

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Suffolk County Council on Environmental Quality was held in the Rose Y. Carappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veteran Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on October 16, 2002.

PRESENT:

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

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Joy Squires
Richard Martin
Jim Bagg
Nick Gibbons

MINUTES TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:35 A.M.*)

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I'm going to call the meeting to order. I don't have minutes of the September 18th CEQ meeting. Jim, have you received minutes for that meeting, September 18th?

MR. BAGG: No.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Correspondence. There are two pieces of correspondence in my file relative to the former of Cornell Cooperative Extension Building in Riverhead. The first the dated September 20th of 2002 from the Riverhead Landmarks Preservation Commission, and I'll read the pertinent sections into the record. "As per conversation with Paul Martin last week, we understand that the Council on Environmental Quality is considering nominating the former Cornell Cooperative Extension Building in Riverhead to the Suffolk County Historic Trust. We further understand that the CEQ is considering recommending that the County preserve rather than demolish this structure. The members of the Riverhead Landmarks Preservation Commission have discussed this structure and believe that the Griffing Avenue facade of the 75 year old building has considerable architectural distinction, has been found by the state to be eligible for designation to the national register and relates well with the County Court house and other historic structures across the state. Assuming that the building is structurally sound and equivalent parking can be found elsewhere, we believe that reuse as part of the courthouse complex would be more appropriate than its demolition. If reuse of the whole of the whole building is not possible, we would advocate preservation of the facade either on its current site or elsewhere in the town. Please let us know if there is anything else this commission can do to further this goal. Sincerely, Richard A. Wines, Chair."

I also have a letter from the Peconic Community Council, Inc. dated October 1st. "Peconic Community Council is a 501 (c) 3 coalition of organizations and individuals dedicated to the promotion and preservation of the highest level of health human services for the entire East End community. Its membership includes over 250 health and human service agencies actively serving the needs of the East End residents with representatives of local businesses. Its current priorities are the improvement of transportation services and increasing the availability of affordable housing. As PCC's role in the local communities has grown so has its staff, so that it now needs to find new space to utilize. It is seeking space in the Riverhead where economic development is so badly needed and envisions establishing its office as a telecommuting center where space and staff support can be provided to profit making and non profit making businesses alike. We read with interest of Suffolk County's search for options for the old Cornell Cooperative Extension building. It is a space that we would consider renovating and utilizing if it is available and structurally sound and we are able to raise sufficient capital. We would wish to preserve the front exterior and any historic details and remove the temporary facade, returning the building to its original look. We would need to involve an engineer

and an architect with a strong historic background to evaluate its condition and advise us on cost of renovation. Please let us know what the next steps would be in considering this as a possibility. Sincerely, Mardythe O. DiPirro, Grants Administrator."

Well, my recommendation would be that this be forwarded to DPW so that DPW could act on it. So, Jim, if you would do that, I would appreciate it.

Ratification of staff recommendations for Legislative Resolutions laid on the table October 8, 2002.

The next item on the agenda are the recommendations of Type II actions by the staff for Legislative Resolutions laid on the table on October 8th. Jim, is there anything you would like to call to the Council's attention?

MR. BAGG:

No. The packet's pretty straight forward, most of them are Type II actions or completed SEQRA reviews, and there was nothing of particular importance.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Are there any questions from CEQ? If not, I'll entertain a motion to accept the staff recommendations.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll make that motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Motion by Mike Kaufman, do I have a -- second by Nancy Manfredonia. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Next item on the agenda, we have a number of tabled projects. The first is the proposed demolition of military buildings at Gabreski Airport, CP-5702, Town of Southampton. My recollection relative to this project was that we had asked Carolyn Fahey to go the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation, Historic Preservation to secure determination as to whether or not the buildings are historic. And in the packet we received a letter from Jim Warren -- Rich, did you have a chance to look at the letter?

MR. MARTIN:

I was there at the meeting with Jim Warren and Carolyn, so we reviewed the site together. And I agree with this determination.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That none of the buildings --

MR. MARTIN:

None of the ones -- it's not the whole site, it's just the -- the old warehouse buildings that they're looking to take down. So some of the other buildings which are south, which are the old hangars do have a unique design, and if anything was going to be done over in that section, we might want to review it again. We did not look at that

area.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So the project is for demolition of these buildings. Does anybody else have any questions relative to that? So then I'll entertain a motion for SEQRA determination, but before I do that, Jim, I have a question. Jim, I have a question for you, I apologize. On the airport buildings, now that we have the SHPO determination, we're ready to make a SEQRA determination. I don't have all the documentation before me. My recollection is that its an Unlisted Action.

MR. BAGG:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. So then I'll entertain a motion for un Unlisted Neg Dec.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Mr. Swanson I believe made the motion, Mr. Kaufman, would you like to second?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. Item 1-B, proposed replacement of Mill Dam Bridge, Town of Huntington. We received a letter. I have a letter dated October 4th, 2002 from Dunn Engineering Associates regarding this. Is there someone here that would like to speak on this matter? You have to use the microphone, and you have to identify yourself, and there is an easel over there if you'd like to bring it closer.

MR. ROGERS:

Okay. I'm Tom Rogers from Public Works and we had asked Dunn Engineering to come in and explain the procedures of the construction. As I understand at the last meeting there was a question about whether the pond would be filled or drained. So Dunn Engineering is doing the design for us. And Mr. Bill {Liveford} is here from Dunn to explain what the procedure is going to be. We also have a couple of representatives from the Town of Huntington. If there's any -- any questions about the pond, they can answer that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

My notes also indicate that the CEQ asked for a consultation with DEC and the Corps of Engineers and for you to provide commentary relative to that. Are you prepared to do that?

MR. ROGERS:

We haven't applied to the DEC because we wanted the design on what we're going to do before we make that. We wanted to complete this, get this to the CEQ so we get approval for this and continue with it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, we'll be -- we'll be happy to hear you, but you should know that there were some CEQ members who felt strongly about having DEC's input prior to making a recommendations for SEQRA determination. But there is a potential that you're going to answer the questions that the various members had. So feel free to go forward.

MR. ROGERS:

I'll turn it over to Mr. Lifford.

MR. LIFFORD:

I would like to just highlight what Tom already mentioned. In the past, we have also had to come before CEQ to get authorization so that we would have a legitimate construction project. That would enable us to complete what we would do, and they would be sent to you people. The various agencies contact you people for comments when they advertise on these anyway. So you would have that opportunity then to reconsider anything you feel that when we initially -- that you felt was different than the way we had it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Your comments are well taken. However, when someone is looking to make a SEQRA determination, which ultimately we only we make a recommendation, but what you consider are all aspects of the environment. And I think that were some members here that wanted the DEC's expertise relative to a commentary on the effects of this. But as I said, you don't have it, so let's just hear what your presentation is and then the members will ask you whatever questions they see fit. Can you make sure that mike is on, and you can take it out and walk over if you'd like to the easel.

MR. LIFFORD:

What we have done is we have revised the construction sequence so that we can keep water behind the tide gates at all times for a period that will enable us to change the tide gates completely. Do that first, and then continue, do the rest of the construction of the bridge with the tide gates in their normal operation. So we propose to have the pond closed off for a period of 30 to 40 days while we accomplish this. Then the tide gates can be put back into complete operation as we continue with the remaining nine months of construction. The proposal is to first close the tide gates, we will then install silk screens, which are oiled -- professional oiled screens in the water on both sides to prevent any debris from going beyond the immediate enclosed area. We'll remove the entire superstructure, that's the roadway you see of the bridge, and we'll remove the walls on which they sit in between these two silk screens that I've referred to. We will then break up and remove only part of the bridge footing. What we're trying to do here is to enable us to construct the bridge in a shorter amount of time, not remove all of the existing footing and piles, which is extensive, but merely break a line through there so that we can put in sheet piles, prestressed concrete sheet piles

and form the U shape of the new abutments. We can do all of that, then we can install steel sheet piling on both sides of the tide gate and close it off to the sheet piles, so that would leave the tide gate area available to us to pump all the water down, remove the existing gates, repair the concrete footing that the gates ride on and go up against the close. That would only take a period of a couple of weeks. We can then install completely new tide gates that would already be manufactured prior to starting the whole construction period. We would then cut the steel sheet pile cooper dam off underwater so that we have the benefit of it for the future that there's no erosion beneath the tide gate. And at that period, we can allow the tide gates function normally once again and continue with construction of the bridge.

So the advantage here is that the pond would be filled for a period of 30 to 40 days, and at that point there would be no exchange of water, there's only minimal exchange now at high tide, and we would then be able to open the tide gates and have them operating during the construction period. And I think that's what was not conveyed at the last meeting.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Larry.

MR. SWANSON:
Thanks, Bill. I think -- it is my understanding that this -- your explanation is a tremendous improvement over what we interpreted was going to go on last time, but I still think that one of the questions that we had raised about the proposed construction was whether there was going to be long term ecological shift in species and so forth as a result of having the tide gates closed. My impression was that they were going to be closed a lot longer then what you have explained, and maybe that will resolve the problem. But I must say I'm not a good enough biologist or ecologist to tell you whether having them closed for 30 to 40 days is still in the area of doing permanent damage to some of the ecological functioning of the -- of the area. And it seems to me that DEC's input would still be beneficial.

MR. LIFFORD:
There's one other feature that I'd like to point out that I understand wasn't clearly spelled out last time. The gates are closed at the end of August. And our --

AUDIENCE MEMBER:
October 1st.

MR. LIFFORD:
October 1st. And are not opened other than by the tide until the summer season. Now in the summer season, and that's July and August, they're tied back so that they get a complete flush each time of much more -- much larger quantity of the water in the pond. Under normal operations, they don't get that. So -- so then a 30 day period here of them being closed, you know, locked so that water can't exchange is not that unusual from the winter sequence of operation.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Joy, did you have a question.

MS. SQUIRES:

I just wanted to -- to say that Jodi {Anastasia}, who's our Director of Maritime Services is in the audience, and also, we have a representative from his department and also a representative of engineering. And I think they have studied the problem extensively, and maybe Larry, any of these questions, you could -- you could -- Jodi could answer for you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

We'll be happy to hear the answer if there's somebody there who's involved with the project that could speak to us.

MR. ANASTASIA:

Madam Chairperson, Jodi Anastasia, Department of Maritime, Town of Huntington. During the time frame we're talking about, as Bill pointed out, is during the winter months. And biologically speaking as it was expressed is everything goes into a dormant state. You have a lot of photosynthesis not taking place, everything is freezing. So this is the time of year when it is best to do this operation, because nothing is really going to be affected by this construction time frame over the winter months. That's probably the best time to do it in this area based on your questions, sir.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other questions? Mike.

MR. KAUFMAN:

One of our concerns for the members of the Council was whether the tide gates would be fixed in such a way that that pond over there would be empty during the winter seasons. We were very concerned that basically it would become a nuisance, more than anything else. The fact that it is going to be filled is -- is a very good thing in my opinion. It also is at variance with what we are trying to guess at last meeting. So I think you're very clearly showing us what is going to be happening. Realistically, there is some flow going into that pond or {enbayment} or whatever you want to call it. Betty Allen Park, I believe, has some flushing into there, there are some -- one or two other streams in the area that are going in. So I don't think that it is going to be become stagnant or anything like that. If it's filled with water and there is some water coming in, I don't think that it's going to be causing any kinds of problems or anything, which is what we were concerned about the last time.

LEG. FIELDS:

I'm going to ask if Nick Gibbons would be prepared to answer any questions or offer any help to us on the panel not having the expertise that you might have of whether or not you can be prepared to answer a couple of questions. Nick is our environmental analyst for the County.

MR. GIBBONS:

I'm not prepared, but I'll try.

LEG. FIELDS:

Do you see this as a problem as far as species and --

MR. GIBBONS:

No, I don't. I would argue that Mill Dam is not operating ecologically as it is with or without the project. It's a very degraded system, and 30 or 40 days of stopping the tidal flush isn't going to make a difference one way or the other. And long term I think it's an overall benefit.

LEG. FIELDS:

Thank you, Nick.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other questions?

MR. KAUFMAN:

What are we looking at in terms of an action here? Is this a Type II in terms of engineering and preparation of design plans?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

No. This is the actual reconstruction of the bridge, so it's not -- you're not looking at a planning, you're looking at an overall project. I'll entertain a motion if somebody has one.

MR. LIFFORD:

We anticipate this to be considered a categorical exclusion from the permitting agencies based on our past experiences with them.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That's a federal NIPA.

MR. LIFFORD:

We'll be replacing this bridge in exactly the same location.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Do you have a motion, Mr. Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah. I'd like to make a motion that this be considered an Unlisted Negative Declaration.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion. Do I have a second? Larry. Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED.

MR. LIFFORD:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Thank you. Proposed intersection improvements on CR 100, Suffolk Avenue at Brentwood Road/Washington Avenue, Town of Islip.

While they're setting up, the Council may recall that there was a motion to table the last time we looked at this, because there were questions regarding the impacts associated with the one way entrance

to the railroad station and increased traffic volumes on Suffolk Avenue. So I would assume that DPW is here to address that concern.

MR. COLAVITO:

Good morning. Bill Colavito, Suffolk County Department of Public Works, presenting the intersection improvements of CR 100 at Brentwood Road. We did present this last year. And as you said, there were some questions regarding. I was focused on the intersection, but we have a park and ride adjacent to it, and it could present some flow problems. What we've done in the past year is we hired a consultant to look at this independently from the Department, see what they generated at what our expertise generated. And they came back with basically the same thing that we did. However, they wanted to do some more acquisitions and open up some through lanes, which we definitely recommend. We were able to -- right now we have the intersection operating at a level of service F. It is the -- I believe it's the highest accident location in all of Suffolk County. If anybody's been through there in the morning and in the afternoon, you know that this is a very busy congested intersection. What we have done -- we have -- we're averaging on the average -- we're doing some acquisitions along Brentwood Road and Washington Road and along Suffolk Avenue. They're averaging I would say on the order of five to six feet. We are -- our intent is not to take anybody out of business, but we do need to push some lanes through this intersection.

With that being said, we have provided -- they are parking restrictions within this project location, except for this area here and this area over here. When we are done with the project, those parking will be -- will remain. Our acquisition have acquired so that we will not remove any parking in this area. There are bus stops on both sides of the road just south of the tracks, this project will not interfere with any of the bus stops. What we have proposed to do is on Suffolk Avenue we would put in two dual turn lanes to turn south on to Brentwood Road. In the southbound direction, we're adding a -- right now we have a right turn and a through lane and a left turn lane. Our acquisitions have provided us to the ability to put in a -- two through lanes; one of them being a shared right turn and a dedicated left turn lane. It also allows us to put about three or 400 feet of through lanes through the intersection so that we can get the capacity through the intersection to the north side of the road. And then we neck back down by the time we get to the next block.

In the northbound directions here we have just provided -- we have a right turn lane, a through lane and a left turn lane, that's pretty much as is now. In the southbound direction, we have winded up so that we can have two through lanes across the tracks to First Street and then we gel and merge right back into the existing alignment. This -- these two lanes here as we go south of Brentwood and to the tracks are very critical to making this intersection work. Right now, we have one lane. If somebody stops and wants to turn into the park and ride, they jam up the whole road and nothing's moving any more. The park and ride is a one way in. It is that now, it was -- that's the way we originally constructed it, it is currently that way, and it will remain that way when we're done with the project. What the Department wanted to do was to eliminate the left turns into the parking and ride so that we wouldn't have anybody jamming up this

intersection. And then we started to talk to the Town of Islip, we wanted to get them involved in this. The town did have some concerns, as we did. We knew that we would be making it inconvenient, but people would be able to circulate around and to get in there. After consultations with the town, what we decided to do is we're going to have our left turn lane and we're going to make this a shared left-right turn lane. We have, I believe, it's White Castle here on the corner, and they're drive through is right there. So eliminating the left turn, I wasn't going to do it for them, but, you know, 50 feet or 20 feet away is the turn into the park and ride, and that was going to prevent -- present some sort of operational difficulties. So that is the way we decided to handle that. And I believe the town is happy with your decision on that.

The one other modification that we did want to make to the park and ride would be -- here's our intersection right over here. Right now we have an -- an exit from the park and ride where you could make lefts and rights out. We are going to make this a left out and right in -- rights out an rights in, okay, I'm sorry -- and lefts in, that's correct, we're going to make sure that we can provide lefts to come into here also.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You have right turn only out, lefts and rights in.

MR. COLAVITO:

Lefts and rights in, that is correct. That would necessitate that we modify this parking a little bit in here so that we can people to come on in and to circulate through this lot also before they'd have to go down into this lot. I think that would be -- that would really work very well with this intersection and for the operation of the -- of the park and ride. There is no environmental sensitive areas in this area and the construction costs about \$900,000. And the right-of-way acquisition is going to run to the tune of about \$600,000. We have a lot of severance and negotiations to take place with -- with these folks here so we don't take them out of business. Is there any questions?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Yes. I'm confused about your exiting on Suffolk Avenue. You're saying there will be no left turns out onto Suffolk?

MR. COLAVITO:

Well --

MS. MANFREDONIA:

There's a light there now, isn't there?

MR. COLAVITO:

We have a traffic light over here. And this is the entrance that we thinking of modifying. So you would still have an signalized intersection out of the park and ride and you would have an unsignalized one.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

All right. But the signalized one, you could make the left turn then?

MR. COLAVITO:

Absolutely. That is correct. And they are interconnected all the way down through Suffolk Avenue.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Great. I had another question in reference to trees. The Islip Town Environmental Council asked me, and of course I have the same interest, as you know, Brentwood used to be called Brentwood and the Pines. And the County's project many years ago to widen Suffolk Avenue took down a large number of the large white pines that were there. I'm not -- I'd like to know what you're planning to do in terms of tree replacement on this project.

MR. COLAVITO:

One of the aesthetic features if I just might add is the town has been progressing a beautification type of project, where they have been doing some of the red brick work. They wanted to do it at this intersection, we asked them to please hold off. We wanted to do something here, we'll take care of it when we do the project. So that's one of the aesthetic features that we'd be adding to this job. There will be some trees taken down. There is some right along the White Castle area. Those trees will have to come down. Also in front of here, those trees will have to come down.

MR. MALLAMO:

On the map, are those the -- it looks like they are three circles along there in the right of way, are those the trees you're talking about.

MR. COLAVITO:

In this region over here?

MR. MALLAMO:

On Brentwood Road.

MR. COLAVITO:

On Brentwood Road, yes. Yes

MR. MALLAMO:

Are those the white pines. I had the same issues with those white pines.

MR. COLAVITO:

No, I -- no, they're not pines. I believe they're --

MR. MALLAMO:

Maples.

MR. COLAVITO:

Maples, or -- I'm trying to think. The same trees that we have over at the Cohalan Court Complex, shade master --

MR. MALLAMO:

Would you know the age of these trees?

MR. COLAVITO:

No, I wouldn't know the age of these trees. I would think just from the top of my head, I'd say they're on the order of 15 to 20 years old. It seems as though that when we have trees very close to roads, like these are, they don't tend to get to 100 years old.

MR. MALLAMO:

These could have been planted when White Castle went in.

MR. COLAVITO:

Correct.

MR. MALLAMO:

Are we talking of any -- of the removal of white pines on Brentwood Road?

MR. COLAVITO:

No. No.

MR. MALLAMO:

Nancy, does that sound right?

MR. COLAVITO:

I believe they've been all -- there's really not that many trees in that -- in this whole region.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I guess that's the problem. They're used to be a lot of trees in this region. And I'm just wondering why we can't replant some white pines. And I'm always sceptical, you know, of your replanting program because it's always depending on the permission of the adjoining property owner, and I often wonder if anything ever gets planted.

MR. COLAVITO:

Oh, yes. We offer that almost on every project that we do. If we have excess right-of-way, the Department has no trouble planting there, we prefer it. We have our own landscape architect on staff, and it's been working out well. When we have areas where we have a sidewalk of only ten feet, there's a lot of utilities that go under the ground, under the sidewalk areas, and now we're trying to make an conscience effort to move all those utilities out of the road and get them on to the sidewalk area so we don't rip up the road every couple of years. That limits our ability to plant. Planting between the curb and the sidewalk is really not the greatest idea. We pop the sidewalk and somebody could eventually get hit and get killed on it. So the feature that we do is planting on the adjacent right-of-way with the permission of the owner has worked out well, and we've planted lots of trees that way on many jobs.

In this -- in this area, it would be very, very tough to replace a lot of the trees. As we progress the design, we would certainly keep that in mind, and would certainly be conscious of that. We just don't like concrete, we like trees too and grass. However, when we only have ten feet of sidewalk are to work with, that's not that much that we can do. So we will certainly look for areas where we could plant, and I will bring it back to the chief. And if we think that we can get

something in some of the sidewalk areas, we certainly would, some tree wells or something to that effect. But planting within the limits of a project so tight around this congested intersection does present the Department with a -- with a problem. It certainly does. We have no problem if we're further away and we have more room to work with. But when we get into a tight intersection like this, it certainly presents a problem for us.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Is there any problem with trying to identify nearby areas where we could plant? I'm just saying if you could work with Islip Town perhaps of the Islip Town Environmental Council, I would really like to see some large trees planted. And if it's impossible to plant them right within the confines of this project, how about a few hundred yards one way or the other, you know, nearby.

MR. COLAVITO:

I don't -- I'm sure we can do something. I don't know what. I might not be able to do it under this project only because the limits of my project only allow me to work within a certain area. I can bring it back to the chief, and if he says, yes, certainly, we can extend the limits of the project and let's look for some certain planting areas, we would have no problem with that at all. We also have some room, as I think about it now, down along the park and ride where we could plant in the -- in the park and ride area between the roadway and the ramp itself, that's one area where we can work. We might have some area -- I think we have some more green area further down the road closer to the park and ride where the traffic light would be in that other entrance that I was discussing, by the Brentwood Road, the Brentwood Parkway, I believe it is, that intersection we would be able to -- to do some plantings in that region.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Did you have an estimate of how many trees you are taking down, and how many you want to plant? I mean, I couldn't tell from this exactly.

MR. COLAVITO:

I believe my -- I believe we had seven trees that we were going to be taking down. I did not think too much about replacing trees at this point in the project. I was really focused on getting the traffic through, making sure I provide for what I need, and then be subsequently, when I see what areas I have leftover and where those utilities are underneath the ground, then we could start planting.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Does anybody have any suggestions on this because --

MR. MALLAMO:

I'll just add if that memory serves me correctly, it was Brentwood Road portion that had the significant white pine trees years ago that may have been taken down. I wouldn't think they'd have to be at Suffolk Avenue, they can further south. But there was a distinct difference between coming from Washington Avenue to Brentwood Road. And we can achieve some restoration of that viewshed, I think that would be important. I had a question. Are you replacing lighting in

this project?

MR. COLAVITO:
The traffic lighting would be replaced.

MR. MALLAMO:
You're not adding not street lighting on any of threes roads?

MR. COLAVITO:
I don't know if there's street lighting there. I believe there is some street lighting hanging on the telephone poles. We don't have any ornamental stuff out there.

MR. MALLAMO:
Your not replacing that?

MR. COLAVITO:
When we move the poles back, those lights will go right back up on the poles.

MR. MALLAMO:
The same -- the same place.

MR. COLAVITO:
Absolutely. Certainly.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
So the town had no intention of putting and any kind of ornamental street lighting as part of their improvement project?

MR. COLAVITO:
At this point, no. We knew about the brick work aesthetics, but we didn't hear anything -- it wasn't communicate to me at this point as far as ornamental street lighting.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
I would just ask that if that does come into play at all with this project that we make sure that they're designed according to dark sky, you know, standards.

MR. COLAVITO:
Certainly.

MR. MALLAMO:
That was my issue too, because I think that's something we're going to be -- at least I'm going to be looking at a little closer in the future.

MR. COLAVITO:
The Department has been aware of that, and we see the trend coming, so we're taking that into consideration. It's big out in California and many other -- many other places. So we will certainly take that into consideration.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Any other questions? I'm entertain a motion.

MR. CAPUTO:
Can I speak?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Absolutely.

MR. CAPUTO:
My name is Don Caputo, and I'm the Chief Engineer for the Department of Public Works for the Town of Islip. And we've been discussing some of the Town of Islip issues here. I'd just like to say a few words. First, I'd like to thank the Suffolk County Department of Public Works and their Traffic Safety Division for taking the time and effort to address this high accident location. We in the Town of Islip also are very concerned even though this is a County intersection of what's going on within our boundaries, and we appreciate the progress that's going with this project. We had several concerns coming into this meeting. A lot of the concerns that the Town of Islip Department of Public Works had has been addressed by Bill. They've been making modifications to this project right up to this very minute, obviously. And we are happy and very supportive of the overall concept of what's going on with the particular project and the improvements recommended.

We would like to continue obviously with dialog between the Town of Islip Department of Public Works, other agencies within the Town of Islip. We began discussing trees and other issues here, and street lighting, which actually does fall under the Public Works Department. We're very interested on how those are going to develop in this project as well. And again, the Town of Islip Public Works strongly supports the project, and we also strongly recommend that, of course, with have continued dialog with the departments, with the County, to make sure that a lot of these issues that have been brought up by both the town, the local community, and of course, this board are addressed as the project develops. So I just wanted to make that statement for the record.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Thank you, Mr. Caputo. I'd like to ask you a question. This board has basic -- one basic charge, which is to make a recommendation as to whether or not -- how to classify the action according to the State Environmental Quality Review Act and to make a recommendation relative to its significant. Now with the understanding of the Environmental Council, the Islip Environmental Council's concerns, as Ms. Manfredonia presented and also yours, would you have a comment that you'd like to make if this Council were, for example, to make a recommendation for a negative declaration with the understanding that DPW of the County would continue to work with the town?

MR. CAPUTO:
Would I have a problem with that? No, I would not.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Okay. Thank you Mr. Caputo. Are there any other questions or anybody else who wants to address the council? Then I'll entertain a motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I have a motion.

MR. MALLAMO:

This is an unlisted action with a negative declaration, that the DPW be -- continue to work with the Town of Islip to develop the project.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion. I have a second by Ms. Manfredonia. Do I have any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED.
Thank you.

LEG. FIELDS:

I'd like to thank Mr. Caputo for coming down. It's nice to hear from the towns when we have these projects, and it's very good to have your input. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Next item on the agenda is the proposed Scavenger Waste Facilities at existing Yaphank Sewerage Treatment Plant Site.

Hello, Mr. Wright.

MR. WRIGHT:

Good morning. Ben Wright with the Suffolk County Department of Public Works. This is the third time that we're here to talk about this particular project.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So I remember.

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, it's been a long time frame. Hopefully you can see that we've taken a hard look at some of the issues that have lasted through those three meetings. Just briefly on the project though as a refresher, we're looking to construct a scavenger waste treatment facility, 200 thousand gallons per a day with storage adjacent to the Yaphank Sewage Treatment Plant off Yaphank Avenue. And that project is needed because of the heavy scavenger waste loadings that go to Bergen point; a number of trucks, the issues of turning them away and the ever increasing volumes that we have to deal with. We came to CEQ back in late '98 with the first presentation. And the issues that were raised there involved going to the civic group in Yaphank and dealing with groundwater quality, odor and traffic.

And we prepared a part three EAF. Jim Bagg had summarized the issues that had to be responded to and amended part three. Then we went to the civic group back in June of this year, and their letter of response to invite us to their meeting indicated they wanted an update especially with regard to groundwater and traffic. Who I have here today with me is Mark Wagner from Cameron Engineering who has been involved with this project and will briefly discuss some of the odor issues that remain, which in Jim's letter of January 2001, indicate that the recharge beds that we are proposing to use for effluent disposal, do they have an odor. And we included a one page summary of that particular situation. We also have Mary Ann Taylor from CDM or Camp, Dresser and McKee, who has prepared a groundwater model for the discharge and -- which was also presented to the civic, you know, group back in June. The traffic study impact study that was included

was prepared by Bob Bornholdt who is still here. But summarize that impact study, he evaluated the traffic that was going to be generated by the facility and what impact it would have on really Yaphank Avenue, which is the adjoining highway system. The existing conditions that he described incorporated some of the comments from the community, which had to do with, you know, weight restrictions, what routes would these particular trucks take, they were also concerned about the bridges in the area. So what's involved in describing the existing conditions is that the highways and bridges do not have any weight restrictions or limits. They meet New York Vehicle and Traffic Law. We do have trucks this size that go over them, you know, all the time. The traffic volume, and I'll get to that in a second as far as the volume from this particular project, but that there's a nominal volume for this type of roadway, County Road 21, which is Yaphank Avenue. And that the accidents that have occurred, there were none for the period of 1997 through 1999 and then three each in the Year 2000 and 2001 which were basically a vehicle losing control and hitting a fixed object.

The proposed facility that we have would generate an average of 40 vehicles going into the site and leaving, and we've taken the worst case of doubling that just to be sure that we've looked at every particular option. The worst -- under the worst case, if they came during the early morning hours, that would be 54 trips per hour. And the reasonable assumption is that half would come from the south and half would come from the north. The south being Sunrise Highway, the north being the Expressway where there are new exit ramps being constructed, that means that the trucks would not have to go, you know, through any residential area and would have to make some internal adjustments within the roadway itself and the County Complex. The impact itself -- I'll just read, you know, a couple of the sentences from the impact -- is that the number of large trucks accessing the site even on a busy day will not deteriorate the excellent existing level of service. They are some mitigation measures that have to take place, and that's because entering the plant site or the County Complex at that point, there are the acceleration lanes going into it from both the north and the south. But there have to be constructed acceleration lanes once upon leaving the plant site. The trucks although they'll be empty at that point, still require a little more length to get up to speed, and it will not pose any operational problems other than reducing the speeds somewhat when these trucks leave the site and there's only one lane in each direction.

Other issue relating to the community and traffic was an emergency response plan which we plan to have prepared as part of this project, and that would cover any emergency that might arise; if there was an accident concerning one of these vehicles, what steps would have to be taken to ensure that -- that the environment and the highway system is not impacted? The conclusions from the study are that this particular project would not adversely affect traffic operations along the road. And one truck every four minutes is a negligible impact on the traffic conditions, and there are no traffic related reasons to restrict the construction on the site. That's basically the traffic impact study that was prepared, and I'd ask just for Bob's purpose, if there are any questions that they might come at this point, so that he can get

back to --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Does anybody have any questions relating to traffic? Is there anybody in the audience who has an interest in this? Okay. If you'd like to go over to the microphone, we'd be happy -- are you here speaking only -- you have a traffic question?

MS. ESSEL:

Yes, absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. Just for purposes of the presentation I'd ask that you ask your traffic question now, and then I'm going to let the applicant continue. We'll let you speak again.

MS. ESSEL:

Nanette Essel, co-president of the Yaphank Taxpayer and Civic Association. It was mentioned that four minutes, it's every two minutes on a worst case scenario for truck traffic. There are restrictions over the two bridges that are over the Carmans River, there are signs and the police give out tickets for -- there are weight restrictions. Those two bridges are crumbling under the ground. We are concerned about them. Our main street is a two lane historic Main Street, there's no way they can take this kind of traffic. There is an area when people come down from County Road 21, which is up to 19,000 trips per day, they get onto Exit 66. The Town of Brookhaven through a visioning weekend told us that they're extremely concerned about the amount of traffic that's going through that area so.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Can I ask you a question? Didn't the County -- didn't they just close Exit 66 and everything is routed onto Exit 65? Didn't that happen within the last few weeks?

MR. ROGERS:

Well, that's temporary until they finish the exit ramps.

MS. ESSEL:

But it really is temporary. They're doing a tremendous job, the Department of Transportation, very -- the communities really think they are doing a terrific job. So we have the bridges, we have Main Street that's too narrow, we have 19,000 trips per day. The worst truck traffic would be every two minutes, not every four minutes as stated. Carmans -- so those types of things we're concerned about with the traffic, and also there is road runoff. Thank you -- that will get into the environmental --

MR. ROGERS:

I believe a response to certain questions that I mentioned that, you know, we looked at the worst case which was, you know, doubling the traffic. When I ended my statement, I said two vehicles which was the average. She's correct that, you know, if we doubled the traffic it would be -- I'm sorry -- going from four minutes to two minutes when doubling the traffic. I mean, we also mentioned in the traffic impact

study that there's the opportunity to discuss with the town any restrictions on any roads. And I know there was some concern from the civic group as far as going into Main Street, somebody going too fast around the corner and a truck overturning. I mean, we've had restrictions on other trucking going to Bergen Point where there's only a particular route that they could take. So I don't -- I don't see that as a problem.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Would you be willing to put forth a restriction for your own traffic such that they're not --

MR. ROGERS:

Whatever -- whatever meets the conditions of the civic group. I mean, there' -- there's -- we feel that there's sufficient access going directly from Sunrise and from the Expressway to Yaphank Avenue unless somebody that lives there need their cesspool pumped. You know, then it would be a little different situation, but, you know, generally the route could be restricted.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Is that a restrictions that the civic association would be looking for?

MS. ESSEL:

I think the Town of Brookhaven placed the restriction due to the poor quality of the bridges that are crumbling.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Yes. But, you know, I think if there's a way for us to help you and to resolve this, I can't imagine that the Town of Brookhaven would object to placing a restrictions on the County if the County was willing to accept that restriction and if it was something that the community wanted and could address a real concern that you have.

MS. ESSEL:

There already is a restriction, is what I'm saying to you, on those two -- because of those -- the poor quality of those two bridges. There currently is -- there was mention that there was not, but there is.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So are you alleging then that under the current condition with the County's facilities there, that the County is not adhering to those restrictions, or are you expressing a concern that in that future they may not adhere to the restrictions?

MS. ESSEL:

Exactly. The worry is that these --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That they would not adhere.

MS. ESSEL:

Exactly. And that you also have the area there from County Road 21 down. Not everyone's going to take the Expressway. From the northern

part of Brookhaven Town, they take County Road 21, and that's how they'll come down. And that is 19,000 trips per day, again, on a small two lane highway. And then the other way they might take is the main street, which is also --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I just wanted to understand your concern.

MR. ROGERS:

You know. I believe there are options with any of the restrictions, but the two bridges that we were talking about were on Yaphank Avenue across the Expressway and across the railroad tracks.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, does the County -- does the County have the ability to provide and enforce mandatory routing plans?

MR. ROGERS:

Yes, we do.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

And do you do it now?

MR. ROGERS:

We've done that at Bergen Point.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Have you been successful?

MR. ROGERS:

Yes. You know, sometimes it means having the police cooperate and have a car sitting there to make sure from time to time that, you know, nobody's trying to bend the rules.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

And do you -- do you have the ability to tell XYZ Transport if they are a repeat violator that the County will not accept --

MR. ROGERS:

They all have permit with us, and if they -- you know, they're livelihood depends on that permit, and if it's taken away for whatever reason, you know, then that's the risk they take.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You have the ability to put-- you have the ability to put restrictions -- conditions or restrictions on their permit such as the access?

MR. ROGERS:

Yes.

MR. MALLAMO:

Do these trucks use William Floyd Parkway?

MR. ROGERS:

They could. I mean, you know, any -- everything is nonsewered in this particular area, and they have cesspools. So I'm assuming that --

MR. MALLAMO:

Well, if you had trucks coming from the north, they could use William Floyd. They wouldn't have to really go down Middle Island Road.

MR. ROGERS:

Yes. There would be options like that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Is there any other traffic questions before we leave this topic?

MR. ROGERS:

I'd ask Mark Wagner to make some comments about -- and I'm going to Jim Bagg's letter of January 2001, where we addressed --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

To summarize the Council's concerns.

MR. ROGERS:

-- most of the odor problems and potential for odor and what about the recharge beds.

MR. WAGNER:

Mark Wagner, Cameron Engineering. Good morning, Madam Chairperson and council members. I'm here to speak on the odor potential from open recharge basins that would be necessary for the proposed facility at Yaphank. The recharge bed basically takes treated effluent after filtering from the process. It's to be tertiary treated, and what that means is that the nitrogen would be reduced to less than five million grams per liter. The suspended solids content would be approximately five million grams per liter or less. This effluent would be discharged out into open recharge basins of approximately 20,000 square feet. At this point, the effluent goes through the recharge basin ultimately into groundwater. The potential of odors generated at recharge basins could be from high levels of suspended solids and/or growth of algae. The algae is present in the water, and under sunlight you can get algae blooms that would be present.

What the DPW does at its other facilities is occasionally dose the effluent with sodium hypochlorite that keeps the algae at bay. And on a regular basis, they switch the beds -- when I talk about a 20,000 square foot bed, the bed might consist of three cells of 7,000 square feet or two cells of 10,000 square feet. It hasn't been designed at this point. But periodically the beds get switched, that allows the bed that's in service to drain dry to the atmosphere. And when the solids and ant residuals solids, algae and suspended solids, when those solids dry to a minimum of 25 to 35% solids, the operators using equipment; front end loaders, bobcats, clean the solids from the bed and put down additional sand media on the recharge beds. So the potential for odors in my estimation is minimal. The actual recharge beds would be located approximately 2000 square feet from the nearest receptor. Suffolk County Department of Health Services has a standard of a minimum of 300 feet from the nearest for receptor for open beds, so we're seven times that distance. Yaphank facility has presently approximately 30,000 square feet of open recharge beds with their current operations. They've been in operation for 27 years, and to my knowledge they can confirm that there haven't been any odor incidents

related to the recharge beds.

So in summary, the proposed open recharge beds of approximately 20,000 square feet that would be needed for the new proposed scavenger waste treatment facility would have a minimal odor potential. I would entertain any questions that you have relative to that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Mike, you have a question?

MR. KAUFMAN:
You talk about the buffer distance being 2000 feet right now, is that all County owned property or is that -- is there a potential for development in that area?

MR. ROGERS:
I think if you go in different directions from -- then going to Yaphank Avenue, you're going to go into the compost facility or the fireworks facility etcetera. So, you know, if you go in that direction, they are other facilities, but not -- not residential.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I think what Mike was asking though is do you -- is there vacant privately owned property that's zoned for potential residential development?

MR. ROGERS:
Well, there a 50 acre site that's privately owned, but what its use is, you know, we're not sure of.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
How close is it?

MR. ROGERS:
About 500 feet from the existing plant, which is further west from the scavenger plants. My estimate is probable seven or 800 feet.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
So it would more than double the Health Department's suggested distance?

MR. ROGERS:
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Okay. Larry.

MR. SWANSON:
Mark, it's good to see you. Related to another County, issue the Vector Control, are these recharge beds going to be potential mosquito breeding grounds?

MR. ROGERS:
At times they do have water in them. And, you know, we have looked at that issue. I don't know if Dominick is still here or not, I but his staff has gone around to some of the plants that have had some ponding

issues and taken samples. I can't answer whether or not -- you know, what the results were. With the chlorine I, you know, understand that that minimizes that effect, but I, you know, really can't answer you.

MR. SWANSON:

Can we get Dominick to answer whether the sodium hypochlorite resolves the issue?

LEG. FIELDS:

How deep is it, the water that stands?

MR. ROGERS:

Well, the beds are four feet deep. Our typical operational mode is that if they start to pond or show any water, then we go to the next bed. And as Mark indicated, there would be multiple beds. Most of our facilities have four beds where we use one at that time. And once it starts to do that, we switch to the second one, it's drying out. If that's one starts to pond, we go to the third one, then we usually have, you know, minimal problems because of the good soil that's in the area. But, you know, they're four foot deep, not necessarily the whole four feet of water, just that typically, that's the way they're constructed.

LEG. FIELDS:

Have you ever seen the Dowling Facility that they have over at the college?

MR. ROGERS:

Years ago I've been there.

LEG. FIELDS:

Is this similar to that?

MR. ROGERS:

No, these are like salt -- stormwater sumps, you know, that you see all over Nassau and Suffolk County, just open beds.

MR. NINIVAGGI:

Hi. Dominick Ninivaggi here with Vector Control. We haven't had substantial problems with this facility primarily because there aren't people nearby to be bitten. To have a mosquito problem, you need to have people to be bitten. I wouldn't want to comment on exactly whether or not there would be a mosquito problem, but if there is, typically we work with Ben and his operation, you know, to deal with that at that time. And historically, his facilities have not been a significant problem. But I wouldn't want to comment on this particular one without actually looking at the plans.

MR. WRIGHT:

Just to add on to that, a couple of years ago, when this particular issue was becoming more prevalent Dominick had issued some directions, and we passed them onto our operators as far as not just for recharge beds, but for anything where there's standing water, you know not to have it. And we do have, you know, some tanks in this particular facility, you know, they would be enclosed, but again, you know, good housekeeping and, you know, proper operator attention takes care of

those problems.

LEG. FIELDS:

You said that you need people to be bitten, but what if this does breed mosquitos and they're biting birds, and then we get into that whole West Nile Virus where you have actually talked about the birds carrying the --

MR. NINIVAGGI:

On the other hand, you have to understand that there are freshwater wetlands and other areas all over the County that do breed mosquitos.

LEG. FIELDS:

But we didn't make those wetlands. We'd be increasing it by do this, right?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

It might be a very minor thing, but I don't think it's going to have any significant impact on the West Nile Picture in the County, especially when you consider that we have major wetland systems that do produce mosquito, and we don't larvacide, because we're not in the business of getting rid of all the mosquitos in Suffolk County. We're in the business of keeping them under control and keeping the interaction of people to a minimum. I mean, there are plenty of wetlands we don't --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Dominick, in your opinion, and I think that maybe they can show you what the plans are, but in your opinion does this type of design given that we've heard it's something that Suffolk County DPW has elsewhere and manages elsewhere, does it significantly add to the mosquito problem? And in the past, has it been a problem for the County?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

No, there haven't been significant problems. And if there's something going wrong, we work with Ben's group and fix that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Are there particular recommendations that your division issues to this division of DPW relative to these beds?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

To these beds, basically to minimize the length of time the water is standing there and periodically disinfect the way they do.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You said periodically disinfect?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. Are there any other questions? Larry.

MR. SWANSON:

Does sodium hypochlorite prevent them?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

Yeah. In high concentrations it will kill them, but, of course, it's only a temporary measure, because it wears off very quickly.

MR. SWANSON:

So sodium hypochlorite is a continuous application?

MR. WRIGHT:

It can be. We -- you know, if the water is going directly down, then we don't ordinarily do that. But we have -- you know, we can turn it on and off as the operator sees fit.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Ben, how often do you have standing water in these beds, and in general how deep is it, do you know, just on average?

MR. WRIGHT:

Some facilities never have it, because the soil is good and the effluent is good. Most of our plants have filters on the -- as part of the process. There are a couple of facilities where the soil is not as good. It could get to a foot deep, and it takes a little bit longer to dry them out.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Do you know -- you may not know, but do you know if the soil -- if the soils conditions here are comparable to the soil conditions in the areas where you're having problems or not having problems?

MR. WRIGHT:

The soil here is good, and that's partly why we never had a problem with getting rid of the treated effluent in Yaphank.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. Thank you, Dominick.

MR. WRIGHT:

If there are no questions on the potential for odor, Mary Ann Taylor will go through the presentation on the groundwater model that was prepared for this discharge.

MS. TAYLOR:

Last year Ben had asked us to use groundwater flow and contaminant transport models to evaluate what the potential impact from the proposed scavenger waste facility would be on area groundwater quality, particularly with respect to its impact public supply wells in the area. Probably since about 1996, we've been working with Suffolk County Department of Health Services, Suffolk County Water Authority, DPW, we've had a lot of assistance from DEC, and the Planning Department as well to develop, calibrate and apply groundwater models for the main body of the Island, for the North Fork, the South Fork and Shelter Island. So we went back to that model. You can see the groundwater contours in the area generally from northwest to southeast. You can see the location of the proposed scavenger waste facility just east of the waste water treatment plant. And the groundwater contours in the area kind of flow towards the southeast towards Carmans River. The existing main body flow model in

the area had a finite -- was based on a finite element grid. The note spacing was about 3000 feet which was really too great to accurately represent local flow conditions. So we superimposed a much more highly {disgradised} grid that you see there in the area of the waste water treatment plant and the proposed scavenger waste facility. We reduced the {disgradization} down to about 300 feet, it increases up to about 1500 feet as you proceed east to the Carmans River. We simulated three different conditions; historical flow fields since 1975 with the existing waste water facility discharging approximately 150,000 gallons per day on average to the ground; and two potential future flow fields, one with the treatment plant at 250,000 gallons per day and the proposed scavenger waste facility at 100,000 gallons per day; and the last with the treatment plant at 250,000 gallons per day, and the proposed scavenger waste facility at 200,000 gallons per day. All of these were 25 year simulations starting in 2001, assuming that the plant would begin operation at that time.

This figure shows a couple of things on it. It shows the path that a dissolved contaminant that was not subject to any retardation or any absorption, and degradation, just a conservative contaminant, how it would flow through the system and discharge. There's a couple of things that I'd like to highlight. You can see it goes mainly to discharge to Yaphank Creek there or to Carmans River. The closest public water supply well -- the closest existing public supply wells are at the Suffolk County Water Authority Station Road wellfield located to the west of the site. You can see that they are not anywhere near in the path of the effluent from the plant at all. As a matter of fact, for the Suffolk County Water Authority we had completed a source water assessment earlier in 2001 that show the contributing area to that wellfield, goes up to the north west of that wellfield. You can kind of make out, maybe on your hard copies it's easier to see, there's little tick marks as you go along the lines of those plumes there. They represent the average path of a conservative contaminant, how far it would travel in a single year. What that tells us is that effluent from the plant would take approximately -- I'm forgetting my notes here -- 14 years to get from the water table where it's recharged to discharge at Yaphank Creek. From the proposed scavenger waste facility it would take about 20 years to travel from the water table at the recharge basin to discharge at Carmans.

There's just kind of an aerial view with that -- those contaminant particles, those hypothetical particles, superimposed aerial photo, so you get a feel for what the land use in between is. I understand there was some concern about what the vertical direction of flow might be in that area. Here's a cross section -- maybe you can make out here -- that goes really through the plume of the scavenger waste facility that's discharging to Carmans there. The red on the cross section is the gardeners clay, you can see the gardeners clay kind of acts as a -- there's two things working here; number one, the gradient kind of switches from downward to upward to discharge to the Carmans River, that's what's dominating the local field; and the other is the gardeners clay really acts as an impediment to downward vertical flow in the area. This again, is just a little visual so you can see where the simulated extent of the plume, where it would be discharging to Yaphank Creek or to Carmans River there.

So the conclusions really from the -- the first set of simulations that we did is that there's no impact upon the existing public supply wells. The closest existing public supply well, the Station Road wellfield is located to the west out of the way of the plume, and that the recharge effluent will ultimately discharge to Yaphank Creek, actually it is at the moment, and Carmans River. The County then asked us to consider a little bit further what the simulated concentrations might be when it ultimately reached the creeks. The perimeters that they supplied based on existing Yaphank -- Yaphank facility effluent are total nitrogen in both the treatment plant, 6 milligrams per liter, and that's the projected concentration in the effluent from the scavenger waste facility. Phosphorous would be one milligram per liter in the Yaphank effluent, and it would be double that in the proposed scavenger waste facility. And the total dissolved solids would be three times the concentration of the existing waste water facility.

Here's some simulated nitrogen levels after 25 years of operation of the proposed scavenger waste facility. You get an idea there of how it discharges to the creek. I just want to caution you that where it appears to be crossing the creek there is really an artifact of the plotting program and the size of the elements in that area. Nothing is simulated to get past the creek at all. The extent of the effluent broadens a little bit if you use the 200,000 gallon per day estimate of discharge. And I'll just summarize that for you in a second.

We wanted to compare to existing ambient levels in the aquifer as well as in Carmans River. The Department of Health Services had conducted a study of the Carmans River in late 2001, sampling station 15, which is right there, is just upstream of this red area down here, which is where the projected impacts are anticipated to be. Upper glacial aquifer, we had done some work for the flow augmentation needs study back in the 1989 that showed levels in this vicinity of the upper glacial aquifer at about .7 milligrams per liter of nitrogen. I think a more recent study that I saw from 1999 from Stony Brook had it up other 4 milligrams per liter in this area. The waste water treatment plant discharge to Yaphank Creek alone, the impact that's currently being felt right now would be about .05 milligrams per liter of nitrogen from the plant into the stream. Carmans River, based on the Suffolk County Department of Health Services recent study was 1.6 milligrams per liter at that station 15 right upstream there.

The combined discharge to surface water with the scavenger waste facility at a 100,000 gallons per day would be about .3 milligrams per liter. That -- that's coming from the plant. And the combined discharge with the scavenger waste facility at 200,000 gallons per day would be the same, because the concentrations are the same. We subsequently looked at phosphorous levels, the track of the plume is the same. These are assessments are very conservative from the perspective that phosphorous tends to be chemically absorbed onto the soil. It makes, like, an insoluble underacidic conditions or optinuetral conditions. It reacts with the iron and it tends to be absorbed onto the soil until the entire capacity in that whole stretch would be -- would be taken up. From the fans work that we did, again in 1989, the upper glacial background levels at that point were .01 milligrams per liter. More recently, I've seen several tenths of a

milligram per liter in the area.

The waste water treatment plant discharge to Yaphank Creek we have at .02 milligrams per liter. The Department of Health Services' work in Carmans River did not find any phosphorous at any levels above the detection limit that they used, .1 milligrams per liter. And that's approximately what the combined discharge to the Carmans would be from the plants. So again, to conclude we had no impact about -- upon existing public water supplies. No significant increases in nitrogen level in the Carmans River, and no significant increases in phosphorous levels within this 25 year planning period in Carmans River as well. And that's -- that's it.

MR. WRIGHT:

Just one comment. We did sent this report that Mary Ann did to Health Services, and Sy Robbins and Vito Minei had looked at it. And we had a memo from Mr. Minei saying that in summary, Health Services concurs with the findings and conclusions of this report. So they are aware of it and did review it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Larry, you have a question.

MR. SWANSON:

I guess the soil conditions make the facility attractive for the settling ponds, makes it sort of unattractive in some ways because of the potential transport downstream. One of the things that I'd be interested in knowing is what is synergistic effect, say, of this operation and the Brookhaven Landfill. That landfill, I think, is towards the Beaver Dam Creek, and then, I guess, Beaver Dam Creek intersects the Carmans River; is that correct? And further, you talk about 25 years, but once that 25 years is reached, then you have a steady state of the -- of the -- whatever it is, phosphorous, nitrogen, or what other chemical, continuously flowing into -- into the Carmans River area. And I guess one of my concerns is since the Carmans River is identified as really one of the significant -- significantly important ecological features of Long Island, if the combined effects of many waste streams flowing in that general southwest -- southeasterly direction isn't going to lead to the ultimate deterioration of what we now consider is a significant ecological environment.

MS. TAYLOR:

I'm not prepared to talk about the Brookhaven Landfill. I don't know anything about that. We did not do any simulations to estimate how long it would take to reach equilibrium, so that basically -- what did we say, .6 going in -- would reach the Carmans River. You're right, ultimately it would -- it wouldn't be 26 years or 27 years, it would probably be -- I don't know, I'm guesstimating based on -- it would probably be closer to 50 years. But ultimately, it would be achieved. You're right. I think what you want to remember though is that .6 milligrams per liter is less than the existing nitrogen level in the Carmans River. That was just measured earlier, I would say November of 2001, at one point 6 milligrams per liter. So it's actually diluting the nitrogen levels. The phosphorous levels, I don't know, because I'm not sure exactly what the phosphorous levels

are in the Carmans River at the moment, number one. And number two, I don't know how long it would take for that sorbed capacity for the soil to be exhausted. So ultimately, long, long term into future, the phosphorous might pose an impact, but the nitrogen, I think, is not going to be an issue.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Ginny, you had a question.

LEG. FIELDS:
I have a couple of questions. How many private wells are in the vicinity?

MR. WRIGHT:
Do you have a map for that one?

MS. TAYLOR:
No, I don't have any information on that.

MR. WRIGHT:
I know as part of -- I don't know. And I know there's been additional construction of water mains, but as part of the Health Department's recommendations, they would look to have Water Authority water placed in the area if there's any downstream private wells.

LEG. FIELDS:
We've had a couple of hearings about this, and I think one of the concerns is that when the plumes have been identified, various plumes in the past, the residents have been notified that there are plumes and that they do affect their wells, adversely affect their wells. But we don't pay for them to hook up to Suffolk County Water, and we've asked for private people to hook up to Suffolk County Water, and they refuse to do so, probably for a multitude of reasons. But I think before this body were to make any kind of judgment, we would have to know all of the information and know how many people are impacted by this privately, not just assuming that the Water Authority tells them that they should eventually hook up to public water.

MR. WRIGHT:
Well, two comments I have is that, you know, New York State and Suffolk County Health Department has standards for discharge which considers what the use of that water would be downstream, and that limit is ten milligrams per liter of nitrogen, where the design of these facilities is six, and as Mary Ann has indicated, that concentration of nitrogen has diminished along that particular route. The second comment I have is that the scavenger waste facility pays for itself. There's a tipping fee involved with disposing and treating of waste. That tipping fee can incorporate a variety of things, including any environmental mitigation that would be necessary. I'm assuming that with the traffic issues that the tipping fee would incorporate the cost of constructing those acceleration lanes from the site. It could also incorporate the cost of any water supply extensions that are necessary.

LEG. FIELDS:
Second and third question, I'd like to ask George Proios to come up

and just discuss a little bit about the situation we talked about earlier.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, before we -- before we do that, I'd like to take other CEO member's questions. Mike had a question, then I'll go to Adrienne. Mike.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Mary Ann, you were talking about groundwater flows with certain percentages of nitrogen in them as flowing into the river itself. Do you have any idea what the daily gallonage of the river flowing to a particular area would be as opposed to the daily groundwater that we could expect in 30 or 40 years? What I'm looking basically looking at according to the numbers I'm seeing, if there's a 1.6 background level of nitrogen per liter in an area, and .3 is coming in, certain types of math would way that a 20% increase. There's no comparison at this point in time for me to figure this out though.

MS. TAYLOR:

You are right. And no, I don't know what's flowing past at this point. I'm going to say it -- to my recollection, it's on the order of 30, 35 CFS, something like that, but I don't know that there's a gaging station right here.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Well, what would the groundwater flow be from the plant at this point, where it intersects basically with the Carmans River?

MS. TAYLOR:

I don't know, but that's something I can get back to you on.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I think that's kind of necessary. One of the issues that I have with this particular project is the Carmans River is, I believe, it's a significant wildlife -- it's in the state system.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

It's a wild, scenic and recreation river.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I should know, I live on one.

MS. TAYLOR:

I don't think.

MR. MALLAMO:

Mike, can I just ask, where plume intersects, is that part of the Wertheim National Wildlife Refuge? Doesn't it go further south along the river? I think it is.

MR. KAUFMAN:

That was going to be one of my other questions in a minute or two was where is this intersecting the river? Is this inside the federal wildlife preserve in that are? But before I get to that, one of the questions we always have is what the accumulative impact of these

projects going to be? How much are we throwing into a system? We know that if you start throwing in various types of pollutants or -- not necessarily even pollutants, just certain types of chemicals into a relatively pristine system, you're going to have an impact. You're going to be disturbing what is over there. We know that we've had nitrogen plumes, we've had phosphorous plumes, etcetera, and we're not able -- from the information you've given us at this point in time, I can't tell what you're throwing into the system down there. I don't know, therefore, what the impacts on the Carmans might be.

MS. TAYLOR:

You mean in terms pounds per day? You'd prefer pounds instead of concentrations?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Whatever measure you can give me of pounds per day. You know, is it going to be a 20% increase? Is it going to be a 5% increase per day? Is it going to be a 50% increase per day at the nitrogen loadings? I just don't know at this point in time.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Adrienne, you had a question.

MS. ESPOSITO:

A couple of things real quick. One is that you keep saying it won't impact the nitrogen levels, but, however, I just want to refer to the cumulative impact, one of the recommendations in the Carmans River environmental assessment that the County did just last year -- actually it was done by Kashin, recommends -- or actually the study found that there has been a trend toward increasing nitrate levels in the Carmans River. And the report makes a recommendation to -- to continue to monitor that and take steps to eliminate that potential increase of nitrate levels. The second thing is I think that Larry's question about the Brookhaven Landfill plume and the synergistic effects is a very real one and one that needs to be answered, because where you are projecting your plume will intersect the Carmans, just slightly above that is the projection where the Brookhaven Landfill will intersect the Carmans. And then above that, there's the Grucci fireworks plume and above that the BNL plume, the Precision Concepts plume and another DPW smaller plume. So there's a number of plumes heading into the watershed of the Carmans that we need, I think, to look at and evaluate overall for protection of that watershed area. And again, because of the recommendations -- are you familiar with the Carmans River environmental assessment report that was released?

MS. TAYLOR:

No, I haven't seen that at all.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Okay. And it makes specific recommendations on protection of the Carmans River watershed area, particularly it names coliform levels and nitrate levels and also salt levels.

MS. TAYLOR:

I think this work was completed before that work, because we were waiting at the last minute to try to get the data, and we got that

right from the lab, I think.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I think -- I think that's right.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Ben, I have a question. You took -- there were measurements taken, at least of nitrogen levels in the Carmans River, from where were they taken? Because there have been statements that there are all of these plumes going into the river, and they've been there for a very long time. So depending upon where you took your measurements, one would assume that the background is picking up the levels that are in there.

MS. TAYLOR:

The background -- we had done this work primarily to focus upon groundwater at the time. And when we saw that it was discharging to the Carmans, we said, well, we should get a reference point to kind of compare those concentrations. The County mentioned that as part of -- and we started exploring what kind of levels were available for the Carmans River. The ones that I had dated back to 1989. So we said we should look for something more recent. The County mentioned their ongoing program with Kashin. They took samples up and down the stream corridor there. Where we were looking was pretty well downgradient, was -- it was 15, because that was the one that was closest to just upgradient from the proposed area of discharge right here. So you are correct that it is pretty far down stream. And it should have it -- it has -- I can tell you that it has the Yaphank Sewage Treatment Plant effluent impact on that already. BNL has been in operation for awhile, I am assuming. I don't know anything really about the Brookhaven Landfill, how long, you know, it would take --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, I think you do -- I think we have to know that. I mean, while we're all making assumptions that it's likely and whatever, I think on both sides, I think the reality is, at least to me, you've demonstrated that the groundwater impacts are not an issue. But you've also demonstrated that the potential is for surface water impacts. So I think it's incumbent upon the department to evaluate that impact, and I think that's what you're hearing. Ginny, did you have a question?

LEG. FIELDS:

I just wanted to ask George to comment about the --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I just want to finish with CEQ members, then I'll go --

LEG. FIELDS:

It was regarding the treatment that --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Larry, you had a question.

MR. SWANSON:

Yeah, going back again to phosphorous. Phosphorous is probably the limiting nutrient in freshwater. And if you recall that 20 or so

years ago, Suffolk County was very advanced in its thinking about trying to eliminate phosphorous from -- and other nutrients because of {algoglumes} and so forth in Great South Bay. And you go so far as to prohibit detergents, phosphate detergents, and I'm concerned that, you know, once again we're going to build that potential situation up. The other thing is I don't see very much about other potential contaminants that may be in the sewage that might not be sticking particles that, you know, would filter out at the settling ponds. And I'm just wondering has there been any analysis of other chemicals of concern or contaminants of concern in the sewage at this facility that could be impacting groundwater.

MR. WRIGHT:

Our experience with facilities similar to this is that the treatment process itself ties up most of -- if they are metals for example, if there's plumbing in a house, it gets tied up with the solids and gets treated in that way rather than being discharged in solution. I would like to the phosphorous issue just for a minute, because Cy Robbin's memo regarding the study, he concludes that he agrees with CDM that phosphorous should not be mobile in the groundwater environment, and therefore, sees no reason to treat the phosphorous removal. So they're of the opinion that it is not an issue in this particular discharge.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Jack.

MR. FINKENBERG:

Are there going to be any ground -- groundwater monitoring wells downstream from the site?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yeah, that's required with all treatment facilities. There's usually something upstream and two or three downstream depending on, you know, where the beds are located. There are existing ones on the sites now from the existing treatment plant, and they would be more necessary.

MR. FINKENBERG:

I was -- I was curious about Larry's question. Are you familiar with the term hot loads? The scavenger truck might dump a really hot load of chemicals at the plant. Is there a way to protect the plant against something like that?

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, we take samples, but often if something's coming out of a truck, if it's got a particular odor to it, like a solvent or something, we stop it right there. With the facilities that are -- that take this kind of waste, they have large holding tanks that mix and blend, and if something like that happened inadvertently because of -- it wasn't an odor situation, it was something else that was in there, we do take samples of every truck and analysis before the treatment process is finished. So it's contained on-site. And that would be going back to this permit issue and response plan on how to deal with these particular issues, but we haven't --

MR. FINKENBERG:

It doesn't go right into the aeration tank.

MR. WRIGHT:

No, it doesn't. No. It goes into large mixing tanks first that have usually a day's storage.

MR. FINKENBERG:

I live in Babylon. Sometimes we get odors from the -- from Bergen Point, maybe once or twice a year. Typically, it's the warmest day and I've got the windows open, I'm trying to sleep, and it smells like hell. And they always say it's, like, the sludge storage tank. Is there going to be a sludge storage tank here?

MR. WRIGHT:

There is. The problem at Bergen Point was that when the scavenger receiving facility was designed, it was inadequately designed, where a large truck would be sticking part way out of the door, and they couldn't close the door. So that building has a door open because a truck is sticking out and there's odor being created inside, which, you know, the main focus is to contain it and then treat it, which you can't do if a door is open. So that's part of the experience that we've -- you know, we've learned over the years.

MR. FINKENBERG:

I have one more question. That typical source of odor is from a similar plant. Where do you -- where would you normally pick up odors from a plant like that?

MR. WRIGHT:

This -- this proposed facility would be completely enclosed. I mean, it's -- you know, we have other facilities where they have open tankage, which usually the aerated tankage did not present a problem, it's usually when you take the sludge out or the residuals that sit in the tank, and -- during that treatment process, there is a potential for odors. I don't know if, Mark, you want to comment more about that.

MR. WAGNER:

The potential sources are the truck unloading. There's been mentioned the equalization tanks, that's where the material first gets received. The actual -- the processing of the material, the aerobic processing, of course, the most potential in the sludge -- sludge processing. As been said in this case, all of the process tanks would be covered. A good example, the Town of East Hampton runs a 45,000 gallon a day, smaller. And we went in there two years ago and covered -- they had some occasional odor complaints -- all the process tanks were covered, with the odor directed through an odor control system. So once you cover the tanks and you reduce the surface area that's exposed, odor treatment is a -- is a fairly straight forward process.

MR. FINKENBERG:

Just a quick anecdote. One of the -- one of the problems we had in Cedar Creek in Nassau County, they had trouble with odors down there. That's an older, much older plant. One of solutions they proposed was they were going to add odors to the -- to the smell, and they came up

with a bubble gum smell. It was just a crazy idea.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

They use it at Fresh Kills Landfill too.

MR. FINKENBERG:

Fresh Kills, oh, yeah, bubble gum. And just one further comment, Ginny -- Legislator Fields was talking at the about the plant at Dowling. And if I remember correctly, that's a -- it's a package plant. And many years ago when I was a public health sanitarian, I used to inspect a lot of these package plants, and they seemed to be the largest source of problems for the Health Department, because there's not -- there is usually no operator there, they try to run them -- they guy shows up once a week to do some monitoring, and the plants themselves are so small that they can get out of balance pretty quick. And that's -- I don't think it's fair to compare Dowling to some -- this kind of a plant.

MR. WRIGHT:

This is a -- you know, there's an operator there full time. I mean, it's not, you know, as you said, go in for a couple of hours a day.

MR. KAUFMAN:

One final question. This, I guess, would be for Mary Anne. You say something about the 1993-94 average condition of pumping and recharge. Why were those numbers used?

MS. TAYLOR:

For several reasons. When we developed and calibrated the groundwater model we used 1993-94 conditions because it was a time frame when there were a lot of observations to calibrate the model to; you test the models ability to represent the flow field by comparing measured water levels with model simulated water levels, same with stream base flows and so on. The second was that it was a period of relatively -- the precipitation was approximating the long term average conditions. So that's really why it was chosen. Water supply pumping kind of mirrored -- goes along with precipitation, distribution over the course of the year. So if that's average water supply pumping, the patterns tend to be average as well. So we had all of that information assembled and we could vouch that the calibration was adequate for that time frame.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other questions before we ask George?

LEG. FIELDS:

Will this plant accept grease?

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, grease is a normal constituent with scavenger waste. But I think you're aware that we've had some problems at Bergen Point where we've got trucks coming in that have the majority of the waste being grease, and it's caused a problem at Bergen Point. So I guess the

answer is yes and no. We're not going to take truck loads of grease, but that there are -- there is grease that's associated with septage. And normally it doesn't present a problem, because it's, you know, with a lot other volume.

LEG. FIELDS:

I think it was my understanding that there is no place on Long Island that will accept grease, and that truckers will have to go to New Jersey in order to do that, and that the reasoning that Bergen Point doesn't want to accept it is because they don't have the ability to have -- apparently the grease causes a problem when it's -- when it's going into the plant; is that correct?

MR. WRIGHT:

We've had -- in the last, I'll say eight months or so, we've had a number of problems at Bergen Point where the grease has increased to a point where it's even -- we have a -- we recycle the effluent from the plant to -- as wash water and with certain equipment. It's been showing up in the effluent that we -- that we use as wash water. It's damaged equipment, and it's presented some big problems. And now we apparently -- the reason for this is that where grease used to be purchased by vendors to render it, that gradually died off, and now they got to the point where they were picking it up for nothing and not getting paid for it. Now they want to get paid for it, and a lot of restaurants are not willing to pay this extra. So they're doing other things with it; rather than the grease trap, you know, it goes into their cesspool, goes into the cesspool truck, which goes to Bergen Point. So there's a situation that's evolved over the last year or so that's created this problem. And you're correct to say {Valley} is the closest location where people can take it. There are some of the private industry people looking at, you know, what they can do here to separate the grease and take the grease someplace else and discharge the liquid, but that hasn't taken place yet.

LEG. FIELDS:

So if -- is this plant equipped differently than Bergen Point or would it be in order to accept --

MR. WRIGHT:

It could be, but our -- our approach would be to have a particular standard where we're not going to take a truck load of grease. This is not going to be an grease rendering facility. I mean, there's other issues involved with that, and we really don't want to get into that business.

LEG. FIELDS:

And what happens when -- when something does happen to the machinery and the plant fails?

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, there's redundancy in equipment. I mean, there's usually parallel trains of the existing -- you know, of the same type of system, and there's enough extra capacity, in fact, or safety that that's not -- that's not a situation that will happen.

LEG. FIELDS:
But it does happen, doesn't it?

MR. WRIGHT:
Equipment fails, and, you know, at Bergen Point it costs us overtime to fix it. There might be a long lead item on a piece of equipment, you know, rather than having spare parts for a particular specialized device. You know, but there's enough capacity and redundancy there that doesn't really effect the effluent quality, it just costs more to deal with it.

LEG. FIELDS:
And the other question that they had about odors. Is there an odor in the effluent?

MR. WRIGHT:
Typically, there isn't. You know, but I -- any question about odor, I never say there is never an odor. There's always a potential for something. But typically the effluent doesn't have an odor.

LEG. FIELDS:
Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Any other questions from CEQ members before I ask George Proios to make his brief statement?

MR. PROIOS:
Good morning. My name George Proios. I'm here as Chairman of the County Salt and Water Conservation District and also as a member of the Water Authority Board. Let me preface my comments with two points. First, since I did raise a lot of the issues that you are dealing with today at the previous two meetings when this was presented, I am n a little bit disappointed I didn't get any of the updated information to review. So I'd like to make a formal request as Chairman of the District which has a statutory responsibility under County law and state law to get involved in County land and water issues that I be on your mailing list again to receive any and all information that CEQ gets in a timely manner. So for whatever reason I got off the list, and I haven't even gotten agendas anymore, but I would like to make a formal request to CEQ so I get put back on this list, at least for the district's points of view.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Isn't the Water Authority on the list?

MR. PROIOS:
I don't know about the Water Authority, but definitely Salt and Water District needs to be. And we've been getting more and more involved in issues which are going to be --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
We're happy to put you on the list.

MR. PROIOS:
Secondly, I also want to make it clear that I think that this project,

wherever it's going to be, is significantly important and needs to be implemented somewhere. We only have the one scavenger waste plant, and we all know about the stories about Bergen Point being closed down at noon, and just all guessing where these scavenger waste trucks that are coming there afternoon that are filled, where they're going with their waste. And we all believe that a lot of that stuff is being dumped. And the Eastern part of the County is a more better alternative than the western part because we don't have any place for these people to go.

Notwithstanding, there are other issues. I want to add problems by addressing an existing problem. And I was a little bit, I guess, surprised to learn that we're still -- or the County is still chlorinating effluent. And maybe I misunderstood that. But if we are, then again that raises the other whole issue relating to what Larry said about other contaminants. And the most important contaminants are that whole class of THMs; the {trihalomethanes} that are created when you add any type of chlorine to your organics. And the higher the organic concentration in your effluent, the greater your concentration of THMs that would be created by any chlorine. So that's an important consideration. Obviously, if we're not going have public water supplies downgradient, then it's as important, but unfortunately the state still treats all groundwater as GA classifications as a potential for drinking water. And so you have to be concerned long term whether, not just what's happening today, but in ten years, 20 years, 30 years, whether there may be a potential need for additional sources of water in different locations. There are other contaminants also, and unfortunately, the state always lags behind in establishing effluent limitations. For many, many, many years, they had only four or five perimeters. And now they've been increasing them. But some of the newer things we've been finding, at least the Water Authority has and Suffolk County Health Department as an example, I have no idea if this is in scavenger waste, I would hope is isn't, but {perchlorate}, which is a new compound, that is apparently very pervasive. We have it now in 60 public water supply well fields, at very small concentrations, but we're still trying to figure out where it's coming from. And EPA is now struggling to figure out what the limit should be. This County Legislature went through many, many hearings on dealing with MTBE, is that in scavenger waste to any degree? I don't know, I've never seen any Health Department analysis looking for some of the things that are being found already in public wells.

We had a presentation by the Groundwater Institute that Larry's associated with finding pharmaceuticals now in waste water treatment. And again, they are very little data as well as any kind of guidelines on what we should be looking for or a setting of limitations on these. So there's a lot of unknown questions, and me personally, I don't know if anyone has talked directly -- I would like -- be willing to talk to the Groundwater Institute people as well as Cy Robbins who you have talked to, as well as the engineers at the Water Authority just to take again another hard look to make sure that we're addressing all -- not just the existing ones, but thing that are just breaking in the last few years in terms of water contaminants that we're finding and trying to figure out where in the world they are coming from.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Thank you. George. In conclusion, are you suggesting that this may have a significant adverse impact from your perspective both on the Water Authority and the Soil and Water Conservation District?

MR. PROIOS:

I don't know. As far as well fields, we don't have a well field directly -- I would accept what Mary Ann has presented as factual in terms of not impacting the existing well, because we know which way the flow is going. To say that there are no private wells or other water sources that might be impacted downgradient, that's not -- I wouldn't say, because there is going to be material coming from sewage effluent. So I think what we need to do since I -- from my perspective, I would like to have a couple of the engineers at the Water Authority take a look at the report that was presented, as well as have the Groundwater Institute look at it. We probably could do a joint meeting at the Water Authority's offices there and see whether they're satisfied with the amount of information there or whether there needs to be some other additions as somebody had mentioned in terms of maybe putting some additional monitoring wells upgradient between certain areas. That would give you some early warning detections of other materials that might be detected from the effluent that's being discharged.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Thank you. Any other questions?

MR. WRIGHT:

One quick comment about George's comments is that, you know, what's in scavenger waste. Every place that is being -- having their cesspool or septic tank cleaned is a groundwater discharge. I mean, the Health Department regulates and controls and monitors those things. So if what they're discharging to the ground is acceptable, then what comes out of the septic tank is what I mentioned before, about the things that get tied up, you know, with the solids which we take care of at the plant, which are, you know, some of the metals and the plumbing that's in the homes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other questions from CEQ or else I'm going to out to the audience. And then we'll do a little discussion? Is there anybody else that wishes to speak on this.

MS. ESSEL:

I handed out the report that was done by the County Health Department, and on the back of the report under conclusions and recommendations, it says, land use work with Brookhaven to preserve the basin. I think if you're putting in a sewer treatment plant, that certainly should be looked at as not with the conclusion and recommendation to expanding, should say expanding it, is not what that recommendation is. I think that's an important issue. Also, the report that was handed out by CDM does show the same picture that was used in the Carmans River environmental assessment. So I guess it's a similar one on the -- showing where the areas that should be protected. And I know that the County Health Department went and spoke to the Open Space Council for the Town of Brookhaven, and they are very concerned about anything

that's going in there, any future building, anything that would expand the potential for building. So I think that this is an issue that the Town would be interested in and certainly have questions about. We know they are some pollution plumes in there, and we'd like to know what the cumulative effect would be. I think they were mentioned earlier. You have the Grucci plume, five people still have not been able, I guess, to afford to put in water themselves. There are five homes that have well water that is polluted that has not been addressed nor taken care of. So I think we have -- we have that as a potential concern. Just to tack on quickly about traffic, I'd like to know what the traffic is from the landfill, Horseblock Road. You talk about traffic coming up, there's nothing that addresses that. Also, what is the traffic from the new 900 unit subdivision that is on Horseblock Road? How is -- ho is that going to be affected by these trucks? Other planned development in the area is something we don't know, it's not mentioned. And then what's the cumulative impact for all traffic? So I think if we look at the current existing condition, I think we have to go a little farther and look at the cumulative impacts. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I'll entertain discussion from CEQ. Larry.

MR. SWANSON:
Well, I'd just that to comment that a quarter of a million gallons per day is not particularly large in terms of sewage treatment plants. On the other hand, it seems to me that this is draining into a particularly sensitive area and that there have been a number of legitimate technical scientific questions raised here that my personal inclination leads to say that this is a positive declaration, and that as you reminded me, we've discussed this several times other two or three different years. And it's probably times to draw it to a conclusion and make an decision one way or the other.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Is that a motion or are you just throwing it out --

MR. SWANSON:
Well, I'd be willing to make it as a motion, and, you know, if it's seconded we can go ahead and discuss it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
How are we classifying it? It is unlisted?

MR. BAGG:
What's the total size of the site, Ben?

MR. WRIGHT:
Three acres is what we had in the original, three areas.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
All right. So you're making a motion for an unlisted pos dec, is that what you're doing?

MR. SWANSON:
Right.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion, do I have a second? Ginny Fields seconded it.
Discussion.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'm not sure that we should necessarily go for a type -- for an unlisted at this point in time. We might want to table it a little bit longer --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You may not want to go for a pos dec.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I don't want to do anything on this until we get more information in. I think that there is more information out there that we could use to make a determination of what we're looking at.

MR. MALLAMO:

I think this is the third time we're talking about this. And I think everyone has a lot of concerns even from this meeting that maybe didn't come up earlier. So I would be inclined to support the resolution. I think there are a number of issues and scientific questions here that -- and looking at the bigger picture and what's going on in that whole area need to be resolved.

LEG. FIELDS:

Just in the future, aren't they also looking to even expand this further sometime down the road?

MR. WRIGHT:

The Yaphank Treatment Plant? It was proposed -- it's not a County sewer district right now. And the only way that non County facilities could connect to it is if it were County sewer district. So when that was proposed more than a year ago, there was objection from the local Legislator and the community about it, so it didn't proceed any further. If it were created -- a Suffolk County sewer district were created, then it could consider it, but the steps necessary to make that connection are first the sewer agency and then the Legislature.

LEG. FIELDS:

There have -- it kind of comes up at a lot of meetings that I go to, so I would -- I would stay with my second on the motion.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I agree.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I would be inclined to support the motion also. I think since the last time we CEQ entertained this, we now have a new study which is the Carmans River environmental assessment study. And what you have handed out here that Ms. Essel provided is actually, I think, a slide show that the Health Department developed. It's not the actual recommendations. In the actual recommendations what they say is to take actions to preserve and prevent an increase in nitrates and to preserve the watershed. So I think if the County paid for the study -- it's considered the most comprehensive study on the Carmans River

to date, and that is clearly one of the recommendations in the study.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Anything to add? Just before -- before I actually ask for a vote on the motion, I just want to clarify something technical. You're altering three acres of thereabouts, is there any -- and, Jim, I'm actually looking at you -- publically owned or operated parkland, recreation area, or designated open space contiguous to this? Do we know? Does anybody know if there's any -- because that does change the classification of the action. I want to make sure the resolution is correct if we're going to go down this road.

MR. SWANSON:

Can I ask you to clarify.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

A type one action, okay -- I've just gone through all the criteria in the regulations relative to unlisted versus type one -- relative to type one actions. And there's one criterion that makes something a type one action that may apply, and I'll just read it to you. "Any unlisted action that exceeds 25% of any threshold in this section", so it would exceed a physical alteration threshold, okay? "Occurring wholly or partially within or substantially contiguous to any publically owned or operated parkland, recreation area or designated open space, including any site on the register of national natural landmarks pursuant to" -- and they give the federal citations.

MR. WRIGHT:

The proposed golf courses -- the proposed golf courses were on at least one side of this particular site.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So that's publically owned land.

MR. KAUFMAN:

But it's not parkland.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

It just has to be open space. It just has to be publically owned open space. It does not have to be parkland.

MR. BAGG:

The County owns 500 acres in this area.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I think you're going to have to amend your motion. I just -- respectfully. There are a couple of amendments I suggest that you make. One is to make this a type one action and the other is when you make your recommendation for a positive declaration, you have to list the reason. So if it's potential impacts to surface water, potential impacts to traffic, whatever it is, but I would suggest that the motion be amended accordingly for the technical corrections.

MR. SWANSON:

Okay. So, I guess, this would then be a type one action, positive declaration with potential impacts on both surface and groundwaters,

and I gather traffic flow.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have an amended motion, do I have a second to the amended motion?

LEG. FIELDS:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other discussion before I call the question? I'll call the question? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED.

Proposed construction of CYS Boys and Girls Club - Recreation Center and Associated Athletic fields, Town of Brookhaven.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Who is here to speak on this?

MR. GIBBONS:

Good morning. Nick Gibbons, County Parks. I guess CEQ staff didn't get the message, but we'd like to have this pulled from the agenda and tabled until the next meeting.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. CEQ did get one message though that didn't exactly make me happy. I got a message from the Clerk of the Legislature, although I know that this is not your concern, and it truly isn't mind either, but apparently there's someone running around putting fliers and paraphernalia in people's mailboxes. And they're using the Legislative Office Building as the mailing address and the phone number for the contact. And the Legislature's been getting -- from what I understand the Clerk of the Legislature has been getting calls and has no idea why.

MR. GIBBONS:

This is the contact in the EAF?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

No. This is the contact on some flier that's being put in people's mailboxes. And apparently they got the call from the -- well, not apparently, I got a note -- from the East Setauket Post Office to advise the Legislature that this activity is illegal. So if the County is associated or has any information as to who is doing this, you should advise them number one that they're not authorized to put County mailing addresses or telephone numbers, and furthermore, it is illegal. And we should tell the Post Office if they're concerned about illegality, they should call the police not the Legislature. So with that I'll entertain a motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Motion to table, do I have a second? I have a second by Larry. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? CARRIED.

Well, can you tell me -- why don't you come to the podium and tell us who you are. What we'll do is we will put -- we'll have CEQ staff put you on a mailing list so that you can get any of the information that

we get relative to this.

MR. CONNOR:

Thank you. My name is Steve Connor. I live at 19 Bobcat Lane in East Setauket. I am here to oppose this CYS structure being built or wanting to be built on this parkland, because we just gained this as parkland, and we want to keep it as such.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. So what we'll do is we'll have CEQ staff put you on the list, and any time we get anything relative to this, you'll be notified of the meetings and you'll get copies of whatever we get.

MR. CONNER:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You're welcome. Do you represent a group or are you representing yourself as an individual homeowner?

MR. CONNOR:

I'm representing myself and our neighborhood.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, thank you very much. I appreciate it. Thank you for coming.

MR. MCDOWELL:

Hi. My name is Richard McDowell. I'm also from the neighborhood, I'm at 47 Bobcat Lane. I would also like to be notified regarding the next meeting.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. Why don't you see Penny who is sitting in between the two gentlemen on the end, and they'll get -- she'll get all the mailing information so that you can be sure you get everything. And thanks again for coming.

LEG. FIELDS:

Can I ask, do you know about this flier? Was this something that you have received also?

MR. CONNOR:

I have not received that, no. I would like to see that, though, if that's possible.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You're welcome to see the piece I have. I'm going to skip over Richard Martin for a minute, because I have -- I have other business. One piece of other business that I have is that Ben Wright was asked to be the mail carrier from Planning Department when he came other this morning. And what we've gotten is the long awaited opinion from the County Attorney's Office relative to segmentation for the 2003 Vector Control Plan of Work. And it's a several page opinion, which today I'm not going to read into the record, and I personally don't have my 2003 Work Plan material here, I don't think anybody else has it. And I also don't think that it would be fair to discuss this

without it being on the agenda and people having appropriate knowledge that we're going to discuss it. So what I'm going to do is ask Jim to make copies of all of this and make sure it gets distributed to all the CEQ members. And also make sure it gets distributed to whoever else is on the mailing list. And on the next agenda we'll be talking about the 2003 work plan.

LEG. FIELDS:

Theresa, what's the time line on the Vector Control where we have to vote on it?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

We vote on it when we think we have enough information to make a recommendation as to a pos dec or a neg dec, or whether we -- you know, we may hear -- we may hear from -- I think it's important that we allow the public to speak on this. And there is a potential that someone could bring an attorney or attorneys that have a dissension opinion from the County Attorney, there may be people who here that may be persuaded by that opinion.

LEG. FIELDS:

I'm not questioning that we're not going to do it today. I'm just wondering about the time line. It has to be by or --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

For the County?

LEG. FIELDS:

Right.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That I don't know.

MS. MITCHELL:

Leslie Mitchell, Deputy Commissioner DPW. The County Legislature needs to approve th '03 plan prior to January 1.

LEG. FIELDS:

When is our next meeting?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

November, the third Wednesday.

MS. MITCHELL:

Assuming that a recommendation is forth coming in November, we'd be before the Legislature the first meeting in December. And we will be requesting that a resolution be filled simultaneously so that it's waiting. So hopefully in December we can approve it. And then December 5th I think is the Legislative meeting.

LEG. FIELDS:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

The other -- the other issue which is not on the agenda is the final scope, which got delivered to my office by FedEx from Kashin

Associates, which we're not really going to discuss the sum and substance of, because as everybody may recall, we set up a subcommittee of Larry Swanson and Tom Cramer, who actually had an emergency this morning, I got a note that he's not here, and I don't know if Larry is prepared to make a recommendation relative to this. I'm going to let DPW speak for a few minutes, but I don't know if you're prepared to make a recommendation to CEQ relative to the adequacy of the final scope. Are you? Is there somebody who actually wants to speak on this? Does anybody from DPW want to speak?

MS. ESPOSITO:

Madam Chairwoman, I'm going to recuse myself from this portion of the meeting and participate as an audience member.

MS. SHAW:

Hi. Kim Shaw from Suffolk County Health. Did you want just a status report of where everything sits at this point?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, this isn't on the agenda, so I want to hear whatever you need from us so that we can be helpful to you.

MS. SHAW:

Well, everybody should have received the DGIS Scope. That was sent on 10/10 by overnight. That was late, unfortunately, due to the amount of comments that were received on the scope. The work plan for the long term plan is due back to your office on 10/18 from the consultants. So we'll be mailings that out the following week probably. The full report, which is the public comments and response, the DGIS Scope and the work plan, that is due us by 10/25. So you'll have that by the beginning of November probably. So it's a compressed time line, but I think we'll have everything to you before the next meeting.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You would think that -- well, when -- I just don't know this from a procedural standpoint -- when do you need things to send out so that they're adequately noticed -- does everybody know -- do each other know what's required?

MR. BAGG:

I believe all departments have been notified that the CEQ's period for send out is two weeks in advance of the meeting, which is usually the first Wednesday of the month. We send it to all concerned parties that have requested to receive information, we send it to the towns, the supervisors, the Environmental Department, Planning Department and so on. And we need at least a two week period so those individuals can receive the material and have a chance to comment, if they so --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So I assume that you have the requisite copied of this which came --

MR. BAGG:

No. My office has not received any of that. That was all FedExed directly to Council members, but --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
-- get it?

MR. BAGG:
Not yet, no. That's one of problems we've had here. There's so many people orchestrating this that it seems like the CEQ staff is out of the loop.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
That's a problem, because you're going to have keep one complete file, especially if this gets litigated. So can we make sure that CEQ -- can you go over there and just make sure that CEQ's file has everything that supposed to be in the file.

MS. SHAW:
We've been trading information back and forth, but I know that Kashin sent out packages on 10/10.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I got mine, in my office, which was -- which is where I like to get my mail.

MS. SHAW:
I'm double check with them, and I'll send it over to you today.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
So everybody knows the distribution now. Larry.

MR. SWANSON:
I guess, Terry, considering the way this has been set up with CEQ that I'd recommend that the County and Kashin get together with myself and Tom so that we can discuss your document and then we can make a recommendation to the CEQ maybe even prior to the next meeting.

MS. SHAW:
That would be a good idea.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I think that they are some -- just looking at the regulations -- there are some mandatory sections of final scope that aren't in this final scope. So you should just take a look at the regs. Anything else relative to this? Anybody else want to speak on this?

MS. SHAW:
Do we have to put anything in writing to be on the next agenda or are we --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Well, what happens is, I think, because I don't do this, you actually send over the requisite copies to Jim with the request that it be on the agenda, and then that's what happens. Historic Services.

MR. MARTIN:
We set up a committee within the Park Department that we had one meeting to review the guidelines for the housing program that we have in the County Parks. And there's two ways that the houses are used

under -- directly supervised by the County Parks and also managed by the Friends for Long Island Heritage. And at this point we're reviewing how they're managed and especially concerned that all the buildings are maintained properly and also the possibility that funds could be increased generated from the monthly payments on these units. About 24 of the units are under the Historic Trust supervision, so we are concerned on how these buildings are maintained.

Also, at Meadowcroft, the auto house, the bid has finally been awarded to {Groot} Restoration, and that should be completed by the end of the year. Our Deep Wells Fall Fair was well attended. We did go to our rain date on Monday. I'd like to invite everyone here to our opening party November 7th, at 5:30 at Deep Wells, to open up our show house. That runs to the end of the year. And Sagtikos, I keep hearing will be closing any minute. So I'm sure you'll be reading about it in Newsday. And we will be scheduling our Historic Trust Committee meeting at that site once the County closes on the property.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Any questions for Rich?

MR. SWANSON:
I'd like to make a comment. I went up to see the Deep Wells activity, and I must say that I was really impressed, and I think the Department of Parks deserves a pat on the back for an activity that's become, I think, almost an institution now. And it's a great -- it's a great fall festival.

MR. KAUFMAN:
It would be better, though, if Dr. Killmore was around, but, hey, you can't have everything.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Any other business? If not --

MS. SQUIRES:
George Proios and I just returned from the 2002 Conference on the Environment, which is sponsored by NYSAC and NYSEM. And this is just kind of a recommendation for CEQ to think about in the coming year. NYSEM gives awards to environmental management council, which -- which, of course, CEQ is, for outstanding work. I'd like to recommend that throughout this year as CEQ is so involved in the Vector Control issue and in the administration, that you kind of pull this together and next year you apply for an award. It's an awful lot of work that everybody is going to be doing, and I think it will be very, very appropriate.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Are you sure it should be showcased?

MS. SQUIRES:
Well, I think it's a significant issue, and Suffolk County again is leading as they often are. George as I speak Upstate and people say, well, Suffolk County is way ahead, well, on groundwater issues, Suffolk County is an in air, so we are considered somewhat reluctantly by people as leaders, and I think this is significant and something to

model.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Then could you give Jim whatever the application, even if it's last year's application, so we can just have an idea of what's involved in it. Because I don't want to dump it on -- we hardly have any staff as you know.

MS. SQUIRES:

I know that, and that's why I'm saying this a year in advance, just so that it can kind of be tucked away.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Anything else? Then I'll entertain a motion adjourn. I have a motion. Do I have a second? I have a second by Nancy.

MR. GIBBONS:

One thing. You're recall I guess it was two months ago now we brought the grasslands management plan for Teddy Roosevelt County Park to the Council for their review, and we're continuing to draft the DEIS. We want to request that two or three members be designated as a review committee to offer some insight before we brought it back to the full Council, which we'd like to do for the January meeting. So the time frame would be some time in the next month or so. We will have one single meeting where they could review the document, add some perspective and comments. We'd incorporate those and send it out for public comment and ultimately CEQ's review.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

No. It would have to come here first for a completeness determination.

MR. GIBBONS:

Prior to their review?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

No. We could -- I don't have a problem setting up a subcommittee, but before it goes out to anybody, it has to come to CEQ for a completeness review and someone, whoever the official body is, has to act, officially act on its completeness, whether it's the Commissioner of Parks or -- who is it? Is it the Parks Commissioner? So we would have to review -- the way it works is we review it, make a recommendation to the Parks Commissioner to make a determination and allow it. So any volunteers?

MR. GIBBONS:

We had two people of the three in mind anyway that I'd like to recommend, and that would be Mike Kaufman and Larry Swanson.

MR. KAUFMAN:

You realize our pictures are up at the Nature Conservancy with dart holes in there.

MR. SWANSON:

How many hours is this going to take?

MR. GIBBONS:
One meeting, two hours.

MR. SWANSON:
When is the meeting?

MR. GIBBONS:
It would be worked around everybody else's schedule.

MR. SWANSON:
And how big is the document?

MR. GIBBONS:
About 30 pages so far.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
We'll appoint Mike and Larry.

MR. KAUFMAN:
I volunteer.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I still have a motion to adjourn, and I have a second? All in favor?

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:50 A.M.*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY

