

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
Minutes

A regular meeting of the Council on Environmental Quality was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on August 6, 2003.

Members Present:

Larry Swanson - Vice Chair
Thomas Cramer
Michael Kaufman
Nancy Manfredonia
Lance Mallamo
Legislator Ginny Fields
John Finkenberg

Members Not Present:

Theresa Elkowitz - Chairperson
Adrienne Esposito

Also In Attendance:

James Bagg - Chief Environmental Analyst/Planning Department
Lauretta Fischer - Suffolk County Planning Department
Peggy DeKams - Suffolk County Planning Department
Richard Martin - Historic Services
Joy Squires - CAC of Huntington
Nick Gibbons - Environmental Analyst/Suffolk County Parks Department
Nanette Essel - Aide to Presiding Officer Postal
Ben Wright - Director/Sanitation Division/Department of Public Works
Christopher McVoy - Junior Civil Engineer/Department of Public Works
Robert Whelan - Junior Civil Engineer/Department of Public Works
Brian Ednie - Lockwood, Kessler & Bartlett
Wayne Culver - Lockwood, Kessler & Bartlett
Hoot Sherman - Peconic Land Trust
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 9:36 A.M.*)

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would like to call the meeting to order. My name is Larry Swanson, I will be chairing the meeting today because our normal Chairman, Ms. Elkowitz, is unable to attend.

Let's review the minutes. And I think that we have minutes for May 21, June 18 and July 16. Any comments on the May 21st minutes? I'll suggest on page 16, I happen to be talking at the bottom of the page, that first paragraph where I'm talking there's the word rarely spelt with an R, it should be barely spelt with a B. Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Motion.

LEG. FIELDS:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All in favor? The May 21st minutes are passed (VOTE: 5-0-0-4 - Not Present: Adrienne Esposito, Theresa Elkowitz, Lance Mallamo & Thomas Cramer).

June 18th. Any comments? I have a motion by Nancy, second by Mike. All in favor? Opposed? Minutes passed for June 18th. And July 16th minutes, these were in your packet or in the mail.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Motion to accept.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Motion to accept by Nancy. A second?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I will second.

LEG. FIELDS:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Legislator Fields second. All in favor? Motion passes (VOTE: 5-0-0-4 - Not Present: Adrienne Esposito, Theresa Elkowitz, Lance Mallamo & Thomas Cramer).

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do you have any correspondence?

MR. BAGG:

Pardon?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any correspondence?

MR. BAGG:

No, no correspondence.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. So we'll move on to the Type II Actions. A, Ratification of Staff Recommendations. Jim, you want to call our attention to anything?

MR. BAGG:

Yes, this is just a point of interest because the Council in the past has been involved in the County Farm in Yaphank. There is a proposed Introductory Resolution 1658 of 2003, it's dedicating the Suffolk County Farm in Yaphank to the conservation of agricultural lands which if the Legislature chooses to do that then it would remain a farm. It's similar to Nature Preserve dedication and it would not be able to be taken out or used for other purpose unless it goes to a referendum.

And I know that Council has had an interest in that and I'm just pointing this out for your interest.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Any comments?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah, I would like to make one, Mr. Chairman. We have had at CEQ a long interest in this particular property, we have discussed in the past dedicating lands around it and possibly this land itself, if I remember correctly, to the Historic Trust, to various preservation programs. The area in Yaphank does have a long history with the County and I think it very definitely is worth the preservation.

Obviously today we're just being asked to deal with a SEQRA recommendation, but I think it would be a good idea, if the rest of the Council agrees, to possibly put in a resolution in support of this beyond what we normally do here today. Again, it is something that we have supported in the past and have been interested in. Rich Martin who is not here today would be able to go into more detail on all this, but I think a resolution in support to the County Legislature would be in order. If the rest of the Council members agree, I would make that motion.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

That's a formal motion you're making?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Do we have a second?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I will second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay, Nancy seconds it. Any discussion? Okay. All in favor of Mike's motion? Opposed? Motion passes (VOTE: 5-0-0-4 - Not Present: Adrienne Esposito, Theresa Elkowitz, Lance Mallamo & Thomas Cramer).

MR. FINKENBERG:

What will carry a motion here, just a majority of those present?

LEG. FIELDS:
You have to use the mike.

MR. FINKENBERG:
Sorry. So what will carry a motion here, is it the majority of the people present or is there a minimum number that's required?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Majority, we have a quorum.

MR. FINKENBERG:
Okay, thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
All right. Was that the only item, Jim, that you wanted to point out to us?

MR. BAGG:
Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
All right. Next is B, Construction of a Sanitary Facility at Indian Head County Park, Town of Riverhead.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Larry, we need to make a motion to accept the minutes -- not the minutes, the Legislative packet.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
That's right, staff recommendations. I apologize, we need to go back. Is there a motion to accept the staff recommendations?

MR. KAUFMAN:
I will make that motion.

LEG. FIELDS:
I will second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Legislator Fields seconds it. All in favor? Motion passes
(Not Present: Adrienne Esposito, Theresa Elkowitz, Lance Mallamo & Thomas Cramer).

B, Construction of a Sanitary Facility at Indian Island County Park, Town of Riverhead.

MR. GIBBONS:
Good morning. Nick Gibbons. Indian Island County Park in Riverhead, that's the campground, not the golf course. I call your attention to the second page in the handout, that's a section from plans that was approved by the Council at the beginning of the year for a campground expansion. At the time you will see the dotted line in general shows the location for the proposed sanitary building, we didn't have the funds at the time, now we do have capital money for that project so we would like to move forward with that.

You'll notice that there is maybe six or ten or so trees that would need to be removed to accommodate the building, but otherwise the site is cleared, it's impacted, no under story to speak of. The third page is a schematic of the building, it's relatively modest by park standards for a bathroom, the dimensions of which are 31 by 50 feet, so 1,550 square foot building. And I'm suggesting it as a Type II Action pursuant to SEQRA as it's under 4,000 square feet.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Question. On the first figure where you have it outlined in the park, the boxes labeled 123 and 124, they're sites?

MR. GIBBONS:

Correct, they're slabs.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

So is the required distance between site 124 and the bathroom up to code? It looks awfully close?

MR. GIBBONS:

That will be subject to Health Department review.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

And how many visitors are you planning the facility for?

MR. GIBBONS:

I couldn't guess, Larry. It's to accommodate both the campground area which you see there, those slabs, those are trailer parking spots and then we have group camping on that second sheet; if you oriented the sheet north/south to the east, the group camping areas would also end, those are about 150 at maximum capacity, 150 sites would use that bathroom as well.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

And there are only five stalls?

MR. GIBBONS:

Right. Well, the majority of the camping there is by self-contained trailer anyway and they use a dump station which isn't depicted on this, that's site 123 and 124.

LEG. FIELDS:

Five more than they ever had before.

MR. GIBBONS:

Right, we have nothing.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I see. And is this a unisex facility?

MR. GIBBONS:

It's one side is mens, the other is womens. If you look at that next sheet, the last sheet --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay.

MR. GIBBONS:

It looks like the south side of the building is womens and the north side is mens.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Right. Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Nick, I believe that we had looked at this area in terms of clearing, etcetera, a couple of months ago; is that an accurate memory?

MR. GIBBONS:

That was to refurbish and reconfigure the existing campground, right.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. So the area of clearance that you'd be undertaking, that was in that area that we were looking at.

MR. GIBBONS:

It was but it probably wasn't part of the original estimate that I had given to you all for the number of trees taken down. And in fact, that was one of the things that tabled it originally, Adrienne had asked for information on that and I had quantified that number but it didn't include this dozen trees or whatever.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I mean, realistically the area is pretty heavily treed and if we do take down a few more trees with this it's not going to really impact, we're taking down a fair amount of trees anyway --

MR. GIBBONS:

Right.

MR. KAUFMAN:

-- to deal with the camping.

(*Thomas Cramer & Lance Mallamo entered the meeting at 9:46 A.M.*)

MR. GIBBONS:

And if you remember, the trees were pretty impacted to begin with, impaction, etcetera.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I have no problem with this particular project, but are there any future plans for anything else going in at Indian Island?

MR. GIBBONS:

The most major project we have is the one that I brought to you in the winter, spring time for the campground expansion. We would also like to install an additional dump station as the current waiting line to use the dump station is unacceptable and with the growing popularity of trailers, most people are going to self-contained as opposed to using the public bathrooms.

MR. KAUFMAN:

We're not looking at any more major construction in terms of expansion

of camp sites or additional out buildings or anything like that.

MR. GIBBONS:

No. The only additional buildings that we'd see possibly would be a pavilion or two down the road.

MR. KAUFMAN:

All right, thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any other comments? I guess it looks to me like the proposed site is only ten feet, one corner is only ten feet from a pad and I just can't believe that the Health Department would approve that.

MR. GIBBONS:

Well, the site is far more generous than the size of the building itself.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Larry, I think you're mixing apples and oranges on this one. The Health Department approvals refer to where the sanitary waste will be deposited, etcetera. We're not talking about setbacks from other structures or anything, that's more like a zoning concept. So if you have a building that's contained like this and it's coming close to one of the paths, it may not be the most desirable place to have an extra pad 124 and that may not be a great pad to use but there's no setback requirements that I know of in County zoning, such as concept doesn't exist.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah, I'll make a motion that this is a Type II Action.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Second by Mr. Cramer. All in favor? Motion passes (VOTE: 7-0-0-2 - Not Present: Theresa Elkowitz & Adrienne Esposito).

MR. GIBBONS:

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right, C, Improvements to Sewer District No. 20, Leisure Village (CP 8148), William Floyd, Town of Brookhaven. This was I guess in the packet this morning.

MR. WRIGHT:

Good morning. Ben Wright with Public Works. This is basically a replacement in kind. We've had some need to enhance the treatment process at this facility due to the winter conditions where we've had difficulty keeping the plant meeting the effluent limitations, so it's to replace equipment that's within the tanks as well as controls

and there's no exterior construction involved. Basically we felt it was a Type II Action.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any comments? Do I have a motion?

MR. CRAMER:

Motion.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Motion by Mr. Cramer. A second by Legislator Fields. All in favor? All opposed? Motion passes (VOTE: 7-0-0-2 - Not Present: Theresa Elkowitz & Adrienne Esposito). Thank you.

Let's see, D, Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest Inflow/Infiltration Study/Rehabilitation and Interceptor Monitoring, Town of Babylon.

MR. WRIGHT:

This is for Sewer District 3 - Southwest. We've experienced higher flows than necessary and anticipated during rain events and there's a need to study various areas to see where we can reduce these extraneous flows from entering into the system. The word rehabilitation shows up in the title, it's not a construction type of rehabilitation. Part of the study program is to close circuit TV some of the lines and when you're doing that, minor cracks and that you can grout it, so that's considered rehabilitation.

In the Capital Program and budget for next year there's additional funds for any recommendations that might need structural involvement and we would come back to the CEQ at that time and do recommendations indicating that that type of rehabilitation is necessary.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'm looking at the project description and it talks about extraneous flows, some of it you talk about the system is used illegally to drain flooded intersections, others divert groundwater. What are some of the other extraneous flows that you think might be out there?

MR. WRIGHT:

It could be sump pumps in basements that in the past, before they were a sewer system, sump pumps were discharged to the driveway, they go out in the street and cause some problems in the winter, you know, with freezing, etcetera. When the sewer system was put in there were many locations where they connected directly to the sewer system. That's an illegal activity, it's very difficult to detect, once you detect it and it's removed it doesn't mean that somebody might do that, you know, a month from then, you know, put the sump pump back in again. There are very minimal options to really get rid of the water from the basements, but it's not supposed to go into sewer systems, it takes away capacity of the sewer as well as the treatment plant. There

could also be some structural problems. Even though the pipes are not considered old even though they're 25 years old, there could be some

areas where there was some settlement or some cracks where some groundwater is getting into it.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Do I have a motion?

MR. CRAMER:
Motion, Type II.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Second by Mr. Kaufman. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries
(VOTE: 7-0-0-2 - Not Present: Theresa Elkowitz & Adrienne Esposito).

E, Improvements to Suffolk County Sewer DistrictS Chemical Bulk Storage Facility Compliance.

MR. WRIGHT:
The New York State Environmental Conservation Law has regulations within it, the Hazardous Substance Storage Act where certain activities have to take place by a certain date, we did not meet that date. Basically there's a misunderstanding with the authority of the Health Department, we felt there that their inspections and registration were adequate but we were misunderstood or we misunderstood the regulations. The various activities that are necessary are the Spill Prevention Report which was developed, some additional alarms that are on some of our chemical storage facilities, but the main purpose I believe of CEQ is the construction of secondary containment pads which are relatively small structure, 10 to 15 foot square that would be placed adjacent to the chemical storage facilities. When a delivery truck comes in it contains anywhere from three to 400 gallons of volume in this depressed concrete storage area. In case there were -- there was a break in the delivery truck hose or when disconnecting it from the chemical tanks there was some discharge, it would be captured rather than go in the ground.

Most of these chemicals or all of the chemicals that we use are used to provide treatment in the treatment plants, so a discharge from a hose of a couple of hundred gallons would not interfere with the treatment process so we could divert it to the treatment process rather than having it spilled on the ground. The if I can call it good news, since the regulations were about two-and-a-half years ago, we haven't had any spills or drips or anything else. But in any event, our plan is to construct these facilities at each one of our treatment plants where we do have chemicals which is 22 facilities. We have indicated that we thought it was a Type II Action because of pending consent order which we're negotiating with the County Attorney's Office and DEC.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
How many are you going to build?

MR. WRIGHT:
There's 22 treatment facilities, each one has a chemical storage tank

that requires a secondary container structure being ten to 15 foot square.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

This is where you store things like hypochlorite?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes, caustic soda for Ph adjustment, there's Methylene Peroxide in some of the facilities where it enhances denitrification.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

It would have been nice to have seen a more complete set of drawings and elevations.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yeah, we haven't gotten to that point yet. We have just entered into an agreement with a consultant that is going to assist us in providing the plan to DEC which is due in about 30 days.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Is there a motion?

MR. CRAMER:

Jim, do you agree that this is a Type II Action?

MR. BAGG:

Well, when we're considering each Sewer District you're talking about the pad is less than 4,000 square feet. It is pursuant to Health Department requirements as well, so.

MR. CRAMER:

So you would agree?

MR. BAGG:

I would agree.

MR. CRAMER:

Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN:

This also might be a citation -- strike that. We could use a citation from the planning aspect of the Type II activity; in other words, call this just planning since we're just looking at a generalized drawing over here.

MR. CRAMER:

Well, as I understand it this is for construction, right?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yeah, we're going to have to proceed -- you know, whatever the negotiating schedule is we're going to have to proceed with that.

MR. CRAMER:

Okay. But you agree that even with -- that it is construction, Jim, that it's still a Type II, because that would be my only problem, what we designate it.

MR. BAGG:

I would agree, yeah, because it's individually less than 4,000 square feet adjacent to existing facilities.

MR. CRAMER:

Okay, then I make a motion for a Type II.

MR. BAGG:

And I don't believe any trees or anything are required, I think the area is already disrupted.

MR. WRIGHT:

No, each one of these sites is in an historic area where the treatment plant surrounds basically the chemical bulk storage system.

MR. CRAMER:

Yeah, I have no problem. It's just whether it was a Type II or an Unlisted, but if Jim -- I don't have the regs here, but if Jim feels that it's Type II, I'll make a motion for a Type II.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Second by Mr. Kaufman. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries (VOTE: 7-0-0-2 - Not Present: Theresa Elkowitz & Adrienne Esposito).

2 - Proposed Replacement of the bridge carrying Motor Parkway, CR 67 over the Long Island Expressway, Exit 55, Town of Islip. Good morning.

MR. McVOY:

Christopher McVoy, Suffolk County DPW. The consultant firm that we used to design this bridge was Lockwood, Kessler & Bartlett; representing them and doing the presentation for you this morning is Mr. Wayne Culver and Mr. Brian Ednie.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Good morning. I always forget so I'll remind you, when you talk you'll have to speak into a microphone.

MR. CULVER:

Okay.

LEG. FIELDS:

You can take the microphone out if you want and stand there and point if you need to.

MR. CULVER:

Good morning, everybody. This project --

MS. MAHONEY:

Could you please state your name?

MR. CULVER:

Oh, yes. Wayne Culver, C-U-L-V-E-R. This project involves a replacement of the bridge which carries County Road 67 over the Long Island Expressway at Exit 55. In addition to the replacement of the bridge, we'll also be reconstructing approximately a half of mile roadway from Caleb's Path down there to -- actually from Old Willets Path to Caleb's Path in Brentwood.

This project started actually it was the original construction of this section of County Road 67 was done in the early 1960's when the LIE was constructed. At that time only 3% of the 1,500 acres of the land which is presently known as the Hauppauge Industrial Park was developed, now over 90% is developed. Because of this and the additional traffic increases over the years, the existing five lane bridge no longer can handle the present traffic, it's created significant traffic problems and that will only get worse. In order to do that, in order to prevent additional traffic congestion, a proposal to build a new bridge has been put forward.

The project objectives, in addition to the bridge, are to increase the safety, to improve drainage and generally take care of the road in that section. Two alternatives are considered for this replacement, one is a seven lane bridge which will include two southbound lanes, two southbound turn lanes, two northbound lanes and one northbound lane. The second alternative is two southbound lanes, two southbound left turn lanes, two northbound and two northbound turn lanes. In addition to that, we're also looking to add some turn lanes at the service road intersections. What I would emphasize through all of this is that no through-lanes will continue beyond this site, it's just really the addition of turn lanes. That's all I have as far as a presentation.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Do we have any questions?

MR. MALLAMO:

I have a question. Good morning. Was any consideration, if you're going through all the trouble of working on either side, at Old Willets Path? Having sat at that intersection in the afternoon you can sit there through three lights, and a few work weeks ago I was just wondering what's the air pollution doing here at five o'clock in the afternoon. To go westbound on the LIE you have to make a left and then an immediate right because there's a gas station right in the way; has any thought been given to eliminating that gas station and putting a through road right in? It would seem to me that would take a huge road of traffic off this intersection.

MR. CULVER:

No, that wasn't really actively considered. We're really doing minor right-of-way takings for this project. We have two properties along here where the widening is and then a little bit on an Exxon Station on the other service road. But we were really just looking to replace the bridge and the turning lanes, so that wasn't actively considered.

MR. MALLAMO:

Okay. Well, I think that would have been a good idea because you've just got an enormous amount of traffic that has to do this constant dog leg and it's a tremendous waste of time and gasoline I think for -- you know, to do an improvement like this and not consider something like that.

MR. CULVER:

Well, this -- with the additional lanes in there, it should cut down on the time that you would have to wait there, I think you would be able to get through without having to wait two or three cycles at the light. The signal lights will also be replaced in this project.

MR. MALLAMO:

Well, note to DPW, I would look at that in the future because this project could go forward without that but it would certainly seem to make sense to me.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Can I ask a question in reference to pedestrians and bicyclists?

MR. CULVER:

Yes.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Is there any hope that they'll ever be able to survive trying to cross there?

MR. CULVER:

Sure. There will be -- we do have a median here that's a raised median. I think there's going to be -- pedestrian signals will be added. There's no actual designated bike lanes, there really was no bike traffic picked up in the counts, but the road is --

MR. EDNIE:

(Inaudible).

MR. CULVER:

Yeah, you have a wider outside lane and you do have sidewalks on the bridge.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

And there's sidewalks on both sides?

MR. CULVER:

Yes.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

There are, okay.

MR. CULVER:

Yeah, there are on the bridge and through part of the site but then once you get beyond the limits the sidewalks do end.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Okay, thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Any other questions or comments? Do I have a motion?

MR. CRAMER:
I'll make a motion.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
All right.

MR. CRAMER:
Will this be an Unlisted Neg Dec?

MR. CULVER:
Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:
I'll second that.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Do we have -- all in favor?

MR. MALLAMO:
Larry, could I just ask one more question? Wasn't this project reviewed six or seven years ago?

MS. MANFREDONIA:
It rings a bell to me.

MR. CULVER:
It probably was. We weren't involved at that time, but the County was going to do a very similar project at that time when it was just going to be a rehabilitation and widening.

MR. MALLAMO:
So can you tell us how this is different than that one?

MR. CULVER:
The difference is that the bridge is now going to be totally replaced.

MR. MALLAMO:
Oh.

MR. CULVER:
New York State DOT determined at some point in the process that they'd rather replace the whole bridge and brought in this additional project.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
According to the notes, this goes back to December of 1996. All right, we're in the middle of -- all in favor? Opposed? Motion passes (VOTE: 7-0-0-2 - Not Present: Theresa Elkowitz & Adrienne Esposito).

MR. CULVER:
Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

3 - Proposed Acquisition of land known as Gabby Lane for Open Space Preservation, Town of Southampton.

MS. FISCHER:

Good morning. I'm Laretta Fischer with the Suffolk County Planning Department.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Hi, Laretta.

MS. FISCHER:

I'm here to speak on Gabby Lane as well as the Hither Woods addition. Just as a note, in your packets this morning is a report that we undertook the last half year regarding all the land acquisition programs that the County has; there are 12 altogether, nine are funded programs, three are internal working programs, just for your information so if you have any questions on that, I would be happy to answer them as well.

Gabby Lane. We're proposing that this property be acquired under the new Drinking Water Quarter Percent Program under the following criteria. It has freshwater wetlands, it is within the South Fork SGPA and it is recommended also by the Suffolk County Planning Department for surfacing groundwater protection. It's 24.3 acres, it obtained 40 points on our ranking scale.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Could I stop you there? What is the best ranking that you can get?

MS. FISCHER:

One twenty-five -- 110, I'm sorry.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

So this got 40 out of 110.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, and the minimum amount is 25; it is a rigorous ranking program so it's hard to get a lot of points.

This originally was requested to be acquired under the old Drinking Water 12(5)D which was the town revenue sharing portion of the old program. So this had been in the works under the former program to be acquired, and since we didn't have enough funding under that program that money is getting less and less. We recommended that it be acquired under the new Drinking Water Program since it does meet its criteria.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

There's a question.

LEG. FIELDS:

Laretta, on the aerial map it has the designated or proposed acquisition in the middle and then to the right is a wetland area; what's in-between?

MS. FISCHER:
That disturbed area?

LEG. FIELDS:
Yeah.

MS. FISCHER:
I'm not sure what that is or was. I have a -- I could say it looks to me that it was possibly used as part of a farm area, but I'm not a hundred percent sure.

MR. KAUFMAN:
I believe the northern portion of that land that Legislator Fields is pointing out is a tree farm. If you look at it, it looks like a north/south access, it's rows in there and they look to be trees. One thing I would like to point out is the -- or ask rather is in the resolution the Town of Southampton is going to be sharing 50% of the acquisition costs; is that still accurate?

MS. FISCHER:
No, they're not. Oh, I'm sorry, yes they are. Yes they are.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Does it rank high in their scale of purchases?

MS. FISCHER:
I don't know what their scale is. But this is an area that they have -- there has been other open space acquisitions or sets for development, subdivisions have been placing pieces of open space in this area. The town also owns north of there the great swamp area to the north, it's owned by the town as well as some other large pieces north of there as well; it didn't show up on this map but they do have interests in this area as well.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Yeah. As I remember, the Town of Southampton has been very interested in the great swamp area and has been purchasing, I can confirm that, too.

MS. FISCHER:
Yes, this was one of the areas that they identified in their revenue sharing portion.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
Can I ask, on the map I see a road with a circular area, is that a public road or a private road, will there be any access to this property?

MS. FISCHER:
I believe there will be and that is part of the subdivision; so I believe it is a public road, not a private road.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
I would like to go back to your criteria. You mentioned that this is 40 on a scale of 110 but that it's very difficult to get a high mark; so what do you consider as a high mark?

MS. FISCHER:

Well, a few things come into play. Endangered species obviously, wetlands which this does have, it is adjacent, SGPA which it is, if it's adjacent to stream corridors, any kind of public access to water front; if it's a large lot it gets more points, also if it's adjacent to other County or other municipal holdings. We did consider this a strategic parcel associated with further acquisition because there are other interests in buying in this area by the town as well as us. If it's a trail link or if there's any kind of development pressure, it also gets points but it also does get points for being an intermunicipal agreement which it did get. So its points were specifically for freshwater wetlands. Unfortunately, in this criteria we also have SGPA as the same number, so it gets five points for that altogether. Unique land forms, it's a morraignal area, the south fork morraignal area. Then it gets five points for being multiple if any of those two. It is between 10 and 50 acres, it got five points there. Then its perimeter to area ratio is less than one so it's a bulky lot and it is also a strategic parcel and it is an intermunicipal agreement, that gives it 40 points.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you.

MR. CRAMER:

And maybe following Larry's train of thought, what would be the minimum that you would give it?

MS. FISCHER:

Twenty-five.

MR. CRAMER:

Twenty-five. So if it was anything above 25 you would consider it potentially --

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, it's a very good number.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Legislator Fields?

LEG. FIELDS:

Lauretta, when we indicate on the resolutions the owner, is there a way of determining who the principals of Gabby Lane LLC are?

MS. FISCHER:

I'm not sure. I don't know how that's determined, but I can find out in our Real Estate Division how they contact the owners.

LEG. FIELDS:

I'd be interested in knowing who the actual principals are.

MS. FISCHER:

Okay. I can get that for you.

MR. KAUFMAN:

One thing I would like to point out is there have been a number of

reports that the County has issued and some of the other agencies around have issued, the State and the towns, etcetera, regarding SGPA's, and they've always talked about trying to limit development in these areas, etcetera. And regardless of the point count, etcetera, when it's in an SGPA previously these reports have indicated that these are properties they're trying to purchase. So I think that we should probably go forth with this proposal and I don't see any kind of negative environmental impact -- strike that. I see a negative environmental impact on this in terms of there's no problems with purchasing it. So I'd actually make a motion, this looks to me as if it's an Unlisted Negative Declaration.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Mr. Kaufman made a motion.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I have a second by Mr. Cramer. All those in favor? Opposed? Motion passes (VOTE: 7-0-0-2 - Not Present: Theresa Elkowitz & Adrienne Esposito).

All right, we have another one. No. 4 - Proposed Acquisition of Land known as Hither Woods Addition for Open Space Preservation, Town of East Hampton.

MS. FISCHER:

Hither Woods addition. This is being proposed for acquisition under the new Quarter Percent Program and the criteria that we were acquiring it under is Suffolk County Planning Department Surface and Groundwater Protection. It's a 19.5 acre lot, it received 55 points on our ranking. This was originally offered to be looked at through a planning steps resolution last year, Resolution 18 -- 814-02, and it is adjacent to -- south of the property is the Hither Woods Park, to the west of it is a large lot that is either acquired or being acquired by the Town of East Hampton. This would basically finish off all the large holdings within the Hither Woods area. It's just adjacent to the SGPA, it's not within the SGPA but it is adjacent to it on two sides, to the west and also to the south.

LEG. FIELDS:

Did you indicate the score on this one?

MS. FISCHER:

Fifty-five points.

LEG. FIELDS:

Thank you.

MR. CRAMER:

Just to the west of that, is that the old subbase, Navy base?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
So there would be public access?

MS. FISCHER:
Yes, there's a road that goes along it on the southerly border now,
there's actually a road there now.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
It will be available to all Suffolk County residents?

MS. FISCHER:
Oh, yes.

MR. CRAMER:
Except Larry Swanson.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
Lauretta, could you explain again, this is under the Quarter Percent?

MS. FISCHER:
The new Quarter Percent Program.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
Okay. But it's not -- this is not in the SGPA?

MS. FISCHER:
No, it's adjacent to it.

MR. CRAMER:
I make a motion, Unlisted Neg Dec.

MR. MALLAMO:
Second.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Second by Mr. Kaufman. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes
(VOTE: 7-0-0-2 - Not Present: Theresa Elkowitz & Adrienne Esposito).

5 - Proposed Acquisition of Land known as St. Gabriel's Property for
Open Space Preservation, Town of Shelter Island.

MS. FISCHER:
I'll just give a little bit of background information on St. Gabriel's
and then Mr. Sherman is going to give a presentation.

The St. Gabriel's site is being considered for acquisition under the
Multi-Faceted Program under the Land Preservation Partnership
category. This would be -- this is a 7.9 acre lot, it received 20
points and it would be considered under the criteria for Land
Preservation Partnership as E, other parkland, and it's use would be
general parks and it's indicated as will be used for passive
recreation.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Welcome, Mr. Sherman. It's an honor to have you here. For those that may not know, Mr. Sherman is the former Town Supervisor for the Town of Shelter Island.

MR. SHERMAN:

Good morning. My name is Hoot Sherman, currently with the Peconic Land Trust. The piece that we're talking about, St. Gabriel's, is, as he said, it's just under eight acres, it's mostly open space; as you can see, it's all open space here. It has public highways on two sides of it and on the third side, this is the piece we're talking about, there's a State right-of-way. There's a 40 acre parcel across Cartwright Road from it that the town is currently talking to the owners about trying the purchase development rights or purchase the land for that -- that whole area is part of the Shelter Island Groundwater Recharge area where, as most of you know, everybody has their own well and ceptic, there's no public water.

This piece was -- belonged to the Catholic Church, it is currently zoned one acre residential. It was in the process of being subdivided into seven building lots when we, the Peconic Land Trust and the town and the county, talked to the owners, talked to the church about preserving the whole 7.9 acres as open space. They stopped their subdivision application, we got two appraisals and they agreed to sell it for the average of the two appraisals. The town is paying 50% and the County is paying 50%. And as I say, there's a 40 acre parcel right next to this that is also very critical. I think this is number four on the County's -- I mean on the town's list of open space that they need to protect or want to protect.

The other ones are there's a 240 acre piece on the Island that they're trying to protect and then there's this 40 acre one right across the street which is I believe number two, then there's a 38 acre piece called -- it's in the {Beckerd} Trust and then this piece was number four of everything that they want to protect.

LEG. FIELDS:

If we were to acquire this and I drove over to Shelter Island and wanted to park over there and utilize that park, would I have to have a special permit?

MR. SHERMAN:

No.

LEG. FIELDS:

So it will have full access to any resident in Suffolk County?

MR. SHERMAN:

If you can get on the Island you can use it; right now that's a problem.

MR. CRAMER:

They're going to stop you at the ferry.

MR. SHERMAN:

It's going to be used basically for passive recreation, hit a golf

ball, go play frisbee, whatever, those type of things.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I have a question.

MR. SHERMAN:

But there's no permit required or anything, no, we don't do any of that stuff.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I had a question on the map. There's an area called acquisition parcel, there's an area called out parcel; what is the distinction between those?

MR. SHERMAN:

The whole piece is 33 acres. I haven't seen the map but the 33 acres, we're just -- we're cutting off the upland eight acres and the church is maintaining the rest of it. What they do is they bring kids out from Suffolk County, Nassau County and the City and bring them out for the summer, for a week or so in the summer.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

The church is keeping the part labeled out parcel which is next to the water.

MR. SHERMAN:

Yes. Yes, they are.

LEG. FIELDS:

You said 30 acres? This indicates on the aerial --

MR. SHERMAN:

I think it's 33.

LEG. FIELDS:

This indicates on the aerial 7.9 acres.

MR. SHERMAN:

That's what we're buying, but the whole parcel, including the out parcel and the part that we're talking about is 33 acres altogether I believe.

MS. FISCHER:

They're cutting off about eight acres of the 30 some odd acre lot, we're taking the westerly portion of the lot.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Is the park --

LEG. FIELDS:

I'm still not understanding. So if I'm looking at the green which indicates proposed acquisition --

MR. CRAMER:

This whole thing.

LEG. FIELDS:
The whole thing, right.

MR. CRAMER:
(Inaudible).

LEG. FIELDS:
Okay. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Looks to me, though, that there's something wrong with the scale. If the area called acquisition parcel is eight acres and the entire area in the green is 33 --

MS. FISCHER:
I think it's -- our notes say -- hold on.

MR. SHERMAN:
On the tax map the total thing shows 32.1.

MR. KAUFMAN:
We're taking about a quarter of it.

MR. SHERMAN:
And you know, if you look at where it says acquisition parcel and the line goes into like -- there's a row of trees along there, that's really where the line is; it moves 50 feet to the west probably from what the map says, but it's all the same thing.

MR. CRAMER:
And tax maps aren't necessary.

MS. FISCHER:
This is just an estimate on our part. We didn't get a site survey.

MR. SHERMAN:
I have a survey if anybody would like to see that.

MR. CRAMER:
And the tax maps aren't necessarily correct all the time.

MR. SHERMAN:
No.

MS. FISCHER:
No, it's just an estimate.

MR. SHERMAN:
And the piece just to the south of that outlined in yellow is State owned land, so that's open space too.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
Can I ask a couple of questions? The out parcel, that's owned by the church you said?

MR. SHERMAN:

Yes.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Okay. Is that in any way protected long-term?

MR. SHERMAN:

No.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

No.

MR. SHERMAN:

The town during this -- during the negotiating process for this, the town has a letter agreement with the church that they would have first refusal on anything the church wants to do. But quite frankly, that's water front property and boy, you better have your checkbook with you if you're going to talk to that stuff. It really gets deer on the Island, but there's no long-term protection.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

But do you have any clue whether they have any immediate plans to do anything?

MR. SHERMAN:

They do not. They just want to keep everything going the way they -- they put a lot of money into in the last few years, built a new dormitory for the kids, so there's nothing in their remedial plans to shut it down, they want to keep going.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

And another question; the State property, what is the -- what's that categorized as, that State land, is that parkland?

MS. FISCHER:

I think that's State Conservation property, DEC.

MR. CRAMER:

DEC.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

DEC, okay. And then the last question, are we -- which program are we buying this under, is this considered recreation?

MS. FISCHER:

Multi-Faceted Land Preservation Partnership, and then the subcategory -- Multifaceted has many different programs and then they have to pick one, so the pick is the Land Preservation Partnership because they're going to be going 50/50 with the town.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I would like to go back again to the point -- Mr. Sherman described I think an ideal situation that we should be considering but the County only gave it 20 points and you just told us in the other acquisitions the minimum is 25.

MS. FISCHER:

Yeah, it's just a guideline, you know, we pick a number.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

But it's their number four, so it seems to be inconsistent.

MR. SHERMAN:

Yeah, every time we end up in the point system we kind of get left out because Shelter Island is unique and a small piece on Shelter Island is very valuable as opposed to a bigger piece in some bigger town and some of the other things on the point system we just don't have.

MS. SQUIRES:

Larry?

MS. FISCHER:

Can I just make a point? When these resolutions come up before us, we don't necessarily -- we just review them with regard to our ranking system, we're not necessarily the author of the legislation. On Gabby Lane and the other two we are, but whatever is brought before us, you know, we do our best to review it but it's not necessarily something that we have authored.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay, thank you.

MS. SQUIRES:

Larry?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes?

MS. SQUIRES:

Could I make a comment? Very often -- and I'm speaking from the point of view of a town where land is very valuable and a small piece of open space you may fight very hard for, it won't meet the specific County criteria for endangered species and stuff. If you look at it, this is a place of open space but the value to have someplace to play, to throw the frisbee I think is very valuable to the municipalities, so I'm sure that's why it's highly ranked. It's also adjacent to other pieces, so it's not going to come up on Laretta's list but the town may very -- and I don't know this particular situation, but the town may want it quite desperately.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you.

MR. MALLAMO:

I think, too, I don't know if you add this in your equation, Laretta, I suspect you don't, but as I understand it, the County doesn't have many holdings on Shelter Island. And I love to go to Shelter Island but I don't know of any place I can go and just park and spend an hour. So I think it should get extra points because it's providing a service for non Shelter Island residents, it's like a little refuge for them to use as well. You know, I'd love to go to a County Park on

Shelter Island, I don't even know of any. So I'll give it some extra points myself.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
All right.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Thank you. You'll give it on the beat scale? Okay. Laretta --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Legislator Fields.

MR. KAUFMAN:
If I might. I give this a 95 on the scale, but at any rate -- on the bandstand scale. Realistically, though, this may be a situation where the County needs to revise its point system, if you will, especially if it's going in on a partnership deal with a town or with a village. I don't know right now whether the County takes into account the fact that it may be a low ranking score in the County system but maybe a very high ranking score on the town system, it may indeed deserve extra points.

MS. FISCHER:
Yeah, I'll give you a little history on this ranking sheet. It was part of the original Greenways Open Space Program, then it was added on to other types of programs such as Multifaceted. It doesn't mean it's necessarily geared towards certain programs that we now have or had in the past, obviously it doesn't -- we don't even rank active recreation sites. So it is, you know, used beyond the scope that it was initially created for and it is something that we are looking at in the program report that we just handed out. One of the next steps is to evaluate those programs and make recommendations as to the new criteria for the new programs and some new ranking criteria with regard to those. So we are looking at this, but at the present time we're under legislation to look at it through this ranking procedure.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Legislator Fields.

LEG. FIELDS:
What would happen if the County didn't purchase this property?

MR. CRAMER:
Seven homes.

LEG. FIELDS:
Is it already through the --

MR. SHERMAN:
Oh no, the subdivision was stopped, the subdivision is not going forward in the hopes that the town and the County will purchase it.

MR. CRAMER:
But if this purchase didn't go through then it probably would proceed with it.

MR. SHERMAN:

Then they would -- they have reserved the right to reinstitute their subdivision and keep going.

MR. CRAMER:

Thank you.

LEG. FIELDS:

So the church sold it for housing?

MR. SHERMAN:

Would the church? Yeah, they would sell it to a developer I'm sure, and then it would go wherever it goes.

LEG. FIELDS:

So then in the future they could do the same thing with the piece that's next to it.

MR. SHERMAN:

They could, yes, ma'am. As I said, we have a -- the town and the church have an agreement that the town would get first refusal.

LEG. FIELDS:

What kind of a church is it, do you know; what denomination?

MR. SHERMAN:

It's a Catholic church. It's not the --

MR. MALLAMO:

Didn't this used to be a retreat house?

MR. SHERMAN:

That's what it still is.

MR. MALLAMO:

It still is.

MR. SHERMAN:

They bring kids out, young people.

MR. MALLAMO:

I was one of those kids many years ago.

LEG. FIELDS:

What does that mean; what do you mean you were one of those kids?

MR. MALLAMO:

Well, I went to Catholic high school so senior year you had to make a retreat at St. Gabriel's.

MR. SHERMAN:

They do a lot -- they'll bring kids out for a weekend at a time during the winter time they bring them out for a weekend. And like I say, they just put a lot of money into rebuilding their dormitory so they're not looking to go out of business, they're looking to keep going.

LEG. FIELDS:
It's for bad kids?

MR. MALLAMO:
No, no; I was a good kid, sometimes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Where would a County resident park to use this?

MR. SHERMAN:
There's parking on both -- the roads on Shelter Island, there's no curb or anything, you just pull off the road and there are plenty of parking places alongside on both Burns Road and Cartwright Road, that's not a problem.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Do we have a motion?

MR. SHERMAN:
People do it now, people go out there now and hit golf balls.

MR. CRAMER:
Motion, Unlisted Neg Dec.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Do I have a second?

MR. KAUFMAN:
I will second that.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries (VOTE: 7-0-0-2 - Not Present: Theresa Elkowitz & Adrienne Esposito).

MR. SHERMAN:
Thank you very much.

MS. SQUIRES:
Larry, can I make a comment before Laretta leaves?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Yes.

MS. SQUIRES:
We just received this, as Laretta told us. If you notice on the front cover, and of course I haven't had a chance to read it, but she is the principal preparer of this and I would like to commend Laretta and Tom Isles because this will be a very valuable document and answer many of the questions that people have in terms of what program did it come out, where is the program, where is the legislation. I notice you can get this on-line and of course people can do that and will do it, but it's very nice to have it in your hands so you can just go page after page. So thank you so much, Laretta, I know this was a lot of work and effort.

MS. FISCHER:

Thank you.

MR. MALLAMO:

I'll second that; great job, Laretta. It's nice to know whenever you need an answer you're the person to call, she always has the right answer.

MS. FISCHER:

I don't know if that's good or bad.

MR. CRAMER:

She always has an answer, whether it's the right one or not.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do we have any other business?

MR. FINKENBERG:

I was wondering if I could ask Laretta a question about one of the sections here. We often vote on these sale of properties and the list of resolutions, and in the back of my mind I'm always wondering if the properties have environmental significance. And one of the sections here that covers the review of tax lien properties for parks and environmental value, it lists a couple of paragraphs that the properties are reviewed and I was wondering if you could expand on that or, you know, give us some insights on how the properties are reviewed; is it a guy sitting at a desk checking off the list?

MS. FISCHER:

It's me. What -- yeah, we get lists from our Division of Real Estate when they come in past the redemption -- well, actually through the redemption and then past the redemption period. Once they get past the redemption period, I look at them very closely, I look at where they're located, obviously, are they adjacent to any other County parkland holdings, I look at whether they have wetlands, whether they're in the Pine Barrens core, whether they're in an area that the County is acquiring other properties to use for future parkland. So there's a number of areas that we evaluate the property on and that just kind of is a small encapsulation of it.

MR. FINKENBERG:

So what happens if you find out that it does have some sort of environmental or ecological significance, does that go --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Then we recommend that they be placed into parks. We do that especially along the stream corridors along the south shore where there are small lots but they add up. And also the Towns of Babylon, Islip and Brookhaven have also picked up properties along these stream corridors, and so we kind of make a connection, a network of municipally owned properties along these stream beds in areas where there are wetlands or other smaller parcels. We still consider them for parkland and we will put them on the list and that list is generated and put into a resolution for the Legislature to make the final determination.

MR. FINKENBERG:
Okay, thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Any other business? Rich, you're on.

MR. MARTIN:
Just to update today on the special events that we have scheduled, just a reminder, August 16th we have the third New York Encampments at Sagtikos Manor, that's from 9 to 4, that's sponsored by the Sagtikos Manor Historic Society. The next day, August 17th, is the Nassau-Suffolk Horseman's Association Annual Horse Show up at Old Field. We are working on the footing right now, unfortunately that will not be completed for that date but should be completed actually by the end of the month, that's the new footing that's being put on the main ring and that works -- going forward now. And September 7th at the Farmingville School House we have the Farmingville School House Association Annual Picnic and the interior of the one-room school house, the plaster work has been completed and that was paid for by the Farmingville Historic Society. And the Cornell Cooperative Extension One-Room School House Education Program will be going at that site that day, they have been giving that program up at Deepwells during the year and I think it's very popular, we're looking to institute that kind of program at the school house once it's opened up to the public.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Thank you. Yes?

MR. KAUFMAN:
Rich, regarding Sagtikos, how are the efforts coming regarding trying to organize some of the local groups to get the place up and running?

MR. MARTIN:
Right. We're negotiating right now with the Historic Society on their contract, on Exhibit B items and what they're going to be responsible for there, but they already have brought in local garden groups that we have met with and coming up with a work plan, especially for the wall garden.

MR. KAUFMAN:
So it looks like something is coalescing in the area to have a support group?

MR. MARTIN:
Yes. They're on-site most days, they've been giving tours in the summer on Wednesdays, Thursdays and Sundays from 1 to 4. And also they're gardener or landscape committee has been just doing basic maintenance, pulling the vines off of all the bushes and trees and doing a basic clean-up of the site.

MR. KAUFMAN:
And I think burglar alarm is in over there?

MR. MARTIN:
Oh yeah, that was put in right away after the County purchased it.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
All right. Thanks, Rich. CAC concerns?

MS. SQUIRES:
No.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Okay. I got my lecture before the meeting. Any other business?
If not --

MR. CRAMER:
Motion to adjourn.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Second by Kaufman. The meeting is adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 10:37 A.M.*)

Larry Swanson, Vice-Chair
Council on Environmental Quality

{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically