

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 March 15, 2006.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Swanson, Chairman
Thomas Cramer, Vice-Chairman
Theresa Elkowitz
Michael Kaufman
Lance Mallamo
John Potente
John Wagner
J. Lee Snead

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Legislator Lynne C. Nowick, Thirteenth District, Chairperson of Parks and Cultural Affairs
Legislator Vivian Vilorio-Fisher, Fifth District, Chairperson of Environment, Planning and Agriculture
James Bagg, Chief Environmental Analyst/Department of Planning
Penny Kohler, Department of Planning.
Richard Martin, Historic Services
Joyce Squires, CAC Huntington
Ben Wright, Chief Engineer, Department of Public Works
Michael Lambert, Civil Engineer, DPW
Victor Keneiby, Sr. Civil Engineer, DPW
Director Tom Isles, Planning Department
Brian Beedenbender, County Executive Assistant
Bob McAlevy, CAC Vector Control
Lauretta Fischer, Planning Department
Greg Moran, Aide to Leg. Nowick
Joseph Congedo, Suffolk County Parks Department
Matthew Atkinson, Attorney for Peconic Baykeeper
Adrienne Esposito, Citizens Campaign
Kimberly Shaw, Suffolk County Health Department

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

(THE COUNCIL CONVENED AT 9:35 AM)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I think we have a quorum. Let's start it. We'll call the March 15, 2006 CEQ meeting to order. I don't believe there are any minutes. Am I --

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I didn't get any minutes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. So there are no minutes to review. There is some correspondence that I would like to call to your attention. First of all, Dr. Potente has written a letter to me which I believe is included in your packets explaining some of the discussions that we had about correspondence this past month. So please read that at your leisure.

And then John Wagner was kind enough to look into the issue of correspondence, communications by CEQ staff members and he has summarized that and I just passed it out. So please review that as well.

I should also call to your attention that in your packet there is a letter from the Peconic Baykeeper, Matthew Atkinson, and also a letter from -- I forget the gentleman's name -- Robert McAlevy concerning the DGEIS. This has been turned over to the Health Department so they can consider it.

You should also note in the packet that there is a new State Law that requires that environmental impact statements be posted on the internet. So I presume that our computers will now be clogged with DGEIS's. And I guess that's about it.

Jim, do you have any comments on SEQRA classifications?

MR. BAGG:

Before we get to that, Larry, you'll note on the agenda there is something noted called a public portion. This has been required by the County and State Law that the public be offered a chance to address the CEQ. This could be either done up front at the meeting or at each respective project, but it should be duly noted. So you might want to ask if anybody is here from the public to address the CEQ.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Larry, I would recommend that we do it for each specific project, that way people have the benefit of hearing the presentation and the discussion before they come up and give comments because it may change their comments or raise questions or answer questions.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

That would be my preferred route. But just for general comment, please feel free that when we reach a specific project that you're interested in that you do have the right to come up and speak to us about it. Okay. Jim.

MR. BAGG:

The packet is pretty straightforward. A lot of resolutions in there for completing SEQRA that's been through CEQ, and most the other ones are all Type II Actions.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any comments from CEQ members?

MR. SNEAD:

I'd just like to have a minute to go through the list.

MR. KAUFMAN:

While we are waiting, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that there is a resolution in there, 1253, establishing a task force to look at the possibility of establishing a legal drag strip in Suffolk County. I just find that to be an interesting bill.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Jim, on 1334, appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Old Field Horse Farm, do we know what those are?

MR. BAGG:

Well, you reviewed that about five times already, Michael. That's for the, you know, restoration of the, you know, stables and everything else there. That was presented by Richard Martin quite some time ago. It appears that once the project gets some type of approval, before they get constructed it takes them quite a while to move through the Capital Program process.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. I'm aware of the appropriation process. I just didn't know which ones we were talking about. Not a problem.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Lee, are you ready?

MR. SNEAD:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Motion to accept.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Motion to accept.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do you any comment? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. Just one other comment that goes back to some of the discussions that we had last month.

MR. BAGG:

Excuse me, Larry. Who was the motion and the second?

MR. WAGNER:

The motion and the second was Kaufman and Cramer.

MR. BAGG:

Kaufman and Cramer. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

That it might be helpful if for any reason a CEQ member needs to recuse themselves on an issue that it be noted up front and then make sure that it's properly recorded for the record.

MR. CRAMER:

I think it should state in the minutes, you know, exactly that, rather than having it in the tally sheet at the end.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Well, in the verbatim minutes it should be in the verbatim minutes because they should pick it up.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Right.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Just make sure it's done loudly so that the stenos, etcetera, can pick it up.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right. Moving ahead. We have proposed donation of properties to Suffolk County. Roberta?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Lauretta.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Lauretta. It was just noted that perhaps I should be on the Senior Citizens Advisory Committee.

MR. CRAMER:

Before Lauretta starts I'd just like to recuse myself from this application. I was involved with this application some time ago.

Proposed Donation of Property to Suffolk County Parks for SCDHS Transfer of Development Rights Requirement - File #R02-03-0866 and 0867.

MS. FISCHER:

The first is a Health Department Board of Review TDR donation. The property that this is -- the sending property is a piece in Yaphank and the receiving site is in Mastic. They are both in hydrogeologic zone six and we are recommending acceptance of the Yaphank area site as a part of the properties that we own in the Yaphank area. This is to the south and west of our holdings in the Yaphank area. And it's kind of a buffer area somewhat. We do have pieces of property near and adjacent to this, but it also can serve as a buffer area between the -- whatever is proposed and possibly going to be developed in our Yaphank area and the area to the west which is an industrial area.

So we would like to recommend that we accept this donation and -- as a part of this TDR. It's approximately a quarter acre in size.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Mr. Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Lauretta, how far north of the jail is this? I'm just curious in terms of the buffer area.

MS. FISCHER:

It's south of the jail. Southwest of the jail.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. Thank you.

DR. POTENTE:

May I make a request? On some of these you have actually hybrid depictions where you have aeriels and with the overlay of the streets, and they are very useful to give an appreciation for what's going on in the general vicinity. Is there a way that we could get more of those? I noticed that some of these acquisition requests have those and this one doesn't.

MS. FISCHER:

Exactly -- I don't understand what hybrid --

DR. POTENTE:

When you have the color aeriels where you can actually see what is going on.

MS. FISCHER:

Oh, the aeriels, yes. Well, it's a matter of time and staff. And I don't necessarily -- I mean, I'll try as I always do, but I don't always have the -- I can't always afford to get these out in a timely manner with doing aeriels as well.

DR. POTENTE:

Because some of these may become questionable. I know it's been questioned in the past where you'll see a plot in the middle of no place being requested.

MS. FISCHER:

I understand. We do try to get you as much information as we can. And get you, you know, whatever you need. But as I said, I'm a one man band and so to get these things out I try as best as I can. And I understand you're a new member and many other members are very familiar with these areas, but I will try to get them to you as best I can.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you.

DR. POTENTE:

Is it possible perhaps whoever is doing the request to do this would be able to help her out in providing that?

MR. BAGG:

Larry.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Jim.

MR. BAGG:

If I might point out. I mean, some of these things come in through the Health Department application process, all right, and are given to the Planning Department. They are not going through the acquisition process and the planning steps process that the County is actually acquiring. The County has previously picked areas where they would like to see these properties acquired and given to the County.

The issue before the CEQ here is this is a donation of property, a small piece of property, within an already established conservation area, and what is the environmental impact on it. It is not going to be developed. It's going to be used for open space purposes and the Council has to make a determination as to whether or not this would have an impact on the environment --

DR. POTENTE:

Yes, I understand that.

MR. BAGG:

-- not policy as to whether or not we want to accept this because we don't like the area it's coming into. That's already being established through the County Executive's Office and the Health Department and the Legislature in terms of policy.

DR. POTENTE:

I understand that, Jim. But the question has been raised on similar properties in the past with TDR's and I believe Larry has brought it up himself that sometimes money is being spent and depriving environmental issues in other areas that might -- where money might better well be spent.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I think these are mostly on acquisitions.

MS. FISCHER:

Actually, there is no money here.

MR. BAGG:

It's a gift.

MS. FISCHER:

It's a gift.

DR. POTENTE:

Well, wouldn't TDR be a similar type of thing?

MR. BAGG:

No, it's a gift.

MS. FISCHER:

And if I may say, if it's not donated to the County it will be donated either to the town or to an adjacent owner with a restrictive covenant. The restrictive covenant comes to anyone who takes on the ownership of the property. So whether we accept this or we don't accept this, this will move forward on some other level.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Lauretta, is it possible to -- for members to look into the Suffolk's GEIS system to look at these kinds of aerial photographs if we are indeed missing them, you know, from an individual publication?

MS. FISCHER:

I would manage you can bring up, as far as I understand it, you can bring up aerials on the internet, you know, if you have that access, yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Do we have any other comments?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll make a motion, unlisted, neg dec.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do we have a second?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Second by Miss Elkowitz. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. Okay.

Proposed Donation of Property to Suffolk County Parks for SCDHS Transfer of Development Rights Requirement - File #C02-02-0138.

MS. FISCHER:

Thank you. The next one is another Health Department TDR donation. This property, the receiving property is Mastic, the sending property is in -- are Miller Place, Yaphank Road Nature Preserve area. They're in two different hydrogeologic zones, however, the Board of Review has accepted this as a donation for this applicant.

The property that we are acquiring is about approximately a quarter acre in an area where we own approximately 90 to 95 percent of the area. And it was also placed on our master -- Master List Two for acquisition. So this would be a nice donation for no cost to the County.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any comments? Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Motion, unlisted, neg dec.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Second by Mr. Cramer. Any other comments? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

MS. FISCHER:

Thank you. The next item is an acquisition and I just want to make a clarification on the title. It indicates that it's a proposed joint acquisition. It is not. It's an acquisition completely to be provided by the County, and that as well as number five. So that was just a typo error, I'm sorry.

Proposed Joint Acquisition of Land by the County of Suffolk for Open Space Preservation Purposes known as the Sagaponack Greenbelt County Park Addition - Ensley Property in the Town of Southampton.

The first acquisition is the Ensley property in our Sagaponack Greenbelt area. And this is approximately 1.1 acres in size in the South Fork SGPA area of Southampton. This was identified in a resolution that we worked with with the Town of Southampton to identify important drinking water protection areas. We are looking to acquire this under the New Drinking Water Protection Program.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay.

MR. CRAMER:

Motion, unlisted, neg dec.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I shall second that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Mr. Kaufman seconds Tom's motion. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

DR. POTENTE:

Lauretta, this is the hybrid map I was talking about.

MS. FISCHER:

Yes, that's the aerial, yes. And we have to do them for the --

DR. POTENTE:

But this street is superimposed.

MS. FISCHER:

Okay. Would you like to come work at my office?

DR. POTENTE:

Maybe.

MS. FISCHER:

All donations accepted. Okay.

Proposed Joint Land Acquisition of Land by the County of Suffolk for Open Space Preservation Purposes known as the Orowoc Creek County Park Addition - Zanaghi Property in the Town of Islip.

The next acquisition is the Zanaghi property in Orowoc Creek in the Town of Islip. This is approximately a half an acre along Orowoc Creek. This has been an area of interest and concern to the County for stream protection. This is one of the five major streams within the Town of Islip that flow into Great South Bay. We have been trying to amass these properties through our old Greenways Open Space Program and we are now looking to acquire this through -- let me see which program, I'm sorry -- through SOS, our new SOS Program. It's, as I said, it's approximately half an acre.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any questions? Do we have a motion?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Motion, unlisted, neg dec.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Motion by Ms. Elkowitz and second by Mr. Cramer. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

MS. FISCHER:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Next is the proposed construction of sidewalks on County Road 10 Elwood Road.

Proposed Construction of Sidewalks on CR 10, Elwood Road from CR 11, Pulaski Road to the LIRR, CP # 5497, Town of Huntington.

MR. LAMBERTI:

Good morning. I'm Michael Lamberti with the Suffolk County Department of Public Works, Civil Engineer. The current project is construction of sidewalks on County Road 10, Elwood Road, between Pulaski Road and the Long Island Rail Road tracks. It's in the Town of Huntington.

County Road 10, Elwood Road, is a -- between Pulaski Road and the Long Island Rail Road tracks is a County owned urban minor arterial that connects State Route 25 on the south and Fort Salanga Road on the north. The present lane configuration is one through lane in each direction with a left turn lane for southbound traffic at Pulaski Road.

There is existing sidewalk on the west side of Elwood Road, which is currently on grade with the roadway. This is dangerous when a moving vehicle is making a left into Tenth Avenue and the vehicle behind it is try to go around it. It can cause a problem since the sidewalk is currently on grade with the roadway that if they go around they could enter the sidewalk area thus endangering the pedestrians. Additionally, just north of the Long Island Rail Road tracks is the Northport High School.

This project currently provides for the construction of sidewalks and curb on the west side of Elwood Road. The new sidewalks would be raised approximately six inches with the new curb. This will provide an obstacle for motor vehicles before entering the sidewalk area. The lane configuration will remain the same with the exception of a left hand turn lane at Tenth Avenue.

There are to be no trees removed. A landscaping scheme shall include reestablishment of turf and additional ground cover. Reconstructing the sidewalks and building concrete curbs will significantly improve the pedestrian traffic at the Northport High School. That's it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Joy?

MS. SQUIRES:

I would just like to make some comments regarding this. Margo {Miles} called you, Jim, this morning. I received this and didn't open it. I received it I guess last week, Thursday or Friday. It wasn't until last night that I showed it to Margo {Miles}, who is interim Planning Director, and a positive declaration has been issued for the {Mattinecock} Court Project, which is located on the northwest corner of Elwood and Pulaski. DPW is an involved agency. There is a draft DEIS which is now being reviewed by the Planning Board to determine if it's acceptable for the purposes of public comment.

I would request -- and let me explain why I am requesting this be tabled until next month. I was the only one in the town who got this, which, of course, I didn't realize because it always goes to the Supervisors's Office and to the Planning Department. But this morning Margo hunted all over town hall and I have the only copy. So I respectfully request that it be tabled until next month so the Town of Huntington can review it. We don't have a problem with it, but they need to review it -- someone other than me.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Mr. Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll withdraw at this point.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do you have any other --

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Well, actually I do, because now that Joy brings this {Mattinecock} Court application up, although I don't know that this has anything to do with it, I prepared the DEIS for {Mattinecock} Court, and because of the hypersensitivity that I have been reading about, I think I'd like to recuse myself from deliberation on this matter.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Very good.

MS. SQUIRES:

And, again, this is being reviewed by the Planning Board. The DEIS is being --

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Yes, I know. As a matter of fact, I got a letter from them yesterday.

MS. SQUIRES:

Yes, I know you did.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Any other comments? Jim.

MR. BAGG:

Joy, we send this, you know, to the --

MS. SQUIRES:

I know you do.

MR. BAGG:

-- Environmental Department and the Supervisor.

MS. SQUIRES:

I know.

MR. BAGG:

So nobody got it?

MS. SQUIRES:

Nobody got it except me. And Margo called every place in town hall. She is Interim Planning Director, so it wouldn't have gotten lost if it went to the Planning Department and nobody in the Supervisor's Office could find it. I'm not criticizing, I'm just commenting that I'm the only one who seems to have gotten it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Tom?

MR. CRAMER:

I'm a bit confused, though. Does this have anything to do with that other project, whatever that project may be?

MS. SQUIRES:

Excuse me. That's not my comment. I'm not tying one to the other. I'm only saying the Town of Huntington did not receive this to review -- yet. So they would like to review it. That is my comment.

MR. CRAMER:

Not that it's --

MS. SQUIRES:

I'm not tying one project to the other at the present time. I am just saying -- giving you some facts and the town needs to at least look at this project before they make comments since it's in the town.

MR. CRAMER:

But --

MS. SQUIRES:

But also it is adjacent to an area that is under review.

MR. CRAMER:

But this is a separate project by a separate sponsor that has no relationship to that other project other than it being in the same area.

MS. SQUIRES:

Right, Tom, but the town hasn't reviewed it.

MR. CRAMER:

So that's your comment, that's your request. But according to Jim, it's been sent out.

MS. SQUIRES:

My comment is a request for a month -- for it to be tabled for a month until the Town of Huntington can review. That's all.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

If this was tabled for a month is that a big concern to you all?

MR. LAMBERTI:

I believe we were anticipating a letting date somewhere in April.

MR. KAUFMAN:

A letting date is basically issuance of a contract request for however -- whatever you want to deal with it. Are you going to be losing any funds?

MR. LAMBERTI:

No.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. That's the real question.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Tom.

MR. CRAMER:

That's Jim, I'm Tom.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Jim.

MR. BAGG:

Larry, if I might point out. I understand this project to some extent they want to expedite it because it is a traffic hazard situation with kids going to school and they would like to have this redone and replaced over the summer. This is a replacement project with curb raising, elevating an existing sidewalk area in a school location, and they would like to get it done as soon as possible in order to increase the safety for the children going to and from school. That's the whole purpose of the project.

MS. SQUIRES:

Well, do you want to do something with -- I will hand carry this to Margo so she can review it and do some kind of phone call? Jim, I can't see you. I don't know how you want to handle this.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Legislator Nowick.

MS. SQUIRES:

Someone has to look at it.

LEG. NOWICK:

I just have one question because this is my third meeting. Is that the norm that the Supervisor goes over these plans or is it more that this particular body is the group or I want to say experts or professionals in the field. What is the norm? Is this the deciding factor or is it the Supervisor's Office in Huntington? Just so I know because I'm not sure of where the answers lie.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do you know, Joy?

MS. SQUIRES:

Well, it's sent to the town, just everything is sent specifically to the town. In this case it would be either Engineering or Planning that would comment on it. But everything is done with town input.

LEG. NOWICK:

My only question is now that I hear that there might be a hazard to children, I would like to expedite anything like that as quickly as possible. So if the final word does come from this group, should we maybe consider walking it over like you say. I don't know, this meeting could go on another hour, I don't know how long it would be. But we hate to put any children in jeopardy.

MR. LAMBERTI:

Any input from the town we would take into consideration before the final design would go out and changes could be made accordingly.

LEG. NOWICK:

That is part of my question.

MR. CRAMER:

In looking at SEQRA, it's my feeling that this could even be considered a Type II Action. Under 617.5C(2), replacement, rehabilitation or reconstruction of -- or reconstruction of a structure facility in kind on the same site including upgrading buildings to meet building codes or fire codes unless such action needs, or exceeds, meets the thresholds of Section 617.4 of this part. Now, it's my understanding that this is an existing sidewalk that you're raising and putting a curb in. In place, in kind --

MR. LAMBERTI:

In kind.

MR. CRAMER:

And it's just being done for strictly safety purposes.

MR. LAMBERTI:

Exactly.

MR. CRAMER:

There is no removing of trees, there is no removing of anything else.

MR. LAMBERTI:

There is no shifting of the sidewalk. It is exactly remove and replace.

MR. CRAMER:

In light of that, I would like to make a motion, Type II, under the provisions that I just stated.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do we have a second?

MR. WAGNER:

I'll second that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We have a second. Any further discussion?

MS. SQUIRES:

I would request that this get -- be reviewed by the Town of Huntington.

MR. CRAMER:

I mean, the town can certainly review it and provide comments to DPW and as in the past, the DPW has always accommodated the towns accordingly.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Joy, also, realistically, this -- we're an advisory body at this point in time and we're simply looking for the environmental impact. The Legislature is the one who finally authorizes all of this and the Town of Huntington has several members at the Legislature.

MS. SQUIRES:

Yes, I'm aware of that.

MR. MALLAMO:

Mr. Chairman. I kind of see both sides to this, but suppose the Town came back said we would like the sidewalk moved back ten feet and street trees planted along Elwood Road because that would make it safer for kids and beautify the landscaping. Are you prepared to go along with

that?

MR. CRAMER:

Well, then that's no longer a Type II Action.

MR. MALLAMO:

Well, then I think we should, you know, I don't know if 30 days is going to make all the difference. I go by that intersection all the time. It was like that when I was in high school 30 years ago, so I don't know what delaying this 30 days is going to do if we did get that input. I think that would have an environmental impact.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Realistically, also, in the past we have deferred at various times when a town or another municipal entity has stated that it needs further time to review this. We have tried to accommodate that request when possible. I think we've got two competing interests here for all purposes and intent.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We have a motion on the floor. Any other comments? I'll call the motion. All in favor?
Opposed?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Opposed.

MS. SQUIRES:

Opposed.

MR. MALLAMO:

Opposed.

LEG. NOWICK:

Opposed.

MS. SQUIRES:

Opposed.

MR. BAGG:

Please let us know who is opposed here?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Seven opposed.

MR. BAGG:

And Squires is opposed?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I abstain. And one abstention.

MR. BAGG:

Six opposed, I believe, right? Mr. Snead, you're opposed?

MR. SNEAD:

I'm opposed, yes.

MR. BAGG:

Nowick is opposed? Seven.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

And we had what, three in favor?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

No, two and an abstention.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Two and an abstention. Okay. The motion fails.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Motion to table.

MR. MALLAMO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We now have a motion to table by Mr. Kaufman and second by Mr. Mallamo. All in favor? Opposed? So the motion is tabled.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I abstain.

MR. SWANSON:

Joy, will you assist in expediting this because --

MS. SQUIRES:

Absolutely. I'll take care of it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I'm not sure that I would agree to table it if it comes back next month and the town has not looked at it.

MS. SQUIRES:

It won't come back. The town will look at it immediately.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right. Moving right along. Good morning.

Proposed Sewer District #9, College Park, Farmingville, Safety/Security Improvements, CP #8103, Town of Brookhaven.

MR. WRIGHT:

Good morning. Ben Wright with Public Works. We have a capital project, 8103, that covers all County sewer districts with the exception of Bergen Point, Sewer District 3, which has its own capital project for security and safety. The majority of the work has to do with adding video cameras, alarm systems, other safety improvements, but three elements of it have to do with construction, have to do with adding a fence at College Park, which is the first item that you have on your list.

We filled out a short form. We're going to add approximately 500 feet of fence that covers an area of 30,000 square feet. It's not the property line that we're fencing. We're fencing an area

that surrounds the treatment structure itself. It's a relatively small building. We've had a severe number of vandalism elements -- events, and we've had trouble even with police assistance in deterring the children in the area, basically teens, that get on the roof of the building. They've started fires, they've broken, you know, equipment, etcetera. So we feel that the fence will at least slow them down a little bit.

There is no trees to be taken down. It's some brush that has to be moved out of the way, and we're going to fence the area in.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes, Mr. Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Ben, regarding the, if I'm on the correct project, regarding the Fairfield STP --

MR. WRIGHT:

That's the next item.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Sorry. Withdrawn. I thought you were talking about all of them.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any comments on the College Park?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I'll make a motion, unlisted, neg dec.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

MR. WRIGHT:

Actually, Fairfield is not next. It's in numerical order. So Sewer District 15, Nob Hill, is the next project as listed.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I thought you were talking about the security fencing with all of them.

MR. WRIGHT:

No. There is some fence removal in the next one.

Proposed Sewer District #15, Nob Hill (Ronkonkoma), Safety/Security Improvements, CP #8103, Town of Islip.

MR. WRIGHT:

Sewer District 15 is in the Ronkonkoma area. It's near the intersection of Richmond Boulevard and Nicolls Road. And it's a relatively small facility, but when we remove sludge from that particular plant, we have tanker trucks and they're large vehicles. We have to stop traffic, we have to back the truck in. And we're looking to improve the safety by cutting a notch out of our property, moving the fence back and installing approximately 235 feet of fence.

There are two four inch trees that would have to be taken down that are along the roadway. We

would do some paving. It would certainly enhance the safety and we do recognize that we have to deal with the Town of Islip with, you know, the proper permits.

So we'd be moving a fence back, constructing a new fence and paving an area where a tanker can pull in and then withdraw sludge from the treatment facility.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

So you have not raised this with the Town of Islip yet?

MR. WRIGHT:

No.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

If I'm reading the map correct, instead of pulling in, it looks like you are going to go with the sludge truck parallel to there.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes, that's correct. And then they can pull off, you know, without interfering with traffic.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Gotcha.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any comments?

MR. CRAMER:

Is there going to be landscaping along the fence after you move it back?

MR. WRIGHT:

There isn't any there now. We weren't going to do any more.

MR. CRAMER:

Is there any reason why you couldn't?

MR. WRIGHT:

Just money, that's all.

MR. MALLAMO:

Speaking for Nancy Manfredonia, who used to be a member of the Council, you know, if we're taking two trees out, can't we put two trees back somewhere along here?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

MR. MALLAMO:

It's looks like a pretty barren area.

LEG. NOWICK:

His answer was yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

You may be able to use some fertilizer from the SGP, you never know.

MR. CRAMER:

I make a motion, unlisted, neg dec.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll second.

MR. CRAMER:

With the addition of landscaping trees.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do you still want to second it, Mr. Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yes, I would still like to second it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Any other comments? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

Proposed Sewer District #28, Fairfield @ St. James, Safety/Security Improvements, CP #8103, Town of Islip.

MR. WRIGHT:

The next project, very similar to the previous one, our Sewer District 28 in St. James, located along Moriches Road. What's a little bit different here is that there is a curve in the road prior to reaching the treatment plant and it's a little less safe even than the prior project.

We're looking to cut a notch, again, out of the property, pave an area, and install approximately 130 feet of fence. Again, there are two trees. These happen to be a little bit larger, six to eight inch trees. And it would also require us discussing with the Town of Smithtown, you know, the access in that area.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Mr. Chairman. I know this site and area fairly well. You should know that -- you should know that recently, I think it was about five to seven years ago, there was a controversy over cutting some of the trees down on Moriches Road when there was a road widening and some work done in that area.

I would request that if you do take down several trees in the area, that they definitely be replaced. Again, it was a controversial situation a couple of years ago when Smithtown did it. That would be my recommendation to you.

MR. WRIGHT:

Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN:

As it happens, the trees that you are going to be cutting down do serve a little bit of a camouflaging purpose for the SGP as they exist right now.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

This is north of 347?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yes. It's the second curve.

MR. MALLAMO:

It's just beyond the sign that says Tree City, USA.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yes. I wasn't going to go that far, but let the record reflect that there is a notation in the Town of Smithtown.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'll make that motion, unlisted, this is a neg dec, with a recommendation that several trees be replanted.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Second?

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Second by Mr. Cramer. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Mr. Chair. I just wanted to ask a question about this. I'm sorry. It's not on the motion, it is just trying to orient myself. How close is this to the entrance to the Borders -- Sports Authority?

MR. WRIGHT:

It's north of the community that we serve there. There is an entrance and a gated community. So it's even north of that, so.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. So it's fairly far from --

MR. KAUFMAN:

It's about 250 yards.

MR. WRIGHT:

It must be a half of a mile north of Nesconset.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All right. Proposed Sewer District No. 23, Coventry Manor.

Proposed Sewer District #23 - Coventry Manor, Improvements to Treatment Facility, CP #8149, Town of Brookhaven.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes. This project for the community receives approximately 40,000 gallons per day of sewage.

The focus or the nucleus of the treatment facility is somewhat of an antiquated process. It's a rotating disc that's 25 feet long and 12 foot in diameter. We've had this at a number of facilities and they have failed. Either the shaft has failed because of fatigue or the media has broken off and, you know, blocked proper treatment. So we're looking to change the technology and, you know, maintain effluent limitations.

In order do that we're looking to construct a process tank with the different technology of approximately 20 feet by 50 feet adjacent to the existing treatment building and treatment tank. It's in an area that's previously been cleared some time ago. And it will improve and give it a longer life and not have us to have an emergency response as we have had in other facilities.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Is this a -- what would be known as a package plant?

MR. WRIGHT:

No, not really. I mean, a package plant is something that you would take off a truck and it was ready to operate and process sewage. This is a particular process that needs other auxiliary equipment and treatment process to go along with it. We have equalization at the site now and a pumping station. So the sequence would be going through a pumping station, an equalization facility, then to this process tank and then to further treatment after that. But it's the process that would take care of the nutrient removal that's the basis for the discharge permit.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Does the County run this or is it under contract?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes. It's a County operated plant.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay.

MR. CRAMER:

Unlisted, neg dec.

MR. WAGNER:

Can I just ask a quick question?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

MR. WAGNER:

Who owns the property immediately adjacent to the plant?

MR. WRIGHT:

This is within the Coventry Manor Condominium Complex.

MR. WAGNER:

And it is operated by the County.

MR. WRIGHT:

It's a County. It was dedicated to the County some time ago and we operate and maintain it.

MR. WAGNER:

We don't see any increase in the area that's going to be served by this.

MR. WRIGHT:

No.

MR. KAUFMAN:

By the way, I'll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I have one other question. It seems to me that small treatment plants like this very often have a rather bad history of compliance. Can you speak to whether or not this is running up to the SPEDES permit?

MR. WRIGHT:

This plant has been operating fine.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

It's operating fine?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes. In fact, every year at this time for the last couple of years we have had to certify that -- that the facilities are within a certain percentage of their design or not. And this particular one is not close to it's design flow or design loading and it has met the effluent limitations.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Good. Okay. We have a motion and we also had a second. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.

We have a general question with regard to a number of these. There seems to be -- number seven and number eleven, for example, are both Sewer District No. 9. And I think we got duplicates on Sewer District No. 3.

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, they are different capital project numbers, so we're looking -- we look at them as individual projects.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I guess we shouldn't. So, maybe we ought to discuss them together.

Proposed Sewer District #9 - College Park, Improvements to Treatment Facility, CP #8163, Town of Brookhaven.

MR. WRIGHT:

Okay. We have talked about Sewage District 9 with the fence. This project, a different capital project number, is to add a building extension of 20 foot by 40 foot on to an existing building to add an effluent filtration system. And the need for that is that the soil in the area has not been as good as we would like it to be over the years and by adding a filtration system we can double the capacity of that, of the recharge facilities. So the filtration system would polish the effluent and the building extension would be incorporated into the existing building.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. And that was your proposal number seven?

MR. WRIGHT:

That was number -- that's number eleven.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Eleven.

MS. ELKOWITZ:
Seven was the fence.

MR. WRIGHT:
Number seven is the fence that would --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Seven was the fence. Okay.

MR. WRIGHT:
Yes. So you have an aerial for both. If I were doing this again I would probably put them, for your purpose, both on the same map and put them together.

MR. WAGNER:
Ben, what is that dark area on the aerial to the north?

MR. WRIGHT:
That's a storm water basin for the community, the town storm water sump.

MR. WAGNER:
Are there any wetlands in there?

MR. WRIGHT:
It was created for recharging storm water.

MR. WAGNER:
How long has it been there?

MR. WRIGHT:
This community was some 30 years old, so I'm assuming it was probably done when that community was developed in the '70's.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Well, your aerial photograph looks like it's closer than 150 feet to wetland.

MR. WRIGHT:
Would you classify it as a wetlands where it's constructed as a storm water basin?

MR. CRAMER:
It's not State designated wetlands, is it?

MS. ELKOWITZ:
Well, it might be because the State recently designated, well, not so recently, but you know your recharge basin on CR 111 in Manorville next to the shopping center? The DEC has mapped that as freshwater wetland.

MR. WRIGHT:
We did, in the upper right hand corner of this area, I did ask for any indications of stream and wetlands. Nothing showed up, so I'm not --

MR. CRAMER:
So this one is not on the State maps is what -- because I saw on your other -- like the Coventry Manor that had wetlands identified from the State.

MR. WRIGHT:
Yeah, that was the same indication, that there were a couple that were 1,500 feet away. This

doesn't show up anything within at least 1,000 feet from this site.

MR. CRAMER:

And your -- the discharge point for this plant, where is that in relation to --

MR. WRIGHT:

There are leaching pools that are on the site. They are both to the east and west of the building. That's on the aerial.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

And what is the daily discharge?

MR. WRIGHT:

Thirty-five thousand gallons per day.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

This is also a County run plant?

MR. WRIGHT:

I'm sorry, it's 45,000 gallons per day. Yes, it is.

MR. CRAMER:

But those leaching beds aren't changing in any way with this proposal, and the existing -- well, the proposed building that you have on here looks like it's on cleared area and it's also taking in -- there is another structure that looks like a shed or a --

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes, there is a shed that we're going to take down. It's a dark photo that's before this aerial, but you can see the area where the extension is going to go.

MR. CRAMER:

Right.

MR. WRIGHT:

And it was, you know, previously cleared.

MR. CRAMER:

You are not changing the buffer between the recharge area in any way?

MR. WRIGHT:

No.

MR. CRAMER:

And the building itself is on cleared area?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

MR. CRAMER:

And you are removing an existing structure. How do you want to handle this with the other resolutions?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I think that we should do them all together as one resolution just to avoid the issue of segmentation. And I would also suggest that whatever we do, we just ask Ben to check the

DEC wetland maps and just be sure.

MR. CRAMER:

Well, should we withdraw the other?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I don't know. We should probably rescind the other resolution and do it all together.

MR. CRAMER:

I'll make a motion to rescind the previous resolution on item seven. Then make a motion for -- well, I guess we need a second.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. We have a motion to rescind item number seven, which was the fence, and we have a second. All in favor of that? Yes?

MR. WAGNER:

Is it my understanding we're going to ask him to go back and take a look at the wetlands map and determine whether it's listed next to it?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Well, we didn't get there yet.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

That may be part of the motion.

MR. WAGNER:

But before we rescind the other one.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

It wasn't my intention to make that motion. What my intention was to make a motion for an unlisted neg dec and to request that if -- that Mr. Wright go to the DEC wetland maps and if there were wetland maps that he seek a permit from the DEC as would be required. I don't necessarily -- if he gets his permit, he gets his permit. If he doesn't, he doesn't.

I mean, he's not -- there's nothing based upon the inquiry that Mr. Cramer, at least from my perspective, based on the inquiry that Mr. Cramer made of Mr. Wright, there's nothing that he's going to be doing there that's going to adversely affect the wetland. So the question is jurisdictionally does he require a wetland permit. And if he does, he should check the map and he should go get it. But I don't think it would change my motion.

MR. CRAMER:

I think he made -- there was representation made that he did check the maps and there is no State wetlands in this area. I'm not aware of any that are in this area.

MR. WAGNER:

My only concern was that if we were going to ask him to come back here after he checked those maps and found out there was wetlands, then we'd have an issue.

MR. CRAMER:

No, no.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. We have a motion on the table to rescind item number seven, which was the construction of the fence. All in favor? Opposed? Okay. We rescinded that. Now we will consider them together.

MR. CRAMER:

Did you want to make this, Terry?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Go ahead.

MR. CRAMER:

Make a motion, unlisted, neg dec, that would cover both item seven and eleven and that the DPW go back and just verify that this is not a State wetlands and if need be, to file necessary permits.

MR. WRIGHT:

Fine.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. Okay. Moving on, proposed Sewer District No. 15, Nob Hill.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

We are now going to do 12 and 13 together, I think.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

MR. WRIGHT:

The only thing with 12 and 13, they are two different capital project numbers, but one is at the treatment plant, one is out in the collection system which is a few miles away.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Well, then you can do them separately.

MR. WRIGHT:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. So we'll do number 12. Proposed Sewer District No. 3, Southwest Grit Improvement Project.

Proposed Sewer District #3 - Southwest, Grit Improvement Project, CP #8170, Town of Babylon.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes. Grit comes into the treatment facility by truck with the scavenger waste and also with the sewage. And it's something that is very wearing on the equipment. If it settles in the tanks and we don't remove it quick enough, you know, then it creates a capacity issue and more of an emergency situation. So we're looking to rehabilitate what is at the site now, but that rehabilitation also requires some construction to take place.

The scavenger building where we have anywhere from 100 to 150 trucks per day that come in

has a number of lanes. Our plan is to add two additional lanes in order to manage the truck flow a little better along with a new ticket booth that is set aside from the building in order to have people get into building a little bit quicker.

At the same time we're going to install new grit removal devices in a building that will also include storage so that we can separate the various waste. We get leachate, septage, waste sludges from treatment plants. They all have little different characteristics, so we'd like to keep them separate, and therefore we are going to construct some storage to go along with that.

The influent sewage that comes down the sewer pipe coming into the facility is going to require a third grit tank. We have two right now with a bypass. We're going to add a third one and we're going to replace the conventional grit system that was constructed back in 1980 with a new or energy efficient system that will remove the grit. That grit building that's associated with that is going to be gutted and new ventilation -- there will be a building extension to cover basically a dumpster that receives all the grit after it's wash and classified.

That's basically the concept. We are adding odor control to the scavenger building because the facility that is there has odor control but it's not sufficient for the volume of air that we're going to be treating from that particular area.

There is a -- not an aerial, but the first foldout drawing that you have indicates on the site, it's called Overall Plant Layout, and it's crosshatched on where all the different elements of construction will take place.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

The grit will be land filled?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Where is it land filled?

MR. WRIGHT:

In Brookhaven.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

At the ash fill?

MR. WRIGHT:

I believe that is where it goes. I know it is the landfill there and we have an agreement with taking leachate and bringing grit back to the landfill.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

On your write-up, the second sentence or third sentence you call the material inert. I would not call the grit inert. There is certainly a lot of organic material that's associated with grit.

MR. WRIGHT:

It's very little. I mean, it's washed before, you know, it's put into the dumpsters. That's part of the system that we have, is it's a washing system.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. So you get rid of the grease and stuff that's very often associated with grit and the rags and --

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes. The rags and the grit are separate also. I mean, they are called raptors. You know, they always have some conventional name, I guess, that you'd like to use, but these raptors separate the, you know, the grit. They wash it and they separate the screenings.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. So this is mostly sand.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any other questions?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I do.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Mr. Wright, are any of the improvements or disturbants going to take place within 300 feet of the wetlands?

MR. WRIGHT:

No, it looks like 400 feet is from the -- from the Great South Bay. We will require the watering permit for the one structure.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

For DEC, okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Any other comments? We have a motion.

MR. CRAMER:

Motion, unlisted, neg dec.

MR. SNEAD:

I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Second by Mr. Snead. All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries. Now we go on to number 13, which is also Sewer District No. 3, but a different location.

Proposed Sewer District #3 - Southwest, Infiltration/Inflow Study and Sewer Rehabilitation, CP #8181, Town of Babylon.

MR. WRIGHT:

The service area for this district is 57 square miles and we have over 900 miles of sewers. We've embarked on a project that will evaluate infiltration and inflow or extraneous flows that come into the sewer district. It could be through manholes. It could be through sewer pipes themselves. It could be through illegal discharges from sump pumps and gutters and leaders, etcetera.

What we have done is we have taken two small pumping station service areas for our pumping stations number one and three, and we have evaluated those two and come up with a series of

recommendations that require either lining of sewers or grouting of joints, repairing manholes. There is no new construction involved, but the nuisance that's associated with it is basically some noise and some traffic maintenance because we have to set up, you know, the lining equipment or the grouting equipment, closed circuit T.V. evaluation of some of the sewer lines. So we have traffic maintenance and some noise that's associated with that.

I think the basic summary is that we're going to be lining about 8,500 feet of pipe, we're going to be grouting joints in almost 14,000 feet of pipe. We're going to rehabilitate 34 manholes, and then we're going to address a route problem in about 800 feet of pipe.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

And are you looking for illegal connections?

MR. WRIGHT:

We'll do that along the way, but it's very difficult with sump pumps. Our experience has been if you're fortunate enough to find sump pumps that are discharged, people will take them out and then they are likely to put them back, you know, a month or so later because they have an issue with water in their basement. And, you know, they could put it down the driveway, they could put it the backyards, but a lot of them prefer just to not see it again. So it's a difficult issue.

We sent out 80,000 letters in the last couple -- in the last couple of months telling people that it's illegal. We've got a lot of calls and sometimes people hang up with us, you know, when they realize that they are doing something that's not allowed, but hopefully some will get the picture and disconnect them.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Very good. Any questions on this project?

MR. SNEAD:

Two quick questions. What is the overall length of pipe you guys studied on this?

MR. WRIGHT:

Oh, on this first phase of the project it was about 40,000 feet.

MR. SNEAD:

So, what, about 25% of the pipe you are going to be treating or dealing with?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yeah, that is probably what the percentage is.

MR. SNEAD:

And we don't want people putting sump water in the system.

MR. WRIGHT:

No. Clean water it is not, you know, by law it's not allowed.

MR. CRAMER:

This is just a rehabilitation of an existing -- of the existing system and maintenance of it?

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, we maintain it. We go to what we call hot spots that have been problems in the past and we have a cleaning program to clean it all.

MR. CRAMER:

There's no new construction associated with this?

MR. WRIGHT:

No, no new construction.

MR. CRAMER:

It's just a rehabilitation?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

MR. CRAMER:

I make a motion, Type II.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Second by Mr. Kaufman. Any further discussion? All in favor of it? Opposed? Motion carries. Thank you.

Let's see. Last one we have proposed installation and construction of a full public safety 800 MHz Radio Communications site. Is there anybody here to speak for it?

Proposed Installing/Constructing a full Public Safety 800 MHz Radio Communications Site, Rocky Point, Town of Brookhaven.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Please identify yourself for the record.

MR. CONGEDO:

Yes. My name is Joe Congedo. I'm with the Suffolk County Police Department. I'm a Communications Technician. We are requesting to install and construct an 800 MHz radio communication site that would include a shelter, 16 by 12, and two other platforms for the generator and the propane tank. Right now the property is owned by the Suffolk County Water Authority and the antennas would go on top of the existing tower.

I think you have pictures. I don't know if we gave you pictures of where we plan to install the tower, excuse me, at the shelter and the other equipment. It should be in the southwest corner. There should be no trees -- there is no trees in that particular area, so it is just going to be putting a concrete platform there. Yes, ma'am.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

This is solely for police emergency communication?

MR. CONGEDO:

Right now the 800 trunking system is used by just about everybody who has a radio, including Brookhaven Town. So it would be the Sheriff's Department, Riverhead Police, the Parks Department.

MR. KAUFMAN:

It's a municipal use is what you are saying.

MR. CONGEDO:

Excuse me?

MR. KAUFMAN:

It's used solely by municipal agencies as opposed to private people.

MR. CONGEDO:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any other questions? Yes, Mr. Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Out of curiosity, how tall is this particular water tower? Any idea?

MR. CONGEDO:

I'm not sure. It was 115 feet.

MR. CRAMER:

It will be on the existing tower itself.

MR. CONGEDO:

Yes, sir.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I make a motion of unlisted, neg dec on this.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We have a question from Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Good morning. It's my understanding that there are going to be other projects where there will be cell towers built for police use. I thought that that would be coming as legislation later on. Do you know about those other cell tower projects?

MR. CONGEDO:

Well, Cell towers is part -- is part of another committee, from what I understand. We're strictly with the Police Department as far as communications. These cell towers --

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

I thought there was going to be another police communication tower built in addition to Rocky Point.

MR. CONGEDO:

That would be the monopole at Caumsett State Park. Is that the one you are referring to?

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

That might be. It was just indicated to us in committee that there was going to be another part of this project.

MR. CONGEDO:

This is a stand alone project. That is -- Caumsett is an ongoing project.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. We had a motion by Mr. Kaufman of unlisted neg dec. I don't think we had a --

MR. CRAMER:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Second by Mr. Cramer. Any further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Motion carries.
Thank you very much.

Moving on to other business. If you go back to your packet there was a letter. There is a letter that was drafted by Jim on behalf of the subcommittee dealing with the Vector Control. I think it's -- it would be appropriate if everybody has an opportunity to review this before we formally send it to Mr. Dawydiak. So if you would please look at it, Joy has already given me an editorial correction, being a school teacher. I'm embarrassed I didn't catch it.

MS. SQUIRES:
I was -- I tried to do that subtly, only you said it publicly.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
You are never subtle, Joy.

MS. SQUIRES:
Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Thank you very much. That's important. Anyway, please review the letter.

MS. SQUIRES:
It's number six.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
So that we can get this off and continue the process of getting the Vector Control plan out for review. Do we have anybody here that wants to speak on the Vector Control issue?

MR. SNEAD:
Larry, if we could. I'm just requesting that we go to the Yaphank Scavenger Waste Treatment Facility, and the reason for that is that I have a conflict, potential conflict, with the Vector Control plan and I'd like to not to be here when that is discussed.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
So, my mistake. Please review the letter, but because Mr. Snead may have a conflict, we're going to move on to the Yaphank Scavenger Waste Treatment Facility.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:
Are you open for comments?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
No, not yet.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:
I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
It was my mistake. I should have gone directly to this, anyway. Are there any comments on the Scavenger Waste Facility or are we ready to deal with it?

MR. KAUFMAN:
Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:
I have some comments. First off, I had written some comments to Jim and I think Jim is in the process of preparing a letter regarding all of this. If I might, I'd just like to bring up those particular comments.

One, in reading the DGEIS I noted that Cashin Associates had done a Carmans River study, and I'm not sure that it was necessarily addressed or identified in this particular GEIS at this point in time. And I think for the purposes of completeness and adequate review that it does need to be reviewed within the DGEIS. Some of the information in there may be useful.

Second comment is to the extent that the jail may be coming in in that particular area, I believe that there was a traffic analysis that was part of this STP, or Scavenger Waste Facility, DGEIS, and I think that they should somehow or other integrate the two. In other words, the traffic analysis that I saw with the Scavenger Waste Plant may not have included the impacts from the proposed jail. To the extent that it is possible I'm just throwing this out, since we do have a traffic analysis for the jail also, they should be looked at and possibly, again, integrated.

A couple of other questions in there. And this is something I'm not sure about so I'm going to throw it out to the Board here. In several different places it talks about they haven't decided what type of, for example, biological control and odor control will be associated with the construction of this particular plant. In other words, the issue is left open. Specifically at page three five, three six and five dash six it says biological controls have not yet been decided. It also talks about a technology regarding packed towers, etcetera.

I'm not sure if we can leave that issue open within the DEIS at this point in time. And I would throw that out to see what the Council thinks.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Anybody got any comments on what Mike's asked? I don't know, myself.

MR. KAUFMAN:
I always like to err on the side caution and it's my personal opinion that if in the interest of completeness, etcetera, if we are going to be going with this the County should try and decide which way it wants to go on all of this. But again, I don't know how it's handled under SEQRA.

MS. ELKOWITZ:
In the alternative you, in general, we don't have to talk specifically about this, but very often people haven't come up with their final design while they are doing the DEIS.

But let's take odor as an example because odor is something that has the potential to cause a significant adverse impact. If they haven't determined the specific odor control product that they are going to use, then, at a very minimum, they should provide specifications in there as to the level of control that will be the minimum that's acceptable so that you can assess that if they were to buy a product or use a product that would achieve that level of mitigation, it would be suitable to minimize significant adverse impacts without actually choosing the particular product.

MR. KAUFMAN:
Yeah, and you would also put in essentially mitigation --

MS. ELKOWITZ:

That's exactly right.

MR. KAUFMAN:

And that's exactly what's missing. I'm looking at 5-6 where it says biological treatment and it says --

MS. ELKOWITZ:

No, I agree. It has to be handled, but I don't know that you can actually force a project sponsor, whether it be the County or whomever, to do a final design.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I just want it to be --

MS. ELKOWITZ:

But I think that's a way that we could handle it and that it should be handled.

MR. KAUFMAN:

That would be fully acceptable to me. Finally, I've got one other question on page 411. It's regarding packed towers. I don't know, what is a packed tower chemical scrubber?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Would you care to answer?

MR. KAUFMAN:

It's listed as a preferred alternative in there.

MR. WRIGHT:

We have a number of packed towers, at Bergen Point and at other facilities. And, you know, just to describe one, I mean the five that are at Bergen Point treat anywhere from ten to 50,000 cubic feet per minute. It's a fiberglass structure, a tower, probably in the vicinity of 15 feet tall and it's got a packing inside that increases the contact between the air and the chemicals. And two chemicals that we add are sodium hydroxide that increases the PH, and sodium hydrochloride that basically disinfects or, you know, treats the odor.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Are these the things that look like missile silos, if you will, down at Bergen Point?

MR. WRIGHT:

They have been called a lot of things, that's probably one of them. Dark green, you still can see them, but.

MR. KAUFMAN:

If I'm remembering correctly they have some sort of dome on them or something?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. I'm okay on that then. Again, though, getting back to the Carmans River Study. We do have to look at all of that, in my opinion.

MR. WRIGHT:

If you'll notice in one of the appendices in the report, I didn't bring it with me because I wasn't sure it was going to be discussed today. But I know the Cashin Report is discussed in there. It's discussed in the executive summary and also in the first few pages there's a couple of

paragraphs recognizing that the report was done and that basically indicated the condition of the Carmans River.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I was not --

MR. WRIGHT:

It starts out -- there is a cover page from PW {Grocer} as the appendix.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I also have to comment that I didn't think that the Carmans River was not adequately addressed, so.

MR. WRIGHT:

It might not have been adequately addressed, but it was discussed and indicated that, you know, it was reviewed and this is the condition of the river and that the conclusion was that what was being discharged would have no impact on it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do you want to make a motion?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Wright submitted this EIS so that the -- DPW submitted this EIS several months ago. My recollection is that we promised him that he'd have a letter last month and we promised him he'd have a letter this month and he still doesn't have a letter. So, what I would like to suggest is I think I hear a consensus that this document is not complete and adequate for public review.

So I'd like to make a motion suggesting that this document is not complete and adequate for public review and certainly Mr. Wright has heard the comments of Mr. Kaufman. Several of us have already transmitted comments to Mr. Bagg. But because of the amount of work Mr. Bagg has had specifically with Vector Control, he hasn't been able to compile that letter. So I'd like to make a motion that we deem this incomplete and, Mr. Bagg, we'll get you a letter within the next couple of weeks that will summarize all of comments that we have put forth.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Do we have any discussion of that motion? All in favor? Opposed? So we'll try to get that to you as soon as we can.

MR. WRIGHT:

Jim is shaking his head yes.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

He promises, Ben, he promises.

MR. BAGG:

This is on my task to do list. I just haven't got time.

MR. MALLAMO:

Can't you get Laretta to help you?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Yeah. He also didn't tell you it's not on the first page of his to do list yet.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Ben, just for your notation, I don't see it in the executive summary at all.

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, it may have been the executive summary of the appendix. It's something that PW {Grocer} submitted and I know it's referenced in there at least three times.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay.

MR. WRIGHT:

I can show you afterwards.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you very much. Well, one of the things that Jim did promise to do and did do was to summarize the comments of the subcommittee dealing with Vector Control.

MR. SNEAD:

Larry -- I apologize, Larry. I just -- for clarification because if we're not going to be discussing this I'd prefer to -- I'll be able to leave, but we've been handed a memorandum from John Wagner. Is that up for discussion at this meeting?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I don't really want to discuss it right now.

MR. SNEAD:

At this meeting.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Right.

MR. CRAMER:

Review it and discuss it next meeting.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yeah.

MR. SNEAD:

So we get an opportunity to review it and then come back.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yeah.

MR. SNEAD:

With that understanding, then I'll take my leave and I thank you for the change in the agenda so that I can move on.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Okay. So we'd like to get the committee's comments on the letter that Jim has written. I'd like also to offer the opportunity for anybody in the audience that wants to speak on the Vector Control issue to please come forward, identify yourself, and make your statement.

MR. McALEVY:

My name is Bob McAlevy. I live in Hampton Bays and I have been a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the Vector Control Study from its inception. And I sent a letter to you all,

I guess you got it, and it dealt with the pesticide issue and lots of uncertainties in that.

Since the question about the wetlands is on the table, I thought I'd make a couple of comments about that. And it's prompted by discussion I had with the Southampton Town Baymen's Association. They are like the last of the Mohicans trying to make a living out of the bay and they are concerned about the declining productivity of the bays and what's going on in the salt marsh.

So, I heard there was a letter and I'll just relate to you the questions that others raised but I'm being their voice. They understand, and I'm sure you understand, that relative to a fixed point on bedrock, the surface of Long Island is sinking, like a slow motion Atlantis job. And it's doing that because we are I think about an eighth of a mile right now above bedrock. And there is slumping or subsiding of the surface relative to a fixed point.

So, I tried to find this information out, maybe you have it and you use it in your deliberations. What is the geologic survey data on past rate of subsidence, what it is now, and what future rate is projected and used in calculating what's going to happen to our salt marsh. That's just one aspect.

I have one other quick one. Because I don't understand and I couldn't explain to the guys that work the water, how the DEC when it came to the Wortheim project first said you need five years of baseline data. Then three. Then one. And then, as I understand it, permitted submission of data, the monitoring data, the ecological monitoring data, not at the site to be dug, but at a nearby comparable site. I hope that you will address this issue and put something in the report so I can go back and report it to the baymen.

The other issue is although in Washington it's a mixed issue, but it appears that the -- in addition to the slumping of the surface of Long Island relative to a fixed point, the ocean level is rising. And it's a controversial one, but I have a letter here from John {McCaine} that he sent to everybody, not just to Bob McAlevy. And he is concerned about it and he is concerned that the insiders and special interest people are preventing the Congress of the United States and Senate of the United States, to deal with the issue forthrightly and honestly.

There is evidence, and I'm giving you just one page of a paper here, that -- entitled the Greenland Ice Sheet and Global Sea Level Rise. It appears based on this paper from the study of the Greenland ice sheet melting, that the present predictions of perhaps a half meter rise of sea level over the next hundred years is too small by a factor of two. It's going to be double that. It's going to be a meter or more than a meter, which has direct impact on the flooding of our wetlands.

I don't know what numbers that you use or what numbers the DEC used to vary the monitoring time. I understand that there's going to be ten years monitoring post disturbance of the Wertheim site. I don't know if you are going to permit other disturbances. So if that's going to be in your report I'd be interested in finding out about it.

I will leave these two documents and maybe if there is a next time, for me and for the meeting of your committee, I will leave here a statement, a very shocking statement, but the Bush Administration decides it can't afford a children's study, that is what's the affect of children, studying them over -- from the time they are born to the time they are 21. So it undermines the uncertainty and our understanding of the effect of County pesticide spraying on the unborn and the development of our children. But that's for another time. So who do I leave these documents with?

MR. BAGG:

Right here, we'll take them.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I thank you for your comments. I can't resist just making a few observations about your comments, and I don't know what will actually end up being in the report with regard to your specific suggestions. I do think that we will never in maybe my lifetime have any agreement on what is causing substance of our wetlands and I don't think in my lifetime or your lifetime that we will probably have a firm answer on what the rate of sea level rise is going to be over the next century. And that if we put everything off in trying to do reasonable environmental management, until those answers are known in some concrete way, we will not move forward at all.

MR. McALEVY:

I understand that, uncertainties are vast, but I wonder what data, what scientific basis there was for the DEC to change from five years to three years to one year. And then you can monitor but they gave data that was somewhat away from the place that was disturbed. I don't understand how that's possible given the uncertainty, and I agree with the uncertainty. And all I'll say is perhaps then the hypocratic oath should apply. First do no harm. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Does anyone else have any other comments?

MR. ATKINSON:

Yes, thank you. I'm Matthew Atkinson with Peconic Baykeeper. I just have two quick comments. I haven't seen the letter but I just want to emphasize that the EIS, the draft EIS, hasn't even been completed in terms of its writing. Certain appendices are still being drafted and in that context it's obviously not complete. And on the process that's taking place here, it's a little bit confusing to me because we have a management plan and typically a management plan would be based upon an EIS. And since the EIS is not complete, the management plan is by its very nature can't be complete or even known since it should be based upon the EIS.

And therefore, until this EIS is drafted and is deemed complete, I'm going to reserve any further comments upon the management plan as I think the CEQ should do as well because it really should grow out of the EIS in a more organic shape rather than sort of leading the EIS. In fact, it was completed and the EIS has not even yet been completed. Thank you.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Mr. Chairman, I'm confused. Mr. Atkinson, I'm confused. An environmental impact statement, whether it be a generic or not, no matter what we are talking about, is based upon a proposed action. My understanding is that the proposed action of the County is the management plan and the GEIS is evaluating the impacts of that management plan.

Now, my further understanding is that the management plan is sitting out there, the GEIS is being evaluated, and my theory, although I won't know this until the end when the Legislature makes its decision, is that the proposed action, the management plan, may or may not be modified based upon the environmental review that's conducted pursuant to SEQRA.

So, while you're right that the management plan can't be finalized until after the GEIS, there has to be a proposed action for a GEIS to evaluate, and the proposed action is the management plan.

MR. ATKINSON:

May I respond?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Sure.

MR. ATKINSON:

The proposed action and the reason that there is a draft generic environmental impact

statement being prepared was the long-term plan.

MS. ELKOWITZ:
Right.

MR. ATKINSON:
It was submitted back in 2002. This management plan is a kind of combination of that long-term plan and a set of findings as to what the actual management plan will be.

MS. ELKOWITZ:
Well, you're entitled to your opinion, but I don't know that I agree with it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
Thank you. Anybody else? Adrienne?

MS. ESPOSITO:
No. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
All right. I'm going to ask that the committee give their comments on the draft letter, the letter really is addressing the completeness issue, no technical issues, and to do so within the week. If we don't hear from you within a week, it will consider your observations as being okay with it. And then we'll send it out hopefully within --

MS. ELKOWITZ:
We need a resolution deeming it incomplete, though.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
We do?

MS. ELKOWITZ:
We need a resolution to deem the document incomplete.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:
The DGIS?

MS. ELKOWITZ:
You do need that. I've reviewed this letter. I don't know if anybody else has because I got it ahead of time, it was e-mailed to me.

MR. BAGG:
It was e-mailed to everybody.

MS. ELKOWITZ:
I'm prepared to act on this letter unless others are not.

MR. KAUFMAN:
There are one or two additions that I have given to Jim for --

MS. ELKOWITZ:
So why don't you just put them on the record and let's just discuss them and maybe we can just act on this and get it done.

MR. KAUFMAN:
I would be amenable to that. Let me just grab the stuff.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Great. And Joy's typo, let's just fix it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

It's not a typo. It's a grammatical error.

MR. WAGNER:

I found a typo.

MS. EKLOWITZ:

We'll fix John's typo, Joy's grammatical error, we'll add what Mike brought forth, and let's deem the damn thing incomplete and get it off the agenda.

MR. WAGNER:

Do you want to know what it is?

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Yeah, come on.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

MR. WAGNER:

Paragraph 5a, the last line. There's an a in there that doesn't belong in there.

MS. SQUIRES:

Oh, I missed that.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Hey, Joy, you met your match.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Teacher, we're going to flunk you now. Joy, I don't know if you are able to teach anymore if you missed that.

MR. WAGNER:

It takes a team effort.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Okay. My particular comments were regarding paragraph four and paragraph five. I'll start with five. Five a, actually. Section has to include an overview of the federal, state and local wetlands laws, their purposes and restrictions. FINS and DEC currently have rules and regulations as well as protocols for operations conducted in wetlands under their jurisdiction.

I had proposed that we expand that language a little bit regarding the integration of possible DEC standards and criteria regarding permits and wetlands into this. Those standards and criteria are fairly well known and DEC has, in fact, stated to the TAC and to the Vector Control people oftentimes what they basically require in order to issue permits, and I thought that that language might be useful.

And then also in the end of paragraph four it talks about various techniques proposed to be implemented to accomplish the goals of the Vector Control Program should be described in detail. And the specific thresholds and criteria for their use be set forth.

At our February tenth meeting I had brought up the fact that I personally would feel a lot more comfortable if Suffolk County Vector Control in many of their efforts would do a -- would

basically comply with SEQRA at County level and I was suggesting maybe a part three or a full plan or supplemental EIS's be placed in there. In other words, the level of SEQRA review be increased a little bit from what was in the plan.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

That's not a completeness issue, though, Mike.

MR. BAGG:

That's done at the end in the findings statement. You are not even in a comment period at this point.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I don't think that's a completeness issue, Mike.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'm trying to remember my arguments of what I was talking about at the meeting.

MR. CRAMER:

But that's -- as Jim and Terry say, that's more of a findings statement at the end of the process. It's not getting us into where this is a complete document or not.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Right.

MR. KAUFMAN:

All right. I will defer to the rest of the Board on this one. I have a different memory. I have a memory that we had gone looking at SEQRA and the compliance.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Well, Mike, it is appropriate actually for a GEIS, whether it be the draft, the final, the finding statement. Somewhere it has to have conditions and thresholds. And it does have conditions and thresholds, but I think what you're doing is you're asking them right now to put in a specific condition or threshold as to when supplementals are required, when part three's are required.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I wanted that ability to be out there as opposed to establishing a specific threshold for each project.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I agree, but I don't think that -- my personal opinion is that we're not at the point, because I don't -- I personally don't believe that there are enough data in there for any of us to come up with what the threshold would be for that further review.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I understand that. I'm recalling my argument at this point in time. My argument at the February tenth meeting specifically was that we couldn't figure out which projects would necessarily -- which individual projects, etcetera, would necessarily need which type of review, but I wanted to make sure that the ability to have that review was placed in there.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Well, the ability to have that review is in the regulations, and it is going to be able to come up -- somebody is going to have to come up with it, either in the FGEIS and the finding statement or at a minimum, in the finding statement because it's required. Okay?

MR. KAUFMAN:

All right. I can live with that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. So we have a grammatical error, a typo and Mike's comments on paragraph five to consider and, Jim, you'll try to accommodate --

MR. BAGG:

We'll integrate them today and I'll try to get you a revised copy tomorrow and we will send it out as soon as possible.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

With that, I'll make a motion -- oh, Joy.

MS. SQUIRES:

I thought it was very complete. I thought that it was a good letter. I just wanted to make that comment.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

I'm going to make a motion that we deem the draft general environment impact statement incomplete pursuant to this letter with the amendments that Jim will make that we discussed today.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Any further discussion?

DR. POTENTE:

Before that happens, if something occurs in the interim, can we submit comments to Jim for any additions?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I think, you know, this is it.

DR. POTENTE:

It looks good, but --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We can't keep the process going on forever and ever and ever.

DR. POTENTE:

No, I realize that.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

And there is a comment period on the GEIS.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

MR. BAGG:

If I might point out. I mean, we're in the initial phases of SEQRA review process. I mean, a draft is just that, a draft. And basically a lot of the comments and concerns that have been submitted to date are really based on the document and should be considered in the FEIS. In other words, the comments deal with the management plan per se, the impacts if they are not in there. And there has to be a response to those comments by the Health Department and DPW

and that's where those things will be dealt with.

Then there will be a final impact statement which includes the substantive comments received, the response to those comments. The FEGIS is then sent out again for a ten day comment period and then the Council will make a recommendation to the Suffolk County Legislature and Executive relative to a finding statement as to whether the, you know, all the analysis is in there, whether or not they think supplementals are warranted at a future date or whatever. I mean, but people are looking at this document that if it is approved to be disseminated to the public that it's laid in concrete. This is just the first step.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you.

DR. POTENTE:

You'll be drawing this up what, within the next week, Jim?

MR. BAGG:

I'm going to get this out of the office probably by Friday.

DR. POTENTE:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

We have a motion and a second. Do we have all in favor? Opposed? And abstentions? Okay. John, you voted in favor or --

DR. POTENTE:

Yes, in favor.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. So everybody voted in favor. I thank you. Okay. Now we'll go on to historic services.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Yes.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm sorry to interrupt, but I just saw Jay -- Legislator Schneiderman out in the lobby and I asked him to come in for a minute because he has been requesting at our Legislative meetings that CEQ take a second look at the Gabreski Airport project. And yesterday the Presiding Officer acceded to his request and said that he would be writing a letter to CEQ asking that we take -- you take a second -- I hope maybe by then I'll be a member of CEQ again, that we take a second look at this. I just wanted to give you a heads up and I wanted to let Legislator Schneiderman know that I would be letting you know.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm here actually for a press conference on trapping issues and I guess it's serendipitous that you guys are meeting at the same time. Let me say a couple of things about Gabreski Airport. Gabreski Airport has roughly 400 acres that are slated for aviation development and there are multiple applications in for new jet hangars and fixed base operations and fuel farms, etcetera. The County is in the process of doing a master plan or an updated master plan and I have been assured by the administration that that master plan will be the subject of a full environmental impact statement. Meanwhile, there are applications coming in.

The one that is before you, Long Island Jet, is a significant expansion of their current facilities. It is not simply an extension of the current lease, which maybe some people were under the assumption that it was. It's significant expansion. And several groups, including The Group for the South Fork, has spoken before the Legislature on this issue and whether the proper routing has occurred, whether the proper analysis has occurred.

Jim Morgo, who is the Commissioner of Economic Development, has stated before the Legislature when he stepped forward to ask us to actually table the determination, that the lease isn't complete. So then it begs the question how can you do SEQRA if you are not sure what you are doing SEQRA on, since you don't know what the project is.

So I have been simply saying look, I want to make sure before this gets approved that we've done our due diligence and that SEQRA -- that the CEQ fully understood the project before it, it made it's best recommendation, and then the Legislature will then act upon that recommendation.

So the Presiding Officer last night said that he would send a letter to CEQ to ask you to take a second look at it. And I'm just here basically to tell you that and answer any questions that you may have.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Any questions? Thank you very much. It's nice to see you again.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes, it is good to see you all as well.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Historic Services.

MR. MARTIN:

Okay. We'll be scheduling the next Historic Trust Committee meeting in April, and this is to take place at the Scully Estate. We have had a meeting there previously to review the property for Historic Trust status, but we'll be now reviewing the plans that are being prepared by the architect, Peter Caradonna. The reason for this meeting is to go over the lead guidelines, which are part of the Green Building resolution that was passed by the Legislature. And I just wondered if Legislator Fisher could maybe inform the CEQ a bit on this process. I know you were involved with it and --

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

I'm sorry. I missed the first part of what you were saying.

MR. MARTIN:

Okay. We're setting up a charrette at the Scully Estate with the architect, Peter Caradonna. And my understanding now is any project that's over a million dollars of County funding gets a specific review by the CEQ now according to the lead guidelines. This would be the first project that I'll be involved with and we need to educate the Historic Trust Committee members as to this review process, and I think the full CEQ at this point. I just wondered if you had any comments on that.

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you. It's exciting that we are there. And CEQ has -- I've done presentations years ago when I first introduced {lead} and the green building criteria. But I believe that DPW, who has a break down of this, should probably do that kind of presentation. Peter Caradonna is the foremost architect with regards to being a member of the Green Building Council, the USCGB -- GBC, United States Green Building Council, GBC. And I'm sure he can tell you a lot, but being the architect he probably isn't the right person to do that presentation.

I think that DPW could probably give you a good break down and I think CEQ should be reeducated on that, too, because as projects come before CEQ, part of the check off will have to be that they are meeting the minimum criteria for certification. So I think at some point, Mr. Chair, CEQ will have to be reeducated on the criteria that we're looking for in green buildings.

MR. MARTIN:

And as far I know, this will be the first project coming forward --

LEG. VILORIA-FISHER:

Yes.

MR. MARTIN:

The Scully Estate. We are looking to start that restoration/renovation project this year. So I'll be sending -- picking a date with the architect. He'll be leading the meeting. Other County staff will be attending and other interested parties and we'll be actually walking through the house, the building and explaining all the work that's to be done and taking any comments from the committee members at that point.

So, I'm not sure of the date at this point. I'm trying to coordinate with the architect and other groups that would like to come to this, but will be conducted in April.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Thank you. Anything else?

MR. MARTIN:

That's it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I have -- Mike?

MR. KAUFMAN:

We'll get notice of the meeting, location, maps, things like that?

MR. MARTIN:

Yes, you will.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Make sure there is a map in there.

MR. MARTIN:

Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

I just have a recollection that while we're all members of the Historic Trust, that the Historic Trust didn't want all of us coming and overwhelming the thing and so we've had a representative, and I'm not sure with the turnover in the Board in the last year or so whether we still have a member that is representing the CEQ and we probably should have. I don't know if anybody is interested in --

MR. MALLAMO:

Yeah, well, I'm the Chairman, so.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

You're the Chair?

MR. MALLAMO:

I'm the Chair.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Is there a conflict of interest?

MR. MALLAMO:

And Mike goes to the meetings.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I've been trying to go to them. I don't participate very heavily in them. I simply listen to what's going on.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. So we're squared away. Thanks, Lance.

MR. MALLAMO:

But we welcome anyone who'd like to come.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

You mean we're not excluded anymore?

MR. MALLAMO:

No. I'm not going to listen to you anyway, but.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

Okay. Yes?

MR. KAUFMAN:

This is regarding the Yaphank Scavenger Waste Facility. It was already dealt with, I'm just trying to withdraw a comment, that's all, and tell Jim. The Carmans River study apparently was looked at in this document. I simply did not see it. I admit that I am wrong.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Is it in the appendix?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Yes, it is.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Well, you know what? It should be summarized in the text of the document so I think if you can't find it, it's not given enough prominence to evaluate the consistency with it and I think the comment should remain.

MR. KAUFMAN:

All right. So I'm half right.

MR. BAGG:

In addition, I think that the DEIS on the expansion of the jail had a significant area of the Carmans River thing with the plumes and everything else in it. And that data should be placed within this document as well.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

CAC concerns? Okay. Do we have any other business?

MR. CRAMER:

Motion to adjourn.

MS. ELKOWITZ:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON:

All in favor? We're adjourned.

(THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 11:19 AM)