

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Suffolk County Council of Environmental Quality was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, 725 Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on May 19, 2004.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Theresa Elkowitz, Chairperson
Larry Swanson, Vice-Chairperson
Michael Kaufman
John Finkenberg
Nancy Manfredonia
Lance Mallamo

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

James Bagg, Chief Environmental Analyst/Department of Planning
Richard Martin, Historic Services
Joy Squires, CAC of Huntington
Penny Kohler, CEQ
Nick Gibbons, Parks Department
Lloyd Nelson, Project Manager, US DOE
Rodrigo Rimando, Federal Project Director, US DOE
Michael McCann, Brookhaven National Lab
Siva Kumar, BNL
Tom Daniels, BNL
Skip Nedeurus, BNL
Jeanne D'Asoli, BNL
Les Hill, BNL
John Carter, DOE - Brookhaven Community Affairs
Ed Samanns, Principal Env. Scientist, Louis Berger Group
Andy Rapiejko, Suffolk County Health Department
Amy Juchatz, SCDH
John Donovan, Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Victor Keneiby, SCDPW
Susan Croce, Resource Management - PBC
Erin Duffy, Environmental Analyst - SCDHS
Kim Kennedy, Aide to Legislator Caracciolo
Margo Myles, Town of Huntington Planning
Nicole DeAngelo, PO Office

MINUTES TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

(THE MEETING WAS CONVENED AT 9:41 AM)

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

We'll start again. Good morning. I'm going to call the CEQ meeting to order and ask that the members review the minutes February 18, 2004, March 17, 2004 and April 13, 2004 meeting. We'll take them one at a time. Does anybody have any comments on the February minutes?

MR. SWANSON:

Motion to accept February minutes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion. Do I have a second?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried. I'll entertain a motion on corrections on the March 17, minutes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I don't see any problems with that. And I'll make --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Is that a motion, Mr. Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yes, that is a motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion to by Mr. Kaufman. Do I have a second?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Second by Nancy Manfredonia. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried.

MR. SWANSON:

Abstention.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

One abstention. Larry Swanson. I'll either entertain corrections or a motion on the April 13th minutes. Do I have a --

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll make a motion that we accept the minutes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion by Kaufman. Do I have a second?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

All those no favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Nancy Manfredonia carried it.

The next item is correspondence. The only piece of correspondence that I have is from Nick Gibbons regarding a project that we're going to be reviewing, so I'm going to hold it until we get to the project.

Next is project review recommended Type II Actions. Ratification of staff recommendations for Legislative resolutions laid to the table April 20th and May 11th. Jim, is there anything you'd like to call to Council's attention?

MR. BAGG:

Yeah, there are a number of things in here that I'd like to call to your attention. One is Introductory Resolution number 1388 of 2004. This is to establish community and youth services program at Sheep Pasture Road in Port Jefferson, Setauket, New York. This involves the entire site. You've you reviewed this twice before.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I remember.

MR. BAGG:

All right. And basically now I guess they want to license the entire 36.8. And they're going to modify the plan as previously presented. So, I said it needs an EAF because it's a modified project. And it's also a Type I action because it involves more than 2.5 acres of parkland.

The next one is appropriating funds for the demolition the old Cooperative Extension building and parking facilities.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

What number, Jim?

MR. BAGG:

1510. This is appropriating funds for the demolition of the old Cooperation extension building and parking facilities in the Town of Riverhead. As you know, CEQ said this is a historic structure. It's a Type I action requiring an EIS. You cannot fund a project until SEQRA's complete. And SEQRA's not complete. So, I pointed that out in the packet.

The next one is 1554 2004. It's amending the Operating Budget to transfer funds from Suffolk County Water Protection Fund Reserve to the Suffolk County Department of Public Works for storm or remediation on the Carl's River at Phelps Lane. This is a storm water remediation project. This also needs SEQRA. It should not be funded until SEQRA's complete.

The next one I pointed out is also Water Quality Fundings for Timber Point. I checked the file. I called Nick up. I wasn't correct. We have received the EAF on our proposed golf course maintenance building. And the Council recommended a neg dec which was issued by the Legislature. So, I will change that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Which one was that, Jim? 15 what?

MR. BAGG:

That is 1553-04.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay.

MR. BAGG:

And the last one is 1382, transferring funds in connection with dredging a Moriches inlet for Smith's Point Beach replenishment to dredging of county waters. It's \$1.4 million dollars. But usually in dredging projects New York State DEC is the lead agency. But I just kind of wanted to point that out. That's a large figure in there.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Has this actually been initiated so that the DEC is the lead agency? Or it's just past practice?

MR. BAGG:

Just past practice. I have no idea what has been initiated with DEC. I mean, they made us do an EIS for \$500,000 --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I remember.

MR. BAGG:

-- on maintenance dredging projects that draft EIS is still in some process of review. And then when DEC was nominated lead agencies and we asked to have them, what is the SEQRA determination in all the dredging projects, they turned around and said they're all Type II Actions.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. Any questions for Jim?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah, I got one on 1552. What is this project?

MR. BAGG:

I didn't bring the packets over here, Michael because it's heavy.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

It's the open marsh water management again.

MR. BAGG:

Oh, those are for studies. They're using water quality money in order to fund studies that were not funded under the original funding for the EIS.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. No problem then. I'll make a motion that we accept staff recommendations.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

As staff has amended them.

MR. KAUFMAN:

As staff has amended.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

A Second? Nancy Manfredonia. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried.

Okay. Proposed upgrading of water utilities at Timber Point Country Club, Great River, Town of Islip. I have a letter. "Dear Ms. Elkowitz, Suffolk County Parks seeks to upgrade water service at Timber Point Country Club. A trenching machine will be used to bury the lines underground, no natural vegetation or trees will be disturbed as a result of this project. I believe this to be a Type II Action under SEQRA Title 6NYCRR Part 617.5 (c) 15 minor temporary uses of land having negligible or no permanent impact on the environment."

Hello, Nick.

MR. GIBBONS:

Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Does anybody have any questions for Nick? I'm just going the citations. Any questions?

MR. KAUFMAN:

No questions.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Actually, Jim, I'd like to modify this a little bit. I think it's more -- I don't know that it's only minor temporary uses of land. I think it's a Type II Action, but I'm not sure that it's just minor temporary uses of land because the action is upgrading the water utility. That's not a minor --

MR. BAGG:

Yes, it could be upgrading of public water, too.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So, I think we that should probably modify this to the citation to 617.5 (c) 2 and 15.

MR. BAGG:

Fine.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. If there are no questions or comments I'll entertain a motion for a Type II Action.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Motion by Mr. Kaufman. Do I have a second?

MR. SWANSON:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Second by Mr. Swanson. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried. Thank you. Next.

Proposed Grease/scavenger Waste Treatment Facility Feasibility Study, Suffolk County. I have correspondence from Ben Wright. "Resolution 413-2003 identified a project to prepare a study to determine the feasibility of entering into an agreement with the private sector to construct, operate and charge fees for operating a grease/scavenger waste processing facility on county owned land under a long-term lease agreement. We are in the process of initiating a request for the funding that was included in the adopted 2004 Capital Budget and Program for this feasibility study. Due to the nature of the project, we have concluded that it is a Type II Action under 617.5 (c) 18 and 21 due to the collection of information and basic data, preliminary planning, etcetera." This is only the planning and funding stage, right?

MR. DONOVAN:

That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. And they concede that they would have to come back for the rest of it. Does anybody have any questions? If not, I'll entertain a motion for Type II.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I make a motion.

MR. SWANSON:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion by Mr. Kaufman. I have a second by Mr. Swanson. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried. Thank you.

Next. Proposed improvements to Sewer District #12, Birchwood/Holbrook, Capital Program 8143, Town of Brookhaven. I have actually an EAF on this. Jim, what's the story with this? I have two memos, one dated May 3rd, the other dated May 11th. And it's listed under the Type II Action.

MR. BAGG:

Basically it was submitted. Ben did a memo, an EAF on it, but I'm not too sure if it is an unlisted action. So he's going for either way.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

He's going with both? Why don't you identify yourself and tell us a little bit about the project. And while you're doing that, I'll try to figure out what it is. How's that?

MR. DONOVAN:

Okay. John Donovan. I'm with Department of Public Works Sanitation. I have a chart. Let me put it up on the stand.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. As I tell everybody, most of here are over 40. You have to come much closer. You can come all the way up and I'll give you my microphone. Here you go.

MR. DONOVAN:

Okay. Basically this is to upgrade Birchwood/Holbrook treatment plant just to add a equalization tank and filter, which is here and the equalization tank is there. It's within the foot print of the existing treatment facilities, which are all over here. And these are the recharge beds. So, it's really not going to disturb anything that isn't already partly disturbed by the treatment process.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Is it less than 4,000 square feet in size?

MR. DONOVAN:

I believe so, yes. It's a 75,000 gallon tank; circular tank. And this -- this is -- I don't know the exact size, but I believe it is less than 4,000.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Are you sure it's less than 4,000?

MR. DONOVAN:

Let me see. Hold on.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

The EAF that you submitted says 1988 square feet.

MR. DONOVAN:

Yeah. It's 30 feet in diameter.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay.

MR. DONOVAN:

And this tank is much smaller than that so --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I think it's a Type II Action. Does anybody have any questions?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah, I just have one question. The filter that's coming in there, what type of filter is it? I'm just curious.

MR. DONOVAN:

That's just going to be a sand filter. Okay. Just to polish up effluent before it goes into the recharge beds.

MR. KAUFMAN:

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

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion for a Type II? Do I have a second?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a second by Ms. Manfredonia. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried. Thank you. It's not always going to be this easy, though.

We're up to proposed safety improvements on CR 50, Union Boulevard from the Vicinity of Gardiner Drive to the vicinity of Aberdeen Avenue, Capital Program 5497, Town of Islip. Good morning. You need to take a microphone and state your name for the record. By the way, I neglected to say this at the very beginning. If there's anyone from the public that wishes to speak on any of these matters, you're free to do so. Just raise your hand and I'll recognize you after the presentation is made. Good morning.

MR. KENEIBY:

Good morning. My name is Victor Keneiby. I'm with Suffolk County DPW. This project is simply, we're proposing to construct sidewalk on the south side of County Road 50 from Gardiner to Aberdeen in a residential area. There should be no impact on the environment.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You're not removing any trees?

MR. KENEIBY:

No trees to removed.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay.

MR. SWANSON:

Any room by bicycles?

MR. KENEIBY:

We are actually not widening the road. We are just working within the sidewalk section. We are not even replacing the curb or the roadway.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Victor, is this within the County's right-of-way?

MR. KENEIBY:

Yes, it is. We own approximately ten feet from the face of the curb to the property line and this sidewalk would be within the sidewalk section.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. So, there's no takings, then.

MR. KENEIBY:

No takings.

MR. MALLAMO:

This is connecting roadways that are there on either side; right?

MR. KENEIBY:

It is. Because we -- yeah, we have an existing sidewalk to the east and to the west. And the only area that was left is the 1200 linear feet in between the two.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Does anybody have any questions? I'll entertain a motion.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll make a motion that this an unlisted neg dec.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion for an unlisted neg dec. Do I have a second?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a second by Ms. Manfredonia. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried. Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Thanks, Victor.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Proposed Sewer District #18, Hauppauge Industrial, Capital Program 8126, Town of Smithtown.

MR. DONOVAN:

John Donovan speaking again for DPW. This is to upgrade the Sewer District #18 in Hauppauge, an industrial park. There are currently two treatment plants that are passed their useful life. We are proposing to combine them into one plant at one of the plant sites which is near the Sheraton off of Motor Parkway. The existing service area is for point 45 -- 450,000 gallons a day. We're looking to expand it to the entire park, which would be 1.65 million gallons per day. On the site, we do have to expand a treatment operation from what is currently there. We're looking to take some recharge beds from the Town of Smithtown to use for our recharge of our waste water. The town has given us some preliminary indication that that should not be a problem. We've had discussions with them, Town of Smithtown, that is. And we are also -- this is supported by the Hauppauge Industrial Association. We are looking to set up a meeting with them to discuss the project further and then go to the public information meeting.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Mr. Donovan, my recollection was that we had an extensive presentation before the Council at the last meeting.

MR. DONOVAN:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

And I believe that all the commission members -- the council members' questions were answered. The only reason that we tabled it was because it was a Type I action that required under the law a coordinated review. My understanding is that the coordination period has --

MR. BAGG:

-- has been over. The letters went out seeking a lead agency for Suffolk County. The coordination period is over. And we received a letter from Mr. Lynch, Superintendent of Highways that says he has no problems with us becoming the lead agency and has no problems with the project.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. So, I think that all the technical questions were answered last month. We had a very detailed back and forth as I recall.

MR. DONOVAN:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So, unless anybody any has questions that weren't answered before, all we were waiting was for the technical coordinated review period to expire.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll make a motion that this is a Type I negative dec.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion. Do I have a second?

MR. SWANSON:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Second by Mr. Swanson. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried. Thank you, Mr. Donovan.

Mr. Donovan, you and I had a conversation before the meeting about the proposed improvements to Sewer District 21, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Capital Program 8121 and Capital Program 8127 Town of Brookhaven. I have a problem because I have to recuse myself. Because I'm doing work for Stony Brook University Hospital. And obviously their sewage is treated by this. Mr. Swanson, who's the Vice Chair person also has a conflict. He's also employed by the university. The problem that we have is that you don't have a majority of voting members present if Mr. Swanson and I -- you don't even have a quorum if Mr. Swanson and I have to recuse ourselves. So, while we apologize, I'm going to have to ask for a motion to table this. And I hope that it doesn't present too much of a problem to DPW.

MR. DONOVAN:
No, it shouldn't be.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
Okay. I'm going to ask for a motion to table.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
I have a motion. Do I have a second.

MS. MANFREDONIA:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:
All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions. Carried. Okay, I apologize, Mr. Donovan.

Proposed Peconic River Restoration Program, Robert Cushman Murphy County Park, Towns of Brookhaven and Riverhead. I have one piece of correspondence as I explained at the beginning of the meeting, which is from the Parks Department. "Dear Ms. Elkowitz: Enclosed are 25 copies of Brookhaven National Lab's project Peconic River Restoration Program Off-Site Areas. Within the report you will find one section of BNL's plan to restore disturbed areas on County parkland after they complete the Peconic River cleanup. Bill Sickles and Nick Gibbons of my staff were successful in meetings with BNL and Suffolk Health Services in getting proper attention paid to the restoration of the various sites. We are forwarding this report to you for CEQ review. Please be advised the Parks Department will be both cooperative and demanding on this project. We want the cleanup to be successful and we must insist on the public's land being properly treated. Thank you for your consideration in this effort. Very truly yours, Ronald F. Foley, Chief Deputy Commissioner, County of Suffolk, Department of Parks."

I also just for the council's edification have gotten a couple of e-mails regarding this application from the Pine Barrens Commission. The Pine Barrens Commission is going to be discussing this matter at its meeting this afternoon. So, the Pine Barrens Commission just so that you're clear, because I responded by asking if the Pine Barrens Commission was going to have input if they wanted us to hold this project. I was clearly told no. However, I believe that their input is relevant. Notwithstanding that, it's a Type I action, which means it requires coordinated review. So, the Council and everybody here should understand that by state law we cannot make a SEQRA recommendation today because just like the Hauppauge industrial sewage treatment plant from last time, we had to go through the coordinated review. But I think that it would benefit everyone here if we heard the presentation as we had done did for DPW last time, raise the questions, got everything answered. And then at the next meeting I'm hopeful we'll have the Pine Barrens Commission's recommendations and our coordination period will be concluded. Hello, Mr. Gibbons. How are you?

MR. GIBBONS:

A few folks from BNL are here today. And I'd just invite a couple of them to come up.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Sure.

MR. DANIELS:

Good morning. My name is Tom Daniels. I'm a group leader for the surface remediation projects at BNL, Peconic River being the majority of that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Good morning.

MR. DANIELS:

We have a presentation. I believe Andy Rapiejko from the Suffolk County Department of Health Services was going to go first. He'll explain the reason for the cleanup. And then we'll go through very quickly how the cleanup is going to go. Some of the key mitigative actions that we're going to take. And then also we have results of the pilot study that we did in 2002 where we went into the river. We used the same techniques that we're going to use now. We remove the contaminated sediment and we restore the river.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

And just so that everyone understands, the reason that BNL is here given that it's a federal authority, the County doesn't have jurisdiction over be BNL's activities. However, they're asking to use County parkland for some of these activities. So that is where the County's jurisdiction lie.

MR. RAPIEJKO:

Okay. My name is Andrew Rapiejko. I'm with the Suffolk County Department of Health Services in Division of Environmental Quality. Mr. Bagg asked me to give a presentation on basically what this cleanup is about, the contamination and the health and the ecological risks that were identified and basically why and what this cleanup is all about.

Okay. Brookhaven Lab -- this is just for location purposes. It's located in the center of Suffolk County. It's about a -- over 5,000 acre site. Property boundaries are indicated in yellow.

The focus of the contamination is the -- and cleanup is the Peconic River, which gets its main flow from the sewage treatment plant which is located here. And you can see the river running off-site and runs into County parkland.

Brookhaven Lab is a federal superfund site. It's a very big complicated site. And it's up broken up into several different operable units. I think there's seven altogether. The cleanup that's going to talked about for the Peconic River is operable unit 5, which includes the sewage treatment plant and the river.

This is just a little bit of a close up. You see the headwaters of the Peconic River. Actually begin on the west side of the William Floyd Parkway flow off of North Drive and the real main flow starts with the flow of the sewage treatment plant. Flows intermittently off the property. And all this green I have indicated is Suffolk County parkland. And it flows out into the headwaters of Flanders Bay. The main areas of the talk -- this is just for reference purposes. I'll be talking about the river on the property, off the property up to Schultz Road. This is Schultz Road. And then the river crosses Manor Road, continues to flow through the County parkland. There's a sportsmans club located up here. And this is Connecticut Avenue.

Little bit of a background. 1989 Brookhaven was listed as a federal superfund site. Peconic River was contaminated through waste water discharges from their sewage treatment plant. This included chemical and radiological wastes. The main contaminants of concern are mercury, PCB's, copper, silver and radionuclide cesium 137. From approximately the mid-1990's to present a lot of studies and testing and sampling have been done over the years. We won't go through each of those. But a compilation of all those results and all those testings basically indicate that the area I've shaded yellow has been identified as having mercury concentrations above background. Higher levels are indicated closer to the sewage treatment plant. As you go down river, the levels drop lower. In November of 2003 sampling was conducted around Manor Road and in the area of Connecticut Avenue. Because of the early winter, they weren't able to get samples in these purple areas. So, actually samples were collected last week or two weeks ago. And so these results should be back soon to see what those levels are. The mercury levels in the sediment near Connecticut Avenue have shown that it's approaching background level. So, you have above background. You have a data gap. We have approaching background a data gap and approaching background. Just to give you an idea of the levels, I said that the levels drop as you go down stream. I have a chart that indicates the average mercury concentration in sediments as you go down stream for each of the different stretches. You'll see up on site, the average is about 4.88 parts per million. And it drops down to by Connecticut Avenue to approximately point two nine parts per million. So, you do see a trend, a decrease as you go down.

Brookhaven Lab is part of the superfund process. We did several risk assessments. The first -- it was both an ecological and a human health risk assessment that was done. The ecological risk assessment showed that they did food chain models. And they showed that the food chain models determined risks to exist to targeted species which were the mink and the belted kingfisher. So, it was just a model that they did with these levels of mercury. And its a model that you use and you see if there is a risk. So, they identify that there would be risks to mink and belted kingfishers.

Also they did analysis of the benthic invertebrate Community. And they found that those communities might be affected by the elevated levels of copper, mercury and silver. Also, as part of the superfund process did a human risk assessment. This assessment found that human health risk may exist now and in the future for a reasonably, maximally exposed individual if no action were to be taken. And these -- all these risks were due to the consumption of contaminated fish. There was no risks of -- elevated risk for any thermal or any of that. All that was looked at. And basically it came down to the consumption of contaminated

fish. If you eat the fish, you would have an elevated risk. The fish -- fish levels -- one of the fish levels that were found. These are mercury levels in fish that were analyzed on Brookhaven property. It's in parts per million. And these were for several years. This is 1996, 1997, 1999, 2000. What I did was I averaged the fish levels in fish tissue for each of those years. And it goes from point five eight, point four eight, 2.14, 2.22. A lot of discussion between FDA and EPA and fish levels and what's safe and what's not. It's been in the papers. It's a hot topic. So, what I did on this chart was I put several standards or things that are looked at. This dotted line is the FDA number for its commercial limit for fish, which is one part per million. And that's basically used for commercial store, where you can sell fish. It's not really a fish level that's used for risk or anything like that. It's just a level of fish that for you to sell. EPA has some guidance that they have and they based it on the level of mercury in the fish and how many fish meals you should eat per month. That's what these banded colors are. This pink banded would be -- would want to limit your fish consumption to one meal per month. This brown is half a meal per month range. And this red would be -- EPA recommends no consumption of fish. So, you do see 1999 and 2000 the fish collected on Brookhaven property were in the range of EPA recommending no consumption.

They also collected fish in 2000 -- 2001 rather in the property -- in the County parkland just adjacent to the BNL property from three areas. It would be North Road, the ice pond and Schultz Road. This is the BNL property. This just off property as the river flows up. And the results of those indicated, again, it's in the EPA limit of one meal per month range. The fish levels are high. The average was point six eight at Schultz Road, which was the furthest down stream of those three areas. Okay. So, basically BNL and EPA and DEC and the Health Department all see that there's a contamination in the sediments of mercury levels elevated, contamination in the fish. And a lot of discussion goes on about now what do we do about it, how do we come up with a cleanup. The problem with mercury is -- there's mercury in the sediments. There's a biological process that occurs because the mercury in the sediments may be there, but that's not the form of mercury that bioaccumulates in fish. There's a biological process that occurs that converts that mercury into sediments to methylmercury. Methylmercury is the form of mercury that bioaccumulates in the fish. And then the oil life, like the mink or the belted kingfish eat the fish and they get contaminated and moves up the food chain. Then also you have the humans who can eat the fish. So, the problem here or the problem in deciding how to do the cleanup is you have mercury in sediments. But that's not the form of mercury that's the problem. You can have mercury in sediments. It's not being converted to methylmercury. It's not going to be a problem. It won't bioaccumulate in fish. It's not even as toxic. The real toxic form is the methylmercury. And that's really the problem.

The problem with this is that it is a biological process and it's not very well understood and it's very complicated, how that biological occurs, the chemistry, the different times of year and the temperature all affect that biological process. So, as a result Brookhaven Lab in 2003 did a methylmercury study of the river. They sampled the water for methylmercury to try to identify areas in the river that are -- they can be targeted as methylmercury production areas. The areas that have mercury in the sediment, that are really producing methylmercury that would show that this area is a real problem. They sampled in 2003 up until Schultz Road, I think in November they went a little further down but we'll get to that. These the sampling locations.

And basically these are the results here. Zero here would be the sewage treatment plant. I indicated here green would be once you're in the County parkland; yellow is the samples indicated on Brookhaven property. And as you're moving down, this is four miles, this is three miles in the sewage treatment plant. They did a round of sampling in April, a round in June and a round in August. And basically it shows that the methylmercury levels were very relatively low in April, which we might expect because the weather is cool and biological process needs it and the temperatures do really get going. In June it started to jump up. You had one spot on their property that really started to jump up. And in August it was a bit of a surprise. You see the areas in the County parkland which had relatively lower mercury concentration in the sediment. Showed that there were very good methylmercury producing areas, producing a lot of methylmercury relative to the places on-site.

This, again, is another calculation that was done. They measured methylmercury. They also measured stream flow and they calculated the flux which would take out the dilution effect. As you move down stream you're getting more and more water in-flow. And it can dilute it. So, this was -- this study was done to try to see -- really hone in on what areas are producing methylmercury. And as you see in August, it shows that the areas just off the BNL property in the County parkland were the high methylmercury producing areas as it was compared to on the property.

And this is -- I just put this one back because I just wanted to point out that this area here, the average of 1.21 is the area that had that highest methylmercury producing area. And as you see, the average mercury in the sediments was much higher on the property, 4.88. But the methylmercury there was much lower compared to the levels in the County parkland in this area. This is the same result; April, June, August and BNL went back in November and did sampling further down because mercury was discovered further down the river near Manor Road. So they extended their methylmercury sampling see if how the methylmercury production was down further in the river. This sampling was conducted in November and pretty much it's hard to make any conclusions of this. Yellow is Brookhaven property, green is up at Schultz Road. And this would be down to Manor Road. And there really wasn't much activity going on in November to make any conclusion about that. Brookhaven has gone back in -- and I think they've already done two rounds of methylmercury this year. We'll assess those results.

Okay. Now, BNL has proposed a cleanup plan and simply put, the proposed alternatives states they will remove the sediment layer approximately six to twelve inches down to sand from depositional areas identified as preferential methylmercury sources. That is their proposed alternative. Now, I'll break that down and actually tell you what that means in English. It's broken down into -- I'll break it down into what that means for the on-site portion, which is the area that's on federal property, the off-site portion, which is broken up to the boundary of the property to Schultz Road. And then also from Schultz Road down to Connecticut avenue. I'll break that up into each of those and tell you what this means, how this applies to each of those areas. Okay. The on-site portion, what they will do is remove sediment in the depositional areas. And sediment will be removed at -- the goal is for mercury concentrations in areas that they have designated for remediation. Any single sample in a designated cleanup area won't exceed two parts per million of mercury in the sediment. And after they're done, the whole average for all the sampling on-site, and all the mercury concentrations on the property, the average will be less than one part per million. So, they'll -- go to the next one. They've designated in the red the areas as depositional areas that they will clean up. So, they'll clean up and as they clean up, they'll take a sampling. Those samples in those red areas can exceed two parts per million. They'll also sample in areas that they're not cleaning up. And in the end, the whole area on-site they'll average it all. And it has to be less than one part per million.

Off-site the first section would be from the property boundary up to Schultz Road. Here sediments will be removed from depositional areas and from areas identified as preferential methylmercury sources.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Does that include on property that's within county parks?

MR. RAPIEJKO:

This is all -- all within county park.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That's all within County parks?

MR. RAPIEJKO:

All the off-site --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Is within County Park, okay.

MR. RAPIEJKO:

So from the boundary to Schultz Road, they're going to do the depositional areas, areas that I identified as depositional areas; but they've also added in -- they're going to look at areas that were preferential methylmercury sources to make sure we get those area that are really producing what the problem is.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay.

MR. RAPIEJKO:

And, again, the goal here would be that any sample in a remediated area, any single sample wouldn't exceed two parts per million. And the average for this stretch from their boundary up to Schultz Road would have to be less than point 75 parts per million --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

How did you determine two parts per million being the cleanup standard or the cleanup value that you would be achieving?

MR. RAPIEJKO:

The who parts per million is actually a federal number for the protection of ground water.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

EPA federal number?

MR. RAPIEJKO:

EPA. I mean, it's actually used by the Health Department.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

It's a RSCO number? A Recommended Soil Cleanup Objective number? Is that what it is?

MR. RAPIEJKO:

I believe so, yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay.

MR. RAPIEJKO:

And the average would be less than point 75 for this part of the river. So, now, they've expanded it, we have the on-site part, which I talked about before. And now the off-site part, which goes from the boundary up to Schultz Road. All these areas in red here would be the areas that are remediated. The depositional areas really are just off the property and up around by the ice pond. These areas were added because these were the areas that were identified as the methylmercury. They really high methylmercury producing areas. So, that's why those areas are included.

The overall concentrations of mercury are lower here than they are on-site. But like I showed you with the methylmercury, these are the real problem areas that were shown through that methylmercury sampling.

Now, the last piece would be off-site from Schultz Road all the way down to Connecticut Avenue. Sediments would be removed in the indicated depositional areas. And the goal here again would be that no single sample in the remediated area would exceed two parts per million. And this action would reduce the concentrations -- the average concentrations of mercury even further below point 75 parts per million. And that means if they averaged all the samples from Schultz Road all the way down to Connecticut Avenue, you take an average of that, it's already below point 75. It's just there's -- there's certain areas identified that had elevated levels of

mercury like as high as seven parts per million up by Manor Road. So, they're targeting those areas right off the bat. I'll show you what that -- I forgot about this. This actually is a big part of the Health Department's position and a big part of the cleanup; that BNL would institute a monitoring program. As I discussed, they're going to be doing monitoring this spring because they've already started. They've collected fish samples down river by Manor Road. They've also collected those additional sediments samples where we had that data gap and they were doing methylmercury sample. If when all those results come back that there's an area identified further down stream that shows a methylmercury problem or a problem, you know, elevated levels, this -- BNL has agreed to expand that area to include that. Almost like it was done on the property where you really saw those -- those ones jumping out. If we see something down stream like that, they've agreed to include that and evaluate that in their decision. And like I said also fish analyses will be done. Brookhaven Lab will also as part of the cleanup be doing a long term monitoring program which will include fish monitoring, methylmercury monitoring, sediment monitoring to see the effectiveness of their cleanup and make sure that it's doing what the intent which -- what the intent was, which is to bring the levels of fish down, which then would knock out that eco and human health risk.

These were samples collected. This is Schultz Road. And we're going over -- this is Connecticut Avenue, Donohue's Pond. These were the samples that were collected in November that I had mentioned. The red dots, I don't know if you can see it, but they were between two and seven parts per million. These were actually all trans-sects. They weren't single samples done across. And I just colored the dot for the highest level in that trans-sect. So, as you see, there are some red dots, which indicated elevated levels down -- we're talking -- this is probably five miles from the sewage treatment plant. Again, all the green if you can see the green, that's still all county parkland. So, down in this area, the proposal is these shaded yellow areas, this is Manor Road here. These areas would be targeted for cleanup. Again, like I said, if the methylmercury sampling comes back or sediment samples back, it shows there's some other area that has lower sediment mercury concentrations but is high in methylmercury producing areas, those areas would be targeted also.

And basically this just shows here the areas targeted for the cleanup and they've collected these samples. We're awaiting the results of this. And as you can see in here, the levels really do drop off of mercury in the sediment back to background concentrations. BNL is releasing their proposed remedial action plan. I think it's May 24th. There will be a 30-day public comments period. They'll begin -- they would like to begin the off-site work this fall. The Health Department was asked by the Suffolk County Legislature in 1999 to do an independent health and environmental assessment. And actually that's going to be coming out in the next several weeks.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I assume that the data that you've collected thus far comports with the data that the federal government has provided?

MR. RAPIEJKO:

The only real data available was the BNL data.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So, we didn't collect independent data. You just assessed it.

MR. RAPIEJKO:

There was no independent data collected.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay.

MR. RAPIEJKO:

And we expect to release in May. Also, the Legislature asked for an expert panel review. This goes back to a proposal that BNL -- proposed remedial action back in 2000. There was a big uproar. People were upset. So the Legislature passed the resolution and said the County Health Department's to put together an expert panel to look at the proposal, which we have a panel but we haven't gotten the proposal yet. It will be coming out May 24th so we'll be putting together a report for the Legislature on that. And that's it. Any questions?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have several actually. This is being done under federal superfund program, federal superfund order. So, it's been approved. You're going through the federal program and it will be an approved remediation plan by the federal government?

MR. DANIELS:

That's right. We submitted a proposed remedial action to the EPA and the New York State DEC. They've allowed us to go and release that now for the public comment period. As Andy said, that's on May 24th. It's a 30-day period. It'll conclude in June. Once we get the public comments, we will address the comments. We'll do a -- we'll respond to all the comments and then that will all be incorporated in the final record or decision. We did have a public comment period back in the fall for the action memorandum for the on-site cleanup. We did extensive outreach during that time. And we were able to get a lot of the community values incorporated in the plan. So, what we're doing now for the whole cleanup on-site and off-site reflects that public comment period already.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. And you've had technical comments from the federal government thus far?

MR. DANIELS:

That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

The extent of disturbance on County lands, I see in the environmental assessment form is 9.2 acres. That includes the areas of sediment removal, the areas of the access pads, the areas of sampling. That includes all of the areas?

MR. DANIELS:

That -- that is the area in the river. That is the sediment removal. The access paths will be

minimal. What we're going to do in the access paths is essentially lay down these composite mats that we can just drive on. We'll do minimal clearing. We'll try and find our way through the woods without having to take down trees. Just hopefully trimming. So, it will be minimal disturbance, the upland areas.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

And we'll be doing that under the jurisdiction or with the corporation of the Parks Department; correct?

MR. DANIELS:

That's correct.

MR. GIBBONS:

Those areas, I'm not sure -- I'm not sure whether or not you would count the access roads. Clearly's there's going to be disturbance. The property isn't going to be cleared, though for those access roads. They're temporary, but they may as a point of information might want them included in the total number.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You actually should included them. Because if you were here just for temporary access pads, that would be a Type II action. But once you have something that no longer makes it a Type II action, it's all part of the project.

MR. GIBBONS:

Right.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So just for completion of the EAF, I would suggest that you modify that.

MR. GIBBONS:

And they have those numbers.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I did say that we have to do coordinated review because it's a Type I action. And I quickly looked at the EAF. It appears to me just based on my own experience that these -- the Peconic River would meet the definition of waters of the United States. So, I believe that the Corp of Engineers would be in involved agency.

MR. DANIELS:

Actually the wetland's permit that we provided you, it's a -- it's a dual permit -- between New York State DEC and the Corp of Engineers.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Right.

MR. DANIELS:

-- between New York State DEC and the Corp of Engineers.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Right. But just for staff purposes, it has to be coordinated with the Corp of Engineers. Okay?

MR. DANIELS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Larry, do you have a question?

MR. SWANSON:

Yes. What's been done to remove the mercury in the effluent, from the sewage treatment plant?

MR. DANIELS:

The sewage treatment plant was -- cleanup on that was completed last year. There is a close-out report. So, there is not a continuing source at the time.

MR. SWANSON:

Okay. And how do you -- how are you going to remove the sediments so that you don't just stir it up and get it back into water column?

MR. DANIELS:

I'll show you a very quick presentation. I'll just -- Andy covered a lot of this stuff. So, I'll just flip through -- actually I'll go to the mitigative actions and then I'll show you pictures during the pilot study of how we did it. Okay?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Why don't you, then, show your presentation. And if we have additional questions, we'll be happy to ask them.

MR. DANIELS:

Sure. I could skip right through here. Andy covered the purpose of the cleanups. You guys are well versed in that now.

MR. SWANSON: Experts.

MR. DANIELS:

That's right. Okay. Scope of cleanup. You saw these maps. The key thing I want to point out here is when we do the off-site cleanup in the County parkland up to Schultz Road, we will not be using the public roads. We'll be able to access all these areas off of what we call Seapath here, which is on lab property. So, the access pads will actually come in off of lab property in here. This way there will be no traffic. The trucks and stuff out on Schultz Road. So, everything will be contained from the inside. Obviously when we get down to the Manor Road area, we will have to go on the public roads. But we only have two access points to these areas off of the public road. We'll come off Manor Road here in this area; and then we'll come off of River Road here. And then our path will go in and then spread down along the river.

Real quick description of the work. This relates to your question about how we're going to prevent the sediment from moving down. What we do is we de-water the remediation area. We put a dam up stream and down stream. We'll de-water the area. So, essentially the area is dry. And we use conventional excavation equipment. As we've said, there will be minimal clearing for where we have to lay the mats down. We expect the mats to be in an area only for maybe two to three weeks. They'll go in, they'll clean up the area. Then they'll remove the mats and go to the next area. We'll send construction equipment to remove the sediment, will load the sediment on and off our dump trucks that have -- essentially it's a contained unit. There will be no leaking of sediment as we drive back to the lab property. Once it's there, we have to dry the sediment. It will be loaded into rail cars and shipped off Long Island via rail.

There'll be a big verification sampling program going on. What we will do is as we clean, we'll be taking our samples to make sure that we're hitting our remediation goals. And we'll also be doing some sampling of the water down stream of the work areas to make sure that we are not sending anything further down stream while the work is going on. When we're done, we plan on backfilling with topsoil. We met with the County Parks and they had some concerns about the amount of backfill that we bring in. They want us to limit the amount of top soil. So, we're working with them to -- to come to an agreement on exactly how much topsoil they want us to bring into a county park.

Restoration will follow. I'll show you slides of the pilot study. I'll show you how that'll go. And then, as Andy said, there will be monitoring going on. And during the construction period, we will continue fish, water and sediment sampling this summer. And then there will be a long-term monitoring program to make sure that the laboratory is not a continuing source of mercury in the Peconic; that the clean up was successful; and that the levels of mercury in the fish are dropping.

In the EAF we supplied you guys, we gave you a whole long list of mitigative actions for all the different categories. Just some of the key ones that we want to point out were the dams that will isolate the work areas. Flow defusers. As we pump the water around our work area, it's going to have to come back into the river somewhere. And we will have flow defusers to make sure that we're not sending high levels of turbidity down the suspended solids that might carry some of the mercury with it. We'll be collecting water streams downstairs to verifying that that's working. And then an extensive confirmatory sampling afterwards to make sure we hit our goals.

As I said, we've successfully completed a pilot study back in 2002 using the same techniques as we're going to use now. As you all know, we have an extensive community outreach program at the laboratory. There will be two public information sessions coming up during the 30-day public comment period. And then a formal public meeting at BNL to present the proposed plan. We believe actually, you know, since the pilot study was a success, we have proven that we can go in and it won't be a long-term ecological effect on the river. And by going in and removing the pollutants, it'll be actually a positive effect. And we covered the post remediation sample. Okay.

One of the areas that we have, we broke them up into A, B, C D. The pilot study was done in section area D back in 2002. It was about a half acre. When they did this, they were lucky enough that the river in this area was already dry so they didn't have to do much pumping

around. But as you can see, they're just going with conventional construction equipment. They scrape the whole sediment layer. There actually is an interface between the sediment and the sand layer. You can go down and remove the sediment without disturbing the underlying sand; load it into dump trucks and transport to a drying area. We have an active wildlife. We call it a rescue program going up. We are doing the on-site cleanup right now. We have the BNL. I forget Jim Green's former title -- he's got a staff who's out in the river with us. As you know, there are banded sun fish to protect the New York State species in this area. Before we started the bypass on the on-site stuff, we collected over 100 of these. We relocate them to a holding pond. When we're done, there'll be brought back. As we're de-watering an area, we have staff on site. We're collecting whatever fish we come in contact with. Fish, snakes, turtles, whatever. We're clearing everything out. Before we're done, we bring the top soil back and plant things. We go ahead and we restore the contour of the river the way it was. They go in and then they plant the grass seed. They put matting down to protect it while it came in. A couple days later they went in and actually started putting plantings in. Through the cleanup we're doing now, we have a consultant, a group, who has been out in the field right now actually taking out the plants that are in the river before we go and clean up. They've removed about 4,000 transplants. They've taken out. They wash the sediment off the roots and put them in a nursery. When we're done cleaning up they're going to use those as native stock to start the restoration. And then we will also bring in more native plants.

This is what it looked like as soon as they finished completing the plantings. A couple of weeks later the water started flowing again. The plants were growing. This was several any months later. It's coming back very well. This was a year after. And then this is what it looked likes now. If you go down to this location in the river, you look up stream to the area we have to clean, and then you look down the river to the area that was already cleaned and was restored, you can't tell the difference. So, we're very confident in our ability to be able to remove the contamination and restore the river. That's all I have. Any questions?

MR. SWANSON:

Could you just tell us how deep was this mercury contamination in the sediments and how much soils sort of on average you're going to have to remove and the various locations?

MR. DANIELS:

Luckily most of the mercury's in the top several inches of the sediment. To ensure that we're getting it out, we are taking the whole sediment layer in the areas that we have to clean up. It's only way really to make a nice clean cut. Total amount of sediment that we have to remove is about 24,000 yards. And it's on about an average of about nine inches in depth. So, that will be how much we're taking out.

MR. SWANSON:

And that represents sort of how long in the chronology of mercury -- what's the sedimentation rate, I guess, that -- during the time in which mercury was being released?

MR. DANIELS:

This was -- past practices from earlier in the laboratory, figure as long as the laboratory's been here, it was being released. The laboratory has gone, not -- as part of the sewage treatment cleanup, it wasn't just go clean up the sewage treatment plant. It was go, look, how we can reduce the mercury throughout the laboratory. It was cleaning out the drain pipes, replacing thermostats, you know, all those things that contributed to mercury getting into the system have been changed.

MR. SWANSON:

Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Are you sure that the contamination is only in the first six to twelve inches of the sediment table, if you will?

MR. DANIELS:

Yeah, we've done several studies where -- we've actually gone down to two feet in areas where we did like a zero to two-inch sample; a two to six and then below six inches. And the majority there is zero to two inches.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Go ahead. Finish up.

MR. DANIELS:

It really clings to the fines in the sediment, the mercury. It really does not get in the sand layer. It really clings to the very fine sediments.

MR. KAUFMAN:

So, do you have any intentions of doing any kind of sampling along the river banks aside from what has already been performed as you're doing the work to see if there has been contamination? Because I know for a fact that sediment doesn't necessarily lay down in exactly equal layers.

MR. DANIELS:

That's right. What we will be doing, as we said, we'll be sampling as we're doing the cleanup. EPA has requested us not only sample the areas we're cleaning up, but also the areas we're not cleaning up. So, it's not just the river channel. A good portion of the cleanup is in the low marsh area. There are some sections where we actually don't even have to clean the river channel. We just have to clean the bank area. So, we sampled from high marsh to high marsh. So, we go all the way up to the high marsh, took samples; low marsh, channel and the same thing as --

MR. KAUFMAN:

So, in other words, you're accounting for high water situations and low water situations and floodings and things like that?

MR. DANIELS:

That's right. And actually, like I said, in some of the off-site locations, that's where the

contamination is. It's actually not in the river. It was from those floodings that did get up in the marsh land.

MR. KAUFMAN:

What would it take to remove all the mercury in the area? It seems like you're focussing upon the benthic organisms converting. The mercury into methylmercury. What would it -- it seems to me if you're going to be leaving mercury behind and we reseeded these areas, that there's a potential for reintroduction of methylmercury contamination into the area.

MR. DANIELS:

We're removing 92% of the mass of mercury in there. We believe, you know, in a circle process, we have to look at all the different criteria. It's just not a -- it's just not the levels of contamination. It's realistically a good portion of our interest in the community. They wanted us to take out the majority of the mercury with doing as little impact on the river as possible. So, you know, we try to encompass all those values. We looked at how can we best get into the river and take out the majority with leaving some areas undisturbed where really the levels of mercury don't warrant a cleanup and they don't appear to be contributing to the methylmercury in the water.

MR. KAUFMAN:

One other question on the restoration. I know they did a -- in Europe they've done a lot of this kind of work; for example, on the _Reindu_ Canal that they were building, I think it was finished a couple of years ago, there was extensive ripping out of the old rivers and putting in the new canals. And then having what they call -- I don't want to call them diversion canals or anything, but basically arms coming off of there so that there would be some remnants of the wildlife populations, the benthic populations, etcetera in the area. They've been successful in Europe in doing that. Is that the kind of model that you're following now?

MR. DANIELS:

I mean, the model -- like I said, we are leaving some areas undisturbed. And actually in the pilot study, one of the key points that we like in trying to leave some of these areas undisturbed, is they went in and they cleaned it out. They restored it. They brought in plants; but there was some natural transplant of things coming down, seed being released from up in areas that weren't clean. And the river actually restored itself. So, I mean it is a key component; that we do leave some areas untouched.

MR. KAUFMAN:

No, I'm talking about the disturbed areas that you're going to be basically dredging out for all intents and purposes. The restoration effort that you're going to be undertaking, is that based upon -- where's that restoration effort standard and criteria coming from?

MR. DANIELS:

I would refer that question to our consultant, Ed Samanns from the Louis Birch Group.

MR. SAMANNS:

The restoration effort is geared to trying to mimic what's out there already. So, we've gone out towards the site, looked at the trans-sects to the wetland areas, looked at the plant communities, and combined that with the proposed restoration efforts. And we came up with a planting plan to basically mimic what's out there already. We understand there's going to be some deeper water areas created with the dredging actions. And those areas will probably go to different plant community, aquatic bed plant community that's going to be beneficial to the existing fish populations out there. So, that's the basic approach we've taken. It's not exactly similar to what they're doing out in Europe on the Rein. That's a much larger project. This is a much smaller scale project in comparison. We're gearing it towards what exists in the system right now.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. Have these types of projects been done in the United States at all?

MR. SAMANNS:

Sure. Yes, they have. We've done, you know, Louis Berger itself, we've done over 5,000 linear food of stream restorations type projects in the US. So, we use those skills that we've developed and applied them to this particular project.

MR. KAUFMAN:

You're saying 5,000. That's about a mile.

MR. SAMANNS:

Yes.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I wonder if you could -- I'm concerned about the fish sampling. Could you explain that? And also tell me if -- I don't know what the Health Department or the Lab has done in terms of the hundreds of people who do fish especially down near Riverhead down stream. What has been done to warn them of the dangers or what's going to be done in the future? Because I'm sure everyone knows there's a lot of fishing that goes on down stream especially -- I don't know about the area where that sportsmans club is, but let's talk about human health and the fish.

MR. DANIELS:

Sure. The levels of mercury in the fish in the Peconic River fall in the same category as all the other fresh water rivers in New York State. New York State DEC posts a fish advisory. They advise the public no more than one fish per week. And the levels in the Peconic River are the same as those other areas. So, no additional advisories are necessary for the Peconic River.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Are you saying that there's no difference in the fish in the Peconic River than in the Connetquot River or some other river in New York State?

MR. DANIELS:

Up near on the Lab property where there not fishing allowed, the levels there are higher. It's where it gets off into the Suffolk County parkland down, the other fishing areas, the levels are a little higher than what is in the Connetquot River. But it's still below the level that the New York State DEC is not required to post any additional advisories.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

All right. But fish do move, I guess. And I'm still very concerned about human health and there's a difference between the person that goes out as a sportsman, but a lot of the population down by Riverhead especially the minority population eats a lot of fish. And they fish for food.

MR. RAPIEJKO:

I just want to mention a couple of things. One is when we did -- Brookhaven did that sampling of the river in 2001 where I showed you the results, that chart, we sent -- the Suffolk County Health Department sent the state -- New York State Health Department those fish results. New York State Health Department has the jurisdiction to post advisories or any stricter advisories than the one that's already posted on all the fresh water fish. And they responded that they look at those results and they felt that there was no -- it did not warrant a stricter advisory like they do put on some waters in the state; that the standard advisory would cover that. And the caveat was also that this will be cleaned up. You know, is going to be a clean up. It is a superfund program, so. So, there is no stricter advisory on that. As I mentioned in my presentation, a big component or a concern for the Health Department was the continued monitoring of fish for a long period of time to make sure that these levels do go down. And so hopefully that will give us some sense that we will see these levels decline in those fish concentrations will come down in the future and will be a successful project.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I agree. The project looks like it's very obviously needed and warranted. But I respectfully disagree. I think that -- whoever is making the decisions, the people in Riverhead should have a little bit more warning what they're eating now.

My second issue that I to bring up, I unfortunately don't see anything mentioned here, perhaps Nick can tell me, I'm the President of the Long Island Green Belt Trail Conference. And the Pine Barrens trail which runs from Rocky Point to the Shinnecock Canal and is part of the larger promenade path actually goes directly where your project is. It crosses at Manor Road. And I just wanted to make sure that access is assured for the trail.

MR. DANIELS:

Yes, we're aware of that. We're going to be speaking with the Pine Barrens Commission later on this afternoon. And that was brought to our attention. We will maintain that access.

MS. MANFREDONIA: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ: Jack.

MR. FINKENBERG:

I noticed there's a no action alternative. And I was wondering if the contaminants would dissipate if there was no action taken.

MR. DANIELS:

The problem with mercury, it's not like the radionuclide. It doesn't have a half life. Yes, eventually there is transport of the mercury in the river. It would, you know, I don't know how many years it would take, but it would wind up down in Flanders Bay. The concern is with us is that since we know where the majority of the mercury is now. But we'd like to get it because it might reach an area where it even becomes more of a producer of methylmercury and become a larger hazard.

MR. FINKENBERG:

How much is the project costing you?

MR. DANIELS:

Approximately \$11 million.

MR. FINKENBERG:

One more question. I fish on the river and I catch pickerel. I didn't notice that fish was mentioned. Do any of the contaminants bioaccumulate?

MR. DANIELS:

They do bioaccumulate in the pickerel. Actually --

MR. FINKENBERG:

That explains everything.

MR. DANIELS:

Pickerels are probably the fish we collect the most and do our analysis on.

MR. KAUFMAN:

You're toast, Jack.

MR. DANIELS:

No more than one a week.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Mike, you had another question?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah. This is directed towards Nick. Regarding this restoration, who's going to be monitoring the program Suffolk County parks? And what guidelines are there for what we want to have

done with the restoration? And, finally, third is, is BNL following what we want done?

MR. GIBBONS:

The answers to the first and third questions are the same. It will be myself representing the Parks Department out in the field. The second question in terms of standards, I'll just comment that between myself and Bill Sickles, we've attended several meetings with the Lab. We've addressed concerns time and again with them. And what you're seeing today is the evolution of three or four revisions of this -- what they've referenced as the DEC equivalency permit, which is the real crux of the EAF, what you have before you today. There's no pretty way to do this. And I'm never going to be 100% satisfied, but they're really -- they've gone out of their way to address the concerns that the Parks Department has brought up. And we really have no alternative here; but you need to get access. And the only way to do that is to make a little bit of a mess. And the best thing you can hope for is to clean it up the right way.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I understand that the County has to go that way. I understand this cleanup is necessary, etcetera. I also obviously have to have a concern about the park itself and its post restoration, if you will, condition. Do you think that --

MR. GIBBONS:

That's really my only concern, Mike.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Do you think that we've got a chance of the park coming back most of the way to what it was pre-construction? Just in terms of its overall ecological value?

MR. GIBBONS:

Yes, I do; except for the fact that, as you know, when we open these access points, they automatically become social trails and everything that goes with that authorized or unauthorized uses. And I share Nancy's concerns with the promenade path over by Manor Road. There's just no easy way around that. The best alternative which is that section from North Street up to Schultz Road, that is access off of the existing BNL roads, essentially private property, even that is issue, though, because they -- BNL has their own issues with ATV's. And now they're going to have at least temporary access to the parkland. So, what the lab is doing there is, they're not going to go and do the entire remediation and then come back and do the entire restoration. They're going to do each step of the way. They're going to, you know, step off of certain section, restore that as quickly as possible and move on. As far as restoring it to the way was, I been a proponent for doing as little as we can get away with because I have a lot more faith in the ability of the property to restore itself and the river than I do, with all do respect, to Louis Berger and the many engineers working on this than I have in that engineering community to replicate what's already out there. So, what I've asked for and what they provided for in the document here is minimal plantings and certainly minimal augmentation by top soil because I have a lot of issues that go along with that. And to buy as much time as we can by blocking up those access points, you know, making those as camouflage as possible. And giving the river and the upland areas time to do what it can do.

MR. MALLAMO:

I have one question. And I think that's the big concern that I have with these access points even on an overnight basis while you're in construction, having worked in the Parks Department, I know we'll be working on a job, come in in the morning, people go in there, they dump at night. You don't know what they're dumping. It can be liquid, cesspools, chemicals, whatever. So, I hope you have a plan in place even on a temporary basis to block these off.

MR. GIBBONS:

This will be -- Lance, I can tell you, and you know from experience, this will be the most carefully monitored piece of parkland for the duration of the project. We don't have the park police to follow up and --

MR. MALLAMO:

It said here you have 24-hour security. Now, are these people going to be at these access points? Is that what --

MR. GIBBONS:

That's from Manor Road.

MR. DANIELS:

That's correct. The Manor Road area really -- we're well off the laboratory property. And there will be equipment and storing some stuff there overnight. We will be providing 24-hour security. And as Nick said, it's not just to protect the equipment itself. We'll have the security right at the access points to make sure no one's going in there and dumping stuff.

MR. MALLAMO:

I think that's really critical. And you may even want to consider putting a fence up temporarily for a period of time until this gets --

MR. DANIELS:

And we're in a -- you know, that's about 2.4 acres there in the Manor Road area. We're working with our contractor to go in and do that area as rapidly as possible. This way we're, you know --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

In and out.

MR. DANIELS:

The least impact.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I just wanted -- there's been a lot of discussion. And I've gotten a lot of contacts about are you supposed to be here, why are you here, is there any SEQRA authority at all? And as I've listened through all of this, there is no reason for Brookhaven National Lab to be here because the County has -- and that's why I was asking the line of questioning I was asking -- you're under an EPA ultimately a record of decision just like a private property owner. You are under an EPA order, which is going to exempt you from a variety of things. You're also an agency of the federal government. You have no need to come to the County for any approvals for your

actual program.

The reason why you got dragged in here and the reason why my ultimate opinion is that this action has to go through SEQRA, is because the County has to -- what has been explained to me-- is the County has to give you an access agreement to go into its park so the County Legislature has to vote and the County Executive has to sign, or whomever gets authorized to sign, this access agreement to authorize you to come into the County parkland. So, SEQRA is not being imposed on Brookhaven National Lab actually. SEQRA is being imposed on the County because the County must comply with SEQRA. And the County is not a party to the record of decision or the order of the EPA. So, in answer to the questions that everybody's asked me, it's my opinion that the County has to go through SEQRA. With that said, the County has to evaluate the impacts associated with entertaining and ultimately executing if it chooses to do so that access agreement, which is why we get into what are you doing in the County park, what is the impact, what are you restoring? But maybe that's a long way of saying we very much appreciate your cooperation with the County and your taking the time this morning to explain all of this. Because without your being here to do so, we could never be able to assess the impacts associated with the ultimate execution of the access agreement. So, there's a very long answer to the questions that I've been getting via e-mail. So, with all of that said, if there are no other questions at the moment, we have to table this because we do have to do a coordinated review. It's a Type I action. You're altering more than 2.5 acres of parkland. And state law requires us to do so.

So, Jim, the action should be described in whatever we send out. And that's another point. I think the Environmental Assessment Form has to be modified, Nick. And I actually think it should be a County form; not a Brookhaven National Lab form. Because this is a County action, the execution of the access agreement. And just -- modify the EAF such that it refers to that in such that the acreages include the access -- the temporary access ways as we talked about.

Also with regard to who the involved agencies are, I believe, the Pine Barrens Commission is an involved agency because there are Pine Barrens lands associated with this, even though they may not take direct jurisdiction over it, they're still involved. They meet that legal definition. I think the EPA is an involved agency because the EPA is the one who's ultimately going to drive what BNL has to do. I also think because of what we said before, the Corp of Engineers is an involved agency. On the EAF that I have, BNL has already listed the US Department of Energy for obvious reasons. We should coordinate with the DEC even though they do not require DEC permits and, of course, Suffolk County parks. Can anybody think of anybody I missed?

MR. BAGG:

Does the Health Department have any jurisdiction here?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Do you have to grant a permit or an approval?

MR. RAPIEJKO:

No.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. You know what, just send it to them as an interested party. Okay? So, if there are no other questions, I'm going to entertain a motion to table just for the purposes of going through the coordinated review process that's required.

MS. MANFREDONIA: I'll make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion by Ms. Manfredonia. Do I have a second?

MR. KAUFMAN: Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a second by Mr. Kaufman. All those in favor? Opposed? And I know I have one abstention, Mr. Swanson. Thank you for very much. I appreciate your time.

MR. GIBBONS:

Terry, just one point you were speaking about --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ: Yes.

MR. GIBBONS:

-- how you were going to describe the action? Was it the execution of the access agreement? That's what we'll --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Yes. Because that really is what's required to go through SEQRA. BNL has no legal obligation to go through SEQRA. Because they're under an EPA order. Furthermore, they're a federal agency. So, they don't -- other than Health Department Article Six, they don't have to comply with anything that County has.

MR. BAGG:

Terry, I have one question here. If it's Suffolk County's responsibility and Park's responsibility to grant an access agreement, where does the EPA approval come in in terms of an involved agency?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

The problem -- I'm just sending it to them because I think, Jim, you know, everybody's now rolled into this because we have to do a SEQRA process. So, I would rather err on the side of caution. I don't think the EPA is going to give a hoot about us. And furthermore, they're really an EPA agency. But I think that everybody who's involved in this should know because if we have sleepers out there, I'd like to know about them. Okay? I have a motion to table. I have a vote. Thank you.

Next, proposed opening of fire lanes in Veterans Parks Complex including Knolls Park, the former Benjamin Property, Town of Huntington. Hello, Margo.

MS. MYLES:

I'm here without my fire commissioner.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That's all right. We'll forgive you.

MS. MYLES:

It turned out to be a Town Board day. He's also the Deputy Director of our Community Development. Margo Myles. I'm here from the Town of Huntington, Department of Planning and Environment. I'm the Senior Environmental Analyst and Coordinator of Open Space Conservation.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That's an interesting combination of titles.

MS. MYLES:

Last year I spoke to you briefly about what would be involved with getting the fire lanes opened in the Knolls Park property that was acquired as a town county purchase in 2000. The Knolls park is an addition to what we call our Veterans Parks complex. It's comprised now of four parks. There are three existing town parks. All of the property -- it's close to 190 acres in total -- was once held by the federal government as part of the VA hospital property in Northport. The VA Hospital used to maintain security and fire lanes that ran for the most part around the perimeter of the property. The Town has been maintaining these roadways within its parks; but the land that was the Benjamin property that is now Knolls Park was in private ownership for almost 20 years. They did go through and maintain those roads not as routinely as we might have liked. There are still pathways, but they're not as wide as they once were.

The East Northport fire commissioners have approached Legislator Cooper, have asked that he please do anything he could to open them up. We've had a series of arsons in East Northport, but we've also had several small periodic fires, accidental, whatever throughout the parks complex. And the fire department is becoming increasingly concerned that they cannot get their equipment in easily. They also would like to have a fire break. The Knolls Park adjoins a very high density residential community. It's zoned R-5. So, their small 5,000 square foot lots. And they really want to have a break that they can use for access but also, God forbid, there should be a fire, that it won't spread either way into the park or into the residences. We're here today to request permission from the County. It's my understanding that it would be the Parks Commissioner that would authorize this action with us. The Town is willing to do the work. We believe virtually all of the work can be done with a Bobcat; that we won't have to bring in very heavy machinery to do it. In many cases it's opening understory. I walked the entire perimeter this Monday. And it's actually, I believe, less average than what I had estimated in the EAF. In the EAF I thought perhaps really two acres out of six total that might be affected or really need to be cleared. And I think it's going to be less than that. I brought along some pictures. And I'd also like to show you, we're working very hard trying to finalize our plan for development of the 20 acre active recreation component.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

But that's not on the table today; right?

MS. MYLES:

Not today at all. But I just want to show you how this does fit into the trails master plan.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Why don't you bring it up here. And then you can use my mike; that way we can look at it.

MS. MYLES:

The property that the Town and County acquired, the 82.5 acre Knolls property is this parcel running up to here, was acquired in three components. This northern 32 acres was acquired with Drinking Water Protection money. So, it's considered a county nature preserve. The 30 acres along the western side was a land preservation partnership with the Town and County. It's going to be used for the most part for passive recreation. And that is jointly owned. This 20 acre parcel along the eastern side that adjoins the elementary school and our nature study area has to be developed for active recreation. That was purchased using Greenways money. The Town's working out its concept plans right now. We feel the beauty of the development of the park is really going to be the extensive integrated trail system that results. The main pathway is going to come through our Veterans Park, our main entrance. This an existing roadway right now. With the EAF I shared both the 2000 survey which showed the existing conditions and showed for the most part the perimeter roadway as well as copies of the 1979 and 1963 federal surveys of the VA property, which also showed the existence of those fire lanes.

Certain components of the fire lanes are very open, particularly up here within the drinking water protection area. Some of these owners had started years ago to maintain it as lawn. They had actually encroached on the federal property. And it's actually mowed right through this section. It's very open dirt roadway through this segment; and then you've got a lot, lot of over growth right in here. A lot of Japanese knot wheat -- not tree growth. It's a lot of invasive species and understory that we're really looking forward to getting out. We've got some bamboo problems up in this area, which we'd also like to get out. Unfortunately, there's a great deal of dumping from the neighbors, mostly yard debris. So, part of our exercise here would be try to get out as much as possible and in order to chip it up because that's a fire hazard in itself.

MR. MALLAMO:

Is there a fencing on this boundary?

MS. MYLES:

There's a great deal of fencing. It's not 100% continuous, but it's pretty continuous probably, I'd say you've got openings through this segment right here and some yards here that open right into the lane. We will be doing neighbor notification a good deal ahead of time so people are prepared. A lot of people already have woods stacked unfortunately in the park. And the letter will serve not only to notify them of the work we plan to do, but also to inform them of what uses are prohibited within the Town and County parkland.

We anticipate it should be a pretty quick exercise. It shouldn't take too long. We hope to have some additional summer staff in there to help us. It will be supervised. We will have -- if I'm not out there, one of the other environmentalists will be while they're working out there. We're going to be looking for the path of least resistance. We're not going to touch any trees that don't need to be touched.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Where exactly are you looking to put them?

MS. MYLES:

This is the roadway that we in Knolls Park -- right now it's not so continuous in here. And we've spoken to the fire department. What I gave you in the EAF is also a worse case scenario because we ran the exact perimeter to do the calculation. And we will be modifying that wherever we can to -- to not have to remove trees and where there are other pathways that we can use. There's a very open area through here that was part of the area that was clean up using funds that were held in escrow when the property was acquired. And that's more or less a successional meadow right now. And I've spoken with the fire department. And they said as long as they have a break for access, it doesn't have to be right along the perimeter. So, they're pretty please that we can swing in here and make that connection through the meadow. I don't know if anybody has any questions. I do have some pictures that I brought along to show of the conditions. This major component coming in here was a roadway at one time that went right up into the VA. And that's probably the most open segment. And that's a segment that in time is going to end up being probably the one paved section within the park. But basically we'll be opening this lane through here, coming around making the connection here, and then swinging up along here. So, that's the property that is County-owned.

MS. SQUIRES:

Joyce Squires. I just wanted to comment, and this is a peripheral comment. Last night Margo and I had a park stewardship meeting. This is the Conservation Board with park stewards throughout the Town of Huntington. A continual problem here is what is the problem all over Suffolk County. And that's the ATV use. The other illegal uses and the fact that the police cannot get into this site in many areas. So that these fire lanes, although they have been requested by the fire commissioner will be much welcomed also by the Suffolk County Parks Police.

MS. MYLES:

They're also going to become probably the main -- the widest trail that runs through here.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other questions?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Margo, I'm concerned about the fire breaks. We're hearing fire breaks are going in. How wide are they going to be basically?

MS. MYLES:

The fire department has requested 15 feet in width. The master plan, which I sent you, speaks of 10 feet which was really our initial understanding. It's probably not going to be a continuous 15 feet. The trucks are 8 feet wide. In order to open the doors, get the equipment off, they need a little bit of clearance. We don't need 15 feet but at least 10 feet.

MR. KAUFMAN:

The fire trucks, are they regular fire trucks or brush --

MS. MYLES:

-- brush trucks. But this is the largest open space that the Northport Fire District has to respond to.

MR. MALLAMO:

I have to admit, I do have a concern. I feel a little more comfortable knowing that the hospital is eligible for the National Register and these fire breaks were historically on the property. So that, I think, is a positive in retaining the historic accuracy of the property. I think my concerns probably go to the fire breaks

(MALFUNCTION OF AUDIO EQUIPMENT)

MR. KAUFMAN:

That actually was one of my other questions. Is the area to the west over here have public water and hydrants and things like that?

MS. MYLES:

Yes, it does. Yes, it does. And the other thing I also want to mention is as part of the Homeland security measures, the VA is about to do a very sizable sizeable perimeter security fence -- ten foot high fence. We've been told that they are going to be clearing 20 feet on their own property to place that fence right smack in the middle. We are negotiating with them. We are almost to the point of begging them at this point to try to maintain the use of some of the trail connections that are really critical through here. And we're going to be reaching out to some of our elected officials in the very near future to try to see if we can get them to at least fence that line and allow us an easement to maintain those trails.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I just had a question. It's certainly looks like, you know, it should be done but, Jim, what is the -- we get into this all the time because it's nature preserve land. And this is -- any precedent problem or is this -- what do we do about this in terms of the fact that it's a nature preserve?

MS. MYLES:

This is an existing condition if you look at the 2000 survey from when the county acquired the property. We're not -- in the nature preserve area, we are not creating any new pathways.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

All right. So, we're just maintaining what was there? Okay.

MS. MYLES:

Yes.

MR. MALLAMO:

I think the concern I have -- the other property that comes to mind is Froehlich Park. That to me is something waiting to happen. We had, you know, when I was in the Parks Department, many of the neighbors here didn't want the lawn mowed. The grass was growing up. And I said, you know, you're setting yourselves up for a major fire in that area. And I don't think there's any fires breaks in there.

MS. MYLES:

No.

MR. MALLAMO:

And I'd rather see us look at that before the fire breaks out than the local fire department -- I don't begrudge them the right to do that in an emergency. They have to do what they have to do. But that's, you know, it's a very good point. This is -- I think we can isolate this one because they're existing. But we should really be looking at that issue a little closer.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other questions for Margo?

MS. MYLES:

So, if this is allowable, we will contact the Commissioner of Parks before we're ready. Is it something that we would get just written approval from the Commissioner?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I actually can't tell you that because all we'll do is make a SEQRA recommendation. Nick, do you have any idea because I understand it's the Parks Commissioner that has the authority here. So, do you have any idea how after we make a recommendation to the Commissioner, the ultimate approval, if it's granted, will be transmitted to the Town?

MR. GIBBONS:

I'll be honest with you. I was familiar with this project the first time Margo came and heard the CEQ'S concerns on that. I haven't seen this application. It came into our office as part of the regular mailing the beginning of the month. The Commissioner's in a position where he's still getting up to speed and probably doesn't -- isn't even aware of where this property is, but I can tell you that based on the conversations I had with him on Bohemian Equestrian, he's definitely a proponent of this type of project.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So ultimately what will happen is I assume we're going to make some sort of a SEQRA recommendation right now. It'll get taken back to the Commissioner. And then, as you heard, the Commissioner's relatively new so that I don't know that the protocol has been established.

But I'm sure there'll be an actual written communication with the Town of Huntington once a determination is made.

MR. GIBBONS:

Just -- is this requiring any county money to do the project?

MS. MYLES:

No.

MR. GIBBONS:

The Town is doing it? Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I'll entertain a motion?

MR. FINKENBERG:

I'll make a motion unlisted neg dec.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion for an unlisted neg dec by Jack. I have a second by Mr. Kaufman. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried.

MS. SQUIRES:

Record my vote in the affirmative.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay. I apologize, but I have a meeting. So, I have to leave. But you won't lose your quorum because Larry will take over and you have five voting members.

MR. SWANSON:

Next thing is other business. Is there any other business?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I know that Joy had something.

MR. SWANSON:

She's at the bottom of the list.

MR. MARTIN:

I just wanted to give a brief report on planning that we've developed for the holiday show up at Deepwells. And also just some of the thinking that's been going on in our division. If you'd like to open up the Leisure News to the back page, you'll see, it's on page six, and we've just -- there's been a lot of discussions and thinking on how to promote our sites and our program to the general public. We've re-done this page. I don't know if you remember how it was done

before. But, we've done it, grouped the different districts, and the states, different types of historic sites to kind of give a more organized sense to the program. And at the end we have the Friends for Heritage Museum stores. And then working on this, we started thinking how -- how else can we promote these sites, how can else can you get the word out on all these historic sites that are now becoming open to the public. And we started thinking about our holiday program that we have up in Deepwells, which has been a general gift -- holiday show house to this time. And it's been very successful and it's got a lot of public attention and interest. How can we use that to really promote our historic trust program. And we started discussing it. And this is just a proposal at this point. We do plan this early for that event. And we're going to ask all our user groups, if you'd flip the page there, these are all our user groups. I actually forgot the police museum that we have in Yaphank. And also the possibility of Seatuck organization, if they are on-site at the Scully estate at this time. They could also join us. And we would offer space within the house that they could set up a gift shop, if they were able to; then they would staff it themselves. And all the funds that they raised at this program would go back to their site. And these groups are all located at our historic trust sites. And we'd also look to possibly if they could sponsor a fundraiser event during this two-week time. We thought two weeks -- we are proposing two weeks now in December. We haven't picked exact dates to see what the volunteer interest is. Of course, this would have to be staffed by volunteers. And if that is successful, we could expand it. We now run a two-month program, which is very labor intensive. It takes a lot of our staff time. We're looking, quite honestly, to bring in a lot more volunteers, other organizations to help us out with this. And I think there will be a lot of talent on the boards and the volunteer members of these organizations, that we can really bring a lot of life to this program. I just -- I guess I want some opinions or comments, what people think.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I think it's a pretty good idea. Anything that we can do to increase participation and access, etcetera to the historic sites is always a good thing. And Deepwells is one of the premiere places we have out there. I'm curious, though, about one thing. If we're going to have individual sites, if you will, at Deepwells and in individual rooms, if the volunteer participation is not there, say they have to close down for one day, say somebody can't show up, etcetera, I know for a fact that there's no way to really block up access to those particular rooms.

MR. MARTIN:

Right.

MR. KAUFMAN:

How will sales be accomplished?

MR. MARTIN:

We really would try -- like I said, we're proposing two weeks now. We haven't picked the number of days. But we will have -- we'll set up a meeting. And once we decide, we really will to ask people to staff those -- the rooms during those times to make it successful. So, we're not saying yet how many days. It could be a 4-day weekend, it could be a 6-day week, you know, we'll see what these groups think they can handle and go from there. We're really -- you know, meet with them first. And what they think they can handle is what we will do. And then I'm hoping -- also we have a great volunteer group at Deepwells right now. We have three garden

clubs are involved with us. They, of course, will help out. They also staff the show house for two months in the past. So, we have a lot of people already interested in this on-site.

MR. SWANSON:

Your logo items, those are, I hope, County logos and not Friends of --

MR. MARTIN:

Yeah. When we say logo items, it's for the eastern site. Like the Big Duck has a lot of logo items. You have the big duck. Those are very popular and sell very well. Actually we're looking to promote more of that kind of merchandise. People, when they visit a historic site, it's the kind of souvenir they like to pick up. And the Friends are actively pursuing that. And, of course, get more done for Deepwells itself. They're working on a lot of things now for the St. James store.

MR. SWANSON: Any other questions?

MR. MALLAMO:

I think it's a great idea. And not only for Deepwells but to promote the other historic sites in the County and to get visitors to understand that these are all county resources. I think it really promotes the whole reason for acquiring Deepwells in the first place.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. MALLAMO:

And I will pledge whatever support the Vanderbilt Museum can do.

MR. MARTIN:

Right. And as you remember, when the County purchased Deepwells, it was to be the center of the historic trust -- Historic Services Program. And I think going this route will truly accomplish that.

MR. KAUFMAN:

By the way, Rich, I was reading the Leisure News. I had picked up a copy earlier. And on page six it has a number -- I think almost all of our County historic trust museum sites on there. So, it look as if the Parks Department is advertising a little bit more or focussing a little bit more on that.

MR. MARTIN:

Yes. We're trying to get the word out. And, of course, we have had volunteer groups at a number of these sites for many years. And they need support. That's also our thinking; that these groups, they are volunteer based. They need some more support. This will be a great networking tool to have everyone together up there to help each other out, brain storm a bit. We might have some programming during the two weeks or before it on what they would be interested in hearing. We're going to have lectures in the house and some other programs, entertainment programs also the 2-week time.

MR. SWANSON:

Thank you. Anything else?

MR. MARTIN:

Just part of this campaign, I guess, is to look for corporate sponsorship and to get some -- we haven't had that in the past. And especially for the opening event during this. We've already approached the St. James Chamber of Commerce. They're very interested in supporting and helping us at Deepwells. And they've already promised \$1,000 dollars towards the summer program that they will sponsor at Deepwells which will include a musical performance and picnic on the front lawn and some other events that they're developing right now. And this is what we're hoping that will happen. Deepwells and also at our other sites, we started promoting this.

MR. SWANSON:

Since I pass Deepwells rather frequently, it seems to me that fencing is collapsing and there's debris accumulating in the woods. And if this is going to be the showcase, it seems appropriate to get a little clean up over there.

MR. MARTIN:

Definitely. And the fencing is on order. And what happens, we wait for the summer labor crews from the Labor Department, they're really our cleanup crews. And they'll be starting there shortly.

MR. SWANSON:

Thank you. Okay. We've reached the highlight of the day where we're going to hear from Joyce Squires, CAC concerns from the Town of Huntington.

MS. SQUIRES:

The first concern is last night. And the first is in regard to parks. So, I really have two items I'd like to bring up. Last night, as I had said earlier, we had a park stewardship meeting. And we did have a police officer from Suffolk County Parks. Suffolk County Parks policeman, who stated what the condition is or the lack of police protection there is for Suffolk County Parks. And I feel compelled to make this comment. Nick could speak to this, of course, much better than I certainly could. But last night he was speaking to our meeting. We were discussing park abuses. And because he was speaking with us and he was all of western Suffolk, the other man who was on duty that night was now covering all of western Suffolk and also central Suffolk County. And there just is such an absence of park police. And I don't know that we can do anything about it. But I think people should be very aware. And all of you are involved in some way or another with the County park. Nick, would you absolutely agree with me?

MR. GIBBONS:

Sure, I would.

MS. SQUIRES:

I don't know what we can -- it was suggested at this meeting that people speak to their legislators; to Suffolk County Legislators and tell them how desperately we need additional parks police.

The other issue I wanted to bring up is NYSAEM, the New York State Association of Environmental Management Councils, which CEQ is a part of, is hosting a two-day workshop in

Albany -- that's on June 7th and 8th -- for environmental organizations. DEC is going to be participating and the Department of State. The Department of State will do morning work shops. DEC, the Department of Environmental Conservation will do afternoon work shops. There's a block of rooms that is reserved at the Fairfield Inn. NYSAEM is providing lunch for this. These are work shops that are done by the two state agencies. They're usually very high quality. They're specifically geared towards county organizations and to conservation boards. And so if anybody is interested, that's -- it's a Monday and a Tuesday, June 7 and 8. I do have this. They also have a website that more extensively discusses what's going on June 7 and 8.

MR. SWANSON:

Thank you.

MR. FINKENBERG:

We should go the CEQ to fund that, I think.

MR. SWANSON:

With our budget?

MR. MALLAMO:

We'll take it out of your pay.

MR. SWANSON:

Anything else, Joyce?

MR. FINKENBERG:

And to address that park police issue, probably we should encourage the CEQ members to get into the parks more. And one way to do that is to, you know, issue us all those green key passes. I think that would help a lot.

MS. SQUIRES:

I must say I was -- we were stunned at -- of course we know what happens in the Town of Huntington. And we know the public safety is an issue and the Public Safety Deputy Director was there. I know what happens in my town. But there was a description of a keg party in Veterans Park, the park that you just looked at, that occurred last weekend where 250 kids were there. Their parents dropped them off with the kegs and in they rode. So, I know this was not an issue of fire commissioners, but it certainly is an issue of the park police.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Isn't the drinking age 21 now days?

MS. SQUIRES:

Yes. But then Tom Smith, the parks policeman who was speaking with us, said that last summer they had a keg party. They pulled in their police vehicles. And he's, of course, an armed police officer, which Public Safety in the Town of Huntington is not armed, and they jumped over the tops of the police cars. They just ran from one car to another. And he said it's very frightening. Someone brought up the idea of an axillary police force of volunteers. And he said, oh my goodness, we can hardly get police officers to be paid to do this job. We're going to

have a tough time getting volunteers.

MR. KAUFMAN:

You're not going to get vigilantes, Joyce.

MS. SQUIRES:

So, I think you just have to -- I think it is responsibility of all of us -- I'm not sure what the answer is -- but it affects each and everyone of us regardless of where we live and in what town.

MR. SWANSON:

Anything else?

MR. FINKENBERG:

There was a vote on the Gabreski Airport parking for the golf tournament? That we're going to park -- have full parking over there.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah, for four days or something like that. Just during the golf tournament itself. Not on one of the runways.

MR. FINKENBERG:

I noticed in the minutes that was voted on unanimously and had me at that meeting. I came in late. I didn't get a chance to comment or vote on that issue. I was opposed to it. And I'd just like the record to reflect that. I've been out there. It's beautiful. It looks like prairie. There's got to be birds nesting there. I was kind of upset about that. The other is I'd like to encourage the members to take a bus to the meetings. Maybe next month's we can all take public transportation to one of these meetings?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I served on the New York State Department of Transportation Task Force talking about increasing busses and things like that. I'd have to walk six miles to find a bus point. It's not very easy for me.

MR. FINKENBERG:

Maybe you can drive to the bus point.

MR. KAUFMAN:

It defeats the purpose, Jack.

MR. FINKENBERG:

Cut down on the mileage.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah, that's true.

MR. SWANSON:

Okay. Anything else?

MR. FINKENBERG:

See you on the bus.

MR. SWANSON:

Do we have a motion to adjourn?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Motion.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

MR. SWANSON:

Motion by Nancy. Second by Kaufman. See you next month. Thank you.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:34 AM)