

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Suffolk County Council on Environmental Quality was held in the conference room of the Planning Department, 4th Floor of the H. Lee Dennison Building located in Hauppauge, New York on July 17th, 2002.

PRESENT:

Theresa Elkowitz- Chairperson
Larry Swanson - Vice-Chairman
Michael Kaufman
John Finkenberg
Thomas Cramer
Nancy Manfredonia
Adrienne Esposito
Lance Mallamo
Legislator Ginny Fields

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Joy Squires
Richard Martin
Doug Shaw
Jim Bagg
Kathleen Rigano
Jeff Dawson

MINUTES TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

Lucia Braaten - Court Stenographer
Donna Barrett - Court Stenographer

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:32 A.M.*)

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I'm going to call the meeting to order and ask the members to review the minutes of the June 19th meeting, and then I will entertain corrections and a motion.

MR. KAUFMAN:

When everyone finishes, I will make a motion to accept the minutes as written.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I don't have -- Larry, do you have a correction?

MR. SWANSON:

Yes. Under correspondence --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Yes.

MR. SWANSON:

Item "A" --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Yes.

MR. SWANSON:

Referring to the letter I wrote. I am not the Director of the Marine Sciences Research Center.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. What is your position?

MR. SWANSON:

Director of the Waste Reduction Management Institute.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. You'll correct that?

MS. RIGANO:

I'm sorry. I didn't hear what you said? You are the what?

MR. SWANSON:

I'll correct it and give it to you.

MS. RIGANO:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Yes, Jack.

MR. FINKENBERG:

It's e-r-g, not u-r-g.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You'll correct that as well? Okay with those two corrections, I have

a motion.

MR. FINKENBERG:
As amended.

MR. MALLAMO:
I have one as well. If I'm correct, I wanted to ask Richard Martin,
is this correct, auto house?

MR. MARTIN:
It's auto house, the American spelling.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Where are you?

MR. MALLAMO:
Page six, under history services Meadow Croft, restoration of the auto
house.

MR. MARTIN:
It's two words. Second word house, h-o-u-s-e.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Okay. Can you make that correction as well? Okay. Any other
correction on the minutes? Mike Kaufman made a motion, do I have a
second? Second by Nancy Manfredonia. All those in favor? Opposed?
Abstentions? Carried.

MR. SWANSON:
One abstention.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I have one abstention? Okay. Larry abstained. There's not something
on here about correspondence, because I don't think anyone knew there
was any, but I did get correspondence that I would actually like to
respond -- to have CEQ staff respond to. I'll read into the record.
It's a letter to me from Ed Hennessy, Councilmen of the Town of
Brookhaven. "Dear Ms. Elkowitz, as you may know the Town of
Brookhaven has begun a planning initiative along the Mastic-Shirley
Montauk Highway corridor from William Floyd Parkway to east to Barns
Road. The community has participated in a visioning process sponsored
by the town, Suffolk County, and other stakeholders that address local
land use in zoning as well as traffic, routing, calming and design.
We are aware of the recent SEQRA Type II determination of the Council
on Environmental Quality issued for the sole purpose of the Suffolk
County Department of Public Works conceptual preliminary planning
initiative on Montauk Highway within the study area. Please be
advised the Town of Brookhaven is a SEQRA involved agency on all
actions proposed within the study area and requests advanced notice
and an opportunity to comment with respect to any and all proposed
actions brought before the CEQ for SEQRA review. Thank you for your
time and anticipated cooperation. Sincerely, Edward J. Hennessy,
Councilman, Town of Brookhaven".

Everybody knows -- I think everybody knows what this related to. This
related to the presentation by DPW with regard to those intersection

and other highway improvements. I would like us, Jim, to respond to this letter, but I'd like to see it before it goes. I'd like to tell him, of course, we're happy to have the town involved, but I'd also like to advise the Councilman that we do send out all our packets to the Town of Brookhaven, and they have them in ample time, and I would further like to advise the Councilman that if it's a Type II action, one never gets to identify involved agencies. So, you know, I'd like to do it in a nice way, but I'd like the technical corrections on the record as well. And that we -- I think that we could probably send a letter to Councilman Hennessy the next time this shows up. But I also think DPW should be sent a copy of this letter, although it appears that Charlie Bartha got it already.

MR. BAGG:

They got it already. Also, I think Steve Brown from Brookhaven CAC was here.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Yep. So all of those things should be, you know, nicely pointed out to the Councilman.

MR. KAUFMAN:

The Conservation Board of Brookhaven gets the notices.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

It also goes to the Supervisor.

MR. BAGG:

Also it goes to the Supervisor and the Planning Department.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Right. So, you know -- and Ed Hennessy is the liaison to the Planning Department, he's the Councilman who is the liaison. So I think we should respond to the letter. Okay. Next, Type II actions, ratification of staff recommendations for Legislative resolutions laid on the table for June 25th. Jim, is there anything you'd like advice anybody about?

MR. BAGG:

Yeah, there's one resolution in the packet I have.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Jim.

MR. BAGG:

Yes. There's one resolution in the packet that I want to point out.

MR. SWANSON:

Mumble loudly.

MR. BAGG:

Okay. It's Resolution 1786, authorizing the lease of vacant land located at Frances S. Gabreski Airport, Westhampton, New York for aircraft hangar purposes. It is an unlisted action that requires an environmental assessment form to be completed. The resolution as written says it's a Type II action. It's a lease of property for --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
It's clearly not.

MR. BAGG:
-- construction in a hangar.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Clearly not a Type II action.

MR. BAGG:
That's the only thing in the packet.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Anybody have any other questions?

MR. KAUFMAN:
No. Aside from Jim's correction, which I'll adopt, I'll make a motion that we accept staff recommendations.

MS. ELKOWITZ:
Okay. I have a motion. I have a second by Larry Swanson. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED (VOTE:7-0-1-1)
(ABSTENTION;JOHN FINKENBERG) (NOT PRESENT;GINNY FIELDS)

MR. FINKENBERG:
One abstention.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
You're abstaining from a staff recommendation?

MR. FINKENBERG:
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Okay. I have an abstention. Item 1B, proposed construction of the 4th Police Precinct, Capital Project 3184, Hauppauge, Town of Smithtown. I have a letter from Ralph {Rocofski}. "This department is ready to proceed with the planning phase of the referenced -- above referenced project. The project will consist of renovations of the existing 4th Police Precinct. The department considers this work a Type II action under SEQRA in accordance with the provision of 6NYCRR 617.5 C21 as it involves the planning phase of the project. Now, as is unusual for me, I don't have my regs with me. Is this citation -- Jim, do you have the regs?

MR. BAGG:
No. What is --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Twenty-one, because it's the planning phase.

MR. BAGG:
Yes. It's planning phase. And I wrote here proposed planning and design for the construction. It's only planning and design for construction.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Exactly.

MR. KAUFMAN:
That's a Type II.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Is that a motion, Mr. Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN:
Yes, I will make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Do I have a second? I have a second by Nancy Manfredonia. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED (VOTE:8-0-0-1) (NOT PRESENT;GINNY FIELDS)

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Done. Proposed purchase of landing counter for Gabreski Airport, Capital Project 5732, Town of Southampton. The Department of Economic Development is requesting that the County Executive find an offset to fund the purchase of a landing counter for Gabreski Airport. The County uses a radar tracking system that monitors aircraft landings and automatically produces a landing fee invoice. Attached is additional information which isn't attached to this, but it's clearly purchase of equipment. So purchase of equipment is a Type II action. Do I have a motion? I have a motion by Mr. Cramer, a second by Ms. Manfredonia. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstention? CARRIED (VOTE:8-0-0-1) (NOT PRESENT;GINNY FIELDS)

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Okay. Proposed drainage improvements on New York State Route 25A (27A) Montauk Highway at Champlin Creek, Town of Islip. Who's here to speak on this?

MR. MALLAMO:
Route 27A.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I'm sorry. Route 27A.

MR. DAWSON:
That's me, I'm Jeff Dawson. I work for Suffolk County DPW in the Highway Division.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Welcome.

MR. DAWSON:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
While he sets up, can we go off the record for a minute?

(A DISCUSSION WAS HELD OFF THE RECORD)

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
We'll go back to the record then.

MR. DAWSON:
Once again, my name is Jeff Dawson. I'm with DPW in the Highway Division. This proposed project is for stormwater remediation at Champlins Creek. The location is State Route 27A, Montauk Highway in East Islip. What we have here is this is this is Champlins Creek, these are the headwaters. It goes down tributary to the South Shore Estuary Reserve. The South Shore Estuary Reserve just had a CMP that was approved for it by the Department of State that calls for stormwater remediation measures.

The creek has been a problem for pollution in the past due to stormwater runoff, which has been identified in the CMP as a primary contributor of pollution. So what this project is going to do is remove that pollution via this stormwater treatment vault here that's manufactured by FABCO Industries. It's basically a big vault shown here. The vault gets inserted into this last drainage pipe run that goes to the -- that discharges directly to the creek currently. We're going to put this -- we're proposing to put this treatment vault in that last run of pipe. The vault has a series of baffles that separate oil and sediment and floatables in the first chamber. The second chamber is filled with fablight media, that's basically an excavated rock that is in Wisconsin, I believe -- I'm sorry, not Wisconsin, it's Montana. Close.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Another western state.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
It's all the same out there, out there someplace.

MR. KAUFMAN:
West of the Hudson.

MR. DAWSON:
And this media has a structure such that that provides very small void spaces in its structure itself that has the ability to trap pollutants such as trichloroethane, napelline, MTBE, xylene, and various pollutants that are associated with stormwater runoff. The work will include installing this 12 by 10 vault, it has two access manholes on the top for clean out. FABCO Industries has offered to provide sampling data for percent removal rates of the media, and they've been in the order of 85 to 95% removal of just about everything that comes into contact with it.

So the actual work is going to include preparing the area for excavation, which will require some trimming of some grass, maybe some bushes, the unit will be installed, there'll be a pipe, a new -- two new pipe stubs installed on either end of the vault, and there'll be some restoration work done, seeding, possibly new curb, and possibly new pavement area, pavement patching. So that's about the extent of this project. FABCO has also offered for a third-party lab to do the testing as well. There are {Pendennault} laboratories. So {Pendennault} will be able to do the testing, DPW is going to do

testing, and FABCO will be doing the testing. This unit has not been installed in any other location for stormwater purposes, but it is used a lot for Air Force Base treatment of jet runoff, jet wash runoff.

So it basically has the ability to remove all contaminants associated with fuel and Air Force Base type contamination.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Is DPW trying this as a pilot?

MR. DAWSON:
Yes. This is -- this is a pilot project. FABCO did perform testing. I'm not sure if this is included in the EAF, but as you can see the blue is the pretreatment levels, and the red is the posttreatment levels. So they have incredible removal rates. This was actually data that was performed at this location. They took raw creek water out of the creek and ran it through this media and processed the results of removals. And it seems to be pretty high. So DPW has been working with FABCO on the design of the vault itself. The semantics about, you know, how much media do you need, what the maintenance costs may be. This project is slated to be around \$40,000. In the future, if this posses -- if this actually is effective in removing pollution from the stormwater, they have also a modified design that's a catch basin insert that you just take off the grate, slide this box in, put the grate on, and it treats everything that goes into that basin. So this is going to be crucial in determining whether different applications could be --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Do you have a period by which this pilot is running in a treatment -- or will you, if you don't already where you're going to sample and there's going to be a period where you determine the success rate and all that?

MR. DAWSON:
They're going to be taking samples. It's going to be dependent on the storm events that we have. So they're going to take samples for low flow dry weather where it's not raining, they're going to test it that way. They'll do probably a two month, a six month, a one year, five year and ten year storm. We may not get the ten year storm in a reasonable amount of time. The frequency of testing, FABCO is very interested in this, DEC has been involved, and they've been notified, the DOT has been noticed also, the State Department of Transportation, and everybody seems very interested and everybody wants to know the data results.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I think DPW should be commended because these are issues that have been raised for a very long time, and it's nice to see that the County is being innovative. Jim, you have a question?

MR. BAGG:
From what I understand basically, there was a gasoline spill in this area?

MR. DAWSON:
Yes.

MR. BAGG:
From what I understand. So that's causing the problem with the runoff into the creek, and they want to try install this as a pilot project to remediate that situation and catch it before it hits the creek.

MS. ELKOWITZ:
But it could also solve some of the problems, some of the issues that we've been raising about other roadway improvement projects that DPW has been doing.

MR. BAGG:
And this is going to be placed on state land, the County doesn't own this land.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Also, you're saying it would filter out 85% percent of the MTBE. That would be quite -- actually, I don't know of anything that does that. So that would be --

MR. DAWSON:
Exactly. We were very surprised to see that removal rate on MTBE, because they haven't really found anything that really affects --

MS. ESPOSITO:
So this would have other applications if this is successful as far as --

MR. DAWSON:
Absolutely. Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Nancy, you had a question.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
Yes. Who would be responsible for the maintenance of this type of FABCO thing?

MR. DAWSON:
That's a very good question. At this location being that it's on a state road, I believe that the County and the state are still in deliberation on who is going to take care of the maintenance issues of this. To be honest with you, I don't think that decision has been made yet. But the life -- the design life of the media is approximately three to five years, depending on how many large rain events is experienced at this location. So they should have enough data within that time to not have maintenance be an issue.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
Is this the only place this is going to be used as of right now? This is --

MR. DAWSON:
As of right now, this is -- this is the only place. There is another

project -- I shouldn't say that. There is another project on CR 96, Bergen Avenue by Bergen Point Golf Course where we're going to do those catch basin inserts I was speaking of before.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
Okay.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Just to clarify two questions. This is the first time this is has ever been used in New York State for stormwater application?

MR. DAWSON:
Yes.

MS. ESPOSITO:
And the second thing is the media that's used, I just want to -- you said it's found in Wisconsin. So it's part of a geological formation of sedimentary -- I mean, what is it?

MR. DAWSON:
Exactly. It's basically -- I believe it's a sedimentary limestone type rock.

MS. ESPOSITO:
It sounds like it, the way you describe it.

MR. DAWSON:
Yeah. They basically just have a huge mine in Montana, I believe.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Montana. Did I say Wisconsin?

MR. DAWSON:
It's mined in ground. There are certain mountains that have more favorable media composition, so they're -- part of their testing is to see which media does the best removal and has the best removal rates for stormwater. So I believe that there's going to be a given mix of the media put in in this -- in this particular vault. And based on removal rates, if it has a good removal rate, like, we're aiming for 90%. If we get to that, that much percentage removal, then we know that we have the right, the right mix. So it's basically a trial and error procedure. However FABCO has been using this product for more highly concentrated polluted runoff like the Air Force Base applications, and it seems that all the mixes have a great removal rate. They just haven't been used for stormwater. So you have pollutants like nitrogen that is usually not found on Air Force Base or airport pads. So to answer your question, if this mix that they use proves to be successful, then they'll know that we have the right mix. If it doesn't prove to be successful, they have various other mixes that they can use and collect data for it to see which one actually has the best application for stormwater.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Jack.

MR. FINKENBERG:

I went by there the other day, it looks like there's some construction already. Any idea what that is?

MR. DAWSON:

I did notice tone out for utility on the road there. When we went out there last week. I know that's not -- that's not County work, as far as I know. I'm not sure. I'm not sure who that is. I didn't see any construction. Although this pole, there's a telephone pole you can see the shadow of right here that was snapped. So maybe it was LIPA out there. I'm sure, though.

MR. FINKENBERG:

Looks like they had pollution barriers up. The other question I had, is this going to be require a {SPEEDYS} permit?

MR. DAWSON:

Not at all. We do have to get a DEC fresh water wetland permit under Article 25.

MR. FINKENBERG:

But there will be a discharge, isn't there ?

MR. DAWSON:

Yes. There's an existing discharge right now. And on March 10th of next year is when the face two regulations from the EPA come out concerning stormwater. And for that, the County's just going to have to file one -- one general permit called the Notice of Intent. You'll have one -- each municipality files one letter of intent and gets a general permit for all stormwater discharge. And being that this is on a State Road, the state will probably have to file for one also, and that would apply to this location.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Nancy.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Yeah. What is the time frame on this project? Do you know?

MR. DAWSON:

From the actual installation? Well, as soon as we -- we have verbal agreement from the DEC that they're going to fast track the application, which is very good news. My estimate would be we could probably start construction within two months.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You're an optimistic person.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

He really is.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

If there are no other questions, I'll --

MR. MALLAMO:

Can I just make one more note on the EAF in answer to question 17, the

present site offer includes scenic vistas known to be important to the community, it answered no. I think all of these little creeks along Montauk Highway offer those opportunities.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Yeah, but I'm not sure that the project -- that this project site is really the creek. I mean, I would have answered that no too. I'll, you know, discuss it with you, but what they're going to be doing is altering an area inland, and this is going to be completely under the ground. So I'm not really sure that the project site offers a vista. I'll entertain a motion.

MR. CRAMER:

Motion, unlisted neg dec.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion by Mr. Cramer, I have a second by Adrienne Esposito. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED (VOTE:9-0-0-0)

Thank you.

MR. DAWSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. Proposed conceptual site plans for the Long Island Maritime Museum, West Sayville, Town of Islip.

MR. MARTIN:

Okay. We're going to do a two part presentation. I'd just like to give an overview of the site. We did have an Historic Trust Committee meeting there a number of years ago when this -- these plans were started to be discussed. And just so you know the Parks Department has sat down with the Maritime Museum staff a number of times to get to this point. And just that people know, the historic structures on the site are dedicated to the Suffolk County History Trust, and also it is designated under the guidelines under architectural scenic vistas, trees and shrubs and the terrain. Okay? And there have been additional historic buildings that have been moved onto the site, which are also on the County Historic List. Also, at this time, the Oyster Cull House is a national landmark. And also in their collections, the Modesty has also been designate a national landmark. And also probably this week New York State is reviewing the Hard Estate, which is an Isaac Green designed estate for national register listing, and this is a thematic listing that's being worked on by {Connie Curry}, the Sayville Historian. Okay. So if you to turn the lights down, I can do a brief slide presentation on the site and the museum staff will give you the details.

This is a view of the museum from the waterfront, and that's the main museum building, which is -- actually the garage, people do sometimes call it the carriage house, it's actually the garage to the estate. That was built in the 1920s. And this actually is one of the buildings that was not designed by Isaac Green, he designed the earlier garage boathouse that you'll see. And the two gazebos on either side as part of the plan would come down. The point of view of

the museum now is to really create an historic ambiance and historic site. This is a close up of the main building of the parks -- the County has put a new wood roof on the building, and also repaired one of the light fixtures at the entrance, and the museum would like to restore the entrance. They do have the original plans to the oversized doors that originally had with smaller doors inserted. So this would come out and that -- this was put in when they first took over the building in the 1960s. This is now turning around looking back out towards the bay. You can see the open view here. And then to your right or to the west, you see the gazebo in the front of their historic structures. The Oyster Cull House is to the right and -- what do you call another building

MR. SHAW:
The Penny Shop.

MR. MARTIN:
The Penny Boat Shop is right behind the gazebo, and they'd like to open up this view, and also at that location put a rope pole barn building, which is an historic structure design that Doug will explain further later. Again, we're now swinging towards the east, and you can see the other gazebo coming into view, there it is there. And this is placed right in front of their BB House, which is a house that was moved from West Avenue onto the site where a fisherman would have lived.

Now, we're stepping back and looking at the main house. You can see the boathouse to the west of the building that was moved, unfortunately moved, from its original location. It's in bad disrepair at this point. We have been debating what to do with this building since it's been moved. Nothing has been done at this point. So part of this plan is to move it back at the head of the inlet here where it originally stood and restore it as a boathouse.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
Makes sense.

MR. MARTIN:
This would be actually one of two boathouses that the County will have, of course, the Coindre Hall Boathouse. And this is typical of the smaller boathouses you would have had along the canal and inlets on the Great South Bay. This is the Oyster house, which they have already, with grant monies, restored this building. So that's in good shape, but they do plan to do a landscape more in keeping with the time around the building. And this is a temporary structure to the left for the restoration of the Priscilla, which will come down, and again, open up the views to the bay at that point. Behind it is where the marine railroad is. The picture in your packet is better because it shows the tracks at low tide so you can get a better sense of it. This would be restored. It was working at one point. This is a view at the head of the railroad that goes out to the inlet which needs to be maintained on a regular basis to keep it clear, open to the bay. And this was put in by the family for their use during the estate time.

Okay. Now we're looking back across the lawn, and beyond the trees is

the BB House, and they plan to do a more historic landscape design around this building. This is their small craft exhibit building, which they would like to add an addition to the front of the west facade where the entrance is on the left here, a frame addition that would tie it more into the historic look that they're going for. Now we're looking at the main building, and this is behind it to the north. And this is a shed building that they erected to restore their buildings. It's planned to take this down, and this is the largest most ambitious part of the project to actually add on to this building with a stucco wood roofed addition keeping the design of the original garage to expand their main exhibit space. It's too dark, but that's the garage behind the building there which would come down. This is a view looking towards their main entrance to the museum site, which is where they plan their new gate and fencing. This is looking back at the existing gate. This is just kind of a hodgepodge of gates and fence designs at this point. It's planned to put a picket fence, a wall pole design, and these two gazebos, which Doug will explain later.

Dark view, but that's just showing additional fenced areas. And here, that fence in there would be taken out. And also, in your packet you had an historic survey included, which you might take a look at at this point. The garage is noted, the boathouse in its original location, the other boathouse is no longer standing. I don't think that came with the property when the County took it over. The chicken house is no longer standing. The tin building has been moved north of the greenhouse, but is still standing. The cottage is still standing, but that's not part of the museum property, we have a County employee living there. And the barn and sheds were taken down before the County purchase. But as pictures have arrived at the museum that show a colonial revival style picket fence that went around the barn and shed area, so that's where the idea came from. And, of course, the main house is in the colonial revival style.

MR. KAUFMAN:

The survey you're looking at, that's the 1939?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes. So there was some fencing at these exact locations, but the type of fencing did exist on site. We think this is appropriate for the colonial revival style estate that we have. The design of the fence is in the packet with the gate proposal. This is on the west entrance to the museum site, which is not used as a regular entrance to the museum. Again, it's hard to see, but it's a mish mosh of fencing there and snow fencing that's put up for their special events with the new fencing that will all come down and won't be used anymore. This is the entrance now on the -- off of West Avenue, and it's a problem, because it's really a one-way entrance that accommodates exit also. And the signage there tells you -- tells you that. It is a problem. Here I am in the County van taking my pictures, and you have to look ahead and wait and make sure you don't run into whoever's coming out. So the plan is to keep the existing gates and entrance as is. The gates do need some restoration work, but these are the original gates. At the front entrance to the property to the golf course, the County did have to widen this at this point and move the pillar over to the east. It's done, you know, appropriately, but we're trying to keep

the original entrance on the other side of the estate, if possible.

This is the small orchard that's still left in the lawn area to the east of the main exhibit building. And just to the south of that, you can actually see almost like a track that goes through it, and you see between the larger trees, the pine trees. We thought that would be the best route, not taking out any larger trees at all, just some brush. And we can open up an entrance there and provide for a one-way circular drive that would come in off of West Avenue, proceed down the existing road. There would be additional parking put in off of this road, just some pull-in parking, and then they would exit from the existing entrance. Okay? Any questions yet? Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll wait for the end of the presentation.

MR. MARTIN:

I'll turn the rest of the presentation over to Doug Shaw from the Maritime Museum.

MR. SHAW:

Thank you, Richard. It occurred to me this morning that we have these wonderful little site maps that we would give our visitors. So I thought maybe I would bring some along to give you a sense of how everything is laid out in the museum and what we use the various buildings for. As you see from the packets and perhaps you remember from my last visit, the museum about five years ago set forth with some planning in order to continue the growth and development of the museum for the coming ten or 15 years. And all of the plans that we have are guided by some very simple goals. And I stated in our plan it's the desire to further develop the site as an aesthetically pleasing waterfront historic park with three consistent interpretive areas and to provide visitors with an opportunity to experience a recreation of Long Island's 19th Century maritime heritage in a safe an accessible park. Those three areas are the estate areas which are the original estate buildings; the garage and the boathouse.

The working waterfront, which is the Penny Shop, which we moved to the museum from Center Moriches. The Oyster House which came from about 150 yards to the southeast and a future pole barn area to develop later on, pole barn walk style. Pole barn is a very typical sort of New England, Long Island style building used for the fabrication of cottage in the 19th Century. And then the Baymen's Cottage and residential area, which sort of tells the story of how folks who came to Long Island and lived in our waterfront communities ran their domestic lives, to be interpreted with the surrounding landscaping and gardens.

The plan as written now, the conceptual plan, calls for ten projects, each of which will come before you, the first two this morning. The first is the reconstruction of our gates and the gazebos at our entrance, which will meet two needs. It will -- my desire has always been for people do come into the museum and realize they're walking into an historic site and not wonder why there's hurricane fencing here and picket fencing there and split rail fencing there. It will also enable us to close the property to vehicular traffic while

maintaining pedestrian access in a safe manner. I think it's difficult to get people to feel that they're in an historic site when they're looking out at a bunch of cars.

The second project is the restoration of our marine railway, which we'll talk about a little later. The third project is the restoration of our boathouse, which is the small building that was moved from the head of the boat basin to beside the garage building which we'd now like to replace back at the head of the boat basin and restore and use as a boathouse exhibit to see how folks who lived on these great estates cared for and stored their small craft. The expansion of the small craft exhibition center, you saw the big buildings, the big sort of butler style buildings. What Richard didn't point out is that those are actually historic buildings, the framework for those buildings is part of the World War I Naval Air Station in Bay Shore, which we moved to the museum and put a new skin on. But looking out from the museum at this beautiful view of the bay, to the east you see these two enormous buildings. You don't see them in their entirety, but we would like to put an addition on these buildings, which will give them a new facade from the front entrance, much more in keeping with the historic nature of the property.

We'd like to restore the original front door configuration to the building, which will be two large doors, which will enable us to open the entire front of the building. It's an historic restoration of what was. It will also enable us to more easily move exhibits in and out of the building. We'd like to construct that pole barn to replace the existing gazebos. We would like to regrade the southeastern end of our property, which is behind those big metal buildings and add an access road to the back of those buildings, which will enable us to have some out-of-sight boat storage and work space, which is currently done very much in view of our visitors. And if we can move that off behind a building, it will just further enable us to maintain that historic feeling to the property. The restoration of the sites around the Baymen's Cottage and the oyster house, and that will be done through using historic photographs in our collection. We know what was planted there, we know what typically grew around oyster houses. Currently it's just sort of grass leading up to this building just stick out of the ground, and I think we can just do a much better job in interpreting those buildings if they're sited in their natural surroundings as best we can. The addition to our main exhibit building, it's an addition of approximately 2700 square feet, which will include three new galleries, a classroom, and some very important bathrooms. The museum currently does not have any public restroom facilities within the site. Visitors need to go around and use the bathrooms at the tennis courts. By the end of June this year, we had seen just under 10,000 Long Island students --

MS. ESPOSITO:
Right.

MR. SHAW:
-- with fourth grade bladders, and you can understand why not having interior bathrooms would present a challenge for us. And the last project for our conceptual plan is the construction of that new access road from West Avenue. That plan -- this project more than any other

I should point out that the entire plan was developed with input from the West Sayville community. This one project, the new access road is the one project that will impact our neighbors, but they were thrilled to see us taking on this project, because they know how dangerous our current entrance is. And when their kids come into use the park, it's just a -- currently a bad situation. You have cars going both ways, kids going in both ways in about a 14 foot span. So that new access road will improve safety and improve our visitor services. Any questions about our conceptual plans? Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

You said you had pictures of some of the landscaping around the oyster house. Generally, what are we talking about in terms of the landscaping? I think you had presented it to us once before about putting in trees and things like that.

MR. SHAW:

Well, no, it's not trees because these were very much shore-front buildings, so it's beach grasses. No real hard scoping, because all these buildings were located in tidal areas. So it would be a matter of getting some beach grass, so it's not a lawn.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Beach plums.

MR. SHAW:

Beach plums, yeah.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second question of this would be directed to both you and to Rich. Do you have a girly (sic) complete photo gallery, if you will, of what was there at one time?

MR. MARTIN:

I dont think so.

MR. SHAW:

We don't have a complete photo gallery. We have a great amount of drawings of the property, and we have -- there's still one member of the Hard family who we're in regular contact with. And we have his recollections, and we have his promise that some day when he cleans out his attic in Stamford, those -- and I've offered to go there and clean it out for him, but those photographs will come to the site. Yes.

MR. MARTIN:

Just to finish, we have some photographs of the main house in that area, but I haven't seen anything in that part of the property.

MR. KAUFMAN:

As a lead onto that or a follow onto that question, basically, the landscaping that you're going to be doing, is that going to be sort of following what was over there as far as you can see from the pictures?

MR. SHAW:

Well, the landscaping that we're talking about is around two

buildings, both of which were moved to the site. The other landscaping area we want to attack is around the Baymen's Cottage, the BB House, which is formerly 45 West Avenue about 300 yards up the street. For that we do have a substantial number of photographs that came with the house of exactly what was planted there, where the garden was, where the vineyard was -- not vineyard, grape arbor, where the well was.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Just could you elaborate on the new entrance driveway a little bit? Where is it in relation to the greenhouse that's over there? And what was the purpose of that instead of just enlarging the other road for a two-way traffic?

MR. SHAW:

Well, our purpose in not enlarging the road was the desire to maintain the historic gate that's at the south entrance. In relation to the greenhouse, it's south of the greenhouse is a split rail fence, to the south of that is apple orchard, our new entrance would come into the south of that. So it would be avoiding the orchard and avoiding the pinetum along West Avenue.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Larry, do you have a question?

MR. SWANSON:

Going back to the beach grasses, they'll all be native species? I noticed in your photograph around the boat basin that's it's been completely grown up with phragmites, are you going to retain that or is that going to be moved -- removed and?

MR. SHAW:

Well, the one area that's particularly grown up with phragmites is in our marine railway.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Yeah.

MR. SHAW:

So that will have to be removed, and we're going to restore that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That's part of the specific project we're going to talk about today.

MR. SWANSON:

Okay.

MR. MALLAMO:

I'd just like to note that when this property was dedicated to the historic trust in 1987, I think there was concern on the part of the museum there it was going to be hamper the overall development. And I'd like to commend the museum on their effort to maintain the historical integrity of the site in development of this plan. I too had concerns with the new gate issue regarding the trees, but when I look at the resolution itself, those are -- the trees that are specifically mentioned are those along the main driveway not along

West Avenue, and the pinetum which is in the northeast corner of the site and you're avoiding. So.

MR. KAUFMAN:

One other question. You had mentioned that the access channel over here is maintained somehow. Is that what you had said?

MR. SHAW:

The access channel, the entrance to our boat basin?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah. What do you guys do, dredge? What do you -- is it a private contractor or do you -- is the County doing it?

MR. SHAW:

The County has handled that for us.

MR. KAUFMAN:

What are they doing with the spoil?

MR. SHAW:

We're in a fortunate situation where we did a major project five years ago which removed all the mud and dangerous spoil. Now our issue is sand flow around our west -- east bulkhead. So it's just sand that we're pumping from one side of the basin to another. We have a lovely beautiful beach at the museum.

MR. KAUFMAN:

You would be taking the sands -- the sand that you dredged out of there and throwing it onto the beach?

MR. SHAW:

Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other question? What action are you actually asking CEQ to take on this particular item?

MR. MARTIN:

Just to approve the conceptual plan and then the museum will come back on each individual item to be approved.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So first we need to do a SEQRA determination on the conceptual plan. And then in our capacity as historic trust are we accepting the planning, and also as CEQ?

MR. MARTIN:

(He nodded).

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

First we need a motion relative -- a SEQRA motion.

MR. CRAMER:

Motion for it would be a Type I, right?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Yes.

MR. CRAMER:
Unlisted -- neg dec Type I for the plan itself.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Okay. Let's do that one. Do I have a second? I have a second by Mr. Kaufman. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstention?

MR. MALLAMO:
I am going to abstain.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
You're going to abstain? Okay. CARRIED (VOTE:8-0-1-0)
(ABSTENTION;MR. MALLAMO)

MR. CRAMER:
And then the plan for the historic trust.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Okay. You're recommending adoption of the plan as submitted.

MR. CRAMER:
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I have a motion, do I have a second by Mr. Kaufman. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstention? Carried.

MR. MALLAMO:
Abstain.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I have one abstention. (CARRIED) (VOTE:8-0-1-0) (ABSTENTION;MR. MALLAMO)

MR. BAGG:
I have a question with respect to the actual neg dec relationship. We're approving the conceptual plan, and as such it's only a concept?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Well, I think that what it is, my understanding based upon the last discussions that we had were they were going to come back with kind of a general plan, and when they come with individual projects in our capacity, I think more as historic trust than CEQ, we're going to see that it conforms with the concept that's been approved. If they come with a project that's completely different, then that would be something that we would be concerned about. I think that's what we asked for, and that's with they came with. At least that's my recollection.

MR. BAGG:
From this point on, individual projects will be submitted compared to the plan --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Yes.

MR. BAGG:
-- to see if they're in conformance, and also, we'll seek further SEQRA review at that time?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Yes.

MR. MARTIN:
And more detailed information with materials.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
From a SEQRA perspective given that the historic trust has accepted the plan, if something comes in that doesn't conform with the plan, that would be a SEQRA issue too, because it wouldn't a plan as officially adopted, right? Okay. Any other questions? Okay. Then I guess we move onto the first specific project that we're going to look at in conformance with this plan, which is the Ken Stein Gate. Hello.

MR. SHAW:
Good morning. As we just spoke about one of the aesthetically displeasing features at the museum currently are the fences and gates which surround the museum. They are sort of a hodgepodge of three or four different fence styles that provide no measure of security for the museum, and for many years we have desired to change that situation, particularly at our front entrance, which is where if I had to venture a guess, I would say 99% of our visitors come through the entrance, which is approximately 400 feet inside the West Avenue gates. And the picture that you have in your packet is of that entrance, which is split rail fencing held up by hurricane fencing with two homemade wooden gates, which at this point are dangling off their hinges.

Two years ago, the museum was presented with an opportunity to have a project privately funded to restore the fences to construct two small gazebos at either side of our main entrance to put in bench seating for visitors using some of the objects from the museum's collections, specifically two large bronze, one lighthouse service, one life saving service, bells on either side of our driveway. The fencing will all follow the current fence line. The current project is to replace the fencing on the eastern side of the property, which runs from an existing fence south to the driveway, picks up on the south side of the driveway, runs south for 45 feet, turns east and meets an existing garage. The fence, the design of which comes from the Wall Pole Company, the chestnut hill model, is one-by-one wood pickets of fur set on CCA posts 12 feet apart. And in going through catalogs and recollections with Mr. Hard, we feel that these fences most closely replicate what was on the museum property when it was the Meadowedge Estate.

This fence installation will be the first project of several fencing installations, all of which will use the same design and the same product. The fences on either side of the gate will connect with two small 10 foot by 10 foot by 12 foot gazebos, each of which contains a

small round bench with a historic bell. The gazebos which have been designed by William (Succo) call for all wood construction, a wood shingled roof to match the existing building, and fascia moldings the detail for that was pulled directly from the garage building. This opportunity for this project came about with the passing of Ken Stein, Sr., who was proprietor of the Sayville Ferry Company, president of the Passenger Vessel Association of America and a longtime supporter of the museum. The family asked if we would be willing to erect this structure in his memory. And funding for the project comes directly from the family and friends of Mr Stein.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Anybody have any questions? If there are no questions, I just want to make one --

MS. ESPOSITO:

I have one question.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay.

MS. ESPOSITO:

On the form that was filled out on question five it says "what proposed action affects surface or groundwater quality", and you answered yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

What page are you on?

MR. CRAMER:

Five you said.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Actually, is it's typed over, it looks like Page 11.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

It shouldn't. The answer should be no, I would think. The other -- you know, I'm glad you brought this up.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I think the answer should be no too.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

The answer should be no. And we have -- this is not a conversation for this, but the Part IIs are not supposed to be filled out by applicants. Jim and I are going to have to have a conversation about this, because in some litigation that we currently have, the Part IIs are not -- the litigation that we have, the Part II clearly wasn't filled out correctly. So we're going to have to make some sort of an internal policy here about filling out Part IIs. Whether we do them at the meeting, whether Jim does them ahead of time when he gets them, but Part IIs aren't supposed to be submitted by applicants, they're not supposed to be signed by applicants, they're the responsibility of the lead agency, which is Legislature. And quite frankly, CEQ is remiss in not ensuring that when it goes over to the Legislature it's correct. So it's something that we have to fix. So as far as I'm

concerned this Part II doesn't exist. But there is something else on the EAF that I do think has to be fixed. I'm just going to cross it out and fix it, if nobody has a problem. It's on Page 2, under "B" Project Description. "The total contiguous acres now at the site are 12.54 acres". I understand your project area is 500 square feet, but I think that should be 12.54 acres, okay? So -- and I don't have a problem that you -- the other chart that you do on -- you know, two pages forward you talk about the project area, but the overall site is 12.54 acres. Now, even though this is 12.54 acres, we're modifying a very small area, I think it's probably appropriately classified as unlisted, right, Jim, even though it's in a park?

MR. BAGG:
No, it's an historic site.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
So it's automatically Type I?

MR. BAGG:
It's automatically Type I.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Fine. I'll entertain a motion.

MR. CRAMER:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
For?

MR. CRAMER:
Neg dec, Type I.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Okay. Type I neg dec by Mr. Cramer. I have a motion, I have a second by Mr. Kaufman. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's carried.

MR. MALLAMO:
Abstain.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I have -- I have one abstention. CARRIED (VOTE:8-0-1-0)
(ABSTENTION;MR. MALLAMO)

All right. Proposed restoration of Marine Railway, Maritime Museum, West Sayville.

MR. SHAW:
As you saw in the presentation earlier, the Maritime Museum has a marine railway on site which has fallen into a state of disrepair and danger. It's currently cordoned off so that the public cannot get up close to it. Our concept to restore the marine railway comes from two desires. One is to actually have an operating marine railway as an exhibit at the museum. For those of you who are unfamiliar, marine railways are a small track system with a carriage that runs down into

the water. At high tide the boat is loaded onto the carriage and then pulled out of the water. It's a means of pulling boats out of the water for maintenance or in emergency situations, and this was the way that boat yards all over Long Island did their work in the past. Of course, marine railways have been rendered obsolete by the development of travel lifts and marine cranes. Unfortunately, our boats were built in the age of marine railways. So to lift on travel lift is actually creating stresses and dangers that we wish to avoid.

Our second desire is to have an operational marine railway on the property to be able to do our own maintenance and to be able to haul our boats in emergency situations. With a hurricane coming up the coast, the museum has an emergency plan regarding its boats, which calls for at certain levels the boats to be taken out of the water to avoid sinking. That, of course, relies on a local boat yard being free and available to do that work. Having a marine railway on our site will enable us to complete that work ourselves in a historically accurate safe and efficient manner. The railway project is a little more complicated than the gate project in that by its nature the tracks run down into the water in an area designated as a tidal wetland. Approximately 20 cubic yards of spoil will have to be removed to uncover the existing railway and to get down to a hard surface to replace it. Funding for the project is almost in place pending a little more paperwork with the New York State, Empire State Development Corporation. And the remainder of the funding for the project will come from the federal government via a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services, which is in hand currently.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You need a DEC permit as well. This is a Type I action, so I submit we can't take any action on it until we do a coordinated review. So although I'll entertain questions and whatever, and I want to see if anybody has any -- I'm going to suggest that if -- you know, we have to undertake a coordinated review with any agency who's going to give funding or has permitting authority. So we have to get the Legislature declared as lead agency, a Type I action, if you have other involved agencies, requires coordinated review.

MR. BAGG:

I have question for clarification. Basically, this project is not approved by the Legislature, I believe it's the Commissioner of Parks that approves this.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

The Commissioner of Parks still has to then do a coordinated review.

MR. BAGG:

Right. But, I mean, that -- it would the Parks Department that would seek the SEQRA lead agency with respect to the project, and then finalize the review.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Right. You'd have to coordinate with Empire State Development if you have a particular federal agency, even though that's need be, you should coordinate with them and also with the DEC. Larry, do you have a question?

MR. SWANSON:

Yeah, I've got several questions. Looking at your photograph, the material you're going to be removing from the railway, is that going to be analyzed for chemical contaminants? Because I would suspect just from what I see that you might not be able to dispose of it. And the second is how do you plan to remove the phragmites which are shown in your picture? Are you going to dig it out or are you going to poison it or --

MR. SHAW:

Well, I assume we'd have to dig it out. We're on County parkland, so I think using any sort of chemical would probably be out of the question, scrapping the ground, getting the root systems out.

MR. SWANSON:

Are you going to do that only at this track, over the width of the track, or are you going to be more expansive? Because it looks like the area's completely overgrown with this material.

MR. SHAW:

Actually, much of the overgrowth on the south side, which will need to come down and they'll need to be a small deck put in is giant knot weed, which is probably even more fun than the phragmites to get out, but that will have to come out as well.

MR. SWANSON:

So you'll follow the DEC guidance on how to remove it. And I do think probably you would have to get some sort of analysis of what the soil that your going to be removing is, because I would suspect you can't use it for beach nourishment.

MR. KAUFMAN:

What are your intentions regarding the soil? What are you going to do with it?

MR. SHAW:

Well, I believe in the application it calls for the material to be dried on site and then removed, trucked off the site.

MR. KAUFMAN:

DEC will require that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

They will require a sample for disposal purposes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Do you have the -- I think it's called a carriage for the railway itself?

MR. SHAW:

We don't have the carriage, we have the materials we need to build the carriage.

MR. KAUFMAN:

That would be a fun construction project.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Adrienne, did you have a question?

MS. ESPOSITO:
Yeah. I think you actually answered this question, the maintenance for this, as you know, phragmites will want to reinfiltate your site there, so a maintenance plan will not include the request from the County to get an exemption from the No Pesticide on County Parkland Program?

MR. SHAW:
No, we will not include that.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Great.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Yes, Mr. Cramer.

MR. CRAMER:
You have plan, proposed plan, proposed layout for what you're going to do? I just see the existing conditions and a new bulkhead cross-section that's been included in our packet, but yet you've talked about decks, you don't show the extent of the clearing that you're proposing. I imagine you need some sort of windship on the top, whether that's going to be enclosed in the house or just opened. There's nothing like that that we've been provided with.

MR. SHAW:
The plan -- we do have those plans. They haven't been engineered yet is our concern. The museum operates on a very small planning budget and we wanted to get --

MR. CRAMER:
So those are a bunch of things that you will need.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Do you -- have you made any conceptual forms so that it would show limits of disturbance and those types of things?

MR. SHAW:
On the overview of the site you have, it shows exactly the extent of the railway, it extends 40 feet upland.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I think that Tom is looking for things that are a little bit more detailed so that he can cull what the impact would be.

MR. CRAMER:
The reason why we're doing it this way is going through the conceptual plan first, which we approved earlier and then moving into the other more detailed projects. It's at that time, and on this particular case, it's at this time when we need the more detailed information. Otherwise we should have asked for everything to be included upfront. You know, we have to take a look at, you know, where you're clearing, what you're clearing, the exact extent of construction, which -- which

we haven't been given.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

And I don't know how everybody else feels about this, but -- and I do respect Jim's comments, but I don't feel comfortable making recommendations to the Parks Commissioner, the Legislature or anybody else if we're required to do a coordinated review until the coordination period is over, because we don't know if we're going to have any objections to whoever in the County being lead agency, and also in my experience doing this, if someone has an objection to the project, you learn about them often during the coordination period. And I don't like the idea if the County is required to do a coordinated review not having the benefit of knowing that there are either no comments, or if there are comments, what they are from an involved agency. So I -- you know, maybe I don't want to use the word policy, because there may be situations where we don't think it's necessary, but I would -- if a coordinated review is required, I'm happy to hear the stuff because often people don't know how it's going to be classified. But I personally think and I want to hear what people think that we should wait until the end of the coordination period before we make a recommendation.

MR. CRAMER:

I agree with you as far as that goes. Also, we need the additional information before we can even do the coordinated review.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I don't necessarily know if we need that. You know, we could talk --

MR. CRAMER:

How do you coordinate something if you don't know exactly what it is?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, I think that -- well, and also if you read the regs, the regs are pretty clear. You're supposed to send out the Part I EAF and the application, whatever it is, it doesn't give you the ability to modify it. You're supposed to send the Part I and the EAF out within ten days or something of receipt of the application.

MR. CRAMER:

Well, I think, you know, you've got to call it a complete application also. I think the wording is complete application in SEQRA.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I don't think it says complete. It says application and Part I EAF.

MR. CRAMER:

Neither one of us have the regs here.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

No. But I don't think it says complete.

MR. CRAMER:

Well, I've always handled these applications.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Me too. In villages that I represent, I make sure we have a complete application.

MR. CRAMER:

My feeling is, I don't know how anybody else feels, but we don't have a complete application because we -- yes, we have a general idea in what's going on, but to have a complete application, I would certainly like to see a full site plan or a full layout something at least more detailed than what we have here.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I agree with you, and I agree with you before we make the recommendation that we absolutely need that. The only reason why I don't necessarily want to hold this up is if they come back to us in another month, then we first have to do coordinated review. And given the entities that we're coordinating with, which is the New York State Development Corporation, the DEC which is going to have ultimate permitting authorities probably is going to require more detailed plan than we will. And whoever it is in the federal government that won't have a clue, in this case, I personally don't want to hold these people up an extra month, because I don't think the information that we're going to send out is really going to cull anymore comment than we would get with what we have. That's the feeling on this one. It wouldn't necessarily be my feeling on every one we have, especially if the DPW is involved with the thing. So -- but I want to hear, you know, other people's comments. First, I'd like to hear your comments about the whole coordinated review thing.

MR. SWANSON:

Well, I would agree with Tom. I think it's important that we see actually what is going to be going on, and this is no surprise, because when we discussed this month's -- maybe even a year ago, the general notion that we would like to see a --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

No. I agree.

MR. SWANSON:

-- a general plan. But then we would look in detail at specific projects is no surprise to them, and they should have come this time with a complete plan.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

In general though, I also am interested in how you feel in general about the coordinating review thing, about making recommendations.

MR. SWANSON:

I think you're right.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

The coordinated review, what is the time frame on that?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You're supposed to declare a lead agency within the 30 days. That's what the regulations say. But do people necessarily -- if it's 35

days, there's no litigation potential if you don't do it in 30 days.

MR. CRAMER:

The county can assume lead agency after 30 days, that's the cutoff.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Right.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Does the museum have any time of time constraints with your grant applications and such?

MR. SHAW:

December 31st, 2003.

MS. ESPOSITO:

We should be able to meet that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So then it's not even an issue. The other two months is not an issue, I agree with you. We should waive the documentation.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

You may want to find out what the DEC requires.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Right. Absolutely. All right. Do we know -- do you understand what we're doing?

MR. SHAW:

No, but I'm hoping that Judy does.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

What we're going to do --

MS. GORDON:

If we have any questions, we will ask Mr. Bagg for it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Right. We'll just make it clear for the record since we actually have one now. We are going to suggest the County Parks Department undertake a coordinated review, because this we have preliminarily determined it's a Type I action, it requires a coordinated review. However, before coordination starts, we want a more detailed plan showing exactly where the construction would be, then they will initiate their coordinated review assuming there are no other objections and there's nothing in those plans that raises any concerns that you haven't heard after the Parks Commissioner become -- the parks -- whether it's the Trustees Commissioner, whoever the entity really is, becomes lead agency, then we would make a recommendation. So at a minimum, you're probably waiting two meetings. Okay. I'll entertain a motion to table based on what we just said, Mr. Swanson, do I have a second? Mr. Mallamo. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's CARRIED (VOTE: 9-0-0-0)

Okay. Hello again.

MR. MARTIN:

Just have a brief report today. The air conditioning has been installed at Coindre Hall in the main part of the building where we have our catered events, so we're now able to run events there through the summer. The foundation at Meadow Croft, this is part of the foundation in the old part of the house was rebuilt under a grant that Bayport Heritage received by Walter {DeGrout}. That job is completed.

And finally, Sagtakos Manor, we have continued the research. And we did have another committee meeting for the use plan of the site, so we're coming up with a good overall plan, because there's so much interest in the community that once the County closes on the property, we really have to be up and running knowing what we're going to do there. And we have found a lot of interesting information within the site itself, including the original plans by Isaac Green. So I think that once the County takes the property, we'll be able to move right ahead with our restoration efforts.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. Anything else? CAC concerns? Okay. I have other business, I want to talk about that Part II issue for a minute.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I would like to -- I don't know if we did this before when I wasn't here, but, Joy -- I'd like to commend Joy for her Margery Sax Service Award for Lifetime Environmental Service and such. So thank you very much.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Also, I just had one other note of business. I wanted to know if other CEO members have or would like to have a copy of SSER Comprehensive Management Plan. If they don't have it, if I can get a mailing list, I can get it mailed out to everybody.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Certainly Kathleen can provide you with a mailing list.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Okay. Do people want it?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Yes, I would.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I would want it.

LEG. FIELDS:

There's also a CD with that.

MS. ESPOSITO:

You can get the CD Rom as well, we'll mail out both.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Great. Thank you.

MR. SWANSON:

Give us an update on mosquito control plan?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Yeah. I think I can. There is litigation based on the 2002 work plan. The litigation -- the County had a return date of this week. There has been a return file. I was asked to do an affidavit as was Mr. Bagg as were people from DPW and various other places. Obviously I have seen my own affidavit, because I worked on it, but I haven't seen the return. With regard to the long-term management program, there is a resolution that with a little bit of luck will be passed at the next Legislative meeting issuing a positive declaration and requiring public scoping. There was some technical reason why it was pulled off the last agenda at the last minute, but the County is still going forward. They issued an RFP, I believe they got responses to the RFP, I don't know if they selected anybody, because I'm not that involved in it, it's just kind of what I hear. But they are committed to doing the full bulk. I've spoken to Charlie Bartha myself, and, you know, they're doing everything. They intend to, I've seen the RFP, and we're going forward. That's what I know.

MR. SWANSON:

Well, I guess my concern is that it's really only eight or nine months until we have to make this decision again and --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

When they come to us on the next work plan, we're going to have to deal with it. And do I know how to deal with it? I don't have a clue at the moment, I really don't. And there -- and I have made it clear to everybody who has asked me that I want an opinion from the County Attorney's Office relative to how this is treated vis-a-vis the long-range plan. I have -- I have made it perfectly clear.

MR. SWANSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Part IIs. This is a real technical kind of thing. Part Is are the responsibility of the applicant to fill out, clearly. Part IIs are clearly the responsibility of the lead agency to fill out. If any of the impacts under Part II are moderate, it requires a Part III. In practice -- in the -- the Part III is the responsibility of the lead agency. In real world practice, applicants and their consultants generally do the Part IIIs and the lead agency looks at it, asks for modifications, whatever. The reason that I'm raising this is that there was a technical matter, without going into detail, relative to whether or not a Part II is appropriately filled out, and it wasn't. I mean, there's not a lot of question whether it was or wasn't, it wasn't. But all of the issues that -- that were not necessarily correctly identified in the Part II were identified everywhere else in the record. They were discussed, they were, you know, it all went appropriately.

However, I'm anal, I'm anal in my own business, and I'm anal here. And I really would like, and Jim is going to hate this, and I don't blame you, for CEQ staff when they get a packet, to take off the

applicants Part II and to suggest a Part II to us just as he suggests staff recommendations for Legislative resolutions. Because it is CEO's responsibility to make sure the record's right. And if we're not doing that, it's, you know, it's wrong. So he's going to hate it, and I'm sorry, but I'd like a little support for it if I can get it.

MR. CRAMER:
I'll give you support for that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
That's because you're not doing it, and neither am I.

MR. MALLAMO:
I've always thought this is like the fox watching the henhouse, having the applicant do the Part II.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
There's a lot things in SEQRA.

MR. MALLAMO:
And I'd also like to see Jim doing more work.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
You know what? You now have literal transcription, be real careful. Yes, Mr. Bagg.

MR. BAGG:
I would like the Part IIs to be filled out by the initiating unit as is. I will then take them, and I will then review them and make the necessary changes, but I still want the initiating unit to be aware --

MR. CRAMER:
That happens quite often.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I have no problem with that, that happens a lot. I really want when something comes to us, it's something that staff is recommending to CEO, and that way, we can look at it and recommend it appropriately to the Legislature.

MR. MALLAMO:
Yeah, I have no problem.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
And I want you to take those signature pages off that the applicants are signing on the Part IIs, because that is absolutely wrong. I'm not the lead agency. It should be whoever at the Legislature, whoever at the County -- we can sign as preparer, but, you know, lead agency is supposed to sign the determination. If they do it or they don't do it, it's fine, but I'm not the lead agency.

MR. BAGG:
Well, the lead agency can appoint a responsible individual to sign that; is that correct?

MR. CRAMER:
Not so sure about that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
No. No. Absolutely not. They can sign as preparer, but the lead agency in itself as its own body --

MR. CRAMER:
Has to do it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Right.

MR. BAGG:
So in other words, something in the Legislature would have to sign --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
We can sign where it says signature of preparer, because it provides for you if different from responsible officer, but then it says signature of responsible officer in lead agency. So from my perspective, it's either the Presiding Officer or if it's -- if it's something in the Parks Department, it's Commissioner Scully or whatever.

MR. CRAMER:
Yeah. We've run into that in the past. It cannot be delegated.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I know. And it's just -- you know what? In litigation it doesn't mean anything, but it makes you look stupid, and it's not necessary.

MR. CRAMER:
We can do that well enough on our own.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
We've found plenty of ways, right. All right. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

MR. CRAMER:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I have a motion, do I have a second? Seconded by Mr. Swanson. Enjoy the rest of your summer, and maybe we will see you in August.

[THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:48 P.M.]

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY