

# 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, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on July 28, 2004.

### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Theresa Elkowitz, Chairperson  
Larry Swanson, Vice-Chairman  
Nancy Manfredonia  
Lance Mallamo  
Thomas Cramer  
Adrienne Esposito

### **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Joy S. Squires, CAC Huntington  
Steve Brown, CAC Brookhaven  
Richard Martin, Historic Services  
Jim Bagg, Department of Planning  
Penny Kohler, CEQ  
Charlie Bender, PO's Office  
John Donovan, Department of Public Works  
Jim Peterman, DPW  
Paul McMahan, DPW  
Jason Farina, LIRO  
Kenneth Holmstrom LIRO engineer  
Michael Marsico, LIRO  
Janice McGovern, DPW  
Andrew Rapiejko, Department of Health Services  
Kevin LaValle, Aide to Leg. Losquadro  
John Carter, USDOE  
Louis Sadler, USDOE  
Michael McCann, Brookhaven National Lab  
Ralph Borkowski, DPW  
Nick Gibbons, Parks Department  
Tom Daniels, BNL  
William Merbaras, BNL  
Siva Kumar BNL  
Kimberly Kennedy, Aide to Leg. Caracciolo  
Thomas Carroll, Aide to Leg. Bishop

### **MINUTES TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY:**

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

**(THE MEETING WAS CONVENED AT 9:41 AM)**

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I'm going to call the meeting to order and ask that the members review the minutes of the June 16th meeting.

**MR. SWANSON:**

I move the minutes be accepted.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I have a motion. Do I have a second?

**MS. MANFREDONIA:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Second by Nancy. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions. Carried. Correspondence. I have some correspondence that relates to CR 80. I have one piece of correspondence that's just for the members' edification, which is the Suffolk County Department of Public Works received a permit from the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation on July 16, 2004 for repair and/or in kind, in place or placement of existing culverts, tide gates, tide boxes and other water control structures in kind, in place, repair or reconstruction of mosquito control ditches up to 400 thousand feet per year to within six inches of their original depth and width. So, this basically is DEC's approval of what was required for the ongoing program. Those of you who have read the paper probably know that the County lost an action last week. And the bay keeper is going to try to hold the County in contempt for continuing its prior mosquito activities; any sort of mosquito control that relates to spraying or anything like that. But the permit was issued and I have copy of it if anybody would like to see it.

The other correspondence relates to CR 80. So, I'll wait until we get to that point.

Staff recommendations for SEQRA classifications of resolutions laid on the table for June 22nd for consideration. Jim, is there anything you'd like to call to Council's attention?

**MR. BAGG:**

No. Everything's straight forward.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Does anybody have any questions for Jim?

**MR. CRAMER:**

Motion.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Motion to accept staff recommendations for SEQRA classifications.

**MR. SWANSON:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

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

Okay, next. Proposed Suffolk County Access agreement for the Peconic River Restoration Program, Robert Cushman Murphy County Park, Towns of Brookhaven and Riverhead. My notes indicate that we previously reviewed this. And that what we were waiting for was for the coordinated review period to -- the coordination period to expire because this was a Type I action. And we were also waiting for commentary from the Pine Barrens Commission. Jim, can you give us a quick update?

**MR. BAGG:**

Well, since we last met and the project was tabled, the County set out coordination letters and did not receive anything back. So we gave them no --

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

There was no -- no objection to the County serving as lead agency?

**MR. BAGG:**

No rejection.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Okay.

**MR. BAGG:**

So, therefore, the County is the SEQRA lead agency with respect to that. It's my understanding that the State Pine Barrens Commission made it a non-development proposal.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Determination? They determined it -- deemed it to be non-development? Okay.

**MR. BAGG:**

Right. And it's now before you in terms of the access agreement to the county park through the county park only.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Right. Good morning.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Is there anything you'd like to add to Jim's presentation?

**MR. GIBBONS:**

I'm not sure.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

You have to state your name for the record.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Nick Gibbons, Suffolk County Parks. I'm not sure if it's relevant or not, but we did get one response. And that was a no objection letter from Ray Corwin of the Central Pine Barrens Commission. I'll

submit a copy of that to Jim for the file. But other than that, he's right, we didn't receive any responses. So, the County has now assumed lead agency at this time. We're continuing to work on the lab -- with the lab on the wetland restoration, which I know is not within CEQ's purview; but that's really the latest from the Parks Department. We'll continue to work with them.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Any questions or comments? If not, I'll entertain a motion.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Motion for Type I neg dec.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I have a motion for a Type I neg dec. Do I have a second?

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I have a second by Adrienne. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Okay, next. Proposed reconstruction of CR 80, Montauk Highway from CR 46 William Floyd Parkway to Mastic Road, Capital Program 5516, Town of Brookhaven. I have correspondence relating to this project. The first piece of correspondence that I have is dated July 20, 2004. It's to Charles Bartha. Dear Commissioner Bartha, please be advised that this agency, the agency being the Town of Brookhaven, Office of the Town Council, has had several meetings with the County of Suffolk regarding the above-referenced project. This project is important to our proposed redevelopment of the Montauk Highway corridor in this area. And the Town of Brookhaven wishes to extend its support to this important endeavor. If you have any questions or require additional information, please feel free to contact this office. Edward J. Hennessey, Councilman of the affected district.

The second letter I have is dated July 26, 2004. It's also to Commissioner Bartha of DPW. Dear Commissioner Bartha, please be advised that this agency, the agency being the Town of Brookhaven, Department of Planning, Environment and Development, has had several meetings with the County of Suffolk regarding the above referenced project. The project is important to our proposed redevelopment of the Montauk Highway corridor in this area. And the Town of Brookhaven wishes to extend its support to this important endeavor. Very truly yours, Daniel J. Gulizio, Commissioner. Hello, Mr. McMahon.

**MR. McMAHON:**

Good morning. My name is Paul McMahon. I'm a senior civil engineer. I'm with DPW. And I'm here to re-present the CR 80 project from William Floyd Parkway to Mastic Road. This project was originally presented to the Council in June of 2002. And it was tabled pending resolution of some issues and concerns from the Counsel.

Today I'm not really going to re-present the project, but I plan on addressing the important concerns that were brought up at that time. Before I do that, I just want to make a few comments about the process of a federally funded project and also to discuss with you some of the key features that

have since been added. Then I will address the issues specifically. This is a federally funded project. It's currently -- we're at the end point, the culmination of the preliminary engineering design approval process. Right now we're planning on going to a public hearing this November. And at that point the final design approval document will be made available to the public along with our preferred alternative, at which point we will receive input and comments, which will then finally be incorporated into the final document, which will then be approved by FHWA and the County Executive.

So, right now we're seeking design approval. And then once we receive that, then we can begin final detailed, design the end all of which will be construction documents. One of prerequisites of design approval is SEQRA concurrence. So, at this time I want to mention some of the key features of this product -- of this project. This project is a, you know, it's a continuing out growth of the public participation project. The main features of this project are going to be to significantly improve the operational and safety of the entire corridor from William Floyd all the way down to Mastic Road, the vicinity of that area. We're basically going to add infrastructure improvements, intersection improvements, improve the highway capacity, reduce congestion and accidents, eliminate flooding, direct discharge into Forge River. Some of the key features will be widen roadway from William Floyd to the Southport Center. Probably five lines. And then we're going to improve the operational characteristics of the William Floyd Montauk Highway intersection. We're going to do pavement rehabilitation, reconstruction of positive drainage facilities. And most importantly we're going to eliminate flooding and direct discharge into the Forge River.

We're also going to include a lot of ideas which were presented to us from the Montauk Highway summit group and the visioning process, some of which are improving the aesthetics of the corridor. We plan on taking care of that by we're going to eliminate an existing recharge basin at the southeast corner of Montauk Highway and William Floyd. We're going to create a park-like setting, kind of an entrance gateway into the corridor. And we're going to discharge that water to the New York State DOT facility up by Sunrise Highway. They'll also -- currently water directly discharges into Forge River untreated. It's just right off the road into the river. What we plan on doing is installing a network of leaching basins and vortex systems or the equivalent. We're going to be required to accommodate the New York DEC storm water quality volume. It's approximately an inch, inch and a half of water. And then any over flow from that point will be past through vortex systems, which eliminate sediments and, you know, pollutants from the water. So, right now one you have direct discharge but no storage. We're going to accommodate the minimal -- you know the DEC required volume plus treat it further after that point.

So, I'm just going to go down the list of some of the issues that were brought. So, I think I kind of talked briefly about the run-off mitigation in Forge River. That was one of the concerns brought up in June. Any specific technical questions we have members from our consultant team Liro Engineers, who could address that specifically.

Another major concern was that the project was in conformance with the town's visioning process. We -- there was a charrette presented by Vision Long Island. They're a public community outreach group that incorporates the public's ideas and their desires into, you know, some of the key components that should be presented in a project. Some of the key features were modern round-abouts, median street scape, you know, we want to create more of a walk-able community in the Mastic area. We feel this new alternative accomplishes that. We're introducing medians and round-abouts. So, these -- any specific questions related to that can be directed to our consultant team. But we've had an ongoing outreach effort with the Town. The Town of Brookhaven supports

this. This charrette was sponsored by the Town. And then subsequently met with the town, got -- you know, received these ideas and input suggestions. And we re-configured our previous alternative into a new alternative, which we plan on presenting for design approval. So, we're incorporating modern roundabouts and we're incorporating medians, decorative street lighting, decorative sidewalk treatments, crossing areas, you know, decorative pavement, street lighting, park benches. You know, this is all going to be included into the design. And we've done this in conjunction with the town rezoning plan also. And we've been working together on this. So, I'd like to highlight some of the meetings that we've had. You know, back in 2000, we had a public -- an initial public information meeting, which is a requirement in the federal process. Then we've had some community work groups. And this led to some of our previous alternatives. Then in 2002 we started working together with the charrette team and the Town of Brookhaven. So, we've -- throughout 2002 into 2003 we fine-tuned this alternative and brought into this alternative the concepts from the charrette. And this has been culminating in formal presentations to the town, the summit. And we're also working closely with representatives of the emergency services units, too; the two fire departments in the area, Suffolk police and also the Mastic Ambulance Company. As a matter of fact last night we had a meeting where we invited the Montauk Highway summit and emergency services. So, you know, the ultimate goal is to seek a common ground which will accommodate everybody. You know, during the final design process, you know, any of the idiosyncrasies can be worked out with -- to accommodate the emergency services groups.

And I'd just like to finally reiterate that, you know, we do -- we -- the concern of the council was are we working together with the Town of Brookhaven? I feel we've accomplished that. So, at this point in time I'd like to -- if there's any questions on this matter, we could direct it to the technical staff that's on hand.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Anybody have any questions. Larry.

**MR. SWANSON:**

Couple of questions. When you said that you were meeting the DEC requirements for storm water, I presume that that means the new DEC requirements as specified by EPA storm water II phase? Phase II?

**MR. McMAHON:**

Yes, we will be meeting those requirements. And, again, these issues -- for design -- you know to get the exact calculations and the final configuration of the plans, that's something that's going to be accomplished during final design.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

So, you're required to actually --

**MR. McMAHON:**

But we are required -- as a requirement, we're going to have to meet DEC requirements. They're going to be reviewing our plans.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

You're required to submit to them a storm water management plan that complies with the Phase II, right.

**MR. McMAHON:**

Absolutely. The storm water management plan plus storing the required volume.

**MR. SWANSON:**

And you're only going to capture the first half inch of rainfall?

**MR. McMAHON:**

No. We're going -- we going capture the mandated required storm water volume. It's over an inch. We're going to store that. Any overflow will also be treated prior to direct discharge. We're going to be working hand in hand with them.

**MR. SWANSON:**

Why does it say first flush, first one half inch of rain?

**MR. McMAHON:**

This is -- it's -- we're going to accommodate more than that. That just has to be adjusted. It could be typo.

**MR. SWANSON:**

Okay. Then the other question I had is I don't understand what the difference between a modern round-about and an antique round-about.

Is there --

**MR. CRAMER:**

This one's designed today. The other ones were designed years ago.

**MR. McMAHON:**

Well, to be honest with you we've -- I've had that question posed to me before. And I actually have an answer for you. Some of the older traffic circles were -- it was strictly a circle placed in an area with roads entering. Today's design requirements, you want to have your -- let's say you have four approaches. You want to have four equal distances between the approaches. You also want to balance the flow. Or else the unit's not going to efficiently operate. And I think in the past there was not really a lot of consideration given to, you know, the wheel basis of the larger vehicles. A modern round-about today is, there's also going to be an inner diameter, which is going to have like a decorative pavement, but which is also going to be able to safely accommodate without damage the larger emergency services vehicles. And it also -- it's going to be carefully designed to have an equal distance between all the approaches.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

That was actually my question. How do the emergency service providers feel about these roundabouts?

**MR. McMAHON:**

They have -- they have concerns, which we're going to be -- as a matter of fact Jim and I could elaborate on that further.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I could understand --

**MR. McMAHON:**

They -- we want to a meeting last night. And we're going to have -- we're going to meet with core

members of the two fire departments and the ambulance company to seek a common ground, you know, the exact placement of openings in the medians. Also, we're going to have some demonstrations that we're going to set up with traffic cones to pinpoint the exact requirements of the diameters. And, again, this is something that's going to be finalized in final design.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Anybody else have any questions?

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

The first flush is an inch and a half. And then you said you'll also accommodate overflow after that. So, what's the --

**MR. McMAHON:**

I'm going to accommodate overflow by -- it's going to be treated prior to discharge.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Right. So, what is the total amount of rainfall that can be accommodated in one rainfall?

**MR. McMAHON:**

That can be fully dependent on the amount of the base saver units, like the size we put in. It would probably be -- the exact amount would be determined really during the final design stage. But for the storage we're going to at least accommodate DEC required volume and we're probably going to try to accommodate more. We can do that by installation of additional leaching basins. But I don't think it's going to be the storage requirements that we would have for positive system where we're trying to accept a ten-year design storm. We just don't have the land for that.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

Paul, let me interject one second. My name is Jim Peterman. I'm the assistant to the Chief Engineer. Just to answer that question, we're going to hold a half inch of rainfall. But if we get more than a half inch of rainfall, the storm water actually will flow through. There's a bunch of proprietary basins out there. But what these do is, the storage is not a concern. What you're doing is you're taking all the floatables out and your sediments before they enter into any estuary. So, the treatment volume depending on -- you could have any size you want depending on the size of the basin that you put in. You could handle up to a 30-inch pipe or a 36-inch pipe with like 30 cubic feet per second. So, you have two instances. You have your first storage -- your half-inch storage, which will be held in leaching basins. If we do get a rainfall event that's over that, it will just be treated through this vortec type system.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

I guess what I was asking is what would be the size of the rain event that would then trigger -- would not be stored and not be treated and would just run direct into the --

**MR. PETERMAN:**

You would not have that instance.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Ever?

**MR. McMAHON:**

No. It would -- it would -- the terminus would go through these vortec type systems with base savers



and other proprietary. If you put -- you might have to two large ones in to handle the final flush. But based on the CFS that's coming out that last pipe, there is a way -- I know what you're talking about. They have a point where they have to by-pass everything.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Yes.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

But you can avoid that by putting maybe two base savers in. So no matter what your alternative that we do pick, you know, there's -- right now let me just give you a little brief history on this federal aid. We're trying to do the cart before the horse here. I need CEQ approval to have a public hearing. I know you'd like to see the final design, but I can't have a final design for you until after I have the public hearing. Okay? What we do with the public hearing, is we'll show all the alternatives that we've looked at and ask for any kind of input or any suggestions, any problems, or any support for any of the different alternatives at the public hearing. After that happens, we have to then -- they have 30 days to get the comments in after the public hearing. We have to actually look at each comment and address it. At that point in time, we might be a conglomeration of a couple of different alternatives that we come up with to try to appease every and still move, you know, bicyclists, pedestrians and vehicle traffic through this corridor while simultaneously solving the storm water problems and trying to introduce greenery and landscaping to the corridor. So, no matter which alternative that we do pick, the drainage and plantings will be included. It's just I can't show you exactly what it's going to be until --

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

You should understand, though, that pursuant to SEQRA -- forget about County process, whose ever process, pursuant to SEQRA, if your plans after the public hearing are modified such that they're different from the ones that we're looking at --

**MR. PETERMAN:**

I know.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

-- as the possessed action, you do have to come back here for modified SEQRA recommendation --

**MR. PETERMAN:**

I understand.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

-- or else you'd be in violation; you know that, right?

**MR. PETERMAN:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Okay.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

At what point would that happen? I mean, at least night's meeting, the summit group was there. They were ecstatic about the project. They were in full 100% support. We had a problem with the emergency services vehicles. They had a problem with the center median. So, we're going to look

for a common ground with both of them. It's probably -- the project is probably going to end up somewhere with sporadic medians, I envision.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Right.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

Maybe just a little bit different geometry on the traffic circles. But other than that, I think the job can go ahead.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Well, I don't think that those are things that require an additional SEQRA review.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

All right. So, you're looking at anything that changes maybe drainage --

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Anything that's substantive. You know, one more median opening is not substantive.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

Okay.

**MR. SWANSON:**

I had just one more question. When was the last time that you updated what a ten-year rainfall event was?

**MR. PETERMAN:**

We've been using the same ten-year rainfall event since I started with the County twenty years ago. I know you think we have a 100-year rain storm every couple of months now.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

That's why I asked my question.

**MR. SWANSON:**

It is true, if you look at the statistics over the last twenty years that the -- what would be considered a ten fall rain event today is a lot different than twenty to thirty years ago.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

Well, we're still using a five-inch rainfall event for the designs. So, it's still five inches, which is -- you know, but we've never had a problem with any of our recharge basins or any of our drainage calculations so far. So, I feel confident on that.

**MR. CRAMER:**

One question. I'm a bit confused. Originally you said it was one inch storage. And you said that that was a typo, the half-inch. But you're talking about half inch storage.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

The half-inch storage is -- is what DEC is considering a first flush. We -- they like to see more than that. So, we give them an inch, they'll about happier. It's only required to have the half inch. But we're going to try to do more.

**MR. CRAMER:**

So, you're providing an inch as part of this project?

**MR. PETERMAN:**

Correct.

**MR. CRAMER:**

So, the half inch doesn't come into play. It's going to be an inch as part of this particular project.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

That's what DEC has let us get by with in the past as far as DEC, an inch, yes.

**MR. CRAMER:**

But on this project it's going to be an inch.

**MR. PETERMAN:**

An inch, yes.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Any other questions? If not, I'll entertain a motion.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Motion TYPE I neg dec.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I have a motion. Do I have a second?

**MR. SWANSON:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

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

**MR. PETERMAN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Proposed improvements to Van Bourgondien County Park, Capital Program 7077, West Babylon, Town of Babylon.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Good morning.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Terry, before we get started, I just want to point out to the Council that the EAF does not match the final design that's been agreed upon subsequent to that EAF's preparation. That's the bad news. The good news is that the amount of trees in the area needed to be required has been significantly reduced. So, we think that's a positive thing, but obviously we'll leave it up to the Council to decide whether or not that's something we can agree upon today.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Well, we can probably -- you can probably hand correct an EAF if we get to that point.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

That's fine.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Because I don't think the math works either because I was trying to figure out -- we'll keep going and see what happens.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Just -- we have Ralph Borkowski from DPW and Tom Carroll from Legislator Bishop's office.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Okay.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

And let Tom speak to the need for the project; Ralph to the technical aspects; and myself for parks' issues.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

You need a mike. Okay.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

I'll start by bringing up the revised plan.

**MR. SWANSON:**

This is different than what we have, is that right?

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Yeah. You need a microphone.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

DPW did the initial design. And then Parks had met with the local Legislator to come to a common ground based on conversations with Suffolk County Parks Trustees and their concerns. The -- I don't have the benefit of the original plan, but the field had been centered in what is right now an intact woodland. This green line is the existing wood line. And the trustees among others asked for the field to be shifted to the west so that we could retain the most significant intact tract of woodland. We also eliminated this original area that was to be cleared in this corner, which would have been here. So, we're reduced to just the size of the field itself and no accessory areas.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

So, we have existing soccer fields and we're adding.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Correct. This is all existing. Van Bourgondien is an active park facility that's managed by the Town of Babylon for Suffolk County. The existing woodland here is -- this area here represents about two -- two acres or so.

**MR. BORKOWSKI:**

2.25.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Well, that was the original.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Right.

**MR. BAGG:**

What does the current plan call for as far as the --

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

You need a microphone. Jim asked what does the currently plan call for as far as clearing.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

What's the acreage number?

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

The current for this one.

**MR. BAGG:**

The current. In other words we know what the old plan called for. You said you're moving it so you're going to clear less. What does the current plan -- it's a two acreage parcel. How much will be cleared?

**MR. GIBBONS:**

1.75; roughly that. About half an acre has been left intact from the previous plan.

**MR. BAGG:**

Also, I have a question is there a buffer being left in the woodland between the, you know --

**MR. GIBBONS:**

The residences?

**MR. BAGG:**

The residences?

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Right. We did that -- that was the other idea about moving this to the west. There is no neighbor here. In fact, the County is entering into an agreement with the local parish to rent or lease a piece of property here for another active recreational field. So, this is already existing cleared area.

Actually, I have an aerial. I'll bring that up. And then over here we do have residences that back the park property. These lots here. And so we'd maximize the buffer between them.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Yeah, it looks like about 250 feet.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Correct; 265. Then Muncey Avenue, we don't have residences on the north side of Muncey but we do on the south that look north into the park. And so we maintain that 100-foot buffer around there. This -- now, again, this is back to the old plan. So, this is -- everything has shifted over to the west. This is the existing -- in fact, this shows the proposal for the lease that the county is looking to enter into. These are the existing athletic fields.

**MR. BORKOWSKI:**

This is the survey. This is a survey that shows the existing trees on the site. Each one is located -- every tree is six inches and over. I don't have the exact number. This basically just shows the existing trees on the site and the topography.

**MS. MANFREDONIA:**

Excuse me. The trees that you're showing us are existing trees? And what size?

**MR. BORKOWSKI:**

Six inches and over. And they're listed here in this schedule.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

So this is the -- an inch is thirty.

**MR. BORKOWSKI:**

Correct.

**MS. MANFREDONIA:**

That's what you have listed here? What you're clearing?

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

No. He has everything listed here. We're just kind of eyeballing this. That's kind of what's going --

**MS. MANFREDONIA:**

Ah-huh. Are there any plans at all to -- any plans to plant other trees anywhere in the vicinity, you know, to --

**MR. GIBBONS:**

No.

**MS. MANFREDONIA:**

-- replace some of the large ones that you're taking down?

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Nancy, this facility is really an active recreation park. So, the point of the project is to maximize or increase the yield of the property for soccer and lacrosse; active recreation. So, planting elsewhere -- the existing buffer is really -- we couldn't replicate that. We can't improve on it. It's an existing intact woodland.

**MS. MANFREDONIA:**

No, I understand that. It's just that -- it seem like there may be an opportunity across the street, you know, to plant some additional trees because you are taking a significant number of large trees down.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Across the street on Town property?

**MS. MANFREDONIA:**

On where you said you're going to lease. It's cleared land, but the, you know, the church property that you're going to lease to the church, you might be able to put some buffers there.

**MR. CRAMER:**

If and when that lease ever takes place.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Buffer between which, though? What would we be buffering from on that property?

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I think -- well, I don't know that you'd be buffering from. I think what Nancy is getting at is could you replace some of the trees that you're removing? So, for example -- is north oriented to the top of that map?

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Roughly, right.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

So, you were -- you showed us an aerial photograph where you were positioning a soccer field on a cleared area of the church property. I think what Nancy's suggesting to you is, for example, could you put some buffer vegetation to the south of that soccer field between the developed soccer and I think -- is it Muncey that I saw on that street?

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Right.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I think that she's -- although I know we can't tie the two together because you're not leasing the property.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Right.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I think she's just asking for your consideration.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

That's fine. I'll take that back to the Planning Department, which, you know, they actively represent the County in determining the terms of the lease. I'll just say that that property from what I know of it

is future church property for -- whether it be for cemetery property or general. I'm not sure what they had in mind for it for the future, but I'll bring that back to the Planning Department.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Trees will work in a cemetery.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

It's not my --

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Any there any other questions? Larry.

**MR. SWANSON:**

Why didn't you consider any alternatives?

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Such as other properties?

**MR. SWANSON:**

I don't know. I just noticed in your form that you did not consider any alternatives.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Although actually they did because they were here with an original plan and their alternative was that -- they shifted it so that they would remove fewer trees and they would increase the buffer. So, while that was my -- Larry and I actually talked about this before. We said how could you have no alternatives, but you did. And it was an alternative that actually reduced clearing.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Right. There's no alternative to actually getting a net gain --

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

A soccer field on this --

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Right. You have to do some cutting to get it. But -- so we tried to mitigate for that by shifting it. And we thought that maximizing the buffers on that east side made the most sense because that's where we have neighbors.

**MR. SWANSON:**

How did you determine the demand for it was really there?

**MR. GIBBONS:**

I'll let Tom speak to that.

**MR. CARROLL:**

How are you doing?

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Hi.



**MR. CARROLL:**

Tom Carroll from Legislator Bishop's office. He apologizes; he was obliged to be somewhere else this morning. The need for this field is very extreme. We have leagues that don't have fields at all. Babylon lacrosse and West Babylon lacrosse are completely playing out of their -- they're playing Wyandanch, they play all the way in Islip just to have fields. We've actually -- we entered into an agreement with the church. The church hadn't received their payment yet. And they came and threw the kids off the field; the priest in his full robes and everything; actually came out. It was quite entertaining.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Is that on the record?

**MR. CRAMER:**

They -- we've looked into hundreds of other alternatives. We're trying to repossess land from the back of old parking lots. We tried another cemetery in North Amityville that owns a piece of property. We can't seem to find anywhere in the town that we can have fields. And the increase -- especially with girls becoming more and more active, we have a tremendous need. And everyone -- no one seems to want to let us go anywhere. And this is one of the few alternatives we were able to come up with.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Okay. Any other questions? Any other comments?

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Just a question. So, what's the -- Nick, the reduction? The original EAF say approximately 200 trees to be cleared. Do you have a new number for us?

**MR. GIBBONS:**

I didn't have the benefit of overlaying the actual cleared area over that survey. But, if we're about roughly reducing the clear area by half an acre, and the original was 200, I'm just -- and the trees, obviously, they're not --

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

As dense as you go along.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Right. So, it's hard to say.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Okay.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

But, I mean if you want me to take a second look at that for the record for Jim's --

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

What I actually would like you to do although I don't to necessarily hold up action on this today, I'd like you to correct the EAF for the file.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

We will do that.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

And I'd like you to take the tree survey. And I'd like you to transpose the area that you're proposing to clear on that tree survey for the file. Just in case we have an issue in the future, we're also working off the same document.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

That's fine.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Okay. And you should probably provide that to the Town of Babylon as well so they understand what the County's approved.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

We'll do that.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Okay. Any other questions? I'll entertain a motion.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Just a quick question, too, as far as community. So, was the community incorporated into this? I mean, have they had a say in this? I mean, what has been the community involvement or role?

**MR. CARROLL:**

I guess I'll answer that. We originally went with our first plan over -- it's got to be the first plan over a year ago and had a public information session. Based on that session, we came back and I worked with Ralph. And we came up with a second plan, the first revised plan we showed you was -- originally the plan was to clear almost up and just leave a 50-foot buffer everywhere. The second plan we came back with was with that 100-foot buffer everywhere. Actually what's kind of funny is the guys who live right next to that sump, they'd love to see it cleared right to their property. But the people across the street in Muncey don't want to hear the kids playing soccer. So, that's where took everything into consideration. There was an existing "nature trail" that used to be run through there. And it became like a haven for kids, you know, doing drugs and drinking beer. That's been tried to stop. And every time they'd rebuild something, the kids would burn it back down. So, this we see is like possibly combating two measures being able to eliminate a lot of the youth in the area from abusing the property and also getting a positive action out of it for the soccer fields.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

I'll entertain a motion.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Motion unlisted neg dec.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Is this dedicated parkland? Is this a Type I action? Is this dedicated parkland?

**MR. BAGG:**

It is dedicated parkland, but the new alternative brings it down below 2.5 acres which makes it an unlisted action.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Unlisted neg dec. And also to have the EAF -- with the corrections of the EAF.

**MS. MANFREDONIA:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

A second by Nancy. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried. Thank you.

**MR. GIBBONS:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Proposed improvements to sewer district 21, Birchwood/Holbrook, Capital Program 8143, Town of Brookhaven. Good morning.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Hi. John Donovan, Associate Civil Engineer with Public Works. That's a mistake; a print mistake. This is SUNY Stony Brook 21.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Okay. We did have it. And you and I had to abstain. Well, you have Brookhaven. You have two -- you have three -- you have four. Jim. Jim, if you get four affirmative, you'll be okay; right?

**MR. BAGG:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Because I have to recuse myself and I believe Mr. Swanson has to recuse himself.

**MR. BAGG:**

That's fine.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

All right. Just before I do this, this is something that we addressed previously. And I believe Steve Brown can vote to this also because it's Town of Brookhaven. This is something that we addressed previously, their upgrades at Stony Brook University Hospital Sewage Treatment Plant. The problem -- the last time was that when I recused myself and Larry recused himself, we didn't have a voting quorum. But we will have now.

**MR. BAGG:**

Where is Lance?

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Lance's father had a heart attack this morning. He had to leave. So, I'm going to have to recuse myself. Tom, would you mind just chairing because Larry's going to have to recuse himself. So, you just chair for this. I'll put it on the record I represent --

**MR. BAGG:**

Terry, that leaves three.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Yeah, but you can have Steve voting.

**MR. BAGG:**

Oh, okay.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Steve will vote. I have to recuse myself. I represent Stony Brook University Hospital.

**MR. SWANSON:**

I have to recuse myself because I'm an employee of the university.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Okay. This is the SUNY Stony Brook Sewage Treatment Plant that services the hospital, Stony Brook campus, sewer district number 10, Suffolk County sewer district and sewer district number 1 from Brookhaven Town. The treatment plant currently is to 2.5 million gallons per day. We are going to expand it to three million gallons a day. That's about five hundred thousand gallons. And also we have to eliminate discharge into the Long Island Sound as mandated by the Long Island Sound Study. So, to do that we have to do some on-site recharge. The college has said that we can use this 3.2 acre parcel here to discharge some of the effluent from the treatment plant into that area. The expansion will be done on this 1.4 acre parcel right across the street from the treatment plant itself. There was some issues about the recharge that -- they wanted to see what the impact would be to the local wells -- drinking water wells in the area. We contacted the Health Department, Water Resources Group. And they gave us information that there are no -- no drinking water wells that would be impacted by recharging this area. The groundwater flow is to the northwest towards the sound. All the drinking water wells are out of that area. And this piece of parcel right here is not in any of their zones of capture; so, there should be no impact to local drinking water wells. Basically that's it.

This is the project on a whole. It's -- right now we're looking to get approval to do design work for the expansion and the design for the recharge. And also to do the recharge as soon as possible once that design is complete.

**MR. CRAMER:**

This is just for the planning stages of it at this point you're talking about.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

That's correct. We'd like to also get approval to use this as recharge because once the planning stage goes through for the expansion, the first phase is to actually construct this where we have a time frame to meet to eliminate the flow from the sound.

**MR. CRAMER:**

But you'll be coming back to us after the design phase is --

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Yes, we will.

**MR. CRAMER:**

-- with the lay out.

**MR. CRAMER:**

One quick question; then we'll open it up for the other members. The discharge area, what is that now? Is that a wooded area? Is that an athletic field?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Yes, that's a wooded area. It's trees and brush.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Any questions?

**MR. BROWN:**

Steve Brown from the Brookhaven CAC. The expansion on the plant, is that across Nicolls Road on the other side?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

No, no. The plant is up here. We're not showing the full plant area. This is the north entrance road into the college. This is across -- this is actually south of the plant in -- just, again, that's a wooded area also that has been set up as a recharge basin but it's not being used. It's a college recharge basin.

**MR. BROWN:**

It's a storm water recharge basin?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Nicolls Road is over here to the west.

**MR. BROWN:**

It's a storm water recharge basin; right?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

It was to be used as a storm water recharge basin, but it's now part of the plant property for expansion. When we built the plant, this was left as expansion area. The plant was built in '89.

**MR. BROWN:**

Are you going to use that for --

**MR. DONOVAN:**

This is going to be -- no, we're not going to use this for recharging. The only recharge is going to be here. This is going to be for when we expand the plant to three million gallons. Process equipment's going to be here.

**MR. CRAMER:**

So, the existing recharge basin isn't being used?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

That's correct.

**MR. CRAMER:**

So, it's just a big hole in the ground with no water going into it?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Pretty much.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

That's the technical definition.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Right.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

I'm sorry, I know you already said this. What's the road between the recharge basin and the area that you want to use? What is that?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Right here?

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Yes.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

That's the loop road; north loop road for the college.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Okay.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Nicolls Road is over here.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

And that area that you want to use is currently wooded, you said and vegetated?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Yes, there's athletic fields on this side. And the DEC building 40 is right here. So, it would be right off their parking lot between these who areas.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Okay.

**MR. CRAMER:**

What type of leaching facility; would it be open or --

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Open recharge beds.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Open recharge beds. It wouldn't be subgrade?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Ah, no. We'd like to do open recharge beds. That's the easiest to maintain. And gets us the best -- best land use.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Right.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Also, we would put buffer -- it would be buffer, vegetation and landscaping. It would be fenced-in area. So, we would maintain some kind of buffer around it.

**MR. BROWN:**

I'm looking at a recharge basin that's not being used; that 's already cleared. And you're looking to clear a piece of property that you want to use.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Well, this is also overgrown. It's the same type of woods that -- being that this hasn't been used, it's pretty much the same vegetation in either one.

**MR. BROWN:**

It's been dug out, though; correct?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Just this point 4 acre in the middle. Point 48. And basically --

**MR. BROWN:**

You know, couple of things that I've always fought for is to stop discharging into Port Jefferson Harbor. That's number one. And I want to commend you that -- I mean I think by law you have to start doing that now anyway. But, you know, I'd like to see the project go forward. But I just -- the design to me is confusing. You know, you want to do an above-ground -- or I should say an open recharge area when, in fact, I think most people are doing closed, you know, recharge areas. You got a ball field to the left of that. What's the smell going to be like for the ball field itself. You know, there's a whole bunch of issues that I don't -- you know, I don't see being answered here.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Well, it is treated effluent and typically there's no odors with that. It is something that with the design consult -- we just put out an RFP to get designs; it's something that could be left open, that they may come back and say, you know, we might want to do sub-surface recharge, if that's a better -- if that can get us more capacity. The best for maintenance and long-term use is open beds. And we would like to go that way, but it's not something that can't be looked at.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

I think we should keep in mind this is only for the planning and design stage. You're going to come back to us after --

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Yes.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

-- it is planned and designed.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Yes, definitely.

**MR. BAGG:**

I have a question here. This has submitted with an EAF in terms of a build out. You're just here for design approval. That's a Type II action. They could have discharge this a while ago. I mean you are now going to take this design phase and come back to CEQ with final plans and specs?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Yes, if -- we want to get the design phase going. We originally had it as two phases; to do the

recharge and part of the treatment process was adding sludge thickening. We decided to set that into phase II when we expand the plant. So, now it's just a recharge and the design phase for the expansion of the plant, which the consultant engineer will also be looking at the recharge. So, I don't -- I would imagine we'd have to come back if something -- if something's different than this.

**MR. BAGG:**

Not different. I mean, either you're going to build this out from what you're telling the Council and they're going to make a SEQRA finding; or you're here just to get planning monies to do your design and come back with the final SEQRA.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Well, we could do that. I mean, I would like to get -- if there's an issue with the recharge, we can take that off of it and come back and do it during the design phase.

**MR. BAGG:**

But what I'm saying is, you represented that you want to build and then you want to design. You can't --

**MR. DONOVAN:**

We haven't -- we haven't done any of the design for this. It's going to be done with the consultant.

**MR. BAGG:**

But you're talking about the recharge basin's across the street. But currently the project before the CEQ is to expand the plant from 2.5 to 3 million gallons and to recharge into that existing recharge basin and stop the, you know, discharge into Long Island Sound. Is that the project?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

No, that's not -- we're not using this as recharge. It would be to use this land as recharge. This is going ultimately be for the expansion of the plant.

**MR. CRAMER:**

The existing recharge basin is going to be filled in; be used for equipment as I understand it.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

For process, right. For the process of the treatment plant. Process equipment.

**MR. CRAMER:**

And then the area to the south adjacent to the DEC in the ball fields would be the area that's proposed to be used as recharge. And at this point, you would like to go one way, but you don't know. You'd like to go with open recharge but you may consider --

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Well, yes. It's -- it's an issue that's going to have to be evaluated by the consultant engineer that we hire for the expansion.

**MR. CRAMER:**

So, you're just in for the planning stage at this point?

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

No, it's either yes or no. I'm getting confused. Are we --



**MR. DONOVAN:**

Okay. Then it will just be for the planning. Yes, just for the planning stage.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Okay, which is a Type II action. So, you don't even have to be here.

I guess one of the things that I have a problem with, and I think that you're hearing from the rest of the committee is that, you know, there's a lot of questions that are still outstanding that sounds like you have to do the planning study in order to address. You know, certainly odors, the amount of clearing. You're right alongside the athletic fields. You're right alongside the DEC. I mean, yes, these may be things that could be addressed, but at this point you don't know which way you're going to go.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Well, the college said this is land we could use. So, we want to use this as recharge to take the flow out of the Long Island Sound. So, it's going to have to be cleared one way or another if we do sub-surface or, you know, open bed recharge. So, if that's something that's going to be an issue -- I mean, we'd like to get approval on that, but I guess you're saying I can't get that at this time because of the issue with the -- I mean it's going to be used somehow or we want to use it somehow as a recharge field. Okay. What type or how hasn't been totally decided. But we know either way we're going to have to clear out this area.

**MR. CRAMER:**

I'm play devil's advocate. Are there any other locations for this leaching area?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Well, the college said they're -- we may -- the other issue is we may need additional land area. And that's something that the consultants will have to study. And they said there is some property to the south on the campus area called \\_la pee\\_ , I believe. I don't know if anybody's familiar with that. But that's down on the south end that they said we could use possibly also for recharge.

**MR. BAGG:**

Basically, there's two things before the CEQ. Right now it can probably be approved for planning moneys only; in other words, they would allow the appropriation for design. There are a lot of other questions outstanding, which would have to be tabled and final designs presented including the EAF for consideration. I mean this project is really not at the point where it's even a facsimile of final design. It's still up in the air.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

Because you can't answer our questions until you have the final design; so, we should just take it in the appropriate stages.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Well, that's correct. We don't have all the information how's it going to be done. But we would love to use this area. And if that's something that we have to just table, that's fine. We would like to get at least planning out of this.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Well, you're also presenting that you have several -- or that you at least have one other alternative to the site; whether it might be more appropriate. And without that information at this point, you know, I think you really should just go with the planning.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Wait until we getting the planning.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Right.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Okay. That's fine.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Right. And then -- then come back to us with everything laid out because I don't think you're going to get the votes for anything else.

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Okay. That's fine.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Do I have a motion?

**MR. BROWN:**

I'll do a motion for the planning.

**MR. CRAMER:**

It'll be Type II.

**MS. ESPOSITO:**

I'll second it.

**MR. CRAMER:**

I have a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

**MR. DONOVAN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Historic Services.

**MR. MARTIN:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Good morning.

**MR. MARTIN:**

Just a few things to report on today. The County has closed on the Scully Estate in Islip. That was done June 30th. Right now they're asbestos clean up on the site and in the main house. And, so, the keys and the deed has not been turned over to the Parks Department at this time. We have not been on-site yet. So, until that clean up is done, I don't know when I'll be scheduling the Historic Trust Committee. But as soon as we get into the property, I will do so. So, at this point I could see early fall, September possibly that we'd have our meeting on that site.

To answer a question last time on the Chandler Estate, the County has cleared the larger building on the site at the Chandler estate. That's been completely cleared off the site. The smaller building that's there has had an asbestos cleanup for that building. But it has not been decided as to the use of that building yet. So, that's still standing. It's completely boarded up and they have cleaned up the asbestos, which had to be done with the other building, too, that had the fire damage.

Currently, again, in the news is the Big Duck, if you seen it on channel five and Newsday. This is basically the same issue that came up two years ago. We have not had any formal contact from the Town of Southampton. Nothing's been presented to the Parks Department on any of their ideas. It's just been played out in the press. So, nothing has changed as far as I know. We did have a Historic Trust Committee meeting in Flanders when it came up last time in February 2004. And everyone understood this building was dedicated to the Suffolk County Historic Trust at the time that it was taken and was donated to the County at their request. They were concerned that building would be handled properly. So, it was dedicated at that early time. And that would need a county-wide referendum if we were to give it to the Town of Southampton. So, the only thought was if the town came back with a wonderful plan that we couldn't refuse, we might discuss it with them on working with them at a park at the original Flanders' site. But until we get any proposal from the Town, it's just being played out in the press.

And just another reminder the Yaphank Historic Society is having their 30-year anniversary August 7th at the Hawkins House in Yaphank. And it's billed as a fundraiser. They're raising funds for their current restoration of Booth House which is across the street. That's it.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Any CAC concerns or other business? I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

**MR. CRAMER:**

Motion.

**MS. MANFREDONIA:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:**

Adjourned.

**(THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 10:37 AM)**