

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

MINUTES

A regular meeting of the Suffolk County Council on Environmental Quality was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on Wednesday July 20, 2005.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Swanson, Vice-Chairperson
Thomas Cramer
Michael Kaufman
Lance Mallamo
Adrienne Esposito
Steve Brown, CAC Town of Brookhaven
Joy Squires, CAC Town of Huntington

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Leg. Vivian Vilorio-Fisher, Fifth District
James Bagg, Chief Environmental Analyst/Department of Planning
Penny Kohler, Department of Planning
Richard Martin, Historic Services
W. Charles Bender, PO Aide
Kevin LaValle, Aide to Leg. Losquadro
Lauretta Fischer, Department of Planning
Nick Gibbons, Department of Parks
Kelly Roper, Department of Parks
Michelle Moravec, Department of Parks
George Proios
Alan Todd Costell, Boys and Girls Club
Cheryl M. Krupa-Simms, Boys and Girls Club
Bob Brown, Boys and Girls Club
Ralph Borkowski, Department of Public Works
Christopher M. Deutsch, Department of Public Works
Jeffrey Petrie, Department of Public Works
Michael Marsico, Department of Public Works
William G. Laverty, Wiedersum Associates
Jim Antonelli, Bowne
Tedd Goder, Department of Public Works

MINUTES TAKEN AND TRANSCRIBED BY:

Diana Kraus - Court Stenographer

(THE MEETING COMMENCED AT 9:37 PM)

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We don't have a quorum. It's not that we don't want to start on time but unfortunately we can't. So -- we need two more people who are expected. Tom Cramer is now here. We're still waiting for one more member. If you would be patient for a little while longer, I would appreciate it.

(OFF THE RECORD)

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We'll call the meeting to order. And the best that I know, we did not receive any minutes and so we'll move onto correspondence.

Jim, there was no correspondence -- where is Jim? We're waiting for Jim. But I don't believe there's -- Jim, do you have any additional correspondence for us?

MR. BAGG:

No.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right. So we'll move onto Type II Actions. Jim, would you like to call anything in particular to our attention?

MR. BAGG:

Yes. IR number 1727, it's a local law to prevent the spread of non-native aquatic plants in Suffolk County. It's regulating, I believe, the sale. It is a new program. And as such it's an unlisted action at least requiring an EAF. 1727. I mean it may be beneficial, but I believe it's an unlisted action. It's not covered in the Type II list and it would require an EAF preparation.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right. So we will advise with regard to that?

MR. BAGG:

Yes. This list goes to the Legislature once it's approved by the CEQ.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right. Any questions from the board?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll just point out one thing. 1724 and 1734, there's two resolutions on appointing members to -- potential members to the CEQ, which I find to be interesting personally. 1724 and 1734. Just noting it. That's all. Aside from that, I'll make a motion to accept staff recs.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do I have a second?

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We have a second. All in favor? Opposed? Okay. It passes.

Proposed Old Field Farm County Park, adaptive re-use of stable building, Trustees Road.
Anybody here to speak to that?

MR. MARTIN:

I'm just speaking to that.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Pardon? Okay, Rich.

MR. MARTIN:

Okay. This is a large stable building in the center of the property. We did review -- I'm sorry, the CEQ did review the restoration of the apartment at the east end of this building after a meeting February 21, 2001 and approved that. And we went ahead and restored that end of the building. Actually that was done with funds from Old Field Farm Inc, the group that's running the property for Suffolk County.

At this point we are looking to appropriate \$100,000 towards the adaptive re-use of the other end of the building. The stables there, the stalls cannot be used or all of them cannot be used for the horse show grounds because they're too small for what people require for the requirements today. So, we're looking to do an adaptive re-use program where possible for these buildings.

And this end of the building, the group thought it would be a good idea to install a classroom, a learning center that they could educate people when they're doing their programs there. And we're also planning on doing a historic exhibit within this building of the site. And the design is to compliment the stable design that we have, which is very generic; barn design. And also relate to the work that was already done for the apartment.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

You put a new roof on this building?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Rich, what's the general condition of the building? Last time I was there a couple years ago, it wasn't all that great.

MR. MARTIN:

The building's in terrible shape. And so we're going to try to salvage what we can. But we do need to upgrade this building completely for public assembly with a new foundation. So, we'll see what we can do; but we're trying to replicate the look as much as possible. And we will use part of the structure.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. So, basically visually it's not really going to change aside from a new roof --

MR. MARTIN:

It'll be an enclosed building compared to an open stall design that you see now.

MR. CRAMER:

But it will match what's there existing with the caretakers?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes, exactly. That was kind of our experiment in a sense to adaptive re-use of this property but keep the look of the historic 1930's stable buildings.

MR. CRAMER:

Make a motion Type II.

MR. MALLAMO:

Can I just ask one more question? Richie, is this one of the \"Richard Havelon Smite\" --

MR. MARTIN:

We haven't had that documented yet. We do have the plans for the large U-shape building that's there that they have restored already. But we don't have documentation to prove that he worked on the smallest stable building.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Technical point. Obviously I see it from the CEQ perspective and I don't have a problem with it. Do we also need to vote as Historic Trust on this one?

MR. MALLAMO:

I think that the motion would be from the CEQ and the Suffolk County Historic Trust.

MR. KAUFMAN:

All right. So we would -- whoever makes it, just say from both bodies then.

MR. BAGG:

Yeah, we usually have a joint motion that deals with the Historic Trust and SEQRA recommendations.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Tom has already made a motion.

MR. MALLAMO:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

One last thing. Do I understand that the stalls for the horses no longer meet code?

MR. MARTIN:

It's not code. It's just the design that the people that own these at this point expensive horses want so that a lot of the people use their own trailers now and keep the horses in the trailers. Some of the stables on the south end of the property are larger and can be reconfigured to the current code. But it's really the horse. It's not, you know, the users that want a certain design, a certain size.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Thank you. So we had a motion and a second. All in favor? Adrienne?

MS. ESPOSITO:

Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Opposed? Motion passes.

All right. Proposed fencing materials for Suffolk County Department of Parks, Recreation and Conservation. Nick, Good morning.

MR. GIBBONS:

Nick Gibbons, Parks Department. This is a capital project -- capital budget item. It's simply purchasing of materials for use at a later date in Parks not necessarily known at this time. This is just an on going maintenance of perimeter fencing within a parks system.

MR. MALLAMO:

Can you describe the type of fencing? Are we talking chain link or do you not know what kind of fence?

MR. GIBBONS:

The money is just specified as fencing materials. It can be split rail, chain link, picket, as we see fit for whatever is appropriate in that application.

MR. CRAMER:

Motion Type II.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

MR. MALLAMO:

Can I make a recommendation? It's a picky point, but I think it's an important one. In the early years the Parks Department to do perimeter fencing used chain link in green vinyl. And in my opinion that really has a negative environmental impact. I think best case driving up Sweet Hollow or Mt. Misery roads in Huntington where West Hills, that this beautiful forest with this school lot type of environment with this fence hugging both sides of the road, so I would encourage you to use either black or brown vinyl chain link; not the green or wood fencing. That would be my only recommendation.

MS. ESPOSITO:

And, Nick, just for clarity, this is just for purchasing; right?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Purchasing.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do you want to modify your motion, Tom?

MR. CRAMER:

Motion. I'll modify it to black vinyl.

MR. MALLAMO:

Thank you.

MS. ESPOSITO:

And he is happy to do so.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right. All in favor? Opposed? Carries.

Capital project 7080, improvements to Cupsogue County Park, Westhampton. Is it really Town of Brookhaven?

MR. CRAMER:

Yes, it is. It used to be a Town of Brookhaven Beach. And they gave it to the County because they used to lose the maintenance people going over there all the time. They would disappear for a day or two before they'd come back.

MR. MALLAMO:

It's a beach. What do you expect?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay, Nick.

MR. GIBBONS:

This is actually something that the Council had looked at a few years back so at least for the purposes of this meeting today, I think, it can be withdrawn. I don't mind discussing it, though, as a point of clarification, but I don't necessarily need a motion from the Council at this point in time. I came to CEQ about four years ago. And the issues haven't changed there; namely we have traffic backing up. We have a parking lot that holds about 800 vehicles. When it's full, it's full. But people still keep coming down. They take that whole trip down through the Village of Westhampton Dunes. And by the time they get there, they're not too interested in turning around and leaving. They just kind of wait. And that traffic backs up on the road in front of these residences where there are now more than ever. And so the issue of handling our own traffic is something that we want to hire a consultant to take a look at and see how we might be able to do a better job.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Jim, is Nick's recollection correct? That we did approve this before?

MR. BAGG:

I don't know. He just stated that today. I assume if he has a SEQRA resolution in his folder that you reviewed it previously.

MR. GIBBONS:

Yeah, I had -- this is -- my intention was to have withdrawn it before the packages went out. But apparently that didn't make it all the way to Dennison so.

MR. KAUFMAN:

One question, Nick. Regarding toll collecting facilities, are there toll collecting facilities there right now? I've never been to the park.

MR. GIBBONS:

Well, depending on your definition of facilities, yes. By Park standards we do have facilities. Most recently we added electric so that was a great upgrade for us. You know, the park has --

MR. KAUFMAN:

It's the 21st century, Nick.

MR. GIBBONS:

Well, in some places. The -- we've done what we could. We have two toll booths. We have a cabin for what it's worth. Anybody who's been there knows that our infrastructure isn't all it should be. And part of what this consultant's going to look at is how to better configure the location and/or the facilities themselves. And then we're going to come back to the Council certainly for what we finally agree would be a good fit for the park. It's always going to be limited by the number of parking spaces. That's not going to go away. The issue is how do we convince the public that it's not in their best interest to drive down the rest of the way only to find out the park is closed. Whether that means an electronic sign up by the bridge, you know, kind of letting people know that it's closed for the rest day, we're not sure. But something we need to

address.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Can I just -- I just want to remind the CEQ members that we're going to lose our quorum at 1030. So you may just want to be mindful of that as we look at projects we don't need to vote on.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right. Good point. So, we'll just move on.

MR. CRAMER:

Do we need a motion to take that off?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Motion withdrawn.

MS. ESPOSITO:

No, he already has a SEQRA motion.

MR. BAGG:

Don't entertain it at this time.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Proposed acquisition of land for Open Space Preservation purposes known as Gould's Pond, Town of Brookhaven. Good morning.

MS. FISCHER:

Good morning. Laretta Fischer, Planning. Do you want to do Sagaponack next or --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Proposed acquisition of land for open space purposes known as Sagaponack.

MS. FISCHER:

This is a piece of property that is approximately 42 acres that goes north/south along Town Line Road between the Towns of Southampton and East Hampton. We have been picking up a lot of properties in this area over the last ten or so years. We own a significant amount both on the Southampton side and on the East Hampton side. And this is one piece that we had on our master list last year. We're proposing to acquire it under Multifaceted as open space, which would require it being used as passive recreation. It's primarily pitch pine and oak habitat.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Do we own anything in the general area?

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, a lot. As I said, it doesn't show on the map but we own adjacent to it in Southampton. And then on the other side is the airport preserve that we own as well. And so, as I said, we have a significant amount of land in the area. Just to the west of this is also the Long Pine Greenbelt Preserve as well. It's also in the South Fork SGPA.

MR. CRAMER:

Motion unlisted neg dec.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

Proposed acquisition of land for open space preservation purposes known as Mud Creek, County Park, Town of Brookhaven.

MS. FISCHER:

This is a small quarter acre lot situated on the -- in the area of the head waters of Mud Creek. If you look on the map, we've been trying to acquire properties both through acquisition and also tax lien procedures. This is another area in the head waters that we're trying to amass the vacant lands in that area. We are also -- surrounding that one particular piece are a number of parcels that are owned by the local school district, which we are now also in negotiations with as well. So, we're hoping to pick up a number of large pieces in that head waters area.

MS. ESPOSITO:

It also complies with the South Shore Estuary Comprehensive Management Plan as well.

MR. KAUFMAN:

It's on the list for acquisition?

MS. FISCHER:

There is no particular list.

MS. ESPOSITO:

No, no, no. What I mean the plan calls for land purchases for head waters of tributaries. That's what this does.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. And where did it come out on your scale for purchase?

MS. ESPOSITO:

For that point two three acres.

MR. KAUFMAN:

It's a small amount of land but --

MS. FISCHER:

Honestly I don't have it with me. It was so long ago. We've been working on this for years but --

MR. CRAMER:

I make a motion for an unlisted neg dec.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Adrienne seconds it. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

Proposed acquisition of land for open space purposes known as Gould's Pond, Town of Brookhaven.

MS. FISCHER:

This is a 5.5 acre parcel that's just south of the -- within the Village of Lake Grove just south basically of the Smithaven Mall area. This parcel actually was requested to be acquired in 1999. We finally have a willing seller and we -- it is a kettle hole right smack in the middle with

our forested vegetation oak primarily surrounding it. We are looking to acquire this under the Old Drinking Water 12-5-A monies. This is in zone one -- hydrogeologic zone one. And that's what we're proposing for acquisition.

MR. CRAMER:
Motion.

MS. ESPOSITO:
Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

MS. FISCHER:
Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
All right. The next is the proposed CYS Boys and Girls Club athletic fields and associated storage, maintenance and restroom facilities, Town of Brookhaven. It's nice to see you again Legislator Fisher.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:
Thank you. It's nice to be here.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Nick, do you want to start?

MR. GIBBONS:
My part of it will be brief. This project's familiar to the Council. It's evolved over the last four our five years. I think we were last to you in 2003. At that time there was -- the most significant change between now and then is the structure that's proposed for the site. At one point in time it was determined that the building had to be on a certain portion of the property. That being general County property versus parkland. This project encompasses both categories. But we are considering the entire site here today.

The location of the building is now more centrally located. It is on parkland. Its purpose is the scope -- the purpose of the building is significantly diminished. It was a communities center at one time. It's now a both bathroom and maintenance facility. We have representatives from the Boys and Girls Club. And certainly we have Legislator Vivian Viloría-Fisher whose district this project is in. It's the Setauket Woods area, Sheep Pasture Road and is -- at least the County parks portion of it is general county parkland.

You have as part of the EAF the site plan which is essentially -- illustrates in several conceptual terms the location of the fields. This will probably be constructed in phases as finances permit. The other significant feature is the parking and entrance to the facility which hasn't change from the last time you saw this. The parking is 350 spaces. And the entrance is off of Sheep Pasture opposite Links Lane; requires a traffic signal and a curb cut from the Town of Brookhaven.

I'll turn it over to questions unless the Legislator wants to add anything.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:
Thank you, Nick, but I'm just here as a backup singer if needed.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. In order to move along, I know there are have very specific questions that the -- some of the board members have. And it might be more efficient if we go directly to those if you don't mind so that we can hopefully get this through the sytem. So --

MR. GIBBONS:

I'll just introduce Bob Brown. He's the consultant working with the Boys and Girls Club. He'll probably answer most of these questions.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Do you want to start?

MR. STEVE BROWN:

I think a couple of years ago we voted on this project. I think happily we wanted that type of field in that area. We had some questions with regards to buffer zones, to the housing in that area. And maybe Bob can explain that a little bit that to me.

MR. BROWN:

May I approach?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

MR. BROWN:

Thank you. Can you hear me? Are we on? The color photo we have in front of us is an aerial view probably six or seven years ago; developments from _north_ isn't there. But basically the portion along -- Southern portion of Sheep Pasture Road is still the way it is today. The area outlined in orange is our site. And as you can see, it's pretty well been mined, devastated in all ways and has -- excavated over a period of time to below street grade anywhere from 25 to 35 feet.

MS. ESPOSITO:

What was it?

MR. BROWN:

It was a sand mine dating way back into the '50's actually. And just a little background, after the sand was mined, there was no value; at least at that point because there was a lot of land around. The property went and was acquired by the County for taxes, but when the landowner recognized the fact that in other places, in Port Jefferson and several other places where sand mines were, they were building condominiums, he went to court with the County and it was -- eleven years of litigation took place. Finally the County prevailed. And that's what makes this property available today.

Actually the only change from the plan that I show you now, which was from two-and-a-half years ago, is that at that time up in the public purpose portion, the six acres along Sheep Pasture Road, there was a 37,000 square foot recreation center with almost every amenity you could think of. Since that time the philosophy of the Boys and Girls Club has changed. Also he had further discussions with the County. And when the line was struck for the six acres of public purpose, the thought process just said well, along Sheep Pasture Road. But if you take into consideration set backs required and the desire to maintain the buffer as Steve was talking about, there's no room because there's about 60 or 70 feet of woods. Then the grade drops off dramatically. Once we get to the bottom of the grade, we'd have to be building this building partially out in the soil. And it wouldn't really work.

The access we're showing at that time from Links Lane with parking in the southern portion of

the property. Today the access is still the same. The only change is that the building is no longer 37,000 square feet. It's something around 4,000. And it's intended for administration, maintenance, storage and general operation of the facility. It's been located -- with restrooms -- more centrally to the fields. And that's why we're really basically back here today for that change. Any other questions?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

So, the question about the -- Route 25A --

MR. STEVE BROWN:

Yes. The Route 25A Bypass, where does that apply to this?

MR. BROWN:

Route 25A Bypass is at our southern limit.

MR. STEVE BROWN:

Okay.

MR. BROWN:

And --

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Including all the right-of-ways?

MR. STEVE BROWN:

Yes.

MR. BROWN:

Yes. The meeting we had at Parks Trustees, we had a secondary discussion at that meeting with Cynthia Barnes, who has been working on the bike path along the Old Bypass Road. And we're going to try to look at a mutual effort to tie the bike path with our facility down here for bicycles so they can lock them up and so to go -- take the bicycle up the path, come to the field and have an inter-relation; so of inter-modal, I don't know, walking, running and bicycles.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Will you have to come back here for that when you come to an agreement? Or is it --

MR. BROWN:

We probably would, yes. But I think it's -- it may be that when they come back with their full plan, we'll be an appendage to that.

MR. STEVE BROWN:

I don't think that's an official Bypass at this time. I don't think, you know, Route 25A Bypass has been given up by the state for that purpose. I think they're looking at some type of program that they're doing so at this time they wouldn't have to come back for that. My only concern was that if they do do the Bypass, how is that going to affect the fields as where you're putting them today?

MR. BROWN:

We're outside of that right-of-way. And by a substantial distance. And we have a portion in our south-east corner that we've committed to the Parks Trustees that we would never disturb the trees in that area since it is the only play where trees remain on the site. And we want to preserve the trees we have.

MR. CRAMER:

Where is that located on the map?

MR. BROWN:

That's in -- Tom, I'm not sure you can see the line, but the property comes to a point. And we're -- there's tree cover down in this area. And we would not be down in here at all.

MR. CRAMER:

But you haven't designated that on the map?

MR. BROWN:

I beg your pardon?

MR. CRAMER:

You have not designated that on the map?

MR. BROWN:

That specifically, no, but it's in the minutes of the Park Trustees meetings.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Are you making such a representation to us today?

MR. BROWN:

I certainly am.

MR. CRAMER:

I have a question with regard to the parking. Right now you're not showing any landscaping in there at all? And you have some 450 feet long of parking stalls. Are you considering putting trees in there to break up that visual expanse?

MR. BROWN:

This is a conceptual plan. Certainly there would be landscaping associated with it because a sea of asphalt is not what we're trying to create. We're trying to make it a sea of green and break up the rows of cars certainly, yeah.

MR. CRAMER:

The conceptual plan can certainly show landscaping because if you look at this as a conceptual plan, it just shows a big area of parking that, you know, certainly inappropriate as far as I'm concerned.

MR. BROWN:

We can certainly commit to that.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

And the appropriate drainage?

MR. BROWN:

Most certainly.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

And what is the rain fall you're designing for?

MR. BROWN:

We'll be designing for a 4-inch storm. And this property is as it was a nice clean bank run, the

run-off considerations we will not be creating any areas of, shall we say, hot spots because it'll mostly likely drain very effectively in all areas.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right. Is it going to be natural turf?

MR. BROWN:

What we're going to try to do is, this property is devoid of topsoil. And we're going to try to work with New York State DEC to develop an organic turf arrangement that eventually will be irrigated and try to be as effective as we can with that since we have basically a clean slate to start with.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

You meant as opposed to as astroturf?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

That's correct.

MR. BROWN:

That's correct.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yeah.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I've got one question on a technical what we are being presented with today. I'm a little bit confused by the language. It talks about a conceptual master plan and then it talks about a building. First question is, I know we've been presented with plans in the past. Were those plans made into any kind of binding master plan? Or is this a master plan that we're being presented with today?

MR. BROWN:

This is the master plan. There was a previous plan.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah.

MR. BROWN:

Again, the concept, which has just been had modified slightly. And at that point we had only record aerial photography to work from. And we've mapped the entire site now so that --

MR. KAUFMAN:

But that previous plan was never binding; was never adopted in a binding way? It was still conceptual at that point in time?

MR. BROWN:

Right.

MR. KAUFMAN:

So the plan we're being presented with today is this map? This is the master plan that we're being asked to deal with?

MR. BROWN:

Correct.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. And then --

MR. BROWN:

One of the major reasons -- if I may interrupt --

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah.

MR. BROWN:

-- was that the definition of the parcel in the early stages was never really clarified. We have mapped the entire site so that we now know precisely as opposed to from the old aerial photographs where the tele-slope is; will be completely on the base not disturbing any banks. We know where we are located.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. So the 37,000 square foot building was just an idea in the past; and now we're being presented with a 4,000 square feet building. And that's what we're going to be dealing with in terms of construction?

MR. BROWN:

Correct. A 37,000 square foot building is off the table completely for discussion. Even as something -- if you said to us we're going to come back with it, we are not.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Thank you.

MR. STEVE BROWN:

Can we get that -- also the area that's going to be delineated for buffer zones as part of this agreement?

MR. MALLAMO:

What's the lighting?

MR. BROWN:

None.

MS. ESPOSITO:

You asked that last time, too.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Dark side.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Yes.

MR. BROWN:

No lighting.

MR. MALLAMO:

No lighting; not even in the parking lot?

MR. BROWN:

Maybe some limited parking lighting. It's just not a night time facility.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I just want to go back to the question about pesticide use. And you had said you'd be working

with the DEC to have an organic -- is that -- organic methodologies used. Is that in writing in the master plan?

MR. BROWN:

It's in our EIS.

MS. ESPOSITO:

It is.

MR. BROWN:

It's stated. And it will be part of our contract agreement with the County.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Okay. Because I believe we asked that last time as well. Okay.

MR. GIBBONS:

Adrienne, this has to comply with our Parks Organic Maintenance Plan as a parks facility. So we will hold them to that.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Jim.

MR. BAGG:

Yeah. It also has to comply with the County pesticide law. That's on the books.

MR. BROWN:

Correct. We are bound to that the moment we agree to the transaction.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Okay. Well, all those three things sound good.

MR. BROWN:

Yes, Tom?

MR. CRAMER:

The eastern most junior soccer field, if you look at that, there's a difference in grade of some 20 feet between one corner and the other. How is that going to be accomplished? I imagine you're going to have to do -- cutting into that bank or filling --

MR. BROWN:

We may cut into the bank somewhat or we may even eliminate that field.

MR. CRAMER:

Because from what you were representing before that that area to the east of it would be remain natural, if that field was to be built, I would imagine you'd have to do filling work or cutting into that bank that would affect that tree line.

MR. BROWN:

We may. When we get the detailed design that field is going to be either in or out depending on how far we have to grade. And it very possibly will affect that field. And we may have to eliminate it.

MR. CRAMER:

I don't know -- I would like to see the buffer line or the area that's going to be preserved shown

on the master plan; you know, graphically shown on the master plan. And also some graphic representation of, you know, some kind of landscaping or something visually to break up that expansive parking included as part of the master plan.

MR. BROWN:

We don't have a problem with that.

MR. MALLAMO:

Can we approve conceptual plan and ask that a more detailed site plan be brought back showing the landscaping, the buffer areas?

MR. CRAMER:

Well, this is the master plan that we have before us. And if we're acting on the master plan, I would rather see some of these concerns that have been brought up included right on this plan as well as some of the things as far as turf management and all. And that can be, you know, either accomplished by notes or, you know, like general areas that we want to preserve. Again, it's recognized that it is a master plan but I think some of these points would be important to have on there in a graphic form.

MR. BROWN:

With some isolated dimensions that show some key locations of limits.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Excuse me, if I may.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Tom, he very specifically says this is a conceptual plan.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes. May I, Mr. Chair?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA-FISHER:

There have been extensive discussions with the Parks Department, with our County Attorney's Office over the past few years. Certainly the buffers, Tom, have been something that have been discussed with the Parks Department. I believe they're on the record at the Trustees -- the Park Trustees' meeting. I see this a conceptual plan. And I believe that those records of Trustees's meetings and records of the meetings with the County Attorney's Office would corroborate that there have been buffers agreed to by the Boys and Girls Club. And so I think that record taken with this concept here would indicate that what you're looking for is in place and that can certainly -- if this could be approved so that we can move finally after four years -- well, I think 20 years of trying to get this facility for the children of my district and for all of Suffolk County where there is such a sparsity of playing fields. And the fields in Three Village have been lost because of the over population of the school district. And so many of our children have no fields on which to play baseball. We would just ask that this be approved today so that we could go ahead with our resolution. We have a meeting in early August before you meet again.

MR. CRAMER:

I don't think anybody's objecting to this project whether it be in conceptual or master plan. It was represented to us just now that this was the master plan on it; that the previous one was a conceptual and this is the master plan for the project.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

I think there was a little confusion about that question.

MR. CRAMER:

May I finish?

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm sorry.

MR. CRAMER:

And I think what I'm asking for is something that would not affect the time frame of this. I know how these conceptual master plans go. I would like to see, you know, certain notations on it. I would be willing to put forth a motion that we approve or -- approve this under the understanding that certain notations would be put on this particular plan as far as what we've discussed here.

LEG. VILORIA-FISCHER:

Okay.

MR. CRAMER:

And again that's my own personal opinion. Whether the rest of the Council agrees with it or not, that's what the vote will be for.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Well, that certainly seems fair if we can move it out. And Mr. Brown is nodding that those notations could be made.

MR. BROWN:

Certainly.

MR. CRAMER:

Motion then --

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

I just wanted to underscore that I thought that there perhaps there was confusion as far as Michael Kaufman's question which was, was the master plan what we saw with 37,000 square foot building, was that a concretized plan or would you say this is? And I think in the contrast of whether that previous plan was the plan or this was, I think what Mr. Brown was saying was this is the one we're looking at. I think that's the intent.

MR. CRAMER:

Yeah, I think we all understand that this is the plan and that's one of the reasons why I'm asking for these things to be shown on the map at this time.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Jim.

MR. BAGG:

I think at this point in time if the Council chooses to proceed, you know, with a Type I Action with a negative declaration, in the negative declaration we're going to point out those conditions that, you know, it has been agreed upon that our appropriate buffers will be preserved, the natural open space and they will be placed on the plan as a mitigation measure as part of the neg dec as well as the other things. There's the landscaping plan for the parking lot as well.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Lance.

MR. MALLAMO:

I think that that's a great way to proceed. I think what Tom's trying to avoid, we had a similar situation in another locality where the parents of the players weren't aware of what the covenants were or the agreements. And got their chain saws out and started willy nilly cutting to make room for another field. We don't want that to happen again.

MS. ESPOSITO:

That was fun.

MR. MALLAMO:

So if we can pass this today and have that --

MR. CRAMER:

I'd like to make a motion, then, Type I Action neg dec with the conditions that the buffer areas that have been agreed to be shown on the plan, that conceptual landscaping be shown within the parking lot to break up the visual expanse; also we could include potential access for future bike path to the south. Is there anything else?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes, I think I'd like to see the drainage for the parking lot.

MR. CRAMER:

Drainage for the parking lot.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

And the identification of that south-east corner as being preserved as woods.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Yes.

MR. CRAMER:

And again this can either be done both graphically or as notes on the plan.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We have a motion. We have a second.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

A second by Adrienne. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you very much.

All right. We have five minutes before Adrienne disappears. We have a couple of tabled motions. Proposed improvements to the water supply system at Cathedral Pines.

MR. GIBBONS:

Just for efficiency, both projects are identical except for the fact that they're across the street from each other; different locations. It's the same concept; that is to upgrade current well water which routinely fails Health Department standards and bring Suffolk County Water Authority utilities further down County road 21 and opposite both Prosser Pines and Cathedral Pines in Yaphank -- Middle Island rather. And then bring that public water in for both Parks staff and public use.

I brought this as a Type II last month. At that time the Council disagreed with that determination

and requested a short EAF, which I present to the Council now. I don't think there are any issues, at least none came up last time around. But for your review is the short EAF.

MR. CRAMER:

Motion, unlisted neg dec.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. And proposed improvement to water supply at Prosser Pines County Park, Middle Island.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Motion, unlisted neg dec.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

Now we have -- we probably won't get through it. The preliminary DEIS for proposed Suffolk County Correctional facility expansion at Yaphank, Town of Brookhaven. CEQ is required to accept this. Welcome, Ralph.

MR. BORKOWSKI:

Good morning. DPW has submitted a preliminary draft Environmental Impact Statement for your review and comments on the Suffolk County Correctional Facility expansion in Yaphank. We have here today Bill Laverty, our architectural consultant, who is the designer on the project; Tedd Godek, the County Architect of Suffolk County; and Jim Antonelli of Sidney Bowne who is the preparer of the draft Environmental Impact Statement. We're here to entertain any questions or comments on the proposed report and this project.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Under the narrative on page two, it talks about it will require the clearing of an additional 20 acres of County owned property. Then on page 59, it says --

MR. KAUFMAN:

25 acres.

MS. ESPOSITO:

-- 25 acres of land will be cleared. And then in the EAF, I believe, and I'm not having luck turning to it right now, but it has another number. So, I wanted to know how many acres will be cleared for this?

MR. LAVERTY:

Well, right now under the configuration that we're looking at --

COURT STENOGRAPHER:

Speak into the mike, please.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

And identify yourself, please.

MR. LAVERTY:

Bill Laverty from Wiedersum Associates Architects. I'm sorry. Bill Laverty from Wiedersum Associates Architects. We'll try to give a slight overview of what we're looking at right now for people who are not familiar with the site itself.

This is an aerial photograph of the existing Yaphank facility. This is Yaphank Avenue on this side. This is the police headquarters up north. This is Skill Nursing Facility. And this is now the existing Yaphank jail. This is Suffolk Avenue that comes up as an entrance into the jail at the time present moment. This is the police K-9 facility. It's in the back. The rest of the area is cleared. We made a determination that the proposed Yaphank site, jail existing site, is about 70 acres overall. The existing facility takes in about 15 acres at the present time.

What we are proposing or what the County is proposing is that the project will be done in two stages. Stage one will involve the addition of 600 beds plus some core facility which involves booking, visitation and the utilization of the former program facility and the existing facility as a combination of. The County is presently putting in a sprung or temporary structure to house 120 inmates as per the Commission of Corrections.

After Phase I is completed, the County is proposing to go with the final stage which will add another 720 beds. And as you can see, the additional core facility for all jail administration, health facility, more staff support and then utilizing part of the existing facility and then part of the facility will be demolished.

We're anticipating that the actual area of clearance will be approximately 20 additional acres or about 35 acres total at the time. The configuration may change somewhat but we think this is probably the worst condition that we'll have.

And finally on this particular aerial, we outline the demarcation line, our boundary line. We're trying to keep a 100 foot buffer between our perimeter road and the outside, a buffer of about 210 feet on the south end because if we ever needed expansion, we would want some this way. And to the north you have your transmission lines up here -- your power lines and your dog K-9's. So, we feel -- this is a little over 70 acres. About 70.7 acres overall if it's blocked out.

So, what we try to do is give ourselves a little bit of variance. The design of the facility has changed numerous times since we've been authorized to go ahead last July. And at this present time, this looks like the configuration that we're going with. So, we're looking probably to clear a total of 20 additional acres for the actual facility. Whether or not we take an acre or two more in the configuration of parking and such -- we're trying to tighten the whole thing up in reality so that maybe this whole thing might come down a little bit to the east a little bit more and not go so far to the west.

At one point we had -- our mechanical room was in this area, which pushed this building further to the west. But now we move the mechanical room into the V of the two housing pods which will prove a lot more efficient as far as the operation of the facility is concerned.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Well, basically you've given us a very long answer on how many acres is going to be cleared.

MR. LAVERTY:

20 acres. Sorry.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. Yet at the same time you're, for lack of a better word, you're appearing a little bit imprecise on what might actually happen. I would simply suggest if you're going to be clearing

up to 25 acres, you might phrase it as up to 25 acres.

MR. LAVERTY:
Okay. That's fine.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Give us an outer limit as opposed to locking it in in one place and then giving yourself expansion ability some place else. Just be consistent on all of those figures and say up to 25 acres.

MR. LAVERTY:
Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN:
And you can say that, you know, it looks right now like about 20 acres, but ultimately 25 could go.

MR. LAVERTY:
Okay. Very good. Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN:
That would solve the problem. I have another question.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Another question.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Yeah. On page 51 of the volume one of the draft EIS, it talks about the groundwater. And I know that there is an SGP in the area. I was involved with an Environmental Impact Statement using that SGP a couple of years ago. So, I'm at least familiar with what's happening in the area. And it looks basically as if the sanitary sewage is going to be going to that SGP and will be under the design capacity. What is questionable to me is the fourth paragraph on page 51, it says overall the calculated increase in the mass load that would eventually reach the Carmen's River from the added plant effluent operating at capacity, plus that of the proposed scavenger waste facility, I guess, represents a 3.6 increase which is insignificant. I don't see the data for this in the report unless I've missed it. And I think it probably should be placed in there; at least that's my opinion right now.

And I would note that there are plumes in the area right now that are causing problems, etcetera. And, you know, you're talking about a 3.6% increase. I'm not seeing how that is really related to the other plumes. And I also don't know that you can really make the statement that 3.6% increase is necessarily insignificant. You might want to just dump the words "which is insignificant". You can make the statement that there's 3.6% increase anticipated. That's okay. We're the ones making the judgement whether it's significant or not.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Well, I'd like to point out that perhaps they should be making a mathematical or statistical calculation as to whether it's significant or not. When you say statistically significance or insignificance in a scientific report, it means that you've actually done the test and not just made value judgements as to whether it's significant or insignificant. And given the sensitivity of the Carmen's River, I think we would like to see that, in fact, it is insignificant.

MR. KAUFMAN:
I know that there are some groundwater studies in the area. Several years ago we were presented with a proposed SGP upgrade. And we declared a pos dec on that particular plan because of the effluent issues that we saw coming out of there. The County had done some studies. I don't remember who did the studies, but they are out there to utilize and look at.

Okay, Health Department did it. Thank you.

MS. ESPOSITO:

It actually just came out just a few years ago. It's the most extensive study on the Carmen's River and watershed ever in the County. And it was just published about two years ago. I think you may have looked at it. But if you didn't, you certainly would want to reference that for this EIS.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yes. Again, looking at it in terms of completeness referencing it and adding data to it, to this particular report, I think, is the important point that we're making. Realistically at least from a non-scientific stand point, a three percent increase in the mass load that's basically being first put through the SGP is relatively a small increase. I'm not saying it's a good thing, I'm not saying it's a bad thing. But we do have to have that in the report that it has been looked at.

MR. BAGG:

I don't even know if that STPA goes towards the river.

MS. ESPOSITO:

It's an STP.

MR. BAGG:

STP goes towards the river. I think it's flowing south. I think that plume goes to the south towards the landfill in there.

MR. KAUFMAN:

No, you're talking the actual plumes or the anticipated plume?

MR. BAGG:

I'm talking about the anticipated plume from the STP. It think currently that plume goes south towards the landfill.

MR. CRAMER:

I thought it was south/east.

MR. BAGG:

Well, I don't think it goes north towards the river.

MR. CRAMER:

There's a question --

MR. BAGG:

I mean that should be documented in there.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yeah. And, again, the studies do exist right now to take a look at and see. You can literally probably look at the base loads. For whatever it's worth, I think it's good that the effluent would be -- run through the SGP. It does have capacity in the area so that's a good thing.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Yeah.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do we have any other questions?

MR. BROWN:

I never received this book of the Yaphank facility within the Town of Brookhaven. So, I would request that at least a copy be sent to me.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Did you hear that, Jim?

MR. BAGG:

That's probably a mistake on our part. However, we sent it to the members. But, you know, Steve is -- an oversight on our part because we only received them recently. I said send them to the, you know, standing members; not to CAC but we'll be glad to get you a copy.

MR. KAUFMAN:

He's involved with CAC so he should get one.

MR. BROWN:

One of the things that we talked about in the past was that, you know, in sending this type of document in a short period of time to be reviewed by everybody, it's very hard to make an educated decision on some of these things.

MR. BAGG:

Basically the procedure is because the Department of Public Works went with the DEIS, at this point in time the Council simply approves the document for completion purposes to be sent out for review and comment from all interested parties and agencies at a later date. As we said, this is a preliminary draft to be changed subject to Council's comments and directions.

MR. CRAMER:

Well, I think what Steve's saying is if you're asking us to look at it as far as scope and adequacy, this short amount of time that we got, I just -- I don't know what day exactly I received it, but I've not had the opportunity to go through the whole thing. I've looked at it cursory, but certainly not to determine whether it fully addresses adequately for sending it out for review.

MR. BAGG:

That's the Council's discretion. That's what you're here for. Tell DPW.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I think I had mine about a week.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Yeah, me also.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do we have any other comments that we can give them that are constructive at this point?

MR. CRAMER:

What is your time frame on this?

MR. LAVERTY:

Anticipated time frame right now I think we're looking to start construction probably in the beginning of 2007.

MR. GODEK:

Actually we have to have under time frame adopted by the Commission of Correction, we officially have to have a shovel in the ground by June of '06. What's critical here is the appropriation of funding in the '05 Capital Program and the '06 Capital Program.

MR. CRAMER:

Yeah, we got to table it.

MR. MALLAMO:

So the funding is in for this year, Ted? Funding is in for this year? Construction funding?

MR. GODEK:

There is a portion of the construction funds, yes, that is in the '05 budget. And there's another -- the remainder of it is in the '06 budget.

MR. CRAMER:

I'd like to make a motion to table this so that we have more time to review for scope and adequacy.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I'll second.

MR. CRAMER:

And so long as Steve gets his copy, Jim.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do we have any other discussion? Motion.

MR. KAUFMAN:

No. I think it's proper to table. And we've got some data that we know is out there that we know we need to take a look at for completeness, etcetera. So, I don't think it's -- and we don't that that data before us right now. I think we do need to table.

MR. MALLAMO:

Can I just ask what does that do to your plan to go for appropriation funds? Do you have enough meetings to do that?

MR. GODEK:

I think we do. I'll rely on Jim to -- Jim Bagg, that is, to fill me in a bit on the -- some of the processes that are going to occur after this. But I believe we have time.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I don't think we can accept it as complete regardless of the time line without -- I know for me without the data showing that 3.6% is insignificant or significant or meaningful or not. I think that's a very critical component to the draft EIS.

MR. CRAMER:

And the study to be included.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We'll table it. You know, those are things that we've identified so far. If we table it, that means that next month we may have additional issues or concerns.

MR. BAGG:

Right. If I might request, if the members could get me written comments or just, you know, the document with written notes on it so that I can get it to the Department of Public Works to make the document or change the document appropriately. And I think that the -- basically the appropriation has to be made by the end of 2005, which is December. So SEQRA has to be completed by then.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. I want to let Adrienne go so we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. So, I think, Jim, we can give comments now so that they can work on them or they can certainly work on the comments based on what we've heard today. But that does not mean that there won't be other comments in the coming month. All right?

MR. KAUFMAN:

If nothing else, this does help the County in terms of making a more complete EIS such that it can't really be challenged.

MR. GODEK:

Well, again, as Jim had pointed out, if we can be apprised of any of the interim comments you might have, things that come immediately to mind so that we can get working on them as quickly as possible, that would facilitate the process, I'm sure.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I think anything that you could do to clarify the issues with regard to the plume and the protection of the Carmen's River would only help our deliberations. Yes?

MR. BAGG:

Larry, I would also suggest that maybe they contact the Health Department that did prepare the report on the Carmen's River with projected impacts and discuss the, you know, the facility with them and what they feel in terms of significant impacts; whether there are some or not, you know. They may just find it's not within the drainage basin of the Carmen's. That I don't know. But it may not be.

MR. GODEK:

We will be in touch with them.

MR. KAUFMAN:

One other comment. I know the site fairly well. And, again, I've worked on the site in terms of historic resources and things like that. On page 46 you have the cultural resources survey in there basically just detailing what's on there. To put it bluntly there's no real historic sites on this particular property. There are no real historic resources or anything. But you might want to just try and confirm that with the County Parks Department. I believe that we have had surveys in the past.

MR. MALLAMO:

He's got a letter in there.

MR. KAUFMAN:

He does?

MR. MALLAMO:

Yes. That letter's in there. The only --

MR. KAUFMAN:

Never mind.

MR. MALLAMO:

I notice south of this there's a roadway. I don't know whether that's a fire break or an old colonial pathway. You're not really impacting it, but you might want to just look at some earlier aerials and see where that dates from. Because I wouldn't want to see that affected if it is an earlier roadway. But he's got a letter from State Parks.

MR. KAUFMAN:

No, I was talking about county parks.

MR. MALLAMO:

And anything else that was in that area.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I was talking about County Parks just to, you know, bullet-proof this thing.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Another suggestion on the Carmen's River, you might want to contact Dr. David _Tanjes_ of Cashin Associates. He's done a lot of work I know with the Brookhaven landfill there. And as I recall from some of his work, there is evidence that groundwater is, in fact, seeping south into the Brookhaven landfill site from perhaps up in this general area. So -- and, of course, then, everybody's concerned about what the landfill has done to the -- is doing to the Carmen's River. So you might want to talk to him.

MR. LAVERTY:

Excuse me. Is there anything else in the narrative that can be better clarified photograph-wise or -- I'm going -- we're going to include the final stage one and two of what -- the boundary around it too in the final draft. But is there anything else that we can put in there?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I actually thought it was pretty well written. Very clear. I like the traffic analysis in there. I thought that was very detailed. I didn't see anything else on my own part.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. We want to thank you, gentlemen. All right. Historic Services. Richard?

MR. MARTIN:

I don't know if everybody knows that Mrs. Barbara _Vanlu_ passed away last Wednesday. And there is a planned memorial service next Monday at 11 o'clock at the Episcopal Church in St. James, which is right on 25A. And also a planned luncheon, I think -- Lance, is that on on-site, do you know?

MR. MALLAMO:

I believe it's on site.

MR. MARTIN:

Okay. And all the Historic Trust Committee members are being invited. People from our Historic Trust sites are also being invited. And I hope anyone here that can make it would try to attend that service.

MR. CRAMER:

Can you get something out to us; fax something over to us or something with the details?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'm sorry. I didn't catch the date. Was it July 25th?

MR. MARTIN:

July 25th next Monday 11 o'clock memorial service at the Episcopal Church in St. James on 25A with a lunch to be served afterwards on-site.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Right across from her house as I remember.

MR. MARTIN:

Right.

MR. MALLAMO:

So if you are planning on attending the lunch, if you can just let me know by Friday because I told them I'd try and develop a count to give them. Well, I think it's going to be on-site or -- her home is right across the street from the church. So I don't know whether they've really figured out whether it's going to be on the church property or her own property. It'll be one park.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do we know what the form of this is going to be? Is it going to be people standing up making comments?

MR. MALLAMO:

I don't know, Larry.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I'm just wondering if that is the case, whether the CEQ should --

MR. MARTIN:

Can we find out, Lance, either talking to her son or the church?

MR. MALLAMO:

Sure. And I'll let Jim know.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Jim, are you planning on attending?

MR. BAGG:

What was that?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Are you planning on attending Barbara _Vanlu's_ memorial service?

MR. BAGG:

The 25th?

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

MR. BAGG:

I have to check my calendar. I will if it's open.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Because it seems to me that if it is the type where people are requested to stand up and say something that -- given the fact that she's probably been the longest member of the CEQ, maybe Tom excepted, that we --

MR. MALLAMO:

She was actually a founding member.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

-- ought to say something if it is appropriate.

MR. MARTIN:

Sure. We'll find out.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay.

MR. MARTIN:

And our next Historic Trust meeting is tomorrow out at Inlet Pond County Park what's known as the Red House. And we'll be taking a look at that building. And there's another residence in the park. These are both on North Road in Southold for possible dedication to the Suffolk County Historic Trust. That's all I have today.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any questions for Richard?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll do my thing by letter.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

CAC concerns?

MR. KAUFMAN:

We're concerned.

MS. SQUIRE:

Just a reminder that October 8, 9, 10 is the joint NYSAC, NYSAM conference on the environment. The theme is wind and waterways of the future. And there's a water track and a wind track. And the field trip will be to the whole wind energy facility that is outside the area. It's in Hamilton, New York close to Colgate University. I'll bring brochures next time. Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Regarding that, I see George Proios in the audience. Any chance of getting a budget appropriation for travel if any of us wanted to go up there? Or is it possible that you can make such an application?

MR. PROIOS:

Not through this administration.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I know he's with Planning, but he's also -- he's one of the Presidents.

MS. SQUIRE:

I think this is probably an inappropriate thing to say in a public forum, but, Michael Kaufman, you can pay your way up to Hamilton.

MR. CRAMER:

I disagree with you, Joy. I think it's a very appropriate thing to say.

MS. SQUIRE:

Okay. Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Thank you for coming to my defense, Mr. Cramer. I do appreciate it.

MS. SQUIRE:

All right. Now that I said that -- but you see I have to say that to anybody who never calls me anything but "Teach." But anyway, Mr. Kaufman --

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll short sheet your bed if you're not careful again.

MS. SQUIRE:

Mr. Kaufman, it will be a good conference. It's a beautiful setting. It really is very nice. It's _Whiteygo_ Conference Center. And I'll bring you more information and jump up and down and try and talk you into coming up.

MR. MALLAMO:

And it's probably tax deductible.

MS. SQUIRE:

Absolutely, absolutely. I'm sure it's tax deductible.

MR. KAUFMAN:

That's assuming you pay taxes.

MR. PROIOS:

EMC does supply scholarships. We have been trying to use that for students to try to bring some new blood into the organization. But each year we have at least a half dozen scholarships we offer to help defray the costs. We waive the tuition fees and pay for their room and board so it is available.

MS. SQUIRE:

One of the things that is exciting is after a longtime when there have been -- and I'm speaking as President of NYSAC, there have been no conservation boards or no new CAC's. We seem to have a resurgence of interest. I have several inquiries from Erie County. I have a couple from Westchester. And there are some struggling along EMC county organizations that are being reactivated; most of them without appropriate money for backing. But they are being reactivated. So, that's good news for the environmental movement.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any other business?

MR. KAUFMAN:

One thing. I happen to be speaking with Nick Gibbons earlier today. And he told me that there were two more environmental analysts that have been hired and are now working at the County Parks Department full-time which I thought was a very, very good thing. Very happy about that.

MS. SQUIRE:

Do you want to introduce --

MR. GIBBONS:

Why not? Just briefly, the Parks Commissioner and I met several months ago and decided to put in an application through the Suffolk County Water Quality Protection Program funding, fund 477 for additional staff that would help to reinvigorate what used to be known as the Division of Natural Resources but what is now being referred to as the Environmental Stewardship Unit. And in that group we have currently five of us. That's including one clerical staff. And you may have heard recently that some employees in the Labor Department were threatened with losing their federal funding and ultimately their jobs with the County. The County Executive transferred those positions to both DPW and the Parks Department. We benefitted in the sense that 12 of the 19 relocated employees came to the Parks Department. They are dedicated to improving

the condition of park properties and are really committed towards the open space and passive parks we have. Not the active parks where we already have staff. So they're relatively at my disposal to go out and address the concerns that you all and the rest of our constituents bring to bear, you know, every day that we usually defer to the fall or the winter; and whether or not we ever actually get to all of them remains to be seen, but we certainly have a lot more manpower to throw at the problem now.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Very good. All right. We have a motion to adjourn?

MR. CRAMER:

Motion.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

VICE-CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All in favor? No objections.

**(THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 11:00 AM)
_ DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY_**