



Since 2014, Beach to Bay has posed questions to candidates running for an elected seat representing their constituency. Our questions are based on the priorities of barrier island voting residents. This year there are three Council seats at play. Please read the responses carefully.

Long Beach candidates running for office: John Bendo, Alison Blanchette, William Haas, Chris Jones, Scott Mandel, Joey Naham, and Leah Tozer.

1. Please remember to vote on Tuesday, November 7th.
2. Take two or three friends with you.
3. A low turnout at the polls will seal our fate for the next two to four years.

It is our most important responsibility as citizens to research the candidates to the best of our ability BEFORE you make a decision.

Q1: What is the most important issue facing Long Beach, and what is your position on it?

JB: All of our challenges are interrelated, so it's difficult to pinpoint a singular, "most important", issue. That said, I'm extremely concerned about the level of borrowing that's taken place over the last several years. It's more than doubled since this administration took office and now stands at a precarious \$100+ million. We need to address that and not pass the buck down to future generations. At the same time, we need to be making strategic investment in our infrastructure. Our water mains are crumbling and our streets are a mess. I'd put an emphasis on trying to address our environmental, resiliency and quality of life issues in a smart, strategic way. Our residents deserve safe, beautiful and inviting streets, downtown business districts and open spaces. I'd work to make that happen.

AB: Infrastructure and water, a hospital, iStar and IDA, flooding on the bay side, the Comprehensive Plan, holding the line on taxes...all important issues, however I believe the most important issue facing Long Beach is City Hall. Toxic pay-to-play culture, patronage jobs, bloated salaries for unqualified political operatives, opaque government systems and disrespectful attitudes and hostility towards residents have eroded trust in local government. What perpetuates this is a cycle of shenanigans sponsored by political party machine A and political party machine B. My view is we need to remove party politics from local. While the incumbent Scott Mandel and appointee Chumi Diamond claim being most transparent, ushering in live streaming and increased Good and Welfare, these are meaningless if not responsive. Emails go unanswered, no phone or office location in City Hall leaves residents grasping at straws trying to contact those tasked with representing them. That's right, our City Council does not even have an office in City Hall. We need a City Council that is more accountable and responsive. government and break down barriers that keep those political insiders and shenanigans safe from public scrutiny. We need a City Council majority with courage to make bold, tough decisions. We need to show accountability and transparency to tackle City Hall, and my plan is to encourage my colleagues to adopt open government data policies (see Q2) and disclose when voting on city contracts where the vendor contributed to a political campaign. Our (nonfunctional) committees should be reconsidered and restructured so City Council members serve on a set amount of committees, thus accountable for championing issues and not just placeholders twice per month and not accessible to residents. While the incumbent Scott Mandel and the appointee Chumi Diamond claim being most transparent, ushering in live streaming and increased Good and Welfare, these are meaningless if not responsive. Emails go unanswered, no phone or office location in City Hall leaves residents grasping at straws, trying to contact those tasked with representing them. That's right, our City Council does not even have an office in City Hall. We need a City Council that is more accountable and responsive.

WH: We have all heard about the overdevelopment and rising taxes in Long Beach. Those are two of the primary issues in our platform. However, the most important issue to me personally is a commitment to ethics in governance. When I first started thinking about my campaign, I knew that every decision I would make – regardless of issue – would be based on my answers to two questions: 1) Is it ethical? 2) Will it benefit the resident of Long Beach? Our current administration discarded any semblance of ethical conduct years ago. We hear about “backroom deals” at city hall, but when I realized the extent of the measures they took to hide their actions – rescheduling meetings at the last

minute, secret votes, insider agreements to support outside developers – I found it truly disturbing. Why would an elected official try to hoodwink his or her own constituents? But it begs the question – what did these individuals hope to gain?

CJ: The high cost of living. Our taxes are rising because of growing expenses, leaving the burden on the citizens. People who grew up here can't afford to stay here, as well as our seniors on fixed income.

SM: There are multiple important issues facing our City, including, but not limited to, flooding along our bayside, parking, and continuing to rebuild our archaic infrastructure. All of these issues require attention and thoroughly planned and budgeted projects so that we may keep our current level of services balanced against rising fees and taxes.

JN: For many people in Long Beach, a lot of the stressful issues comes down to the toxic pay to play culture in a city council. In the year 2017, there simply is no excuse for having overdevelopment on the shorelines, and a zoning board who doesn't fight ethically for the city and its natural resources. We are advocating for opening the city's checkbook for the public to view, and have council people serve on committees. Having City Council members who are willing to be accessible and accountable to the public on issues relating to pay to play; overdevelopment, private landscaping contracts, etc is something that must become a reality. Let's have a flood preparation committee working on this important interest, so there aren't holes in city bulkheading. That is one example of my policies that you will have if I'm elected to city council. My running mate, Allison Blanchette, and I don't take corporate contributions, and we will not be beholden to any party boss.

LT: We have many important issues facing Long Beach but as the anniversary of Super Storm Sandy is upon us, I find it necessary to talk about the infrastructure, and critical systems that are vital to life on our barrier island. I have been a long supporter of having a comprehensive plan adopted, we are still in a draft phase since it was tabled by the council back in March with no progress. We must tackle the issues that our community has with the draft and get a plan passed so we can open up opportunities for state and federal dollars to fix our infrastructure and build with resiliency and sustainability measures.

Q2: The Long Beach 2018 Budget has increased \$7 million (10%) from the Budget 4 years ago, resulting in increased Real Estate taxes to homeowners. What actions do you propose to reduce the budget and Real Estate taxes in the next 4 years?

JB: Everyone wants to hear that their taxes are going to go down. Some candidates want to promise that they'll freeze taxes for a certain period of time. The truth of the matter is, a) taxes never go down and, b) we need to really get into the books to see what the true budget is before we can make any promises to anyone. Anyone that's seen or listened to me at City budget hearings knows I understand the City's finances (what they show us) and have a keen eye for detail. I'll use that to bring down whatever costs we can. The other reality though is that a vast majority of the budget is comprised of fixed costs that nobody has any control over. We need to bring serious efficiency to our operations, but also come up with some new ways of increasing revenue. It's the only way to try to keep taxes in check. I've proposed we evaluate the potential to do a real estate transfer tax when new home buyers pay a 1%-2% real estate tax that would go toward either infrastructure or environmental improvements/protections. This wouldn't tax existing residents, only those looking to buy into our community. It's been utilized by Long Island's 5 east end towns to protect groundwater through open space preservation for the last 20 years and has raised over \$1 billion toward those ends without negatively impacting home prices or the larger real estate market. I'm not sure it would work in Long Beach, but think it warrants a discussion as a new idea for increasing revenue.

AB: I have introduced opening government data at the fair and non-partisan Civics Association Candidate Forum, and have since received spectacular feedback, including from other candidates who agree my plan exceeds outdated suggestions of addressing transparency through simply putting the budget online (psst...it's already online) or restructuring the Ethics and Zoning Board (with new political appointee's). Open government data online means putting our budget and city checkbook online, allowing residents to explore city expenditures, revenue, liabilities and assets, payroll, contracts, taxes, utilities, and more. This extends beyond financial information into all departments, so information like crime reports, RFP's, planning documents and building permits would be explorable. I believe open data is the way to go to address our opaque government. We also need to consider creative solutions to increase revenue that isn't more tourism subsidized on the backs of our local businesses. By no means the only solution but a great idea to start with, let's get those street fairs off the boardwalk and into our business districts a la "summer streets" and watch our local shop owners thrive.

WH: One of our first orders of business will be to hire an independent auditor to perform a forensic audit of our books and determine where we stand financially. Recently, the State Comptroller's office listed Long Beach as one of the five municipalities under moderate fiscal stress – mostly due to short-term borrowing. The next administration will not be inheriting a healthy balance sheet. That being said, we promise to freeze taxes for two years. The current administration likes to tout the fact that it has been able to keep the year-over-year tax increase under the maximum 2% allowed by New York State. But a 2% increase every year over five years adds up pretty quickly. In addition to creating revenue by raising taxes, the city council has more than doubled the debt load and demonstrated a complete inability to act with fiscal restraint. Leah, Chris and I have a different approach. We are going to run the city like a professional business that is beholden to our shareholders – the taxpayers and residents of Long Beach. We are going to cover more of the City under the STAT program and use other best practices to create efficiencies and measure success. We intend to reduce payroll through retirement to the 2014 and 2015 levels which follow the same cost-cutting and responsible-spending tactics that enabled Anthony Santino to produce a \$29 million turnaround and first balanced budget in Hempstead in twenty years.

CJ: Well we have to take a good, hard look at the budget, specifically spending. We have to identify why our expenses keep rising. After identifying what's plaguing the budget we must cut waste. Also, we need to implement a comprehensive plan to get state and federal grants to LB.

SM: While not easy, since taking office in 2012, we have been successful in bringing our City back from the brink of bankruptcy and to a position of fiscal stability as evidenced by the passing of six balanced budgets, 9 positive credit actions and two Moody's upgrades. As is done each year, I would work with the City administration to review the proposed budget for any areas where cuts may be made without a significant loss of services. For example, during our last budget review, I was successful in securing a reduction in water/sewer fees and, as a council, we were able to get a reduction in discretionary spending. In addition, I would continue to direct that our City look to any and all available grants and alternative streams of income to subsidize and offset potential expenses. To date, this administration has successfully brought in over \$4.3M in grant funding, well exceeding any amount of grant funding realized by any prior administration.

JN: I would do everything I could to keep the budget from increasing. It's in the county and the state where the opportunity for reducing our taxes is possible. Changes like implementing the NY Health Act would have a net savings of \$17.3 million annually for Long Beach that's employee benefits that would be paid to a single payer system instead of private insurers (By the state). Slashing real estate taxes in favor of a graduated county income tax (by the county). Hiring a professional assessor to fix the broken unfair real estate assessment system (by the county). Consolidating the school districts to save on administration overhead costs (by the Legislature). Stop hiring incompetent patronage jobs. Bringing a lot of the services hired out to for-profit firms of legal services back to the city where it can be done for cheaper. Even looking at having a Long Beach congestion price for vehicles from out the assembly district who would be charged less than the cost of a gallon of gasoline to use our roads for a month-long basis. (The equipment is already in place but would require legislation from the legislature and the state.) Basically, it's very difficult unless there are these structural changes. Now, these changes have been talked about for decades by Democrat and Republican candidates, but they are never implemented because of the pay to play culture. We have an opportunity to make most of these changes a reality by voting for Green candidates for County Executive and County Comptroller. Those would not only bring long-term fixes, they would bring the possibility of significantly lowering taxes closer to fruition than anything the city can do. Again, these mostly are not dealt with in the City Council, and I would be lying if I told you differently.

LT: We must decrease expenses by 2% by better managing overtime, sharing services and increasing performance metrics, increase our cities revenue by 1% through grants (based on the approval and implementation of amended comprehensive plan) and other revenue streams using our city workers.

Q3: The Long Beach Medical Center closed as a result of Hurricane Sandy. South Nassau Community Hospitals proposes investing \$40 million of FEMA funds to build a Long Beach "Medical Pavilion" and \$130 million of FEMA funds to improve the Oceanside Hospital. What are your comments regarding this plan?

JB: While we'd all love a brand new full-service hospital to re-open, I'm just not sure that's feasible. Primarily, this is because it's not profitable for hospitals to be run this way anymore. Most are setting up specialty centers, not full-service hospitals. That South Nassau proposes to spend \$130 million in Oceanside instead of Long Beach, in my opinion, violates federal regulations. The money was meant to reimburse Long Beach for what was lost, not enrich a private entity. What I'd ultimately like to see is South Nassau use the funds to set up a specialty campus for geriatrics

or something of that sort, while also beefing up the services provided at the emergency center. This would give us the health services required, but also bring back both the investment and jobs to our community.

AB: The plan is like using wet Kleenex and scotch tape around a gashing wound. The SNH plan for a "Medical Pavilion" is not enough to satisfy the best interests of our community. We need more advanced medical resources and a City Council that will go to bat for a complete hospital as hard as they went to bat for a complete boardwalk- do you know what I mean? Of the many concerns, what really stands out to me are the mental health services and drug and alcohol programs that were lost. These are a priority that we cannot wait around for. Residents do not just want a hospital, they deserve a hospital that can serve more levels of service than a simple "Medical Pavilion." Demand better, demand more!

WH: Having a hospital in town is a quality of life issue. We are a densely-populated barrier island and our town has a high median age. As we are often reminded, we are at the mercy of Mother Nature. Leah, Chis and I believe that we need a full-functioning hospital on the island and that the \$130 million of FEMA funds diverted to Oceanside is OUR money. We intend to fight for it. Logistically speaking, requiring our residents to travel to Oceanside for acute and preventative care places an undue burden on our elderly and less-mobile population. The Regional Emergency Medical Advisory Committee (REMAC) of Nassau has specified nine conditions for which they will not transport a patient to Long Beach's "Medical Pavilion." Surprising to me was that many of these emergencies – trauma, burns, labor, joint dislocation – require transport to Oceanside. How effective is a \$40 million Medical Pavilion if it isn't equipped to treat a dislocated elbow?

CJ: It's not right! That money was meant for Long Beach. On a barrier island, it is my humble opinion that a fully functioning hospital is imperative.

SM: As I have publicly advocated for in the past, I believe that Long Beach should receive any and all medical services possible with a state-of-the art medical facility. Any and all FEMA funds available should be allocated in Long Beach so that these services can be established and funded.

JN: First and foremost, the land that the Long Beach Medical Center formally stood on should not be developed for anything that is not medically related. We have lost half of our primary care physicians since we lost the LBMC. I believe that Long Beach is crippled without these crucial services, jobs, real estate tax revenue, and negative impact on home prices. Long Beach should receive more money to build a hospital that will be able to provide services that our area requires. What South Nassau has proposed is only a medical pavilion, and that is a far cry from a hospital. As we observe South Nassau investing \$279 million (including \$154 million of FEMA funds earmarked for the LBMC) in both Long Beach and Oceanside locations, there are a number of things that are fairly obvious. First, is that SNCH is actively investing in its Oceanside medical campus, while they're only investing \$40-45 million into Long Beach which pales to the original \$154 FEMA funds. I think Long Beach needs to offer these services: geriatric, cardiac, trauma, stroke, endocrine, kidney, orthopedic, Psychiatry, Rheumatology, Gastrointestinal, pain, Pulmonology, urologic, and surgical services, in addition to SNCH's Emergency Department, Family Practice, Radiology Services, Behavioral Health, and Chronic Renal Dialyses. The LBMC was a bankrupted hospital, and Long Beach deserved better back then, and we have an opportunity today to make a sustainable hospital to restore our quality of living. South Nassau should not spend more than 2/3 of the FEMA money in Oceanside.

LT: The majority of the funds should come back to LONG BEACH!! The money was supposed to be for our barrier island not Oceanside's hospital.

Q4: The iStar proposal to build a 15-story residential building exceeds the current 10-story zoning regulations. What are your thoughts regarding the iStar proposal?

JB: Nobody has been a more vocal opponent to iStar than I have. That said, zoning was created for denser development at the super block as a means to mitigate increase the tax base and lessen the tax pressure on the rest of us. I'd likely be ok with a well-designed building there that offered more amenities and benefits to the community (and if that tax benefit was there), but what iStar has proposed isn't that. Moreover, we all know iStar has been making a play to get out of their tax obligations through a deal with the Nassau IDA. Let me be clear, luxury waterfront apartments should not qualify for tax incentives. With that in mind, I've been at the forefront of the fight against iStar's attempted tax breaks. We've beaten them twice on applications for more than \$125 million and \$109 million in tax breaks. Rumor has it they'll be coming back for something around \$85 million. We'll fight that back too, but, either way, Long Beachers can be proud that iStar is already going to be paying some \$40 million more in taxes than they hoped to because we've beaten their efforts back.

AB: This zoning variance should never have gone through, however our City Manager and City Council tasked with representing our best interest, found this to be in their best interest. They conveniently were legally obligated to be silent on the issue. I am appalled at the cast of character involved, and that any one of them would expect to be re-elected. Voters must send a message to City Hall on November 7th that bad decisions at our expense will not be rewarded. This zoning variance should never have gone through, however our City Manager and City Council tasked with representing our best interest, found this to be in their best interest. They conveniently were legally obligated to be silent on the issue. I am appalled at the cast of character involved, and that any one of them would expect to be re-elected. Voters must send a message to City Hall on November 7th that bad decisions at our expense will not be rewarded. As for the potential tax break from the IDA, my running mate Joseph Naham and I are categorically opposed to corporate handouts, luxury residential dwelling handouts and the general nature of IDA's.

WH: The City's handling of the iStar project was the issue that motivated me to run for office. I have lived in Long Beach for 20 years and like many residents, I believe that the quality of life here has been deteriorating due to overdevelopment and strain on our infrastructure. It is hard to walk anywhere in Long Beach and not see examples of the City's failure to protect its neighborhoods from greedy developers who look to circumvent the building codes through shady backroom deals. We have long-opposed the iStar's request for a multi-million-dollar tax break. Chris, Leah and I are plaintiffs in a lawsuit seeking to revoke the building permits which we believe have expired. We are asking the city to hold a new hearing in front of the zoning board and reapply for the variances. I highly doubt that building to our current code will cause the developer extreme financial hardship or will truly bring a significant economic benefit to the city. If iStar's multiple requests for tax breaks are granted, we may not see an economic benefit for 20 years.

CJ: I've been against everything regarding iStar from day one. The abatement, the variances, and the designed project.

SM: In 2011, the then Republican City Council sued iStar. In 2014, we were advised by the City's Corporation Counsel that the majority of the City's claims against iStar were thrown out by the NYS courts, that the courts determined that iStar could build its planned project as a matter of right, and that the City's outside counsel fees had already exceeded over \$500,000. We were further advised by the City's Counsel that the then proposed settlement was in the best interest of the City and its residents (where the City would receive, among other benefits, over \$5M, critical upgrades to a major water/sewer line from Broadway to Park Ave., and iStar withdrawing its substantial tax certiorari claims against the City). Based upon the advice of the City's Counsel, the current administration was able to settle the suit. Unfortunately, due to the terms of the settlement thereto settle the suit. Unfortunately, due to the terms of the settlement there is a limit as to what may be discussed publicly. However, that aspect of iStar's proposal regarding a variance, like every other variance applied for by both residents and commercial property owners, was brought before the Zoning Board of Appeals (the "ZBA") for consideration, as the City Council does not have the authority to grant or deny variance applications. In general, once the proposed Comprehensive Plan is approved, with substantial community input, the City will be able to carry out the much-needed revisions to the City's antiquated zoning code, which would result in considerably less applications to, and reliance upon, the ZBA.

JN: The proposal was unfortunately approved by the zoning board. Over the last few years, we've seen battles where the iStar developers have utilized brave unions as pawns to charge ahead for \$82-\$129 million in tax abatements for their \$336 million project. The site is owned by iStar and received a variance from the zoning board to build at the 15-story height. I have been vocal at the tax abatement hearings regarding my strong opposition to this project. Every architect you ask will tell you that you never build high on a shoreline. This is over development via corporate welfare. iStar's intentions have been dubious, first stating they were "Shovel in the ground ready," and now they are threatening a \$105 million lawsuit if the city doesn't support their tax abatement. iStar's website, <http://www.iStarLongBeach.com> is inaccessible. iStar is in the process of taking a third attempt at an \$82 million tax abatement, and the IDA has publicly stated that the support of a city will not affect the IDA decision process. iStar is obviously not being forthright with their intentions. But I will always clearly lay out my stance on protecting our super-block from overdevelopment.

LT: Having a 15 story, 2 building, structure goes way beyond the height that we should have here on our island. Over development is a huge problem that we will be facing and we must get it under control.

Q5: A Long Beach Comprehensive Plan was published in May 2016. The City Council has not yet approved implementation of the Comprehensive Plan. What are your thoughts regarding the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan?

JB: Long Beach hasn't updated its comprehensive plan since the 1980's, so it needs to get done, but it needs to get done well. I was/am on the Citizen's Advisory Committee working on this version of the Comprehensive/Resiliency plan. While there are some good things in it, on a whole, it contemplates too much density throughout the City and has the very strong potential to gentrify and displace areas of Long Beach that can least afford such things. I'm against the adoption of the comprehensive plan until these concerns are addressed.

AB: The draft Comprehensive Plan heavy on zoning which opens the door to wrong-sized development and gentrification of our beautiful bay side communities, predominantly North Park. Despite the dozen+ open meetings, the plans are (purposely) confusing with misleading schematics and jargon. The critical transportation component was not part of the public meetings, violating residents' rights. We cannot champion a model city if it is not inclusive or leaves some people behind. Because public outreach during the City of Long Beach Comprehensive Plan planning sessions did not include a component on transportation, the outreach process is incomplete and cannot be implemented until then.

WH: Chris, Leah and I would like to move forward with an amended Comprehensive Plan. The Plan addresses many of the issues in Long Beach such as overdevelopment and we believe the positives outweigh the negatives. I have spoken to many residents about their concerns regarding the Plan and I would just like to address two of the issues that repeatedly surfaced. The first is that Eminent Domain is not part of the plan. We do not intend to use Eminent Domain to repurpose any of the privately-held land in Long Beach. The second concern I would like to address is the zoning code update. By updating the code, we will not automatically allow outside (or local) developers to build large, multi-unit structures. We are simply talking about changing the code so that the residents of Long Beach do not have to seek variances for their homes in order to become FEMA-compliant. Once we have adopted a Comprehensive Plan, Long Beach will become eligible for many Federal grant programs which we will use to execute the plan.

CJ: I feel a comprehensive plan is vital to bringing in federal and state government monies and improving quality of life. That being said the current plan is clearly flawed! We must make changes to it. The idea is there and we should agree on something and move forward as a community.

SM: As addressed above, I would like to see the proposed Comprehensive Plan presented for a vote before the Council and upon its presentation, I would anticipate the plan's approval. While the plan itself is a "vision" of the future for Long Beach, and not a mandated scope of work to be carried out, passage of the plan triggers the more crucial next step of our community being able to fully revise the City's antiquated zoning code. Currently, we have been faced with having to make zoning code revisions on a case by case basis, and the overuse of the ZBA due to residents' and businesses' needs to apply for variances because of the outdated code. Having the ability to revise the entire zoning code with the entire community's input will allow our community to modify the code to reflect current needs.

JN: I am against the Long Beach Comprehensive Plan because it doesn't adequately satisfy transportation concerns and specifically a bicycle element for an acceptable comprehensive plan. I also feel that this comprehensive plan will be a vehicle of gentrification. This comprehensive plan also seems to enable eight story development along the bay-front which would create a northern great wall. This is unacceptable.

LT: This shows the lack of leadership that we currently have on the city council. Too much misinformation and the lack of getting all parties together to flush out a draft so we can get a this to a vote. Not having a comprehensive plan and implementation of one will have long lasting negative effects on our community.

Q6. Several studies indicate that both the quality and availability of our drinking water from the Lloyd Aquifer is at risk. What are your thoughts regarding the actions the City Council should take regarding this risk?

JB: We know we're at great risk of salt water intrusion and see evidence of it in the Lloyd Aquifer. The Lloyd is the deepest and purest of Long Island's 3 aquifers and Long Beach is only allowed to pull from it because the other two aquifers don't exist in our area. This is a privilege few communities enjoy and we need to defend its integrity with all we have. There are threats of additional pumping from NYC and elsewhere. As a Councilperson, I'll figure tirelessly to make sure it doesn't happen. In addition to reactive measures though, we need to be more proactive in its protection. We need to increase the amount of green and permeable spaces in Long Beach to allow for recharge. We also need to understand that water that falls in other Long Island communities ends up in the Lloyd, so I would advocate trying to forge regional alliances that advocate for the shared protection of our share resource.

AB: The Lloyd Aquifer is a public resource that must be preserved and managed—not exploited or impaired for private gain. Salt water intrusion and nitrogen pollution are real, and so is the threat of NYC trying to tap into our water source. It is imperative the City Council joins other stewards of our water sources in keeping NYC at bay (pun not intended). I support the collective Water Long Island's view in having one agency, "Management Compact," to manage the complexities of Long Island's water use and protection of aquifers. Our City Council must partner with environmental groups, businesses, conservation and land use groups, and individuals who are the boots-on-the-ground stewards of our water sources. The Council should co-host public workshops, encouraging the public to attend with emphasis on our younger population taking root in this critical issue. Education and encouragement on conservation of water use inside and outside the home is important. The city could consider hosting the next water conference. This is too serious of an issue- we must not take our water source for granted!

WH: In Long Beach, we rely on groundwater provided by the Lloyd Aquifer. The water contained in the aquifer is of excellent quality and we are one of the few municipalities allowed access it under New York Environmental Conservation Law §15-1528, which establishes a moratorium on the use of water from this formation in order to maintain it for future generations. As a member of the council, I plan to fight anyone's attempt to repeal the conservation law. The groundwater at Lloyd Aquifer is 6,000 years old and it is not a renewable source. We will work with Health Department officials and engineers to develop better land-use practices that will protect the aquifer. The real problem in Long Beach is not with the source of the water, but with the delivery. Our pipes are old and corroded and the solution depends on infrastructure improvement.

CJ: The Lloyd is ours and it must stay that way! Every time it's drilled into or tapped into that's potential for contaminated water which is unacceptable! We must fight to keep it ours and get help from other elected officials of higher office.

SM: The City Council has already taken steps to protect the Lloyd Aquifer by working closely with the Western Nassau Aquifer Committee and has successfully coordinated with the Committee in advocating for a \$6M study performed by the US Geological Survey. The US Geological Survey is currently doing a comprehensive study and report of Long Island's groundwater, which will include the Lloyd Aquifer. We have also strongly advocated to stop NYC from opening water wells which draw from the Lloyd Aquifer and that NYC use the data from the US Geological Survey before taking any steps on invading well water resources. We have also successfully advocated for the re-opening of the monitoring well in Long Beach which was closed by the County in 2010, so that we can better determine with certainty where the salt water interface occurs.

JN: I support a study for a recharge reuse of treated sewage water, as is practiced in Orange County California because that would help the aquifer. The composition of our aquifer will only get worse with sea level rising factoring into saltwater intrusion. As a horticulturist, I perceive a lot of faults with the delegation of water resources throughout our landscaped city. It's my priority to emphasize our need for changing the composition of our blvd malls. Turf needs to be removed from the blvd malls and replaced with native ornamental perennial plants. Native plants would bring in native birds and insects. This would also reduce the practice of overwatering and influence residents with their landscaping practices. I oppose the Queens wells from re-opening their Nassau County wells.

LT: We must start taking this seriously, at the present time the city of Long beach will tell you that we do not have salt water intrusion, so there is really nothing being done. This is unacceptable. We must start by pushing for real water conservation and start listening to the experts and not shrugging off what will be the downfall of living on our barrier island. The city council must be the advocates that lead the march for other municipalities to not be allowed to drill into the aquifer and to work with NY legislators to protect our water source.