, once they have an outline, for what they want the Groundwater Resources Management Plan to look like, they can tap into members of the subcommittees and kind of assign them workloads to produce – here's the contents we want for this section – go to work – and that will be the full focus of that subcommittee to update and present. That's how this all starts to come together and make sense and feed the report each year and the plan (they have to do an annual update, but that's administrative). That's the idea. Ms. Meyland asked Mr. Schweitzer is she can be added to the mailing list. Ms. Gallagher stated that we have her on our "larger group" mailing list. Mr. Szabo thanked Mr. Schwietzer.

Mr. Szabo stated that everyone should have the State of the Aquifer Report before them. Ms. Gallagher stated the working draft. Working being the operative term here. This is where we're at – we have to have something released by March 27<sup>th</sup>, statutorily. Ms. Gallagher stated that she'll walk everyone through this quickly and that they should take it with them and any of the missing content or edits or comments should be sent back to her by December 19<sup>th</sup>. It gives them a month to go through it and if they're rewriting a section, please feel free to rewrite it, send it to her in an email and write "please use this section in this place or here's updated information or here's a better graphic". Just send it to her in an email – she'll send out a PDF of this so they'll have it electronically as well. The idea being that they tried to tackle what they could with regard to water quality, water quantity and some background information on the aquifer system. One of the big gaps they've encountered is the fact that there is no Island-wide water quality database. So they'll see that this year's information is more background and anecdotal than what we would like to get to eventually. Eventually it would be nice if they could do more of a report card. But until they figure out how to gather all of that information and have it all in one place and analyze it and spit it out – that's what we'll be working towards. As you go through, you'll see some areas with highlights – anything with highlights means the data is missing or the contents are still under development. So if you happen to have data that is available or you have content ready at your fingertips, send it on over. Some of the other formatting components – ideally, each page or every other page, we would like to have a side bar that highlights one particular aspect. So, for now, that's just in a text box because when we had it in a side bar text box, everything was getting crazy with the formatting – things were disappearing as we tried to move stuff around. Also you'll see circles; those are supposed to be quick little facts. People maybe aren't going to read everything on the

pages, but they may look at the sidebar and that quick little fact. If you have suggestions for better facts for a topic, send it along. She is totally open to constructive criticism, input, you name it, but this at least gives you something, like we said with the public to respond to and it gives the Commission something to respond to. So, especially if you have additional graphics that you think would be helpful, it would be nice to have at least one or two graphics on every page to make it visually appealing. Again, you'll see highlighting which means there's data missing or content under development. It goes through the various water quality aspects, then we get into water quantity, water use on Long Island, and finally we get to, and this is where we're going to need additional input, especially from the Commission is where do we go from here – that might be where we come up with some of our recommendations for the first year, or things that we've discovered, such as the fact we don't have water quality data Island wide and we really need to do that or that we don't have a sentinel monitoring program Island-wide and we really need to have that in place. There are some key things that have come up at all the Committee meetings and Sub-Committee meetings – what we can do and how do we engage the public in taking action on helping to protect the aquifer; if you have ideas or activities that they can also engage in and also what's on the web – that's at the very end. So if there are really good resources on the web that we should be pointing people to, send those links to her and she'll make sure that we include it. She stated that she can spend more time going page by page if they want. A member asked if this gave any direction on where to send them for climate change facts. Ms. Gallagher responded that we have climate response network in there, but if you have other stuff, like she said, any other links you want to see in there, graphics you want to see in there, if you think something is not scientifically accurate for some reason or we need some other piece of information, then please send it to her by December 19<sup>th</sup> and she'll spend the holidays writing the report. We want to have something that will be in a more final format for that February meeting so that we'll still have another 5 to 6 weeks to get it finalized. The content and layout finalized – hopefully at that point, it's just getting the lay-out and design finalized and officially issued by the 27<sup>th</sup> of March. A member asked if this was going to include like where we are, what's going on, where do we go from here, how do we sustain what we have, but how do we sustain it moving forward. Another member stated that when we identify what's working, what's not working, what's available, what's not available, what about moving toward the future; how do we sustain what we do have? Mr. Szabo stated that the report is important and let us not lose focus. It's supposed to be a snapshot – 2014 State of the Aquifer. Based on other numerous reports that have been generated over the years with updated information from the Health Department, Nassau County, putting it all together – this is the State of the Aquifer today. But, there is a section here, and he thinks the most important thing and that hasn't been done – there has never been a State of the Aquifer Report done. What are the recommendations – this Committee should make recommendations to the County, to the State, to other entities and prioritize, where we are today, and where do we recommend the powers that be move us into the future. There will be a section on recommendations. A member stated that he thinks the subcommittees are a key part of that too. Mr. Szabo stated that they are supposed to vet out some of the key areas to be focused on and that will be part of the report. Ms. Gallagher stated that she guesses that what these guys should be working on at their

meetings in December – what do you want to see included in the State of the Aquifer Report. Keep in mind that while Suffolk County may have more specific data information – the key is to put together what you can say is Island-wide information and that was very, very challenging. Even in putting together the State of the Aquifer website, where they pulled .... A member stated that we are still missing Brooklyn and Queens. Another member stated that we're trying our best – we still have the city – was very diligent in collecting lots of aquifer information over the past 6 years to try and come up with a way to solve their problem and how they're going to subsidize their water needs when the pumps get shut down – so there is a pretty good database of information up to about a year or 2 ago. A member asked about the management aspects, if you look at this from a standpoint of critical path, there'll be, for argument's sake, three different directions in which we move forward during the course of the next 20, 30 or 40 years. How, overall, water resources get managed – we've had this discussion before, right now there's certainly not the kind of integration that we've seen elsewhere – does that become then simply an aspect feature of what we have in the section of moving forward because a decade or two from now we will not be looking at the same setting and operational construct that we have today. Management is an iatrical part of it, the members agreed. Ms. Gallagher stated that that will be elaborated on even more so when we talk about the Groundwater Research Management Plan and offering alternative scenarios – maybe this is how we do things now, this is where we're at now and where we're going to go in the future. We want to protect what we have and improve it. We have to do the basics to maintain for what we actually hope we can be improving water quality if it's possible and get rid of all the legacy contaminants and don't pollute anymore.

Ms. Gallagher stated that every year we're in existence, we have to produce an annual update, which is just an administrative document on what we did during that year. We have to produce a State of the Aquifer Report, which this will be the inaugural and we'll hope to get to more of a report card type document with say a special analysis, so it might be here's the snapshot of how we're doing in these various categories and, by the way, we're also going to do a more in-depth look this year at salt water intrusion or climate change or VOC and what's happening with those plumes and then the third thing, which we don't have to do every year, but the first version is due by March 27, 2017, so within 3 years of the Commission meeting, there is a Groundwater Resources Management Plan, which she believes may have to be updated periodically or maybe we saved ourselves because we don't know if we're going to exist after 5 years. We exist for 5 years, if nothing has been implemented at the State level, we have to be reauthorized to continue to exist.

Mr. Szabo stated that that covers the Agenda. He asked if there were any other comments or discussion topics that anyone would like to bring up – a member brought up the New York City wells and the salt water intrusion – we did get a proposal from the USGS which we requested from them on looking at the entire issue more in depth at their direction. It's a sizeable dollar figure and one that the County Exec has not really evaluated the proposal yet, he just got it a couple of days ago; the biggest issue seems to be, as part of the proposal, is the installation of monitoring wells in basically Brooklyn

and Queens. The proposal is over \$3 million and if the County is going to be participating in this project, we will not be able to pay to install wells not on County property. So, it's an issue that's going to come to the forefront if it's going to be part of the evaluation, which really needs to happen, that the City is going to have to step up and be a participant and a cooperater in this project, which is going to be a problem. It was asked if there has been any discussion between the DEP and the County and the answer was "no, not for this particular proposal". Mr. Terracciano stated that they have reached out to the City and they recognize that they are putting together an Environmental Impact Statement for the resumption of pumpage, they reached out to the DEC to obtain as much information as they can on what their plans are. We don't want to propose doing work that they are already doing; evaluate what the impact of turning on those wells are going to be; they revisited a lot of the modeling that they have done previously; they reached out to the Mayor's office; to Jim Roberts who is in charge of the bureau and are still waiting for a reply. One of the topics is to reach out to the City and invite them to Nassau for a public forum to let them know that there are going to be some pretty loud voices who want to know what the proposal is all about. Mr. Szabo asked if he thought it appropriate to have representatives from the City speak before LICAP? The answer was "absolutely, that was something that was discussed at the Water Resources board meeting was to collectively have maybe one meeting in Nassau and one in Suffolk or collectively just have a LICAP Meeting with a presentation from the City and Michael White was going to reach out to his contacts in the City and see if we can make that happen. Mr. Szabo stated that they may need to have a meeting before the February meeting and follow up with Mr. White to see if he's made any progress because we would all be interested in hearing from someone, he's assuming, from the Mayor's office or DEP.

Mr. Szabo asked if there was anything else and Ms. Gallagher stated that she and John checked the Resolution and it appears that both Dorian and Brian require legislative resolutions as well because it says that their appointment is subject to legislative approval.

Mr. Szabo thanked everyone and stated that the next meeting will be on February 11, 2015, if not sooner.

As there was no further business to be considered, a motion was made by Mr. Dale, and duly seconded by Mr. Schweitzer, the meeting was adjourned.

Prepared by: Maria Trupia

Reviewed by: Carrie Meek-Gallagher, CSO