

RECEIVED  
SUFFOLK COUNTY DEPT. OF PLANNING  
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

**ORIGINAL**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

SUFFOLK COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING  
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

100 Veterans Memorial Highway  
Hauppauge, New York 11788

November 19, 2008  
9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

MICHAEL KAUFMAN, Vice Chairman  
HON. JAY H. SCHNEIDERMAN  
EVA GROWNEY  
RICHARD MACHTAY  
GLORIA G. RUSSO  
MARY ANN SPENCER  
DANIEL PICHNEY

ZEB YOUNGMAN  
RICHARD MARTIN, Historic Society  
Representative

JAMES BAGG, Chief Environmental Analyst

1 THE CHAIRMAN: Good morning, everyone.  
2 Today is Wednesday, November 19, 2008. This is the CEO  
3 meeting. First off, I'd like to say that our dear  
4 leader, Larry Swanson, is currently unavailable. He's  
5 currently hiding in an undisclosed bunker avoiding SUNY  
6 budget cuts, so he could not be here today. I'll be  
7 running the meeting.

8 I wouldn't necessarily be following the agenda  
9 exactly. There are several reasons for that. If there  
10 are members of the public here, I ask that they sign  
11 in. And ~~if~~ you have an interest in the project that  
12 we're going to be talking about, let us go through our  
13 initial discussions, then raise your hands. I'll ask  
14 for public comment. We'll hear what you have to say.  
15 Then we will take votes.

16 For the record, I see Legislator Schneiderman  
17 has just arrived. Welcome. We're just literally  
18 beginning the meeting. First thing, we don't have any  
19 correspondence, as far as I know. We're going to do the  
20 SEQRA classifications of resos laid on the table for  
21 November 18th. Ask the members to take a quick look.  
22 Anything in there of salient interest?

23 MR. BAGG: It's fairly straightforward;  
24 Type II actions and previously reviewed by the council

1 and agreed to by the legislature.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: I agree with Jim. I have  
3 looked through what is in here. I'll entertain a  
4 motion.

5 MS. RUSSO: I make a motion.

6 MR. MACHTAY: Second.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor? Opposed?  
8 Abstentions? Motion carries.

9 Is Mr. Ceglio around? Would you mind going  
10 first? You have three projects over here. I want to  
11 get the tough stuff out of the way. Which one do you  
12 want to try and do first?

13 MR. CEGLIO: I will go in the order you have  
14 them listed on your agenda, Holy Moses Cheesecake. Tony  
15 Ceglio. This is a bakery at Gabreski Airport. The  
16 first project we have is an application to lease a  
17 building at Holy Moses Cheesecake at the airport. It's  
18 been a tenant at the airport for approximately twenty  
19 years. They're relocating from one building to another  
20 at the airport. Actually, the relocation has been done  
21 already.

22 The reason for the relocation was that the old  
23 building was in an area that is going to be developed as  
24 a Hampton Business and Technology Park. The building is

1 similar size and type located on the west side of the  
2 airport, located near the tower and terminal building.  
3 We consider this to be a Type II action, requesting your  
4 review.

5 I can point it out on the map. I did include  
6 a similar map to the one I have over on the stand. That  
7 shows the exact location of where Holy Moses relocated  
8 to. It's in your packet. ~~If~~ you like, I'll step up to  
9 the map and point it out to you. This is our proposed  
10 airport land use map. Holy Moses is located in that  
11 area. They were located in the pink area, which is the  
12 proposed Hampton Business and Technology Park. They  
13 relocated in the yellow area, which is the existing  
14 aviation development right behind the control tower in a  
15 similar building about twenty-two hundred square feet.

16 They're not proposing a different use. They  
17 baked cheesecakes for twenty years and they will be  
18 continuing to do that.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Had you had any problems in  
20 terms of discharges or anything like that from the  
21 factory?

22 MR. CEGLIO: They have minimal discharges.  
23 They have to get a permit from the Health Department.  
24 They are connected to the sewage plant.

1           THE CHAIRMAN:    I have one question for Jim.  
2    We have got this listed as a Type II because it's a  
3    lease.  Maybe my memory is wrong.  Is it a Type II or  
4    unlisted because it's leased?

5           MR. BAGG:        In the SEQRA regs it's a lease  
6    renewal.  The people are in this building.  They have a  
7    temporary lease that is being extended and they want to  
8    go for a long-term lease.  The building is circa 1940's,  
9    old Air Force building that has been upgraded.  It's  
10   connected to the sewage system.  Therefore, I felt  
11   interior renovations and lease renewal qualified as a  
12   Type II action.

13           MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:   If I could add to that.  I  
14   have visited their operations; it's quite benign.  It's  
15   excellent that they're providing this kind of economic  
16   activity.  It's really quite a good product that they  
17   produce.

18           THE CHAIRMAN:    In which case, I'll entertain  
19   a motion.

20           MR. MACHTAY:     Motion.

21           MR. YOUNGMAN:     Second.

22           THE CHAIRMAN:    Okay, call the vote.  All in  
23   favor?  (Show of hands)  Opposed?  Abstain?  Motion  
24   carries.

1           Let's see. The next one is Hampton Jitney.

2           MR. CEGLIO: Similar type of proposal for the  
3           airport. It's an application for Hampton Jitney to  
4           lease three acres, almost three acres on the south side  
5           of the airport. The current location, Hampton Jitney is  
6           in the Hampton Business and Technology Park. They had  
7           to be moved because of the proposed development of the  
8           park.

9           On the map, airport land use map, it's in an  
10          area where we indicated to be future non-aviation  
11          development. I just want to mention that also the  
12          Airport Conservation Assessment Panel also renewed this  
13          and also considered this to be an unlisted action that  
14          will have no significant impact on the environment.  
15          I'll point it out on the map to give you an idea where  
16          it is.

17          The Hampton Jitney is currently located in the  
18          Hampton Business and Technology Park. They're going to  
19          relocate on the south side of the area, kind of a teal  
20          color in here, five acres for non-aviation development.  
21          I believe it's two point eight acres; of which they're  
22          going to clear about a half acre to put in about  
23          twenty-five to thirty parking spots and a bus shelter.

24          THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions?

1 MR. BAGG: I have one question, Tony. The  
2 Airport Advisory Committee recommended, ~~is~~<sup>if</sup> possible,  
3 they not use asphalt paving, that they use some type of  
4 pervious paving. Is that possible?

5 MR. CEGLIO: The reason why they that is  
6 because Hampton Jitney, at the Airport Conservation  
7 Assessment meeting, mentioned they're going to try to  
8 talk to the developer about the technology park. If  
9 they do move to the south side of the airport, maybe  
10 with a short-term lease and with the future of being in  
11 the park.

12 With that in mind, they didn't want to put an  
13 impervious surface down that might have to be ripped up  
14 in let's say a year. As we get closer to putting the  
15 lease together and in negotiations with the Rechler  
16 Associates for the park, Rechler will make that  
17 determination, whether it's going to be a long or  
18 short-term lease and will decide whether we want to them  
19 to put down gravel or paved surface.

20 MR. BAGG: Is a paved surface required, even  
21 if they were there for long-term? This is really a  
22 staging area, parking area for vehicles. Is it  
23 necessary that it has to be asphalt?

24 MR. CEGLIO: In the airport development

1 standards for all parking, we have requested paved  
2 parking. And only because gravel tends to get dragged  
3 out on to the main roads. It's a maintenance headache.  
4 It's really for the long-term benefit of the airport  
5 it's necessary.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: What about RCA, would that  
7 have the same problem as gravel?

8 MR. CEGLIO: That is a recycled concrete  
9 aggregate. That is the stuff I'm talking about. It  
10 gets dragged out on to the main roads and becomes a  
11 maintenance problem.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm looking at the aerial  
13 photograph. This is a somewhat wooded area now.

14 MR. CEGLIO: It's entirely wooded. Three  
15 acres is what they're intending to use. They're  
16 planning on clearing about a half acre.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: It looks as if there is a road  
18 network area in the south.

19 MR. CEGLIO: Yes, there is a road immediately  
20 south of that. Then you have the Long Island Railroad  
21 tracks. It's the airport roadway. It's our perimeter  
22 road and probably about a hundred feet south of that is  
23 the railroad tracks and south of that is the concrete  
24 plant.



1           MR. PICHNEY:   Getting back to the parking lot  
2           again.  I wish I knew the name of the type of material.  
3           They make like a grid lock type of material that is laid  
4           out so grass can throw through it that can handle  
5           heavier vehicles and so forth.  Have you ever used that  
6           or considered using that?

7           MR. CEGLIO:   We haven't used it on the  
8           airport.  I'm thinking of maintenance.  If grass can  
9           grow through it, somebody has to mow it.  The parking  
10          lot doesn't require any maintenance.  I have to check  
11          with Hampton Jitney.

12          THE CHAIRMAN:  Is there an increased cost  
13          connected to that in the event that the lease may not be  
14          long-term?  It's an interesting idea; in fact, I have  
15          seen the product you're talking about.  It may not fit  
16          in with what the applicant needs or the long-term plans  
17          of the airport.

18          MS. GROWNEY:   Sir, about that particular  
19          product, ~~if~~ it was going to be used you don't need to  
20          mow the lawn.  That is not something that really  
21          happens.  It's self-limiting.

22          MR. CEGLIO:   It gets worn out by the cars and  
23          trucks.

24          MS. GROWNEY:   Because there is so much

1 concrete. ~~If~~ it's applicable; just letting you know.

2 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: There was some discussion  
3 at the ACAP meeting regarding the amount of clearing  
4 regarding the parking lot, and in we could configure  
5 the parking lot, particularly since it's going to be a  
6 temporary location, to cut down the least amount of  
7 trees. Is there any update on that issue in terms of  
8 how the buses will come in and out of the leasehold?

9 MR. CEGLIO: Hampton Jitney, as you know,  
10 Legislator Schneiderman, gave us a preliminary sketch of  
11 the area showing how the fifty cars are going to be laid  
12 out. They're only going to clear about a half acre of  
13 the three acres that they're going to use. I think it  
14 was going to be minimal to begin with.

15 When we come up with a final design, we will  
16 make sure they're not clearing more than they need to.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Legislator Schneiderman, the  
18 point you bring up is interesting. While we have to  
19 make a SEQRA recommendation today, we can make a  
20 recommendation to the legislature saying any plans that  
21 are submitted should have a limit on the amount of trees  
22 that are being cleared in the area, ~~if~~ <sup>if</sup> possible. We  
23 can always put that in as a recommendation to any  
24 motion.

1 Any other questions? Anyone want to make a  
2 motion.

3 MR. YOUNGMAN: I'll make a motion.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: I recognize Mr. Youngman  
5 making a motion. This would be unlisted, I would guess,  
6 Neg Dec.

7 MR. YOUNGMAN: That's right.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to put in any kind  
9 of recommendations or anything.

10 MR. YOUNGMAN: Recommend minimized clearing.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Do I have a second? I have a  
12 second by Ms. Russo. Calling the question. All in  
13 favor? (Show of hands) Abstentions, no ~~votes~~<sup>vetos</sup>? Motion  
14 carries. Okay.

15 Mr. Ceglie, I think you're here again.

16 MR. CEGLIO: Yes, I am. My last project at  
17 Gabreski Airport is Ocean Aviation. Because we started  
18 so early, the gentlemen from Ocean Aviation was going to  
19 be here to answer questions.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: We can wait until he gets  
21 here.

22 MR. CEGLIO: The reason why he was going to  
23 be here was if you had any specific questions you might  
24 want to ask him.

1 THE CHAIRMAN: I'd rather not bifurcate the  
2 hearing. I'd rather wait until he gets here in case  
3 there are questions, if you don't mind.

4 MR. CEGLIO: No problem at all.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: I'd like to get hopefully an  
6 easier one out of the way. Sewer District Number 2,  
7 Tallmadge Woods. We have a letter here from Dan White,  
8 chief engineer and head of sanitation from DPW. Please  
9 come on up and identify yourself for the record.

10 MR. WARREN: Ronald Warren, Director of  
11 Operations and Maintenance, Division of Sanitation,  
12 1-M. I'm here to answer any questions that you would  
13 have on this correspondence that we sent you.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Do any of the members have any  
15 questions on this? I've got one or two on this. First  
16 off, for SEQRA, if we do judge this to be a Type II, I  
17 think it would be maintenance and repair, C-1 and  
18 replacement, rehab and construction. Interesting that  
19 there is a lot of repair and replacement going on.

20 How old is this particular sewer district?

21 MR. WARREN: I think it was completed in  
22 2000, but it was operated by contractors who apparently  
23 didn't have enough money to do structural work that  
24 caused, not significant damage, but ongoing structural

1 problems that we have to address before they get worse.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: They ran it into the ground,  
3 in other words.

4 MR. WARREN: Not so bad. We don't want to  
5 have to pay for it later on down the road when it could  
6 be much more expensive than trying to address it before  
7 it gets any worse.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Looking at it from a SEQRA  
9 sense, it does look as if it's Type II, in maintenance  
10 and replacement.

11 MR. MACHTAY: Motion.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: Any seconds?

13 MR. PICHNEY: Second.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Calling the question. All in  
15 favor? (Show of hands) Opposed? Abstentions? Motion  
16 carries.

17 While we're waiting for the airport thing, I'd  
18 like to take Legislator Schneiderman's local law to  
19 reduce the use of fertilizer near surface waters in  
20 Suffolk County, basically place it on the agenda and do  
21 a SEQRA classification and take any comments on it.

22 Legislator Schneiderman, if you would like to  
23 describe the bill at all.

24 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yes. I think it is

1 simple. I wish the bill were a stronger bill than it  
2 is, but I watered it down to try to assure its passage,  
3 although I'm still not sure it's going to pass. It  
4 tries to keep fertilizers out of our harbors and bays.  
5 Fertilizer contain nitrogen and phosphorus. It gets  
6 washed by rains into the harbors.

7 Just as it accelerates the growth of plants on  
8 your lawn, it accelerates the growth of algae. The  
9 algae blocks out the bottom plants, the whole ecology,  
10 brown tide, those types of things we have seen in the  
11 past which wiped out our shellfish populations.

12 We passed, not so long ago, a bill that limits  
13 or prohibits the use of fertilizers, residential  
14 fertilizers between April 1st and November 1st when the  
15 ground is frozen. This is a follow-up to this measure  
16 to try to pull the fertilizers away from our surface  
17 waters. The original bill was a hundred feet, which I  
18 thought was responsible. I ran into a lot of problems  
19 with that. This bill is a twenty foot setback, which  
20 is small, but I think it has a better chance of passing.  
21 It's better than zero feet.

22 There is an exception if someone has a ten  
23 foot natural buffer that would absorb the water, then  
24 they're exempt from the setbacks. That is basically

1 it.

2 THE CHAIRMAN: How do you define "continuous  
3 natural vegetative buffer;" are we talking trees,  
4 bushes, undisturbed?

5 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I don't have the bill in  
6 front of me. I think it might be unmowed, unpaved.  
7 There might be an exception for an access trail or  
8 something like that. Let's see. "It shall not apply to  
9 a continuous, natural vegetative buffer at least ten  
10 feet wide." Natural vegetative buffer. I suppose more  
11 language can be added defining what a natural vegetative  
12 buffer is.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm thinking more in terms of  
14 the legalities of it. I'm an attorney, so I drafted a  
15 number of laws that relate to exactly this kind of  
16 stuff.

17 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: That could be amended.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: You might want to define it a  
19 little bit better. There are codes out there wherein,  
20 for example, at state and village level or Long Island,  
21 wherein those concepts are defined a little bit better.  
22 Simply I know as an attorney, people will try and dodge  
23 around this language. To make this effective --

24 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: (Interposing) If you have

1 some language that you can recommend, I will certainly  
2 amend the bill.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: The paragraph above talks  
4 about a Section 8. I'm talking at 289-9(a) -- (b).  
5 Just showing Jim this for a second. There is no Section  
6 8. It goes up to Section 6 and that's it. Our  
7 legislative council will be able to catch that.

8 Never mind, they have it backwards. Withdrawn  
9 on that particular comment. I guess you would need to  
10 add a description of the natural vegetative buffer to  
11 the Section 8 in your definition, if we can come up with  
12 something.

13 For whatever it's worth, I appreciate your  
14 efforts in trying to go to a hundred feet. In my  
15 village of Nissequogue, we have regulations talking  
16 about a hundred fifty foot setbacks and hundred foot  
17 setbacks, from one waterbody, such as marshes, et  
18 cetera, and we discourage any -- actually ban any  
19 removal of vegetation and try to discourage, as heavily  
20 as possible, the application of fertilizer, because we  
21 know it runs into there both as runoff and ground water.

22 There are some areas which would have  
23 appreciated the one hundred feet. The DEC limits are  
24 seventy-five but we understand the --



1           MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:    (Interposing)  Problem is,  
2           people love their homogenous lawns.  We spend millions  
3           of dollars reseeding bays and harbors are plants, only  
4           to have homeowners pollute that resource with  
5           overloading it with nutrients with fertilizers.  It's  
6           difficult to enforce.  It sends a message.  I hope that  
7           people, if they believe it's prohibited, wouldn't do it.

8                        There is an enforcement mechanism, but it's  
9           largely based on complaints from neighbors or people  
10          that might be aware of the problem.  We don't have the  
11          ability to go to every home to keep an eye and test,  
12          but I think it's good policy.  I think it should be in  
13          place, and I hope that it helps to clean up the harbors  
14          a little bit.

15                   THE CHAIRMAN:    I agree with that.

16                   MR. PICHNEY:    I have a question.  I just  
17          wanted to say for the record, I have a small gardening  
18          business.  I have for many years.  While I don't do  
19          lawns in any sort of capacity, I am sympathetic to the  
20          people who do.

21                   In respect to the limits, when you're  
22          prohibited in applying fertilizer from November 1st to  
23          April 1st, the leaves have fallen completely from the  
24          trees only within the past week or two.  The people that

1 do this are boxed in in terms of doing clean-ups and  
2 putting down winter fertilizer. This really is a big  
3 constraint on them to be able to do their business.

4 I would think, in terms of when the -- within  
5 the spirit of the law, when the ground really becomes  
6 frozen, you're really looking to December 1st. We have  
7 some frost now, some light freezes, but nothing that  
8 would make the grass impermeable that there is  
9 substantial runoff.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: The problem is that ship has  
11 sailed.

12 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: A lot of people are using  
13 these slow release fertilizers. They put them on in  
14 October. They're actually being released all through  
15 the winter. I think that was an important step, but it  
16 certainly wasn't a cure all.

17 MR. KAUFMAN: Any other questions? Calling  
18 the motion, it looks like an unlisted.

19 MR. BAGG: This is a very difficult bill. I  
20 don't really know how to get a handle on what are the  
21 environmental impacts because you're simply saying you  
22 cannot apply fertilizer to this area. It's not like  
23 you're saying you have to apply fertilizer; you're not  
24 adding chemicals, you're simply allowing it to revert to

1 its natural state. I don't know what the impact is of  
2 saying you can't do something.

3 MR. MACHTAY: Never mind the impact, what is  
4 it classified? I'm thinking of how many acres it can  
5 possibly affect.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: That is what Jim and I were  
7 talking about yesterday. If it's a large area, it's  
8 Type I.

9 MR. MACHTAY: Environmentally, it would be a  
10 Neg Dec. That is the way I would see it, to be safe.

11 MR. BAGG: Basically the law says technically  
12 it deals with the acreage is the physical alteration.  
13 Are you physically altering here?

14 THE CHAIRMAN: Or not physically altering,  
15 but we are impacting it, to be consistent.

16 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Look what we did with the  
17 November to April prohibition, which affected a much  
18 larger area.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: That was Type I. Again, I  
20 don't see this, given the fact that the surface area  
21 impacted is probably larger in terms of lineal length  
22 than actually acreage in the county, which is five  
23 hundred thirty-seven thousand. We have a fairly large  
24 area that we're talking about. You multiply the surface

1 area times twenty feet and you're going to get a very  
2 large number.

3 Were you talking about Type I and impacts?

4 MR. MACHTAY: I would make a motion that it's  
5 Type I, and Neg Dec.

6 MS. RUSSO: I would second that motion  
7 because I do agree it should be a Type I, but Neg Dec.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: Calling the motion. All in  
9 favor? (Show of hands) Anyone opposed? Abstentions?  
10 Hereby declare this to be a Type I action with Negative  
11 Declaration.

12 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Does that mean we haven't  
13 filled out the right EAF?

14 MR. BAGG: You will have to fill out a long  
15 EAF and attach it when it gets sent to the legislature.

16 MR. MACHTAY: Mr. Chairman, we didn't declare  
17 it anything; that was the recommendation for the  
18 legislature. They have to declare it; is that right?

19 THE CHAIRMAN: I'm not listening to him.

20 MR. BAGG: What was that?

21 MR. MACHTAY: He said we declare it.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: The vote was taken.

23 MR. MACHTAY: I said that was not a  
24 declaration, that it was a recommendation to the

1 legislature.

2 MS. GROWNEY: Yes.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: With the correction given by  
4 Mr. Machtay, who is now on a certain list of mine.

5 MR. MACHTAY: Does it begin with S?

6 THE CHAIRMAN: It is a smiting list, not the  
7 word you were thinking of. With that particular  
8 correction, we shall move on. Mr. Ceglio, are you  
9 ready?

10 MR. CEGLIO: Okay, yes. Jim Reiher from  
11 Ocean Aviation just arrived. If you need to ask him any  
12 questions, he's here.

13 This project is an application to build two  
14 buildings that will house basically thirteen storage  
15 garages for aircraft on the north side of the airport.  
16 He's looking to lease about three acres of property.  
17 Because the property is contiguous to the pine barrens  
18 core, the recommendation from the Airport Conservation  
19 Assessment Panel was that it be a Type I action with a  
20 Negative Declaration on environmental impact.

21 Again, the map that I provided shows the  
22 location of Ocean Aviation on our proposed land use  
23 plan. It's in an area that has been designated for  
24 future aviation development, about twenty acres on the

1 north side of the airport. Currently, there are hangars  
2 in this area, about twenty-five, I believe, so it's  
3 compatible with the surrounding use of the airport  
4 development area.

5 Again Jim Reiher from Ocean Aviation is here.  
6 I'll point it out for you on the map. If you have any  
7 questions, feel free to ask. Airport land use plan,  
8 twenty acres shown on the north side of the airport is  
9 the proposed aviation development. Ocean Aviation is  
10 looking to build two buildings for thirteen hangars or  
11 storage garages for small aircraft. They will be  
12 located on the easternmost part of this area.

13 The yellow areas shown here are current  
14 existing airport housing aircraft, including the Suffolk  
15 County Air Force Medivac.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: How close is this to the pine  
17 barrens itself? From the map it looks that it's in the  
18 pine barrens area.

19 MR. CEGLIO: This yellow line is the border  
20 between the pine barrens core. Everything to the north  
21 of this is core, everything to the south is compatible  
22 growth area. The location of the hangars is probably a  
23 hundred to two hundred feet from the core property, but  
24 it is in compatible growth.

1           THE CHAIRMAN:   When we looked at previous  
2           airport uses, we made a distinction, if you will, on how  
3           to define contiguous.  If it is very close to the pine  
4           barrens areas, we always thought that it was a Type I,  
5           but if it was far enough away, a thousand, two thousand  
6           feet, we generally listed it as an unlisted action,  
7           even though the SEQRA rules say if the property is  
8           contiguous to parklands it's Type I.

9           We have had some issues with that as to what  
10          "contiguous" means.  In my opinion, if it's a couple  
11          thousand feet away, even if the landowner is the same,  
12          it's not necessarily contiguous.  That is a battle  
13          between ACAP and CEQ, it has no effect on the projects  
14          itself; it's just how we type it.

15          MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:   A comment from the ACAP  
16          perspective, because we had a pretty lengthy discussion.  
17          When we talk about property contiguous to parklands,  
18          they're looking at the airport as the property.  If you  
19          cut up leases within the property, I think in their  
20          mind, the property is still the airport.  I think  
21          through their filter, everything that happens to the  
22          airport is going to be Type I because it's contiguous to  
23          the pine barrens core.

24          If you looked up ACAP in the Suffolk County

1 Charter to see what their authority is, you will not  
2 find them because they were not created by us; this  
3 group was by the legislature. They were created to  
4 advise CEQ and the legislature. To what degree, I think  
5 it's up to this group how it weighs those  
6 recommendations. The committee did feel fairly strongly  
7 that it should be Type I.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: I agree with that. The  
9 language in SEQRA is adjacent or substantially  
10 contiguous. That is where we had a bit of battle. I  
11 discussed it with Bob DeLuca extensively. It's a  
12 tempest in a tea cup. It's a Type I action, it's just  
13 how we classify.

14 MR. BAGG: The actual parcel that runs up  
15 against the airport circumference road and right across  
16 the street is actually the pine barrens parklands.

17 MR. CEGLIO: This proposed lease property  
18 runs up to the airport road.

19 MR. BAGG: In essence, it's just the width of  
20 the road until you hit the pine barrens, so it's very  
21 close. There is no separation of any other types of  
22 development between the parkland and this development  
23 and whatnot.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: Does anyone have any



1 questions? Mr. Machtay?

2 MR. MACHTAY: Thirteen more hangars, does  
3 that mean more air traffic at the airport or are these  
4 planes that are already there?

5 MR. CEGLIO: It's possible that the planes  
6 are already there. The way the Master Plan is being  
7 updated indicates that the airport will offer private  
8 developers at the airport, will build about eighty of  
9 these type of garages, if you want to call it that, or  
10 hangars.

11 MR. MACHTAY: It is addressed in the Master  
12 Plan?

13 MR. CEGLIO: Yes.

14 MR. MACHTAY: The SEQRA was done on the  
15 Master Plan?

16 MR. CEGLIO: SEQRA was done on the current  
17 Master Plan that was updated in the 1990's. The latest  
18 update is still ongoing. What I'm referring to is the  
19 current update that is still in progress.

20 MR. MACHTAY: SEQRA wasn't done on that yet.

21 MR. CEGLIO: Yes.

22 MR. MACHTAY: We're sort of jumping in ahead  
23 of it.

24 MR. CEGLIO: Yes, we are. The SEQRA that was

1 done on the 1990's Master Plan, it was done for a number  
2 of hangars that would accommodate for, I believe two  
3 hundred fifty operations.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: On the 1990 plan there are no  
5 restrictions placed on future growth, aside from the  
6 size of the airport. In the Master Plan now, there are  
7 some limits, if you will, being contemplated, as I  
8 understand it.

9 MR. CEGLIO: That is correct. The limits  
10 that we're talking about are based on the land use plan  
11 that you see to the left of me showing that we will  
12 address land aviation use.

13 MR. MACHTAY: How does your committee, ACAP,  
14 feel about more traffic at the airport, noise and that  
15 sort of thing.

16 Second, this proposed airport land use plan,  
17 the limited amount of growth is compatible with the  
18 surrounding community noise and air traffic and it will  
19 limit it to a point where they're comfortable with it?

20 MR. BAGG: Tony, could you please review --  
21 the only Master Plan in force now is the 1990 Airport  
22 Master Plan. This project is consistent with that.  
23 That Master Plan reviewed the airport when it was  
24 actually more active then it is today, and a Neg Dec was

1 issued relative to that Master Plan and based on the  
2 flights that were proposed for generation. You might go  
3 into that a little bit more.

4 CEQ did recommend that it was a Type I action  
5 with a Negative Declaration. Every other Master Plan  
6 that has been passed, the pine barrens plan, SGBA said  
7 this airport, we should be channeling development into  
8 this disturbed area and preserving the outlying space as  
9 open area.

10 MR. MACHTAY: I just needed to know that was  
11 in conformance with plans adopted pursuant to SEQRA and  
12 it was consistent with whatever those plans proposed.  
13 That is all.

14 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Your one assumption was  
15 that the Master Plan was done pursuant to SEQRA. I  
16 don't believe there was ever an EIS on the original  
17 Master Plan where there should have been, looking at the  
18 cumulative development. I believe, under the new Master  
19 Plan, there will be some kind of environmental impact  
20 statement on it; at least that is what I have been told.

21 I don't know what the status of the Master  
22 Plan is. I don't want to be presumptive and say because  
23 it was part of the prior Master Plan that there has been  
24 proper environmental review done because I don't believe

1 it has.

2 MR. CEGLIO: Just a quick comment on the  
3 previous Master Plan done for the FAA and 1990 plan, the  
4 FAA does not require an EIS on Master Plans. County  
5 Executive Levy has indicated that we will, on this  
6 Master Plan update, do an EIS once it's complete. We're  
7 expecting it completed early next year. We vetted  
8 through our Community Advisory Board. This ACAP panel,  
9 a lot of them are members of the Community Advisory  
10 Board and have seen it and made comments on it. We  
11 don't think it will be much of a problem.

12 Based on the map to the left, we're reducing  
13 potential development from a hundred seventy-five acres  
14 down to forty-seven acres, so it's significantly  
15 reduced, again, with community input, with input from  
16 the Planning Department, and the airport.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions from  
18 members?

19 MR. MACHTAY: The FAA approved the Master  
20 Plan?

21 MR. CEGLIO: The current approved FAA Master  
22 Plan is the 1980 Master Plan with the update the county  
23 did in 1990. They have reviewed the current update,  
24 including the map you see to your left, and have

1 approved it.

2 MS. RUSSO: I make a motion.

3 MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I'll make a motion for it  
4 to be a Type I action with Negative Declaration.

5 MS. RUSSO: I will second it.

6 THE CHAIRMAN: Second by Ms. Russo. Polling  
7 the question, all in favor? (Show of hands) Opposed?  
8 Abstentions? Motion carries.

9 We will move onto historic services now and  
10 Historic Trust docket.

11 MR. MARTIN: Good morning. Just to give you  
12 an update on the housing, at this point we have eight  
13 vacancies within the Suffolk County Parks Housing  
14 Program that we're still looking to fill. We have  
15 rented two houses in the past two months; Robert Cushman  
16 Murphy County Park and another one at the West  
17 Sayville -- the gatehouse on Montauk Highway have  
18 recently been rented. We still have the word out in the  
19 county that the homes are available, but we are also  
20 working to have them reappraised to possibly bring the  
21 rents down, especially for the houses that have the  
22 higher rents. That is still in the process.

23 The Isaac Mills House, we just completed the  
24 installation of a new heating system there. We're

1 hoping to get the appraisal for that house done shortly  
2 and have it rented early in the year. The Housing  
3 Advisory Board meeting, which is newly established to  
4 review this program now as part of the resolution that  
5 is going forward to revise the rentals, we're having a  
6 meeting December 1st, one o'clock at West Sayville.  
7 I'll be sitting on that committee and I think Mary Ann  
8 has also been contacted to represent the CAC as Chairman  
9 of the Historic Trust Committee, to be sitting on the  
10 committee.

11 We will be reviewing all aspects of the rental  
12 program, especially if we have a problem renting one.  
13 We can go to the legislature as a hardship case to see  
14 if we can reduce the rent and occupy the building.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Appraisals that might be done  
16 in the future, I know right now the appraisal industry  
17 is up in the air, how to value properties, and even  
18 methodology. Is that going to impact?

19 MR. MARTIN: We're working with the Suffolk  
20 County Division of Real Estate to do the appraisals.  
21 That is part of the committee's role, is that question  
22 of procedure and how it's going forward, and I'm sure we  
23 will be discussing it at the next meeting. They are  
24 taking a common sense approach now compared to the

1 original market rate that the original appraisal was  
2 done at. They are taking a broader view of each  
3 location and the situation of the building.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions from members?

5 MR. MACHTAY: These residences are still only  
6 for county employees?

7 MR. MARTIN: Right now the existing  
8 resolution, it's only county employees. The new  
9 resolution going to the legislature shortly will include  
10 Suffolk County residents, which we had in our prior  
11 program we were able to do that. We will open that up  
12 again. If we can't find someone employed by the county  
13 we can open it up.

14 MR. MACHTAY: No incentive for someone  
15 looking for affordable housing?

16 MR. MARTIN: Concept came up in the community  
17 and I think it's part of the conversation, but I think  
18 we're looking to give the commissioner as much of a role  
19 in this as possible, to see what person or persons will  
20 best benefit in the role in the building. We're really  
21 looking more for a caretaker person to be in a historic  
22 site.

23 MR. MACHTAY: Because someone is low income  
24 doesn't mean they can't be a caretaker.

