

**Long Island Regional Planning Council
Summary Minutes**

**LIRPC Meeting – March 11, 2021
Zoom Virtual Meeting**

LIRPC Members Present

John D. Cameron, Jr., Chair
Michael White, Vice Co-Chair
Jeffrey Kraut, Treasurer
Theresa Sanders, Secretary
Supervisor Don Clavin
Elizabeth Custodio
Mayor Barbara Donno
Nancy Engelhardt
Jeff Guillot
Mayor Robert Kennedy

Staff and Guests Present

Richard V. Guardino, Jr., Executive Director
Elizabeth Cole, Deputy Executive Director
Missy Leder, Executive Assistant
Alan Belniak
Todd Poole
Regina Zara
Jim Green
Mitchell Pally
Sarah Lansdale
Kate Laible
Richard Bivone
Dorian Dale
Connie Lassandro
Mark Smith
McAlado
Charles Flagg
Jim McCaffrey
Robert Brodsky
Richard Murdocco
Dave Barnes
Aaron Siegel
Wendy
Ted Rosen
Sabrina Verma
Sean Sallie
Diana Weir
Angie Carpenter
Anthony Core

Amy Waldman
Mia Knapp
Ian Wilder
Bryan DeLuca
Kevin Brady
Mary Jo O'Hagan
Patti Bourne
Jonathan Keyes
S. Colgan
A. Thomas Levin
Jenny Kate
Kendra Armstead
Lorraine Deller
Randi Shubin Dresner
Michael Fitzpatrick
Kevin Gershowitz
E. Pleva
Natalie Wright
Rob Carpenter
Carol Lane
C. Sandler
Trudy Fitzsimmons
Rebecca Sinclair
Michelle Bergin
Adam Moss
Tracey Krut
Sharon Mullon
Hui Min Yao
Jeff Murphree

Meeting Commenced:

John D. Cameron, Jr., opened the meeting at approximately 10AM.

John Cameron:

I'd like to welcome you all to the March meeting of the Long Island Regional Planning Council. What we typically do when we are in person is have a pledge of allegiance. I would like to have the pledge and maybe since Supervisor Wehrheim happens to have the American flag in his office in our livestream, maybe you could lead us in a pledge.

Pledge of Allegiance

John Cameron:

Thank you, Supervisor. Our Executive Director, Rich Guardino, will now conduct a roll call.

Rich Guardino:

Welcome, everyone. Thank you all for being with us this morning.

Roll Call

John D. Cameron, Jr., Chair
Michael White, Vice Co-Chair
Jeffrey Kraut, Treasurer
Theresa Sanders, Secretary
Don Clavin
Elizabeth Custodio
Barbara Donno
Nancy Engelhardt
Jeff Guillot
Robert Kennedy
Ed Wehrheim

Rich Guardino:

John, we have a quorum thanks to our Council members. So, what we'd like to do is have Alan Belniak of VHB, who's been assisting us the last few months with regard to our virtual meetings, explain how the technology will work for our audience. Thank you.

Alan Belniak:

Absolutely. Thank you for the opportunity to assist this meeting. For those of you joining us this morning, thank you and welcome. If this is the first time you've been part of the zoom webinar, they are somewhat different than zoom meetings and we are looking forward to some interaction. There are three ways you can interact. For those of you who are joining in from zoom via your computer or a mobile device, if you look down below in your strip of zoom commands, you should see a couple options. One should be raise hand and it looks like someone's giving you a high five. You should also see q&a. When the time is right if you press raise hand it sends a command to me that you would like to speak. Once the time is right, I will selectively call out your name and allow you to speak or ask your question or share your comment and the rest of the panel will respond and react. We will then cycle through everyone raising their hand again. If you prefer not to do that, you can use the q&a box where you can type that question in. I'll read that question or comment out loud to the panel and they will respond and react. If we have a mix of both, we'll kind of go back and forth to keep it somewhat interactive. If you're dialing in on the telephone, star nine will raise your hand and I would then send a command to your phone to unmute yourself and then you would follow the same exact procedure. As a reminder, this meeting is being recorded for archival purposes. I'll repeat these instructions once more when we get to the q&a session. With that, I'll put myself back on mute and I'll hand it back over to John and Rich for the rest of the meeting.

John Cameron:

Thank you, Alan. Rich, I guess first order of business are the resolutions.

Rich Guardino:

The next order of business will be the adoption of the minutes from the November 18 meeting.

Adoption of the November 18, 2020 minutes

Motion to Accept: Jeff Kraut

Seconded: Jeff Guillot

All in Favor: So moved.

Election of Officers for the 2020 LIRPC

Motion to Accept John Cameron as Chair of the Long Island Regional Planning Council: Michael White

Seconded: Jeff Kraut

John Cameron abstained

All in Favor: So moved.

Motion to Accept Michael White as Vice Co-Chair of the Long Island Regional Planning Council: Nancy Englehardt

Seconded: Barbara Donno

Michael White abstained

All in Favor: So moved.

Motion to Accept Jeff Kraut as Treasurer of the Long Island Regional Planning Council: Nancy Engelhardt

Seconded: Barbara Donno

Jeff Kraut abstained

All in Favor: So moved.

Motion to Accept Theresa Sanders as Secretary of the Long Island Regional Planning Council: Nancy Engelhardt

Seconded: Barbara Donno

Theresa Sanders abstained

All in Favor: So moved.

Rich Guardino:

The next order of business is the presentation by Todd Poole, the President of 4ward Planning and he will be talking about the impact of multifamily housing on both school districts and parking. Todd has done a great job for us on a number of projects. He did the economic impact for both Farmingdale and Patchogue. He is President, Founder and Managing Principal of 4ward Planning. Todd has more than 29 years of economic development experience, both in the private sector and the public sector. We're delighted to have him back with us this morning for this presentation.

Todd Poole:

Rich, thank you very much and John, congratulations.

Good morning, everyone. As Rich mentioned, my name is Todd Poole. I'm President, Managing Principal of 4ward Planning. We focus on performing real estate and economic analysis on behalf of public and private sector clients nationally. The presentation that I'm about to take you through really, I think, is a timely one. It's a topical one. It is focused on the impacts of multifamily residential development. While

we're focused on Long Island in this case, this could have application anywhere in the country. I know because we work on such projects. In this particular case, what we're focused on are the impacts of public-school aged children, resulting from the development of multifamily residential units, as well as parking. Specifically, is there enough offsite parking where the project is being built such that it doesn't place a burden on street parking in a particular village or town or city. Those are the two issues that we're going to look at and were the subjects of the study we were hired for by the LIRPC.

So Alan, I guess I can share my screen now. Super.

I'm going to take you through a kind of a high level view of the study that we conducted and then get right to it with key findings. We're breaking this up into the student impact and then the parking impacts. The first set of slides will go through the student impact.

Enrollment trends are uneven across school districts. We looked at multiple school districts where these projects were developed. In total, there are six school districts that were identified and where these developments were built. What we saw was that relatively few students were added by new projects in that they had any significant influence on the school district's enrollment trends. Where there was increasing enrollment, it really had little to do with the fact that there were multifamily residential projects being built. As a matter of fact, in most cases, there was an increase in enrollment, but only about 20% of the students coming from these development projects were part of that increase in enrollment. So, we don't see any influence with respect to new development. Total spending is not a precise indicator of enrollment trends and really, what we're talking about here are budgets, which across all school districts continue to rise. This rise is not necessarily a function of the number of school kids that are enrolled, there are a variety of other reasons for the increases. In some cases, it's because of expenditures on capital equipment or special education. Other times, teachers or new personnel need to be hired. There are cases where budgets increase, yet the enrollment has decreased. We've seen this in this study. We do a lot of fiscal impact analysis for other clients and we examine a lot of enrollment trends as well as school district budgets. It is not uncommon to see enrollment at a particular school district either remain flat over a number of years or even decrease yet, the budget continues to increase. So again, we did not see any influence relative to the addition of school aged kids from these projects having influenced budgets.

I will show you a little bit more detail. The project revenues that were created as a result of these multifamily projects, which were in part ad valorem taxes and is the conventional property tax that is applied to a development or a PILOT (PILOT is an acronym standing for payment in lieu of taxes, which a number of these projects were subjects of PILOTs) contributing specifically to the school district (not excluding the municipality and the county) exceeded the estimated cost per pupil. In many cases, it well exceeded the costs. As you can see at the bottom, the median surplus of revenues over service costs was approximately \$322,000 which is a pretty sizable benefit. This is for one year examined and the reason that it is one year examine is because in many other years there is not complete data. We wanted to make sure that when we examined this, we had complete data across all districts for a given

year for the selected projects. You can see which municipality they're associated with in the county and then ultimately the school district.

Why were these particular projects selected? We had a screening criteria that we developed in consultation with LIRPC that looked at multifamily projects that had at least 100 units that were (in most cases) within a mile of mass transit, such as a commuter rail or light rail station and were built in the last 10 years. In this case, 2010 was the cutoff. We also wanted to have some semblance of balance between Nassau and Suffolk County. These projects for the most part are what we consider at least their market rate projects, some of them might be considered luxury. Most of these projects were predominantly filled with studios, one and two bedroom units while a few had three bedroom units. Here we show what the total units for each of these projects are and you can see most of them are in excess of 200 units.

In order to look or to understand student districts, or school district enrollment trends, and how these particular projects may have influenced student enrollment, we looked at enrollment for each of the districts across time, starting with 2010 and going all the way through 2018-2019, which for our purposes is the latest year where we could have consistent data across school districts. The numbers or the enrollment figures that you see in red, indicate the year in which this particular redevelopment project or multifamily residential project was opened. In other words, it was constructed, it received a certificate of occupancy, and it was now leasing. We wanted to use that as the starting year. You can see for the different districts where you have the red enrollment numbers is the year in which that particular project in that district was leasing and the other years, either before or after that, are showing you how enrollment has changed. On this particular slide, we're showing you enrollment numbers as of the first year of residential occupancy, and in parentheses you have that particular school year and then we're showing you, as of 2018-2019, the number of total students enrolled. The change of students enrolled is listed in the next column as is the percentage change. As you can see, the takeaway of this slide is that of the six school districts that are identified here, only three of those school districts show an increase in student enrollment. Those would be Uniondale, Mineola, and Longwood. We're also showing you the total percentage change in students enrolled between 2010 and 2019. Uniondale clearly has the largest percentage increase at 10.2%. Now, if we stopped here and I gave you no new or additional information, one might surmise that the development of these multifamily residential buildings had everything to do with those increases.

What I want to show you is on this particular slide. Our chart here shows the change in students enrolled in the year of occupancy through 2019 in the first column in the table to the left. You can see those numbers with Uniondale at nearly 500 students and Mineola at about 115 students which represents two separate multifamily residential projects. At the bottom of the screen it's notated that The Allure in Mineola saw an increase of 15 students enrolled and at the One Third Avenue project 7 students were enrolled. For those of you who are wondering, how did you already know how many students were enrolled? We utilized the study that was done by Stony Brook just a couple of years ago. Through their efforts using a FOIL mechanism, the Freedom of Information Law, they were able to identify the number of public school aged children from each of the projects that were enrolled in the

public school system for that given district. These numbers are not estimates, but actual numbers as reported by the school districts themselves.

Again, looking at that first column, you see the net increase in number of students enrolled. If you go all the way to the right using the percentage of students associated with the residential projects relative to the total increase in enrollment, you can see what those percentages represent. You will see Uniondale with 2.65% which is 13 divided by the 490, Mineola with 19.1%, and Longwood with 15% of the students associated with that residential project as a percentage of the total enrollment, all of which are relatively small. These numbers demonstrate that the increase in enrollment in these districts were not driven by the number of kids that were coming from these residential projects.

It's important to understand in many cases, and most of you have probably been witness to this, when there is pushback on the development of multifamily residential projects, often it's because those in opposition believe that the residential projects will dramatically increase the number of public school aged kids. There's a variety of reasons for why that is not the case, not least of which is fertility rates throughout the region, particularly in New York State, but certainly on Long Island that have been decreasing. Another reason is married couples are choosing to have fewer children. Those two issues are reasons why you see fewer school aged kids and not because of the number of residential units being developed. When you have smaller bedroom counts being developed, you will naturally have fewer public school age children attending the school district. Now, having identified the number of school aged kids from each one of these residential projects, the next step is to figure out approximately what is the service cost for each one of these students within a given school district. Let me start by saying, and I'm sure most of you have been exposed to this, this notion that every kid that arrives at the school district costs an average of the entire budget divided by the total enrollment is just not correct. In many cases, if you did that math, you might arrive at a number of anywhere between \$20,000 and \$30,000 per student in terms of that student's educational cost to the district. The fact of the matter is that is a gross overstatement for most cases and it certainly does a disservice to those really trying to understand what the true service cost is to that school district. The method that should be utilized for this calculation is to strip out things associated with personnel like salaries and benefits, strip out debt service capital projects and transfer costs. We are doing this because the next student that arrives in that particular school district (under the assumption that there is a capacity for that student) will have little if any effect on personnel in the district. Think about it this way, a student arrives and there are a number of empty desks at varying grade levels, the only true costs associated with that student would most likely be purchasing an extra textbook or additional food being provided to that student. We may also include paper materials or gym equipment that might be specific to that student. We are really talking about marginal costs for each additional student that shows up. So knowing that, if you're at capacity in that school district where you would be required to hire new personnel, teachers, teacher aides for an additional student, there is an additional cost. It is not likely that you're going to be hiring a new administrative person or somebody in the superintendent's office and it's not likely that employee benefits are going to increase because a new student has showed up. These are the reasons why we would strip out those costs trying to limit it to incremental cost associated with adding new students. So after having done that, and we do this now for all of our fiscal impact analyses that we perform, you end

up with an adjusted budget expenditure per student, in this case of \$6,684, and this is for the Farmingdale school districts. As an example, multiplying that \$6,684 by, in this case, the six students associated with this project, the Jefferson at Farmingdale, would give you one-year total cost number of \$40,101. That is to say that we would expect the total cost for that specific year, using the latest budget year in this case, to be approximately \$40,000 for these six students to enroll and are likely spread across grade levels. That's how we arrive at the cost side of this equation and we've done this for each one of the school districts in which these projects are located. In this case, I'm showing you the Avalon Garden City with 13 students multiplied by the adjusted budget expenditure per student, in this case \$9,230 resulting in almost \$120,000 total cost for the 2020-2021 enrollment year. Finally, I'm showing you for Mineola, the One Third Avenue and the Lord Mineola projects combined 22 students, and you're seeing a total one year combined cost of \$128,313. For reference, I do provide the methodology in more explicit detail in the study.

We took a look at what each of these projects were generating in terms of annual revenue, whether it be the ad valorem tax, the real estate, property tax or PILOT revenues. For each of those, we went to either the Nassau County tax assessor's database or the Suffolk County tax assessor's database or, in most of these cases, we had to look at the IDAs, the Industrial Development Agencies and examine their annual budgets to figure out how much each of these projects were contributing annually in PILOT payments. Now, you will see in parentheses that I have in that second, from the first right column, I have the annual revenue from each one of these projects associated with these districts. It is for 2019. The reason we are using 2019 is that we do not have data through 2021 to match up against the school district budget cost numbers. So really, what we would expect is if we did have the more current year revenues they would be even greater than what we're expressing here in this table. The \$292,216 revenue figure associated with Farmingdale school district would probably be in excess of \$300,000 if we were looking at the latest data for 2021. The same thing applies all the way down into this column. Nonetheless, what is highlighted in the red outline is the net impact to the school district. As you can see, in every case, the net impact is positive. That is to say that the revenues generated, whether they be ad valorem taxes or PILOT payments are in excess, and in most cases well in excess, of the estimated total annual school cost. Keeping in mind that we're using the latest school cost figures, yet 2019 revenue figures for each one of these projects, it's quite favorable and I think it demonstrates that in the case of revenues versus school costs, these projects are more than paying for themselves. This is just a recap of what the median net positive impact per district is. What we've identified is that basically \$322,329 is midpoint of positive impact created by the school districts and this is as great as \$737,456 within the Mineola school district. The lowest positive impact is in Patchogue at nearly \$55,000 above the school cost generated.

As I mentioned, we also looked at parking. Here are some of the key findings. Multifamily parking ratios do not increase on street parking demand. These developments have been built with lower than average historical parking ratios. By that I mean that 20 years ago, you might have had a multifamily rental unit being built with the requirement of having a 2.0 parking spaces per unit built. What we are now seeing is that those ratios have been reduced to 1.5, in some cases as low as one or even below 1.0 spaces per unit. One of the reasons that is possible is because the units that are being built are generally

being served by mass transit. In many cases, it is close enough for folks to either walk, perhaps take an Uber or maybe there's a shuttle bus. Add to that, younger persons who are falling in the millennial generation cohort don't necessarily want to drive or even own a car so they're taking full advantage of public transit, if they're not working remotely. Obviously, as we've seen over the last year, more and more folks who have the ability to work remotely, are being given that opportunity so that's also contributing to why you don't need as many parking spaces per unit.

Multiple new multifamily developments continue to provide parking volume at or above standard minimums. What we're really saying there is, even while the ratios have been lowered, there are in many cases more parking being provided than is being demanded by that particular development. We know this based on a survey and a conversation with some of the representatives of these residential projects, whether it's a leasing agent or the manager on site, as well as anecdotal evidence. Mixed use multifamily developments, maybe call it co-located with other parking intensive uses, are not contributing directly to demand for space. Many of the multifamily development projects that we see being developed today and certainly some that we've studied here, are referred to as mixed use. In other words, while the majority of the development is residential in nature, there is a portion of that development that is commercial in nature. It might have restaurants or service businesses on the ground floor. While the parking demands created by the commercial element will increase the need for parking spaces, in most cases, that parking demand is being satisfied by on street metered parking or by spaces located in publicly created lots. However, it is not impacting the residential parking associated with that particular project because the developments themselves have supplied a sufficient number of parking spaces for those users. Finally, off-site visitor retail patron parking does matter in the communities in which we examined the parking demand, specifically Patchogue and Farmingdale come to mind. We've studied these two villages and conclude that they intently have done a great job providing off street parking in addition to their on street metered parking. They have acquired property and developed surface parking lots. In many cases, the meter cost of parking is quite low. These parking lots are scattered throughout particular municipalities close into the central business district. This table shows the development projects that we examined on the very left hand column, the municipalities in which these projects exist and the county. Again, we're showing the number of residential units and the parking spaces associated with each one of those developments in the space, the ratio of parking spaces per unit. And as you can see, the vast majority of the parking space ratios are 1.5 or less. In none of the cases where we had responses from the multifamily residential representatives did we hear of any issues where parking for residents wasn't being satisfied. This table shows the projects and what we heard back or observed in terms of our examination of the parking demand issues at these properties. In some cases, there wasn't sufficient parking in the initial phases of development, specifically in the case about the Reserve at the Boulevard, but with subsequent development fees, additional parking spaces were added to accommodate residential parking on site.

Finally, I would just like to spotlight the New Village at Patchogue, which was created or developed back in 2014. Mayor Paul Pontieri of Patchogue really deserves a lot of credit for being a champion for the creation of more parking. It is important to understand where there are parking challenges, specifically in these particular communities which have seen multifamily development, it's as a result of the success

of the commercial establishments that have been created over the last five to 10 years. Restaurants, retail and other service businesses bring not only patrons, but also the workers that need a place to park. As a result of a lot of forward thinking, elected officials have basically been out in front of this and created more parking areas within their communities. In some instances, they have been creative. In Patchogue, for example, they have a mechanism that is known as PILEUP, which is different from PILOT. PILEUP is an acronym for payment in lieu of parking. To explain, if there's a development with a lot of commercial space, rather than trying to create those parking spaces on their project site, which could become cost prohibitive or a space issue, they've created a fund to which many contribute. The municipality controls it to build offsite public available parking spaces throughout the central business district. They're contributing a certain amount of money that offsets the cost of constructing that parking space, which is a very smart way of doing it. It's a win-win type opportunity.

With that, my formal presentation or the overview of the study is complete and I will be more than happy to answer questions.

John Cameron:

Thanks, Todd. We're going to open it up to questions from the Council first and then the general public, but I would like to make a couple of comments. This study is very important for many of you that have been following the work of the Council. Over 10 years ago, we did LI2035, which was a 25-year sustainability plan for Long Island. We identified two major impediments for Long Island's future viability, those being the challenges of an unsustainable tax burden and the lack of diversity in housing. There have been numerous studies which show that Long Island really does have a dearth of rental housing, which is why you look and say it's very expensive. New apartments can be expensive and it's simply a story of supply and demand. Supply is inadequate for the demand. As a result, the cost of these new units can be quite expensive. It's very difficult for young people to be able to afford these apartments while saving enough money for a down payment on a home. If you look at the paradigm of what we need to establish here on Long Island, it is sufficiency of rental housing and not just for the young working force. The empty nesters who would like to downsize their homes are also looking for options. We could actually get that transition model going if we have sufficient rental housing. Some of the senior citizens if you will, or empty nesters, would like to move into rental housing in particular in the downtowns. My wife and I can personally attest to this as it is exactly what we did. In turn, your house becomes available for the market for young people to move into to raise their families. We need to have this rental housing stock significantly improved. As we all know young families bring school aged children. Well, unfortunately on Long Island, there have been many schools that have been closed and the space used for development because there has been a lack of young people. This study is providing, importantly, the data to show that these units, these multifamily developments, really are tax positive and it's debunking a myth that's been out there for many, many years.

I think it's critical that we get this information out there. We've done additional work as Rich Guardino alluded to and it's important work. I want to mention that there is a parking study that was completed a year or two ago done by the Rauch Foundation. The study examined the excess of parking lots on Long Island and the potential to economically drive our economy and to grow our commercial tax base or the

residential tax base by developing these parking lots. With the onset of the COVID pandemic, unfortunately, we have even a greater excess of parking spaces. I'm not proposing that we will utilize them all, but we should be looking at these smartly. It's important to have the data regarding the demand for off street parking due to these multifamily units.

I want to salute Todd for an excellent job. Alan, if you will, please explain how this will work.

Alan Belniak:

Great, thank you. As a reminder for those joining from the public, we're going to get to your comments and questions in just a moment. I'm just going to run through how that works. Again, you have two options, you can use the raise hand button down below. If you look in the bottom strip of zoom commands and it's not there, just move your mouse over it, you'll see a hand that sends a command to me that you'd like to come off of mute, and ask a question or share a comment. When the time is right, I'll call out your name, send the command to your device to unmute yourself. You ask your question, share your comments and a member of the of the panel here will respond. If you prefer to interact in text based form, you can use the q&a box down below as well. Simply type in your question or comment and I'll read it aloud. Once again, a member of the panel here will respond. If you're dialing in via the telephone and want to raise your hand, you can by pressing star nine. As I said at the top of the meeting in case anyone has joined late, we are recording the session for archival purposes. With that, I'd like to turn it over to the board and the panel to give them the first opportunity to ask questions or share comments. Let's start with Jeff Kraut.

Jeff Kraut:

This is great. It's so critical to replace fear based or uninformed comments with fact-based comments. That drives smart growth. I think the issue here is showing the net positive impact of some of these developments and refuting that they increase taxes. Would you be able to estimate the next year school budget after the development was done in terms of the reassessment of taxes in Mineola for example? How you would tease this out? The fact of the matter is because the district added an additional \$737,000, it has a calculable impact on the taxes, school taxes, which everybody would pay. I wonder if that is negligible or even quantifiable. Any discussion or study which can take these numbers and pop them into very simplistic, but easy to communicate, talking points is very helpful to put some balance on this anti-development fervor.

Todd Poole:

Jeff, here's where it gets complex. I have to say, I do these kinds of analyses in different states and New York is always the one that I grimace about doing, because it is so complex. The complexity is that while these projects, as I've demonstrated in this study, are creating more revenue than it costs to educate these children (whether it's ad valorem or PILOT monies), it does not necessarily mean that the school districts get all of that money. I've had this discussion with superintendents as well as business administrators and what they will say is that these projects are generating that money and access. They will refute that issue. I've had most of them say, "Yes, you're right, but we may not see that money if our budget does not allow them to spend that money." However, what it does do, because the money goes

somewhere, is it gives local jurisdictions the ability to stabilize the tax rate because if it's not going there, it's going back into the general fund. It does allow for a stabilization of the taxes for the citizens of that particular community so there's a benefit. To the extent that the cost of the public school child is covered, absolutely, that is the case.

I thought if I could just add a clarification with regard to the school budgets. The capital expenditures are excluded from the from the cap. You get additional revenue that can help DPS. So I think there is a strong benefit there also.

Alan Belniak:

Great, thank you for that. The next hand I see as Nancy.

Nancy Englehardt:

Todd, thank you very much. I would assume that most of us are in alignment with the data and research that you're showing. We're looking to really break down the barriers that exist in having more of these developments in different communities. What vehicle or opportunities do you have to disseminate this information to present in the different communities across our region because again, as Jeff said, it's the fear of the unknown or false assumptions that create pushback. Do you have a plan to be able to present this to people who do not know and are not for ongoing housing diversity?

Todd Poole:

This is an opportunity to take a report like this and disseminate it in various areas of Long Island and keep it up on a website and just continually hammer it home. You can't just present this one time and expect everybody to absorb this. It needs to be an ongoing conversation. I'm working on another study, looking at the repurposing of struggling shopping center sites to include more affordable housing and workforce housing. This is an opportunity to marry a lot of this information. I think if it's presented often enough, I think eventually it does sink in.

Rich Guardino:

Nancy, what I would add is two things. Number one, Todd has previous reports, one on Patchogue and the other Farmingdale. This analysis, in terms of the net revenue to the school districts, has been used by developers in presentations over the last couple of years. They've contacted us and asked for the report. The other thing is that Todd is available to go on the road. Todd and I have done presentations, including at the annual conference at Hofstra for all planning and zoning officials. We tried the best we can to disseminate the information. If there is an opportunity, we're glad to bring him in and present the information.

Alan Belniak:

Thank you for that. Next, I have a hand raised on the panel. Jeff, would you like to share your comment or question?

Jeff Guillot:

I completely share Nancy's and John's worldview on this particular issue. I think that growing more multifamily housing in the region is critical for our economic survival. I think it's really important that we're talking about this today. More local governments should take the algorithm that Todd presented here and use it proactively. When there is a proposed project, this data can be used to say, there's going to be a net positive impact and we're not going to be adding more cars and more kids to the school district, which are the common talking points.

Perhaps I missed this, but one of the bigger contributions to school districts to my understanding are contributions to the commercial tax base. We talked about the impact of more kids in schools, but what is additive with multifamily housing is the extra spending activity that goes with eating in restaurants, going to entertainment venues and taking in culture. Is there a way to quantify that number as well? I think that probably adds to the amount of revenue that the district will get.

Todd Poole:

Absolutely, I would point you to look at the Patchogue study because it exactly addresses your point. In my field, for every household, we use the colloquial term walking wallets. You add a whole bunch of residential units and you are also adding a whole bunch of walking wallets. The vast majority of those folks are going to first look to spend locally. They want to support the local businesses, the restaurants, the retailers, the service shops. It is a dramatic increase for those local businesses, which in turn, strengthens the value of the real estate in which those businesses operate, which in turn, increases the tax base. It is a food chain that occurs and for those communities that push back on investment or push back on residential development, ultimately, they're hurting their own costs. What happens if you don't get more residents in a community who in turn, increase the local commercial tax base, is that the current residents bear the cost of local services. There is a connection between development and taxes.

John Cameron:

Todd, I'd like to augment a little bit on that. You presented some prior data at an earlier meeting of the Council where we documented the impact of the pandemic and how it would affect our commercial businesses and the downtowns. We already knew pre-pandemic, what the internet sales were doing to to the brick and mortar downtowns, retail, restaurants, etc, but now we know that there's many of them that will not survive. Having increased foot traffic, which can be generated by multifamily into downtowns presents a great opportunity to enhance the likelihood of the walking wallets in your downtown. I think it's a great strategy for post pandemic that we should be looking at trying to repopulate our downtowns and help our brick and mortar businesses.

Alan Belniak:

Excellent. For those of you following along at home, I've placed Todd's contact information from his final slide into the chat if you'd like to check out Todd's website or follow up with Todd directly. I don't see any more hands raised on our panel.

We have two hands raised in the public q&a. This comes from Tracy. First, she starts off with thanking Todd for the presentation, "This is terrific information that we as a town would love to share with our

communities. Would you be willing to share your PowerPoint presentation, and we'd love to have you speak at some of our community members when it's possible." Todd, I'll let you respond to that, please.

Todd Poole:

Absolutely. As was already mentioned, this information can't be shared widely enough. I think the problem is that what dominates the conversation is based on misinformation. To the extent that we could counter that with sound analysis and good information, it would be to everyone's benefit.

Alan Belniak:

From Diana, "Excellent presentation, wanting to thank you all. Thank you, Todd, for the presentation." Diana, thanks for sharing. It's good to know that the presenters that LRPC brings in to speak are valuable. Now I'll turn the attention to the first hand raised and I believe it's Ian Wilder. I'm going to send a command to you to take yourself off mute so you have the opportunity to ask your question or share your comment.

Ian Wilder:

Hello, this is Ian Wilder. I am the Executive Director of Loan Housing Services, an over 50-year old civil rights organization focusing on fair housing. I think these are very powerful studies. I think that another thing you should consider doing is presenting this to the same panel that investigated the fair housing problems reported by Newsday because I think a statewide solution would be useful. I've seen similar arguments and other studies brought to various town boards stating that the information about school districts is incorrect. Both school districts and zoning powers are ultimately a power of the state. They are being continually misused. My personal belief is that school districts are going outside of their mission and I think that statewide legislative solutions are in order. One school district should be used to make it clear that it is not a use of school tax dollars to oppose children coming in at all. This would provide factual basis for that legislative clarification of what school districts can and can't do. Right now, every affordable housing developer who comes in has to fight the same battle over and over again, which greatly increases the cost of that development. It becomes a systemic problem and not an individual area problem. It needs a systemic solution.

The second thing that I would suggest, is going to be a bit harder to swallow for a lot of people, but is necessary. We need a larger body statewide to review zoning decisions. I realize that would require a great deal more, including possibly a constitutional change, but we need to look at that. We will not get there by individual town municipal discussions about this. Part of the problem is, let's be honest, is the zoning power and the school district lines were drawn to continue a pattern of segregation throughout our counties. That's why they were drawn. We have to be aware that there are underlying attitudes and that people have a different frame of reference than those on this call. They are not necessarily looking at things purely fact based, but they are looking at it based on their own prejudices and fears. The factual information will not move through. If you look at the work of communication experts, you will see that it is very hard to get factual information through to people who have other prejudices. The place I would start would be with the same Long Island state senators who already have shown interest. I think they would be interested in this study and there would be interest in a larger discussion of how to

decrease the cost of affordable housing, make the process go smoother based on factual information. Thank you.

Alan Belniak:

Thank you for that. Next is a text based question from Sharon Mullen. Sharon asks, "Great study. The new argument against additional children may be the per student classroom space requirements due to social distancing resulting from COVID. This has reduced class size and forced redeployment of teachers or hiring of new staff. Can you factor this into your study?"

Todd Poole:

This is a study that looks at long term trends and as difficult as it has been over the past 12 months, we recognize that it is temporary. We would expect by this time next year, we'll really be back to a normal classroom situation with normal attendance within school districts so that it would not be applicable to go try and think about the current situation with social distancing. Having fewer children per classroom has relevance over time, but we know this is just a momentary issue.

Alan Belniak:

Turning back to a raised hand in the audience, Richard Murdocco. Richard, I'm going to send a command to you to unmute your mic.

Richard Murdocco:

Hello. Good morning, everyone. Todd, thank you for the informative presentation. Very helpful. I've been writing on land use issues for about 10 years. The spread of misinformation about developmental matters has accelerated at concerning rates. Anyone who reads my work knows I'm not always rah rah development. I've tried to seek out a balanced approach, but the rate of misinformation these days is just nearly insurmountable. The information you're presenting is data backed. It has all the core of good public policy, but it's going to need a dedicated effort with dedicated resources at the grassroots level. I'm talking almost civic meetings every night. I go to local libraries as often as I can to talk about developmental best practices on ways to communicate with elected officials and the audience is always receptive. The issues are on social media and these Facebook groups that feed off of each other. Since 2016, it's been incredibly counterproductive. For the local elected officials, for anyone really listening, I urge you get out there and just talk to as many people as you can and devote the resources for a strategic communicative effort to ensure that the right information is informing the population of the residents.

Alan Beliniak:

Thanks very much. I'm going to turn back to one of our members, Barbara. If you'd like to take yourself off mute and share your question, please.

Barbara Donno:

Thank you Todd, for your presentation. It was very informative. I do have a question that piggybacks off of Sharon's. As a former school board president, we always had and I think they still do have

requirements on class sizes. Being in Manhasset, we are land locked and we don't have any place for our schools to go. We've had a huge increase in enrollment. I'm wondering if class size caps or requirements were factored in, which I don't think they were, from your answer. Twenty students, depending on the ages and the grade levels of those students, coming into the multifamily developments could impact greatly on the number of classes in each of those grade levels. Just one student just breaks everything. We went through this when I was on the school board. I wondered if you have a comment on that.

Todd Poole:

Great question and there are instances where a school district is at or nearing capacity, where development could contribute enough children such that it causes both increased personnel costs, ie. hiring of new teachers, teacher aides, and capital costs or provide portable buildings or even permanent buildings. However, what I would say is this is more the exception than the rule. This is the other important reason why fiscal impact analysis needs to be done on every project before it is built so the school district, the municipality, as well as the development team understands what is likely to occur and it is perhaps factored into either the incentives offered and or allows for planning in terms of the need to build or expand a building for a school district. They need to take into consideration the need to potentially hire additional personnel. There should be a negotiation about how that particular development can help offset those costs, but it should not mean that the development is stopped cold in its tracks.

Barbara Donno:

When you look at the students or the children that were moving into these developments, did they span elementary to high school or were they focused more in the younger grades or in the upper grades?

Todd Poole:

We didn't get into looking at grade level in this particular study. That would have been a deeper dive than our scope, however, having done this in a variety of other studies I can tell you the pattern is usually two thirds of the students coming from new developments are representative of elementary to junior high, so call it K through eight, with the majority of those in K through five or six. A relatively smaller amount of public school age children are in the high school. This is the case because by the time they get to the high school grade level of nine through 12, typically, there are other factors including parochial school or private school. As I said, there are relatively few districts at capacity. Your district is probably one of those districts, but for the most part, what we see happening in the region, is that there are schools losing so many students that they're now in discussions about what school building they're going to mothball and perhaps put on the auction block to redevelop consolidating the remaining students and personnel.

Barbara Donno:

With the influx of people coming onto the island from New York City is there a huge influx of students also? I know you haven't done any of that study specific to COVID? Do you feel that that could become a problem for the school districts and the communities?

Todd Poole:

I'm doing a study now that's looking at suburban communities that are offering the kind of the urban amenities defined by a mix of services, walkability, and a very high quality of life. Those are the school districts that are probably going to see an influx, however, and as I mentioned during my presentation, fertility rates in this country are going down. I'm going to say it, because it's in the literature, this is a crisis right now. There are too few children being born, such that this is going to be reflected 25 years from now as economies in different regions start to shrink. It is only because of migration that we have a rising population in many areas of this country. So, my thinking is communities that allow for more housing, and particularly family housing, quite honestly, are going to be supporting their own businesses because most businesses in the communities that we're talking about were able to sustain themselves on a mix of demographic households, not just singles and couples, but also families. If you start to prohibit those types of households from forming in your community, ultimately, you're undermining a number of your small, independently owned businesses that require that particular type of household to support them.

Alan Belniak:

There is one other one follow up comment from Tracy, "Our biggest obstacle is trying to get this information out to the masses like we're all talking about here." I believe with that we are all caught up. I'll hand it back to you.

John Cameron:

Thanks, Alan. I think this discussion was extremely informative. Obviously, judging from the number of participants, it's of interest to not just the Council, but to the Long Island population itself.

Rich Guardino:

I will start to work through the resolutions.

Resolution 2021-101, authorizes grants of \$5,000 each to Accomsett Middle School and Cutchogue East Elementary School to implement proposals submitted by the schools in the 2020 Long Island Nitrogen Action Plan STEAM challenge program. The Council developed the STEAM challenge program as part of the nitrogen action plan. I'd like to ask Liz Cole to talk for a minute or two about the program and where we're at right now.

Elizabeth Cole:

Last year was the inaugural year of the LIRPC STEAM Challenge and we received proposals from five different teams from three different schools out in Suffolk County. We assembled a team of experts to assess all the proposals and score them. Our team consisted of Sue Van Patten from the Department of Environmental Conservation, Jacqueline Grennon Brooks, professor of teaching literacy and leadership at Hofstra University, Corey Humphrey, director of Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District, David Ganim, Director of the Nassau County Soil and Water Conservation District, myself and Kyle Rabin, who was the former program manager of the Long Island Nitrogen Action Plan. We scored the proposals and the top two proposals came from Accomsett and Cutchogue East. Both of these proposals dealt

with stormwater treatment. They are proposing to implement a rain garden on school property to treat stormwater runoff. This resolution is granting an award of \$5,000 to each school to implement the proposal.

Rich Guardino:

Please, could you just give us another minute on where the Challenge stands this year?

Elizabeth Cole:

Yes, absolutely. We launched the second Challenge back in November and opened it up to high school students for this year as well. It was open to grades six through 12. To date, we've received 15 proposals from a number of schools from both Nassau County and Suffolk County and our deadline is April 1. We will then assemble the team of experts to score the proposals. We have not determined how many awards will be given this year, but expect some very interesting projects. At that point in time, we hope to come back to the Council again and authorize grants to implement some of the proposals that come from the 2021 LIRPC STEAM Challenge.

John Cameron:

I would like to add one comment. There is an excellent story about a student in Jericho High School who is a finalist in the Regeneron science competition which talks about the importance of STEM and STEAM education. This young man noticed there were issues with regard to water quality and potential industrial contamination of groundwater. He's focused on an amino acid in green tea for treating tetrachloroethylene, which is an industrial solvent. He is also studying one of the contaminants coming out of the Grumman flow to treat and reduce the potential of Parkinson's disease. It's just phenomenal. This is where students get this kind of start. Anything we can do as a Council to encourage and provide opportunity is terrific.

Rich Guardino:

John, to add to that, I believe he got to the semi-finals. Last year, one of the students from the Baldwin area who worked with us on the South Shore Estuary looked at bioextraction and came up with a project that was very successful in the competition as well. He actually worked with our consultant. This is a great way for us to introduce our students to science and some of the environmental issues here on the Island.

John Cameron:

We've had these discussions. Unfortunately, the minority communities are underrepresented in the STEM fields and we've been endeavoring to try and expand that the pool of potential future employees. Anything we can be doing to help to expand that for every Long Island student is an excellent purpose.

Motion to Accept Resolution 2021-101: Barbara Donno

Seconded: Supervisor Ed Wehrheim

All in Favor: So moved.

Rich Guardino:

Resolution 2021-102 authorizes in agreement with Long Island Financial Management Services to perform an audit of the Council for the year 2020. The Long Island Financial Management Services has done audits for us for the years 2016 through 2019. They are an A1 CPA peer reviewed, certified accounting firm and a certified woman owned business. The Executive Committee has reviewed their performance and recommending them for the audit for 2020.

Motion to Accept Resolution 2021-102: Supervisor Ed Wehrheim

Seconded: Nancy Engelhardt

All in Favor: So moved.

Rich Guardino:

Resolution 2021-103 authorizes an agreement with Epoch 5 Marketing Inc. for consulting services, including public relations, social media, education and marketing strategies for both the Council and Long Island Nitrogen Action Plan. Epoch 5 has provided services for the past three years and the Executive Committee recommends that we continue with them.

Michael White:

I understand that Jim Green, who has been working with us, is leaving and I think he deserves great thanks for the work that he's done. I'm sure the person who's coming on board is going to follow through on that, but I want to thank Epoch 5 and Jim Green for the work.

John Cameron:

Thank you, Michael. Well spoken. Jim has done an excellent job for us and we wish him the best in his future endeavors.

Motion to Accept Resolution 2021-103: Jeff Kraut

Seconded: Michael White

All in Favor: So moved.

Rich Guardino:

Resolution 2021-104 approves the financial summary for 2020 and the 2021 projected budget. The Executive Committee recommends the approval of both financial summary and the projected budget. The one thing I would mention is that the 2021 projected budget includes funds from the Long Island Nitrogen Action Plan grant for management and personnel and consulting services. The funds from that grant were paused in 2020. The DEC has been very supportive. I'm sure you're all familiar with the issues the state has had in terms of its budget. Hopefully, the relief on the federal level will ameliorate some of those problems. We're expecting that the funds that we're owed from 2020 will be paid this year.

Motion to Accept Resolution 2021-104: Michael White

Seconded: Jeff Kraut

All in Favor: So moved.

Rich Guardino:

Resolution 2021-105 renews the contracts and extends the terms of personal service contracts for myself, Liz Cole, the Deputy Executive Director and Missy Leder, part-time Executive Assistant.

John Cameron:

I think our Council has really been blessed with a great staff headed up by Rich, Liz and Missy who are all extremely dedicated. We all know this past year has been very challenging and they did an outstanding job for us. I just want to say that we strongly endorse their retention and support their continued service.

Rich Guardino:

I just want to thank you all very much. We appreciate your support. Everybody responds immediately when we reach out to them. We know that you all serve without pay and spend quite a bit of time doing this. We certainly appreciate you and thank you. Thank you for your continued support for us.

Motion to Accept Resolution 2021-105: Nancy Engelhardt

Seconded: Michael White

All in Favor: So moved.

Rich Guardino:

Resolution 2021-106 amends the Bylaws of the Council. Specifically, article 11 section 1103 - Contracts requires a majority vote of the Council to approve contracts entered into in amounts greater than 2000. There is a current limit of \$1,000 which was established in 2008 and the Executive Committee of the Council recommends the threshold being increased to \$2,000.

Motion to Accept Resolution 2021-106: Jeff Guillot

Seconded: Jeff Kraut

All in Favor: So moved.

Rich Guardino:

We appreciate you all considering this on such short notice. We feel it's really important going forward. Resolution 2021-107 authorizes an agreement with Raftelis to provide consulting services for the continued implementation of Suffolk County's Countywide Wastewater Management District. Suffolk County, as you know, gives us a series of projects they'd like us to pursue each and every year. This is a priority project for 2021. They have asked that the Council partner with Suffolk County to provide funding for continued implementation of the various elements of the Countywide Wastewater Management District. John has volunteered innumerable hours as a member of the advisory committee meeting basically on a weekly basis to push forward this Management District. John, I'd like to turn it over to you.

John Cameron:

Thank you. As the Council will recall, we identified the early action items under the Long Island Nitrogen Action Plan and the creation of a Countywide Wastewater Management District was one of them. We've discussed in the past that it's difficult to address an issue such as groundwater contamination or surface water contamination without dealing with it on a regional level. As we know, groundwater and surface waters don't know municipal boundaries and we really all are one island. If we're dealing with our wastewater infrastructure, we really do need to deal with it on the macro level. I have to compliment Suffolk County and its leadership headed up by Deputy County Executive Peter Scully, as well as Sarah Landsdale, Dorian Dale and health department personnel and economic development personnel in creating a really an outstanding plan. They did a procurement and selected Raftelis. I have to tell you, having worked with them over the last number of months, they've done outstanding job. They've completed their tasks and scope of work. We're at a point now where we need to have legislation drafted. The County needs legislation drafted to go before the state legislature for a vote for a potential creation of a Countywide Wastewater Management District. If the County pursued their own procurement to move forward with the plan, it would take them a number of months so they've asked us to help cooperate and collaborate with them to authorize up to \$10,000 for Raftelis to assist them in this effort. Candidly, it's money well spent. We're actually anticipating additional funding coming from LINAP also. The funds will not be an issue. It's really sort of completing the circle, if you will, for the creation of this district. I would recommend that we move forward with this approval of this resolution.

Motion to Accept Resolution 2021-107: Michael White

Seconded: Supervisor Ed Wehrheim

All in Favor: So moved.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

John Cameron:

We've had an excellent meeting here. But as we all know, we're just completing the year since the pandemic hit. Our region really was ground zero for this. There have been a lot of personal challenges, mental challenges, family challenges, and business challenges for all of us here on the island and really in the country. Business wise, as we all know, government budgets have been adversely impacted in the private sector. In fact, it is a concern and there is a survey that shows a lot of businesses are not going to be able to survive this pandemic. It's necessary that we all we all come together.

We are an agency creation of both counties, the towns and the villages. We have representatives on our Council who can attest to the financial difficulties that they've encountered. Fortunately, yesterday, the Congress passed a \$1.9 trillion stimulus bill. While there's been a lot of arguments and discussions about where the funds are going, I think we all would agree that the New York Region really suffered probably the most of any region in the country. Fortunately, we're going to see some good infusion of capital into our municipal budgets, as well into the businesses and families that need it.

We are also here talking about the future of economic development on the Island and in the country. We believe that the President is going to advance an infrastructure bill. We have talked about this in the past. Our infrastructure is in woeful shape. I always use the analogy that was used in engineering and construction circles. The one topic in Washington they always agreed upon was the need to improve and upgrade our infrastructure. Unfortunately, the democrats would say, raise revenues, meaning taxes, and Republicans would say cut spending, so they can never come together. It's been decades and we are in serious need of major infrastructure improvements here in the country. We believe that the President is going to advance them by putting before Congress a multi-trillion dollar infrastructure bill that will address not only highways and roads, but also energy, probably with this administration a lot of green energy, renewable energy, environmental projects, broadband, etc. It's something that can create economic stimulus for the country and for the region. Hopefully, if this is done smartly (and not just sort of restoring antiquated infrastructure) and in areas where we can stimulate private investment (in particular on the Island here), we can see economic development here and realize the benefits of this, not just for a few years, but potentially for decades. We have to be smart about that investment.

We have a lot of challenges regionally and we've talked about them in the past. A number of the recommendations in LI2035 need revisiting. It's good to hear that we're addressing the issue of economic development, but we also need to address affordable housing. We also know that (and Barbara brought it up earlier) there is an issue with the influx of city residents leaving the city for a number of reasons. One reason is the pandemic. Another is a safety issue in the city. We all know that and it needs to be addressed. We have to look at this because not only does it come with potential economic development and a potential boon for Long Island, but for certain districts it could be a challenge. We need to handle that migration of families, individuals and businesses to handle it smartly.

Recently in the news, the Town of Brookhaven has come out and stated that they do not intend to seek a renewal of the permit for their landfill. The sanitary landfill has been accepting ash from three resource recovery plants. Babylon still has its own ash landfill and they still intend to dispose of their ash at that landfill but the town is planning for Brookhaven to close its landfill in 2024. For those of you who know, we actually had a Council meeting last year before the pandemic where we focused on the issue of solid waste management on Long Island. County and previous Council Member and the Supervisor of the Town of Brookhaven Ed Romaine was there. We discussed that it's not only a major revenue producer for Brookhaven, but it's closure will produce some other challenges for not just the Town of Brookhaven, but also for those other resource recovery plants. If we don't have an option on the Island for a disposal location for not just the ash, but also for construction and demolition debris, streets, sweepings, etc, that material is going to have to be shipped off Long Island. Shipping off Long Island is not only an export of economic activity, but it's going to cost those resource recovery plants and ultimately, the taxpayers more to dispose of their solid waste. It's an issue with great significance. I believe that not only the plants, but also the townships which are sending their waste to those plants, are going to have to do some planning and look at ways in which they can hopefully mitigate the potential increase in their solid waste budgets.

As we all know, there are a lot of challenges here on the island and hopefully, we can serve as a collaborative authority here or at least an entity by which people can come together and where we can agree and where we can disagree. Unfortunately, it seems like that art of discussion, of being able to have a civil disagreement or a civil discussion, has gone by the wayside recently. I think, hopefully, on Long Island, we can always have those open disagreements, and respectfully deal with the challenges that we have. I look forward to your continued progress and I'll turn it over to Rich, our Executive Director.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Rich Guardino:

Thank you, John. Liz brought you up to date with the STEAM challenge. We're really excited to get that going this year. As we mentioned earlier, getting our own young people involved with these environmental issues has been very exciting and rewarding for us. We also at this meeting showed again our commitment to Suffolk County and the County Wide Wastewater Management District. I just like to spend a moment talking about the project that we have going in Nassau County, and that is the Water Quality Monitoring in the South Shore Estuary Reserve which is now in its second year. The Water Quality Monitoring Program is a framework for monitoring analysis and reporting water quality within the surface waters of Hempstead Bay and its major tributaries. It's a joint program. It's a collaboration between Hofstra University and the Town of Hempstead. They've been doing an excellent job. The water quality data is being collected from strategic locations in Hempstead Bay and this is going to provide a baseline against which we can evaluate changes to nutrient loading in the bay. Many of you are familiar with the fact that there are some large-scale ecosystem based and hard engineering upgrades in the region. They're going to convert the Long Beach wastewater plant to a pumping station. There's also the diversion project that is diverting the wastewater from the Bay Park Plant to Cedar Creek. This is probably the largest engineering and infrastructure project we have going right now on Long Island. Finally, there's a study that's going to get started soon to take a look at sewerage to Point Lookout. All this major work is being done in terms of infrastructure. We're providing the baseline for what's there and as these projects come online, we're going to continue to do the water quality monitoring to show the improvements that take place. Thanks to one of the professors from Hofstra University, we're looking at nitrogen deposition also, which is critical in evaluating the nitrogen input to the bays. The good news is although we're just now getting into the second year, fortunately thanks to the support of DEC, we have funding for a third year of doing the water quality monitoring.

John, that completes my report.

Michael White:

I think it's great that work is going forward on the water quality monitoring. I have two questions. Is his report ultimately going to be issued? I can recall some discussion about one of the things that it was going to look at was the nitrogen deposition, atmospheric deposition versus the other sources. I'm hoping we're going to start to get a look at that.

John Cameron:

Good memory, Michael. Yes, it was absolutely an important issue like we discussed and because the E.F. Barrett Generation Plant, the station plant in Island Park, which is continuing to operate is an antiquated plant. We do have other ones, the old plants in Northport, etc. With Barrett being one of the oldest, we were concerned about atmospheric deposition, and they are looking at that. So, Rich, maybe we can get back to them and see if they have could give us possibly an interim report at one of our meetings rather than waiting for the final report. That might be worthwhile. Maybe we could find out if they have feel they have sufficient data that gives us an update on this study.

Rich Guardino:

Two things. One, Michael, Professor Raciti from Hofstra University has some expertise in nitrogen deposition, atmospheric nitrogen deposition and he did a number of studies in the Boston area before he relocated to Hofstra. He has a really aggressive program going on in the bay right now. In addition to the sites that were subsidizing, he was able to get additional funding to look beyond just the South Shore Estuary. We would be glad to bring him in and have him talk about that. There's also a historical water quality data analysis that was recently done and I'm going to ask Liz to get you a copy of that so you can take a look at it. John, I think it would be a great idea to bring him in sometime in the near future to talk about what's going on with the water quality monitoring.

John Cameron:

I know the County's moving forward with this wastewater diversion project, as Rich alluded to earlier. I think what would be very good would be to have a LIRPC meeting dedicated to this topic. We can have a presentation on the diversion because they are just moving forward having selected a contractor. They are going to be moving forward with that project and candidly, it's a very innovative project where they can save tens of millions of dollars. They have a new outfall two and a half miles offshore for the City of Long Beach and the South Shore and tied into the former aqueduct over to the Cedar Creek plants. It was really innovative and I think we can get some details on the project. We can possibly ask Brian Schneider and his DPW staff to come and do a presentation. Recognizing once that discharge comes out of the Reynolds Channel part of Hempstead Bay, a huge source of nitrogen from that Bay will be removed. I think it would be a great meeting. Rich, I think maybe we could pursue that.

Rich Guardino:

Great idea. Thank you.

Theresa Sanders did join us although it was after the roll call. It's always a pleasure to see you.

John Cameron:

Thank you very much, Rich. Any other comments from the general public will be tabulated and then we can respond to those. That being said, we have a motion to adjourn.

Motion to adjourn. So moved. All in favor.