

Long Island Regional Planning Council  
Summary Minutes

---

April 18th, 2019 Meeting  
Bank of America Building – lower level  
300 Broadhollow Road  
Melville, NY

**LIPRC Members Present**

John D. Cameron, Jr., Chair  
Jeffrey Kraut, Treasurer  
Michael White  
Elizabeth Custodio  
Nancy Engelhardt  
Laura Gillen  
Jeff Guillot  
Robert Kennedy  
Ralph Scordino

**Staff and Guests Present**

Richard V. Guardino, Jr.  
Elizabeth Cole  
Missy Leder  
Kyle Rabin  
David Berg  
Andrew Mulvey, Nassau Comptrollers  
Ellen Kelly, Selfhelp Realty Dev.  
Tatyana Golikova, NYSDOT  
Adam Moss, Nassau County Attorney  
Mohinder Taneja, SVAM Int.  
Susan Bergtram, Nassau Suffolk SBA/Nassau BOCES  
Jan Barbieri, Child Care Council Nassau  
Kevin Moran, Long Island Builders Institute  
Nelle D'Aversa, NYSDEC  
E.J. Torres, LIHS  
Mike Falk, NYS Assemblyman Mike C. Petri  
Joyce Novak, Peconic Estuary Program  
Erika Hill, Nassau County Comptroller's Office  
Robert Carpenter, LI Farm Bureau

**Meeting Commenced:**

- John D. Cameron, Jr., opened the meeting at approximately 10:15AM with a welcome
- Pledge of Allegiance

**Rich Guardino: Roll Call**

John Cameron, Michael White, Jeff Kraut, Elizabeth Custodio, Nancy Englehardt, Jeff Guillot, Mayor Ralph Scordino present.

Supervisor Laura Gillen and Mayor Kennedy will join us shortly and we will have a quorum. We will therefore begin with our presentations.

**John Cameron:** We are fortunate to have with us today an alum, a former member of the Council, Elaine Gross, who is the President of ERASE Racism. As I am sure you know, Elaine’s organization has been a strong advocate of Equity on Long Island for many years. When we did our Sustainability Plan back in 2010, one of the four thematic areas was Equity. Elaine was a strong advocate and contributor to that aspect of the program. Elaine has been conducting detailed research and she is here today to present her report titled, “How Do We Build a Just Long Island; Housing and Education Equity.” With that, I welcome Elaine Gross.

**Rich Guardino:** Elaine, before you begin, I would like to introduce Supervisor Laura Gillen who has joined us. We now have a quorum.

**PRESENTATION:**

V. Elaine Gross, MSW, President ERASE Racism  
“How Do We Build a Just Long Island; Housing and Education Equity”

**Elaine Gross:** Good morning everyone. I am the Founder and President of ERASE Racism. Some of you might have seen some of the forty-five or so press pieces about “How Do We Build a Just Long Island.” We launched this initiative last year at the end of November and we kicked it off with five public conversations focused on that question. We held these meetings from North Hempstead to Riverhead. We were very pleased having seven hundred plus people participating in the forums. The idea was to continue after the forums with both dialogue and bringing people together to work on specific campaigns.

I am very pleased to announce one victory which just happened a couple of weeks ago. ERASE racism started in 2016 to start a state-wide coalition to amend the New York State Human Rights Law to include legal multiple sources of income as a protected class. To explain, there was an issue because veterans were being denied housing because they were using some form of benefits, women (especially women with children) were being denied because they were using public assistance or alimony to help pay their rent, people with disabilities, people of color were all being denied. And even though you cannot discriminate by race, there was a way around that by saying that we are only going to accept wage income, not other kinds of legal sources of income that one may receive. This bill was enacted as part of the Omnibus Bill. Everything was approved and one of the reasons we had strong support was because people who had participated in the forums wanted to get active. So, I am very pleased to be here to continue in that effort of education and engagement. You will see why I have chosen to focus on education and housing as primary engines toward “How We Build a Just Long Island”.

First, I would like to draw your attention to the idea that when you start to talk about demographics or identities, there are a million things that could be discussed. All of these things could be ways that people see differences, irreversible differences and ways that we cannot be unified. That is not the way we need to look at it, but some people do. I also want to point out that even though there are a lot of things up there on that slide, the slide that I want to talk about today is the one that says race. That does not mean that there are not issues around age and gender and ability and anything else listed. There are lots of things that fall into the category of identity, but we are not dealing with the entire kaleidoscope of things right now.

Why do we talk about race and racism? We are not talking about the kind of individual who says offensive things. We are talking about actions by institutions or governments that have created racial inequities and disparities for a population of people. We are talking about people of color today. This is frequently referred to as structural racism as opposed to the individual racism that people sometimes focus on. The left side of this slide says, "What is the problem? It's the same distance?" While on the right, there are a number of obstacles versus on the left. This visual just gives an idea of what we are talking about. It involves the cumulative and compounding effects of an array of societal factors including history as well as existing policies and practices, culture and ideology, interaction of various institutions, etc. It is not the simple racism that we are talking about. This is not to minimize the damage of the simple racism, but we are focusing on a piece that is often not considered or explored.

What does structural racism look like on Long Island? Long Island is among the ten most segregated metropolitan communities in the country. Being infamous for this statistic in 2019 is not a good thing. These snapshots demonstrate our tremendous fragmentations and you know that we are not a tiny place (approaching three billion people). This is sort of a racial composition for the two counties. We do have more racial diversity than we used to have. I will not go into the detail of the Long Island history, but it is important to note that it set us up to have this statistic about our segregation. We were developed to be separated and if you don't know the Levittown story, please see me after. We are talking about the Federal government's role in terms of their creation of maps with red lines where there would be no mortgages and where there would be discrimination against people who are not white. Places where the realtors and the developers moving along with that mantra (Levittown by example) had racial covenants in their deeds which kept African American veterans from being able to have access to housing. The deeds intended to make it perpetual. The deeds meant to keep access to that housing limited forever. It wasn't until the 1968 Housing Act when housing discrimination based on race was finally no longer legal. Banks red lined neighborhoods and racial steering and blockbusting existed. That gave us the landscape that we currently have and as I said, without intentional concentrated efforts not to perpetuate this reality, we have done a very good job perpetuating racial segregation.

I also want people to know that this is not just history. ERASE Racism is a little organization. We have had a couple of lawsuits and have successfully showed the reality that black seekers of apartments were told there was nothing for them and/or that they should come back another time while white seekers were shown vacancies and encouraged to apply. You may have seen in 2018 when the Suffolk Credit Union was found to have discriminated against African Americans and Latino people looking for mortgage loans. You also may have heard about the Department of

Justice lawsuit against the Town of Oyster Bay for saying only people who already live here can have access to the affordable housing. In the Town of Oyster Bay there are very few African American residents. So, you don't need a sign that says no housing for you, you just need a policy which produces the same result. That is the housing conundrum.

The other conundrum has to do with public school education. The school districts mirror housing segregation so we have segregated schools now as well. This slide shows what it might look like if we had school districts by town. Even though you can't see the colors, you can see that the circles look very similar in regard to the number of White, African American, Latino, Asian, etc. populations. The other map looks different with areas where there are no white students at all. Again, we looked at 2004-2016 to see what was happening with changes in the student population in the school districts. We have more racial diversity in the student population now than in 2004. We also have fewer students who are attending the school districts that are 70-100% white. This means there are fewer students in racially isolated districts of white students only.

The demographics for the students are similar to the demographics for the region. The uptick in diversity is very small. It was 19% and went to 21% and 21 districts decreased to 19 districts. The bad news is we are not just looking at aggregate numbers. Digging deeper into what is happening in the school districts, we see that the number of students attending the majority of minority districts more than tripled and the actual number of school districts had more than doubled. These were the districts that were intensely segregated. Those districts were 90-100% non-white. We obviously aren't getting the full benefit of the increased diversity within the districts if we are increasing by large percentage the number of students in those heavily segregated districts. They more than doubled.

This slide shows the more than doubling of the school districts and the tripling of students. The bottom line is that 3 of every 4 black students and 2 out of every 3 Hispanic students are attending the majority of minority segregated school districts. I think this statistic is shocking to most people at this time because there is a lot of talk about how things are much better. People don't realize that there is such housing discrimination going on and they think that we are becoming more diverse on Long Island which is true, but it is not improving the situation. This statistic does not jive with the narrative that people hear in their head.

I have also pulled something you may be interested in. I remembered when the Long Island Index had an analysis done that looked at a \$450,000 home in every district on Long Island and asked the question, "How much would you have to increase the taxes in order to be able to spend \$250 more per student?" This analysis is not simple because you have to take into account the size of districts. However, this shows at the tip top, you would only have to raise the taxes on a \$450,000 home \$1.72, but at the bottom the increase would have to be \$325. Fire Island is at the top with the small increase and at the bottom you see Brentwood, Wyandanch, Hempstead, Roosevelt. Another way to look at that data is to say more simplistically, looking at similar size school districts, there are differences in terms of the NY State identification of need. So, high need is represented by a 3 and low need is represented by a 6. If you are high need, you have fewer resources and low need you have more resources. As you might guess Brentwood, Wyandanch, Hempstead and Roosevelt are high need. When we are talking about structural

impediments we mean the ways in which the policies, the practices and the actual structures of school districts are resulting in whole populations being impacted in a racialized fashion. That is the difference between structural racism and individual racism. You might ask yourself, how is it possible that more than sixty years after *Brown v. Wade* we find ourselves with these boundaries still in place on Long Island?

To drive it home, even though we think about personal racism, really the big thing is structural racism. Without looking at things this way, why would you know that this type of disparity exists. It goes unnoticed. This graphic is simplified, but it helps present a picture of what happens with this kind of situation. One reason ERASE Racism got into the area of fair housing is because we were concerned about the lack of fair housing enforcement. We are trying to highlight what institutions are doing and the reality is that without a lot of aggressive fair housing enforcement residential segregation continues. If you follow down from the upper right, that residential segregation is supported by government fragmentation. We do not have one government on Long Island, we have a couple of counties and a couple of cities and then we go crazy. So, there are a lot of people not paying attention which exacerbates the problems on the municipal level. That ensures unfair education because education boundaries mirror the housing segregation. With that, you get economic inequities that fuel the concentrated poverty. Simply because a person is poor does not mean that they will not be able to do well in school. We hear the great success stories of some poor people. But that is very different from concentrated poverty. Let's pretend the people in the first row are poor. If in the classroom, you have a great teacher and resources and after school activities, you can take care of those poor people. Unlike a situation where this whole room is a classroom full of poor people with the exception of those in the back row. These students from low income families and didn't go to the museums or have tutors or participate in a preschool program. It is easy to understand that there is a very different dynamic in that classroom. I don't care how good the teacher is. Now let's pretend that all the classrooms in a school are like that. The challenge is simply too big.

Because I want to wake you all up, I want to talk about local control. In many segments of the planning role, local control is like the bible, you don't dare say anything wrong about local control. The reality is that part of the reason we are in this situation is because of local control. I would like to challenge the Planning Council and those others here to really think about how local control of housing policy including the placement of local housing developments perpetuates the toxic nation of historical segregation and white supremacy. If you think white supremacy is only Nazis, then speak to me after ... that's a whole other workshop. We are talking about the exclusive power of white people to marginalize groups deemed not white and mark them for discrimination. In other words, the power to exclude. That equals structural racism. If we were to study the history of development of whiteness or the construction of whiteness in the United States, we would see all the different laws and policies that have essentially created what we call whiteness. You would have also seen how happy Hitler was to take all that development that took place in this country to support his plans: to have justification that was created right here. It was homegrown in the US. We are dealing with something so deep, that when we think about it as a concept with lots written about it, it sounds great. But the reality is that macro policies and how they play out results in structural racism which in turn has played havoc with housing equity and in a similar way, education equity. We aren't supposed to talk about it. Local control has been systematically baked into laws and government policies,

institutions (large and small) and the very culture of the United States. In a similar way as housing, it has produced one hundred and twenty-five school districts that are very different in terms of their access to resources. The decisions made around populations and housing have developed into structural racism.

I would like to stop there and maybe we can have some discussion.

**Question:** There is a lot of apartment development on Long Island and it was my understanding that there was a law that would help prevent this inequitable housing situation. Can you talk more to explain how it could be more equitable?

**Elaine Gross:** The short answer is that it is not working. The long answer is that there was a law and it was supposed to work, but if you aren't really serious about making it work, it never will. Who is enforcing the law is also an issue. Last time I looked it wasn't even clear who responsible for the fund. Some of my colleagues here at the Planning Council may have more details on that. Long Island is unlike New Jersey, where there was a lawsuit and then a mechanism and consequently, housing has been built. We have been screwing around.

**Question:** I think it would be productive to look at models that might be working better. It is my impression that segregation is better handled in the southern states of this county which is ironic. Are other places doing things better?

**Elaine Gross:** After much resistance, there was a big surge in the South to have integrated schools. It was seriously undermined because of the white flight to private schools. But, they did in fact see quite an increase in terms of the access to quality education for the black students there as a result of the consolidation of the schools. More recently, people from the north have moved south to retire and have changed things. There was a big battle in North Carolina in a school district because the original goal, which was for racial integration was disrupted when whites from the north came down and were elected to the school boards and they tried to recreate what they had up north. There was this sort of back and forth where the locals said we need to do this because it was working and good for them and things were progressing, but then there was this influx of people from the north. Not all of them were retirees, some had children. People that were moving here were not trying to create integrated schools.

**Comment:** I have to believe white and black people in the South had to deal with each other all the time and were not foreign to each other. That may be the reason that things are typically better in the South.

**Elaine Gross:** I am not doing research in this area, so I cannot say that it is better in the South. In the newspaper I pick things up more than others might. I have heard anecdotally from blacks in the South that yes, some things have changed and yes, there are things that haven't changed. I do believe that the proximity in the South was always there including during slavery. Whites and blacks lived together. There is something to be said for that. Not having the same degree of separation that existed in the north. I am working with high school students now and they are delighted when there is a rainbow of students. Everyone is a student like themselves interested in learning with each other. We deny our students that by keeping our current structures in place.

**Jeff Guillot:** I enjoyed your presentation. I think these discussions are important and I have benefitted from one of your other presentations on “Understanding Privilege” immensely in the past. One thing that became clear to me today is that we often as a region subscribe to this notion that we have this serious problem of millennium age talent leaving Long Island. In reality, there are predominantly white school districts that are losing classes. Whereas your presentation shows that in the majority of minority districts the classes are getting bigger and bigger. I have long thought that the win for the region and the way to create a thriving community on Long Island is for people in the areas we are discussing to be in a position to own houses. I understand that the housing policy creates a huge barrier, but outside of local control, what are some changes that we as a region can put in place to allow for more socio-economic mobility and breakdown the institutional racism that you so articulately mention in your presentation?

**Elaine Gross:** One of the reasons I mention local control is that a lot of things come back to that. There are things that you can do related to schools for example which can allow for the boundaries to be a little more permeable and allow for the sharing of resources. Maybe students from several different schools can get together for certain rigorous classes in order to make them happen. It is not that anything I suggest is easy to do, but if we don't figure out the ramifications of the decisions that we do make, we certainly feed into the perpetuation of this problem. Let us have instruction that is more real and more accurate. DNA shows that we are all more similar than we once thought!

**Question:** Thank you Elaine for the powerful presentation. I am thinking that there might be a way that we could partner with you and others to work some of what we have talked about into action items. It looks like the trend is going in the wrong direction and maybe we can put something together to develop funding. I would like to connect with you.

**Elaine Gross:** Thank you. I will mention there are various policies that are out there. Some exist in Massachusetts and Connecticut on the housing front. They are a variation of giving the developer more power. If the local municipality is saying no, there is a process by which the developer can go around that policy. It helps to elicit change.

**Question:** In so many regions where we know housing and education are substandard, sometimes there is pushback on potential gentrification. What have you specifically seen in these areas?

**Elaine Gross:** On Long Island, I think Wyandanch is a good example. Here, a legitimate investment was made prior to development. Some of the problems come when less can be done after the development has started. We need to be confident people are secure in their homes. Sometimes people own homes but are not economically secure so they can get thrown off by unexpected costs like repairs or other costs and suddenly they cannot pay their mortgage. I am not an expert on this but from what I understand there was assistance to ensure the home owners were secure in their homes. Renters were also given opportunities that they may not have thought about. Economic and retail activity were considered so that people could take advantage of jobs coming in. There needs to be an effort before people come in. This preparation needs to

be on the local and county governments. We do not have the kind of foresight that says we need X number of affordable housing units and figure out how are we going to get it done. We need to set goals for ourselves and truly push to make them happen. We need to push those municipalities who are not cooperative to change their ways.

**Laura Gillen:** We are trying to do that in the Town of Hempstead with what is going on at the Hub. As you may know, there is a Community Council involved and we are bringing people from the Uniondale communities in and explaining and pushing affordable housing. We have discussions with the developers so that jobs go to local folks. We are trying to work with labor unions to make sure that there are proper training programs. People who may not have the pathway to college can learn a trade and have something to take on. So maybe historically, there has been a lack of political will, but currently it exists in the Town of Hempstead. I would love to talk more to you about that. We would like to be instrumental in bringing about change. I have also organized the first Superintendent of Schools Symposium in order to get the Superintendents together to talk about how we can reach out and try to empower school districts. We are working with contacts at the Roosevelt schools to try help provide a pool for swim lessons. There are lots of little things we are working on, but I welcome any direction and discussion.

**John Cameron:** As always, this is to be continued. There is a lot of work that needs to be done and we look forward to collaborating.

**Elaine Gross:** If anyone has ideas or questions, email [justli@eraserascimliny.com](mailto:justli@eraserascimliny.com). We would love to hear all of your questions and ideas.

**John Cameron:** Before our next presentation we have a number of business items to take care of. First, we will address the December 6, 2018 meeting minutes.

**Adoption of the December 6, 2018 minutes. All in favor.**

**Motion to Accept: Michael White**  
**Seconded: Ralph Scordino**  
**All in Favor: 8**

**John Cameron:** Rich, please proceed.

**Rich Guardino:** The next resolution is Resolution No. 2019-101 approving the Financial Summaries of 2016, 2017, 2018 and the Budget for 2019.

This resolution includes Financial Summaries from 2016, 2017, 2018 and the budget for 2019. The Executive Committee of the Council consisting of the Officers of the Council and the Executive Director recommend approval of these documents. Past practice has been for the Executive Director to report on the finances of the Council and for that report to be part of the minutes which are then approved by the Council. The Council's auditor has recommended a separate resolution approving these documents. They have suggested the Financial Summaries and budgets be separately approved rather than part of the minutes which are then approved.

The 2019 Projected Budget includes revenue from two New York State grants for management and personal services and an appropriation from the Suffolk County Economic Development Corporation for 2019. The bottom line is that between the assistance we are getting from the state with regard to state grants and the contributions being made on a regular basis by county funders, the budget is in great shape for 2019.

**Laura Gillen:** Is it appropriate for a Council Member who was not at a meeting to approve minutes for a meeting before their term.

**John Cameron:** Yes, I think that is appropriate. You are approving the summary.

**Laura Gillen:** Is the audit in the 2019 budget for the year 2016?

**John Cameron:** The audit is being conducted for 2016, 2017 and 2018 which is why the expense is more than a one-year audit may typically be. In 2016, we did not have the funds to conduct such an audit. That audit is in the process right now and we expect to receive it in October.

**Motion to Accept Resolution No. 2019-101: Jeff Guillot**

**Seconded: Jeff Kraut**

**All in Favor: So moved.**

**John Cameron:** The next resolution is Resolution No. 2019-102 and I will ask Jeff Kraut to speak to this issue with regard to the contracts.

**Jeff Kraut:** The Executive Committee met and reviewed the performance of the Executive Director Richard Guardino, the Deputy Executive Director Elizabeth Cole and the part time Executive Assistant Missy Leder. We are recommending a salary increase of 3% for the calendar year 2019 and I would also recognize that we had not granted salary increases in the last two years. We are suggesting that they also renew and extend their personal service contracts for the year 2019 with the 3% increase.

**Motion to Accept Resolution No, 2019-102: Jeff Kraut**

**Seconded: Michael White**

**All in Favor: So moved.**

**John Cameron:** I would like to add that on behalf of the Council, we are extremely blessed to have three outstanding individuals who do a great job representing the Council for us. We look forward to another highly productive year.

**Laura Gillen:** Reviewing the agenda I see the Election of Officers for 2019. I would like to make a Motion to Accept the Officers to serve in the same capacity.

**Richard Guardino:** We will continue with the election of Officers of the 2019 Long Island Regional Planning Council. The Officers of the Council include Chairperson John Cameron, Vice Chairperson Michael White, Secretary Theresa Sanders and Treasurer Jeff Kraut. These

are the current officers and they have agreed to stay on in their role. We appreciate all the time our Members dedicate to the Council and we especially would like to thank these Officers. The officers of the Council are determined by a majority of voting members.

**Motion to Accept the Election of Officers for the 2019 LIRPC: Laura Gillen**

**Seconded: Nancy Englehart**

**All in Favor: So moved.**

**John Cameron:** On behalf of the Officers, it is a privilege and an honor to serve. Thank you.

**PRESENTATION:**

Kyle Rabin, Long Island Nitrogen Action Plan Program Manager

Nelle D'Aversa, Bioextraction Coordinator

“Long Island Nitrogen Plan: A Broad Plan to Mitigate Nitrogen Impact on Water Quality”

**Kyle Rabin:** Thank you very much. In this presentation, I will provide an overview of the environmental threat posed by Nitrogen and what's at stake, explain some of the background of the LINAP initiative and provide review of the LINAP related projects.

I will begin with a brief overview of Long Island's nitrogen pollution problem. As you've probably heard on more than one occasion, while nitrogen is essential for all life on earth, too much of it poses a problem. All that extra nitrogen has been found to be the leading cause of water quality deterioration with regards to our groundwater and surface waters. Once in the groundwater, nitrogen can easily reach the aquifer system, which is our sole source of drinking water. Through groundwater drainage and surface water runoff, nitrogen also reaches our inland waterbodies (like streams, rivers and lakes) and our coastal waterways. Recent peer-reviewed science demonstrates the impact that excess nitrogen has on the health of coastal marshes, literally causing some to disintegrate, thereby losing both critical habitat and a natural protective barrier against coastal storms which, as we know, are growing in intensity. In the Great South Bay, there has been a dramatic decline in wetland coverage, sea grass levels and shellfish landings.

Excess nitrogen in surface waters can bring about excess algal (plant) growth far beyond what ecosystems can handle. Large growths of this algae are called algal blooms. These blooms out-compete and kill slower-growing beneficial plants. They are increasingly occurring in Long Island's bays and harbors. In fact, they have also become a national and international problem. Significant increases in algae can severely reduce or eliminate the oxygen that fish and other aquatic life need to survive leading to illness or death. In addition, these blooms sometimes create toxins that can kill fish and other animals. Once in the food chain, these toxins can harm or kill larger animals. Some algal blooms are harmful to humans because they produce elevated toxins and bacterial growth that can make people sick if they are in contact with polluted waterways, consume tainted fish or shellfish, or drink contaminated water. The blooms can also degrade wetlands and marine habitats. They have also had adverse impacts on recreational and commercial fisheries, boating and tourism.

This map graphic shows the different types of water quality impairments that occurred during the summer of 2018 across Long Island both in coastal waterways and inland waterbodies. There were confirmed freshwater and marine water Harmful Algal Blooms in Suffolk County in 2018 including brown tide, rust tide and blue-green algae. The blooms in 2018 were similar to previous years. However, the Great South Bay faced significant impairment earlier in the summer versus that in previous years causing a brown tide, seaweed bloom, rust tide and low oxygen within a two-to three-month period.

Nitrogen is normally the limiting element concerning biological growth in marine systems. Excess nitrogen starts an adverse chain reaction that pollutes and impairs water quality. The main source of this nitrogen pollution is wastewater associated with unsewered homes, predominantly in Suffolk County but also in Nassau County. An estimated 70 percent of nitrogen pollution in the Great South Bay comes from aging septic systems and cesspools. In addition to these outdated systems, nitrogen pollution is also linked to sewage treatment plants as well as fertilizer and stormwater runoff. Atmospheric nitrogen deposition (associated with fossil fuel-related energy production and transportation) is also a factor.

The UN Environment Frontiers report identifies pollution associated with reactive nitrogen as a global concern with local implications. As this quote conveys, humans are significantly altering the global nitrogen cycle. This disruption is causing multiple forms of pollution and impacts. Reactive nitrogen is a key pollutant to tackle, both locally and globally. It is one of the most important pollution issues facing humanity given the threat to public health, climate and ecosystems.

Before I discuss some of the projects, let me share some background on LINAP. As you know, LINAP is a multiyear initiative to reduce nitrogen in Long Island's surface waters and groundwater. LINAP will determine how best to achieve these reductions, whether that be through technical actions through management or through regulatory and policy actions. This is a locally-led partnership including the DEC, LIRPC, and Suffolk and Nassau Counties.

In 2015, the state appropriated \$5 million to develop the LINAP program. These were EPF funds. Long Island's legislative delegation along with local environmental organizations strongly advocated for this funding which has allowed other funds to be leveraged to support LINAP-related projects. For example, in the Round 15 Awards for Water Quality Improvement Project (WQIP) grants, announced in December, over \$20 million dollars was awarded to Nassau and Suffolk counties to help reduce nitrogen loads. Many entities across Long Island are receiving funding from multiple sources, most notably Clean Water Infrastructure Act Funds and the Environmental Protection Fund. This funding helps to bolster and protect other investments, such as Governor Cuomo's Long Island Shellfish Restoration Project.

Partnership and collaboration have been key to developing and implementing LINAP and achieving the goals set forth in the LINAP scope. In addition to the New York State DEC, the Long Island Regional Planning Council, Suffolk and Nassau counties, the partnership includes: towns, cities and Villages, USGS, EPA, Estuary programs, protection committees, the Long Island Clean Water Partnership and a number of environmental groups, non-government

organizations, scientists from Stony Brook University, Hofstra University among others and finally, consultants.

The major goals include the following:

- To assess the level of nitrogen pollution in Long Island's surface waters and groundwater
- To identify the sources of the nitrogen pollution
- To establish nitrogen reduction endpoints (which refers to the desirable conditions we seek in surface waters for individual estuaries and embayments) as well as watersheds
- To develop implementation strategies to achieve these reductions and restore and protect the health of the region's estuaries as well as groundwater resources

It's worth noting that a robust and healthy economy are dependent upon clean air and water. On Long Island, a safe supply of clean drinking water and ecologically healthy creeks, lakes, bays and harbors are important to the quality of life of nearly 3 million people in Nassau and Suffolk counties. Our water resources also support a multi-billion dollar economy fueled by tourism, boating, fishing and abundant seafood.

Nassau County has several LINAP related projects. I'll discuss a few here starting with Subwatershed planning. This important planning project is expected to be completed this year. It will help determine how much nitrogen is entering groundwater from different sources, e.g. wastewater, fertilizer, stormwater, atmospheric deposition. This effort is being led by Stony Brook University's School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences in partnership with the county, NYS DEC and the Regional Planning Council. A Nitrogen Load Model (NLM), which is central to this work, has been completed and nitrogen loads for each of the county's 13 subwatersheds have been calculated. The hydrodynamic modeling of the subwatersheds, which is nearing completion, will help determine the priority level for the nitrogen present in the subwatersheds and how much nitrogen will need to be removed to achieve water quality goals. The modeling will also inform which nitrogen load reduction strategies to deploy. Suffolk County is also developing a subwatershed plan using the same model. That work is expected to be completed later in the year.

Another LINAP project is South Shore Water Reclamation Facility Upgrades. Nassau County continues to conduct major reconstruction and resiliency upgrades to this facility, formerly known as the Bay Park Sewage Treatment Plant. The regional vision associated with the facility includes ocean outfall discharge, consolidation of local wastewater treatment plants and nitrogen removal from wastewater effluent. To date, many enhancements have been completed including: construction of perimeter flood protection, rehabilitation of final settling tanks, the completion of 22 pump stations among other improvements (the cleaning and repairing of digesters, as well as improvements to sludge thickening facilities, grit facilities, and influent screening). Work currently underway includes: 7 additional pump stations, Sludge dewatering improvements, as well as upgrades to the effluent pumping facility and stormwater pump stations, and construction of a new force main in the Village of Hempstead.

South Shore Water Reclamation Facility Effluent Diversion Project is the LINAP diversion project which has received a fair amount of press over the past few years. At the present time, treated wastewater for the Water Reclamation Facility discharges into Reynolds Channel, part of

the Western Bays of the South Shore Estuary Reserve. After reviewing different options to divert the treated wastewater discharge to the ocean, Nassau County determined that an abandoned county-owned aqueduct located under Sunrise Highway could be rehabilitated and repurposed as part of a plan to reroute treated effluent from the facility in Bay Park to an existing ocean outfall at Cedar Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. The County is partnering with the DEC to implement the project in a prompt manner. The next major step is to restore the section of the aqueduct that will be used in this project. A preliminary engineer report and environmental work plan were recently completed. Draft design criteria will be completed in May and final design criteria completed by the end of October. The project will prevent the discharge of 19 billion gallons of treated sewage into the Western Bays each year. The resulting reduction in nitrogen pollution will help restore vital marshlands that provide habitat for wildlife and protect coastal communities from storm-induced waves.

Long Beach Wastewater Diversion to Bay Park began in 2017, when the City of Long Beach entered into a Consent Order with the DEC committing to the planning, design, construction, and operation of a project to divert wastewater from the Long Beach Wastewater Treatment Plant to the South Shore Water Reclamation Facility for treatment and discharge. The Long Beach plant would be converted to a pump station to enable this diversion. Currently, Nassau County is developing an inter-municipal agreement with the city of Long Beach which will create the framework for the pump station conversion project. This project, in conjunction with the Water Reclamation Facility Effluent Diversion Project, would remove approximately 60 million gallons per day of wastewater effluent containing over 15 tons of pollutants from entering Reynolds Channel and the Western Bays.

Next up is the Point Lookout Sewer Study. The concept for this project is to convert the Point Lookout community to a sanitary sewer system and connect to a new pumping station that will be constructed at the current site of the Long Beach Wastewater Treatment Plant. Back in December 2017, as part of the Long Island Regional Economic Development Council Awards, Nassau County was awarded \$2 million towards planning, designing and permitting for this sewer infrastructure project. In May 2018, the Nassau County Legislature approved \$1 million to be used for a feasibility study. A Request for Proposals (RFP) will be developed soon and will be released in late 2019.

And last but not least, Nassau's Septic Improvement Program. The County was awarded \$1 million from the State Septic System Replacement Fund to create a septic improvement program. In 2018, the County officially entered into an agreement with the State to use this funding to provide single family households with 50% of replacement costs, up to \$10,000 for failing septic systems. These replacement systems, similar to Suffolk County's program, would need to reduce nitrogen effluent concentrations by 30% or more. The County's intention is to launch the program later this year with a public announcement to residents who would be eligible for applying for a grant. The next slide illustrates where the county's unsewered areas are. While 90 percent of Nassau County is sewerred there are areas of the North Shore and South Shore where cesspools and septic systems are being used. On the North Shore, there are approximately 60,000 individual systems which are a significant source of nitrogen to the watersheds of Hempstead Harbor, Cold Spring Harbor and Mill Neck Bay and are partly to blame for the water quality conditions in the Western Bays of the South Shore Estuary Reserve.

I'll now discuss some of Suffolk County's initiatives starting with the county's Septic Improvement Program. First, a little background. Suffolk County has the largest concentration of septic systems in the US. Only a quarter of Suffolk County's population is connected to sewers and the remaining use onsite sewage disposal systems. To put that into perspective, about 75 percent of the US is connected to a sewer system. Of the 360,000 onsite sanitary systems in Suffolk, approx. 250,000 just have cesspools due to the fact that they pre-date the 1973 requirement for a septic tank. Over 200,000 of these cesspool systems are located within priority areas that greatly impact surface waters. To make the cost of new onsite wastewater treatment systems more affordable for homeowners, Suffolk County has developed the Septic Improvement Program. Under this program, individual homeowners who decide to replace a cesspool or septic system with innovative and alternative onsite systems may be eligible for up to \$20,000 in funding, thanks to a combination of county and state grants. A few of the East End towns have also made funding available. On December 18, 2018 the Suffolk County Legislature voted to amend the Septic Improvement Law to make the county's program more consistent with the State's Septic System Replacement Program and the eligibility criteria has been expanded to include LLCs, corporations, second homes, seasonal properties and rental properties. Since January 22nd, over 153 people have applied, illustrating high interest in the county's program. To date, 1500 people in total have requested information about the program. Efforts to reverse the degradation of our water resources will greatly depend on replacement of existing systems with the newer technologies.

The Suffolk County's Subwatersheds Wastewater Plan is an initiative that began in 2016. It is the first major evaluation of wastewater management policy in Suffolk County since the 208 study in 1970s. This plan will provide a recommended wastewater management strategy to reduce nitrogen pollution from old onsite wastewater treatment sources through the use of Innovative/Alternative onsite systems as well as the expansion of sewer districts where feasible. This plan will identify priority areas for wastewater upgrades and establish nitrogen load reduction goals for up to 191 waterbodies. A draft plan is expected for public rollout later this spring and a final plan expected to be issued this summer.

Suffolk County is examining new technology through its DEC-funded Septic/Cesspool Upgrade Program Enterprise (SCUPE). During Phase I, Suffolk monitored six Innovative/Alternative Onsite Systems at 19 residential sites and approved four systems for provisional use. During Phase 2, seven additional technologies were installed at 19 residential sites and a total of two systems have been approved for provisional use. Three additional Phase 2 systems are expected to receive Provisional Use Approval by the summer of 2019. The County is working with the remainder of the manufacturers to improve performance.

Moving on to the Sanitary Code Changes. The County recognized that it would need to make changes to the sanitary code. In December 2017, County Executive Bellone signed legislation to amend the Suffolk County Sanitary Code regarding replacement of failing cesspools. This policy requires that replacements and retrofits of existing onsite wastewater disposal systems meet Department of Health Services standards, which require, at a minimum, a septic tank and a leaching structure. This policy change has two phases. The first part, which went into effect on July 1, 2018, requires 1) reporting of pump-outs of existing onsite wastewater disposal systems,

and 2) reporting of replacements and retrofits of onsite wastewater disposal systems. The second part, effective July 1, 2019, will require people to get a permit from Suffolk County for replacements and retrofits of existing systems. Under the new amendments, advanced wastewater treatment systems for commercial buildings will be required if a building will have an increase in the amount of sanitary waste discharged and that increase does not conform to the current standards.

Suffolk County Coastal Resiliency Initiative involves the installation of new sewer infrastructure in low-lying areas along the County's south shore. The initiative will extend sewers to an estimated 6,350 homes in Mastic, Babylon and Patchogue, in addition to 400 hundred homes in Oakdale. The \$390 million-dollar initiative marks the largest investment in water quality infrastructure in the County in more than 40 years and will eliminate thousands of cesspools and septic systems. It will improve water quality, boost economic development and protect against storm surges through the conservation of wetlands.

The Harmful Algal Bloom Action Plan was released by Suffolk County in 2017. It's a comprehensive and coordinated strategy for the research, monitoring and management of HABs. The plan will help guide the work of government, scientists, and academia to address HABs that threaten the County's environment and economy. The Action Plan will help to achieve inter-governmental cooperation and consistency in HAB and nutrient management. The plan's outputs and outcomes will be reported on and recommendations will be made for Action Plan updates.

In this last part of my presentation, I'll discuss those initiatives that are led by DEC and LIRPC starting with the Suffolk County Water Quality Improvement District (WQID) feasibility study, which was identified as an early action item in the LINAP Scope. The overall goal of this study is the development of an implementation guide for a Countywide Water Quality Improvement District (WQID). The study would include the various prerequisite actions that would be required to establish the District and will also consider the management structure and financing required for the operation of the district.

The overarching goal of Western Bays Water Quality Monitoring project is to provide a framework for monitoring, analysis, and reporting of water quality within the surface waters of Nassau County's South Shore and its major tributaries. LIRPC has entered into a contract with Hofstra University and the Town of Hempstead Department of Conservation and Waterways to carry out this work. Monitoring water quality in this watershed is critically important to tracking nitrogen load reductions associated with the infrastructure projects being planned and underway. Uniform sampling, data collection and analysis will be performed before and after these projects go online. A historical data analysis will also be done as part of this project. The data that the Town of Hempstead has collected for several decades will be included in this. Findings from this project will be made available to the public and LINAP partners.

Workgroups have been formed to focus on specific issues. For example, water reuse as well as fertilizer management. The workgroups are comprised of representatives from environmental organizations and trade groups, from towns, cities and villages, federal, state and county

agencies, estuary programs and protection committees, academic institutions and land use planners, engineers and technical experts.

Encouraging water reuse for additional nitrogen removal was also an early action item in the LINAP Scope. The Water Reuse Workgroup was established to explore wastewater reuse as a possible means of achieving additional nitrogen removal prior to effluent discharge to groundwater and surface waters. The Workgroup identified the need for a guide to explain this permitting process, and how agencies other than the DEC may be involved. To meet this need, the Workgroup published a Treated Wastewater Reuse Roadmap which was prepared in consultation with the DEC's Division of Water and Division of Environmental Permits. The roadmap is geared to municipalities and engineering and consulting firms. Treated effluent from wastewater treatment facilities can be used as a source of nonportable water for various purposes including golf course irrigation.

Fertilizer is the second leading source of nitrogen contamination of Long Island waters. The Fertilizer Management Workgroup came together to help draft recommendations for best practices that would balance residents' interest in having a green and healthy lawn with the immediate need to reduce nitrogen loads to Long Island's waterbodies. The workgroup was formed in 2016 and is facilitated by staff from DEC and the Regional Planning Council. There have been several workgroup meetings. Based on the workgroup discussions, DEC has compiled a set of recommendations for best management practices for turf grass fertilizers. The recommendations have been finalized and the DEC recently announced that the recommendations are available on their website. The LINAP newsletter includes this announcement. The Regional Planning Council will be adding the recommendations to their site as well. The finalized recommendations were the basis for a DEC agency bill that was delivered to the legislature in March. The recommendations focus on reducing the likelihood of over applying fertilizer; therefore, limiting the amount of nitrogen that either runs off the surface or leaches into groundwater. The recommendations apply to homeowners and professional landscapers; they do not apply to agricultural applications. The recommendations are backed by scientific studies. And information from Suffolk and Nassau Counties, Cornell Cooperative Extension, Cornell University and the University of Connecticut are the primary sources used to develop the recommendations. As proposed, the recommendations will reduce the amount of nitrogen entering the environment by one to two pounds every time a typically-sized lawn (5,000 square feet) is fertilized. This represents up to a 40 percent decrease in fertilizer nitrogen loads. Over one season, this would prevent hundreds of thousands of pounds of nitrogen from entering Long Island's waters.

Currently, we are gearing up a STEM Challenge program. The competition is geared to grades 6, 7 and 8. The goal of this initiative is to connect students, teachers, and their communities with the LINAP program. Student teams will focus on one of two challenges on school grounds: 1) Stormwater Treatment or 2) Low-Input Landscaping. We reached out to all middle schools in Suffolk and Nassau Counties. Long Island STEM Hub and various school and teacher associations helped to spread the word. We're planning on extending the deadline for letters of interest to give schools a little more time to respond.

There are just a few more projects to cover. Nitrogen Smart Communities is also a recommended action item within the LINAP Scope. To participate in this program, municipalities would need to prepare and demonstrate various levels of commitment to nitrogen reduction activities and practice by taking specific actions to protect groundwater and surface waters. This program would be modeled on Climate Smart Communities and other similar programs. We anticipate that this program would start with a pilot project.

The Long Island Water Quality Integrated Data Sharing (LIQWIDS) system will be a one-stop portal for water quality data collected in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. The LIQWIDS database is being designed to store, manage, and query most chemical and microbiological contaminants data, allowing resource managers to access data necessary for protecting supply and determining the best uses. This unified data sharing system will also help to increase awareness and availability of this data.

Nelle D'Aversa will speak to the Nutrient Bioextraction initiative in just a few minutes.

Regarding outreach, there are ongoing LINAP updates and presentations to stakeholders. LINAP participates in a number of committees across Long Island. There is a monthly newsletter that has about 1,700 subscribers. LINAP also has an events newsletter that goes out regularly.

**Nelle D'Aversa:** Nutrient Bioextraction combines growing and harvesting shellfish and seaweed for the purpose of removing nitrogen and other nutrients from coastal waters. It is an effective nonpoint nutrient management strategy. Existing land based nutrient management efforts in urban estuaries are the Long Island Sound Shellfish and seaweed which provide other ecosystem services such as habitat for fish and crustacean species and improved water clarity for submerged aquatic vegetation

There are many goals for this initiative which will provide information to help decision makers with the guidelines needed to facilitate public and private seaweed and shellfish farming and harvest operations in their coastal waters. We do this by:

- Assessing the efficacy of and potential challenges involved in advancing seaweed and shellfish aquaculture to remove excessive nitrogen loads from NY and CT surface waters;
- Actively reviewing and reporting on literature, permits, and policies; and providing recommendations to streamline the regulatory process;
- Developing a GIS-based tool to identify potential seaweed and shellfish aquaculture sites for bioextraction;
- Creating an interconnected workgroup of professionals and stakeholders that will work towards advancing bioextraction.

The Bioextraction Initiative is engaged in assessing the efficacy of and potential challenges involved in advancing seaweed and shellfish aquaculture to remove excess nitrogen loads from NY and CT surface waters. The Initiative is actively involved in reviewing and reporting on literature and policies and providing recommendations to streamline the regulatory process. Additionally, the Initiative is working with industry professionals to develop markets for and

assess cultivation costs of potential bioextraction species and evaluate the overall economic viability of seaweed and shellfish bioextraction operations. As part of this program, a publicly available GIS-based siting tool to identify suitable sites for bioextraction is being developed by incorporating relevant natural resource, navigation, aquaculture, and use conflict data.

Since the start of this project last March, a number of projects have been underway that are governed by the mission statement of the Initiative.

1. Over the last several months, we have been developing a publicly available shellfish aquaculture permitting guide with the input from all regulatory agencies involved in the leasing and permitting process.
2. We are also developing a shellfish aquaculture permitting road map, which depicts the shellfish aquaculture permitting process. This road map is also being developed into an interactive interface, where applicants can click-through the process to learn more information about each step.
3. As part of this program, a publicly available GIS-based siting tool to identify suitable sites for bioextraction is being developed by incorporating relevant natural resource, navigation, aquaculture, and use conflict data.
4. We are leading a coordinated effort between NY state and local regulatory agencies and CT federal and state agencies to develop a system for regulating commercial seaweed aquaculture in NY. In the next several months, future work will be focused on developing a comprehensive program and determining a mechanism for implementation.
5. We are currently planning nutrient bioextraction feasibility studies in partnership with local organizations to study the efficacy of nutrient bioextraction in removing nutrients, contaminants, and pathogens from urban NY waters.
6. And finally, a nitrogen removal rate database is being developed based on the literature that will aid management in understanding how many acres are required for removing a certain amount of nitrogen from the water.

From the start of the project, it has been a priority to connect with local and regional stakeholders who have been invested in Long Island Sound's and NY's water quality, the aquaculture industry, and nutrient bioextraction. We have developed relationships with other organizations and agencies conducting small-scale bioextraction research such as Suffolk County Cornell Cooperative Extension, Stony Brook University, and NOAA Milford Lab. Additionally, it has been equally important to connect and foster relationships with the aquaculture industry. We've met with several members of the Long Island Oyster Growers Association as well as the Long Island Farm Bureau.

The Bioextraction Advisory Committee is a small network of interdisciplinary researchers and experts in nutrient bioextraction, seafood safety, nutrient resource management, and shellfish and seaweed aquaculture working in federal, state, and local government agencies; academic institutions; non-profit organizations; and the aquaculture industry. The Committee is comprised of a total 19 regional researchers and experts from academic institutions; governmental agencies; including federal, state, and local agencies; non-regulatory organizations; and the members of the aquaculture industry. The Committee will make recommendations and offer guidance based on sound science that will ultimately be used to inform management decisions.

The Guide to Marine Shellfish Aquaculture Permitting in NY is being developed to help prospective, new, and existing aquaculture farmers better understand the laws, policies, and permitting processes applicable to, and the regulatory agencies involved in marine shellfish and seaweed aquaculture in New York. This guide serves as an introduction to the permitting process required for shellfish and seaweed aquaculture. Additionally, this guide discusses important environmental and social considerations, such as navigational concerns and aquaculture best management practices, when starting shellfish and seaweed aquaculture operations. Through better comprehension of the aquaculture regulatory process, this guide aims to streamline the regulatory permitting process by providing permit application materials, direct contact information, and links to supporting documents and information, which is something that was previously unavailable to the aquaculture industry. There are numerous federal, state, and local regulatory agencies involved in the leasing and permitting process for shellfish and seaweed aquaculture in NY. Guidance Documents require coordination on everyone's behalf and the project is in the final stages of review.

The GIS-based siting tool will identify areas within the project area that are considered suitable for nutrient bioextraction using seaweed and shellfish aquaculture and will have the greatest potential effect on nitrogen reduction. These identified areas will be considered priority areas for nutrient bioextraction operations. The project will be made publicly available through an online, interactive map with all available datasets & suitability analysis.

We are currently engaged in the planning and development of pilot projects in NY coastal waters with participation from local partners and researchers. The purpose of the pilot projects is to investigate the effectiveness of nutrient bioextraction in improving NY's water quality using a cold weather seaweed species. We will evaluate the efficacy of seaweed at removing nitrogen by measuring growth rate, performing nutrient analysis, and various contaminant and pathogen uptake.

Thank you so much for your time. Please feel free to reach out with any questions.

**John Cameron:** Any questions for Kyle or Nellie? As you can see, this is a large initiative and we thank all the organizations involved for all their hard work. We work closely with DEC at their headquarters in Albany as well as regionally in Nassau and Suffolk Counties. We are appreciative to the State Legislature for funding this program. Thank you, Kyle and Nellie, we appreciate your presentations today. Rich and Liz are actively involved in the project management of LINAP. There has been a lot of progress and hopefully we are going to make a dent in what is a major environmental issue. County Executive Bellone refers to nitrogen as public enemy number one.

#### **Chairman's Report:**

**John Cameron:** I will try to be brief, but we all know there is a lot that has been taking place in the state. Unfortunately, on the heels of the Amazon debacle, the State has a number of considerable initiatives to consider. One important initiative that has been discussed in the business community as well as the environmental community is this North East supply

enhancement program for natural gas in the New York metropolitan area. It effects Con-Ed in the city as well as the lower Hudson and National Grid on Long Island. There is inadequate natural gas to supply for the future growth here on Long Island and the city and the lower Hudson area. In Westchester, they have put a moratorium on some future projects. It is a very serious issue. A number of people in the environmental community have objected to any increase in fossil fuel use in the metropolitan area. As a result, there has been a lot of pressure on the state government and legislature and the state DEC will rule on the permitting of this project by the end of May. National Grid, PSEG, LIPA and the business community, LIA where I am a member, have come out very strongly and supported this. Frankly, if it does not get approved you will see a moratorium issued in the New York metropolitan area even for minor expansions. This will be a major hit to the economy. We are probably ranked 50<sup>th</sup> in the business-friendly environmental category and number one in highest tax state in the nation. We don't need to do anything else to adversely affect our economic growth.

Another proposed bill in front of the state legislature is a prevailing wage bill which would require prevailing wages on any projects which receive any form of public subsidy. The development community is very upset and concerned about this and frankly it could cause a major setback on the creation of affordable housing on Long Island and the State. This is a major concern and challenge. In fact, when we issued our LI2035 plan, we had 2 identified two major impediments on the future sustainability for Long Island: 1. the unsustainable tax burden on Long Island and 2. inadequate affordable housing on Long Island. We know we have inadequate affordable housing here on Long Island which Elaine alluded to earlier. If we now have developers that are required to use prevailing wage, there is no way they can create affordable housing. It would affect not only housing, but also major real estate development projects. That bill is before state legislature now. The Long Island Builders Institute had a forum last night with State Senator Kaminsky to discuss this issue and they are very concerned.

Those are two state initiatives that will certainly affect the future economy here on Long Island. In Fact, in Newsday today, there is an article that discusses how the population growth on Long Island has been muted. Nassau has had a very slight increase and the population of Suffolk has had slight decrease. We are almost at full employment. Unemployment numbers on Long Island are very low. The challenge is getting the workforce. As a corollary to Elaine's presentation, the school districts which are experiencing the highest growth are those which are the most challenged for some of those employment opportunities. Most of those students are not afforded the same opportunities for those positions. I remember when we were having discussions with the schools working groups on? equity in schools. I remember commenting on the Hempstead school district and I was shocked to hear that they didn't have an AP class in Physics. I thought, "How can they have any sort of opportunity in a STEM program without AP Physics?" I was reminded that Hempstead did not have an AP class in any subject. Then I read the story on Wyandanch the other day and they are proposing a huge increase in the tax assessment. In the discussion, they bring up the fact that there is not an AP class in Wyandanch. We have been talking about this for years as showed in the Long Island 2035. These students in these school districts are not afforded the same opportunity and therefore the chance at the American dream is simply not there for these students. If the great growth on Long Island is in these school districts which are failing, we really have a problem. Not only can we not satisfy the need in the high growth areas in STEM and healthcare related careers, but it also puts greater burden on social

services. This is not going away. We are our brother's keeper in that if a neighboring school district is underperforming, it's a problem not only for that school, but also for all of Long Island. I think we need to focus on this. We also know how tough the discussion is on the consolidation of school districts. Not that we would say it won't happen, but we can't wait for it to happen. We need to talk about what else we can do. We talked about using BOCES which transcends and pierces the school district boundaries trying to get programs in there. We need to be leaders on this issue.

**Jeff Kraut:** You can't say the answer is always government. This is where the private businesses on Long Island need to develop pipeline programs for the Hempstead school district the Uniondale school district, the Roosevelt and Freeport districts where they don't have this opportunity. For about 8 years, we have been taking some of the most promising kids and putting them in a program on weekends, evenings and summers to give them that enrichment that the school district isn't able to provide. We pipeline them. We pay for SAT tutoring. We pipeline them into college. Hopefully, some of them will come back. For instance, some have returned into our medical school. But, the reality is that it takes private business to spend the money that the districts are unable to for a variety of reasons. We just need more participation to do this in a more organized way. We have STEM initiatives and the focus is on technology and coding to learning technical skills to get those higher paying jobs. It is up to the private sector on Long Island to grow our own work force because we can't depend on the public local schools. The Universities are doing a great job but we can't even get the kids into those Universities.

**John Cameron:** It isn't always about the money. What private industry can provide and maybe this is a catalyst for an initiative and maybe look at the LIA to get other business groups to "adopt" or be big brothers to certain school districts. I remember going way back discussing with Ken Morrelly, God bless his soul, the school districts and wanting to focus on Roosevelt and a trade program. Not everyone is right for college and that doesn't necessarily have anything to do with the school district you are in. We can bring our brothers and organized labor to work with us and possibly advance those initiatives in those school districts as well as initiatives for those who are college ready. This is something we need to do. We said this nine years ago. We talked about making a change, but it hasn't gotten better.

**Robert Kennedy:** This summer in the Village of Freeport, we have started a summer program for students for summer help. The community development groups are contributing money so that the local businesses (auto body shops, local mechanics, etc.) can hire these students for the summer and we pay half the salary. It makes it easier for these individual blue-collar shops to hire these young people. Hopefully, the kids like what they learn and maybe choose to pursue it. This is a new program.

**Jeff Guillot:** Another initiative is a group called Development Institute. We have worked closely with them in the past and they realize there is a tangible gap between the education and the industry pipeline as has well been articulated. They fund training programs for vocational programs for folks pursuing a trade rather than going to college. They will work with industry to provide training programs. To your earlier discussion about BOCES. While I think they do really great work, I would like to rehabilitate the image. I would like to take the initiative to

change the negative connotation associated with BOCES. We should educate the public that BOCES is a great thing.

**Elaine Gross:** I would like to urge the business community to make these types of statements publicly and strongly, it would change the conversation in the halls of the decision makers. Let's face it, those folks care about what the business community cares about.

**Jeff Kraut:** We don't give them enough cover most of the time. You need strong voices to allow them to do what they fundamentally know they need to do and sometimes circumstances prevent it. You can't let government take the burden. It is unfair. It's up to the business community, but we don't have a strong enough or loud enough voice sometimes.

**Elaine Gross:** We need to do a lot of things in the interim, but also not give up on fundamental structural change. That will happen if there is a strong enough voice for it and there hasn't been. Nevermind the details but I tried to have a conversation with a group that usually meets in this space and education was not on the table.

**John Cameron:** I hope we can have that conversation. The Council is moving forward with the STEM initiative and competition. Maybe that can be a catalyst to bring in the underprivileged schools. Maybe we can get speakers out there to educate about stimulating the curriculum and giving them an opportunity. School districts left to their own devices don't always have the resources all the time.

**Elaine Gross:** People have criticized Hempstead schools and I am not an apologist for the Hempstead schools. However when you hear that a school that is already fragile gets bombarded with additional students needing additional services and everyone else gets to sit back and wag their finger it is very frustrating. It is not for them to solve, but for the region to say we have an influx of students and we need to serve them well. It is not the individual school districts responsibility to take on all of that entire challenge. That is a structural problem.

**John Cameron:** I agree. Hempstead is interesting. Looking at the numbers, that demographic has changed and it is not what people think it is. ESL is burdened and that district is financially challenged to begin with. So, let's make sure this is not the end of this dialogue.

I would like to add that if anyone is interested, Elaine has her annual benefit on June 11. It's a very healthy discussion and presentation and solutes people who have been leaders to address these issues. We have fliers up here to take with you or you can go on her website.

### **Executive Director's Report**

**Rich Guardino:** You all saw the presentation last month that Todd Poole did on Patchogue. We brought the presentation to the Suffolk County Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors. John, Liz and I were there. Todd did the presentation and their response was very positive. I will give you a couple of take-aways.

1. There is a village of over 12,000 that over 17 years has had \$700 million of economic output which is really phenomenal in terms of revitalization.
2. They were also interested that the multi-family housing in the Patchogue Medford school district produced a surplus to the school district. It was a very thorough analysis looking at the number of school age children, the cost per child and the revenues from 700 units of multi-family homes. It was a significant surplus to the school district.

This is in terms of what we talked about earlier. Pushing people to have affordable housing and transit-oriented development. I serve on the Board of the Community Development Corporation. They have been circulating the report and receiving a good response as well.

Also, I wanted to mention the Council assisted in planning a program at Hofstra with a presentation by the New York City Department of Planning. It was on the Geography of Jobs. John served on the panel. Quickly, I will provide a couple on insights from the presentations. As we are all aware, New York City has had significant post-recession economic growth. That presents opportunities for Long Island. The office-based employment in New York City has been tremendous. We have seen growth in terms of healthcare. Jeff can certainly talk about that. The office-based employment has been significant in NYC. They did an analysis that says the labor force of 25-54 will grow along regional rail corridors where housing is available. Transit oriented development is critical to Long Island's economic future. With great opportunities like East Side Access and the Third Rail Project, we are ripe for development. There is tremendous opportunity, but we are falling behind when we talk about the Geography of Jobs. When you look at what is happening in New Jersey, Long Island is not keeping up with multi-family housing.

Finally, I will mention the report that Kyle did for the New York State Ocean Acidification Task Force, also talking about excess nitrogen and what impact that might have on ocean acidification. Now I will mention that 60 Minutes, if any of you are interested, did a terrific segment on bioextraction and I recommend it to all of you. It showed someone who was previously a fisherman and now is involved in kelp farming. He is doing it in a sustainable fashion and making a living.

**John Cameron:** It would be great if we could put that link on our website. Any other questions, comments, new business? If not, I would like to take this opportunity to wish everyone a Happy Easter, Happy Passover and I look forward to our next meeting.

**Adjournment**