ORIGINAL

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Arthur Kunz Library
H. Lee Dennison Building
4th Floor
100 Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, New York

June 17, 2009
9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

R. LAWRENCE SWANSON, Chairperson

REPORTED BY:

THERESA PAPE, Court Reporter/Notary Public

BOARD APPEARANCES:

HON. JAY H. SCHNEIDERMAN

THOMAS GULBRANSEN

RICHARD MACHTAY

MARY ANN SPENCER

JOY SQUIRES

RICHARD MACHTAY

DANIEL PICHNEY

ABSENT BOARD MEMBERS

EVA GROWNEY

GLORIA G. RUSSO

HISTORIC SOCIETY MEMBERS:

RICHARD MARTIN, Director

ALSO PRESENT:

JAMES BAGG, Chief Environmental Analyst

LAURETTA FISCHER, Suffolk County Planning

KATHY LARSEN, Cupsogue Park

KEN WARREN

CHRISTINE DESALVO, CEQ Staff

(WHEREUPON, this proceeding convened at 9:30 a.m. Off-the-record discussions ensued, after which the following transpired:)

(Time noted: 9:37 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We'll call the meeting to order. And anybody like to comment on April's minutes?

MS. SPENCER: I thought they were great.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Did you find any mistakes?

MS. SPENCER: No.

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Rich?

MR. MACHTAY: A few minor errors, but nothing worth talking about.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. And I sent mine in, too. So --

MR. GULBRANSEN: I sent them in to Christine.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

So do we have a motion -- motion to accept April's minutes --

MR. BAGG: As corrected.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- as -- as corrected.

MR. MACHTAY: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Second from Rich.

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

Jim, what do you want to call our attention to with regard to correspondence?

MR. BAGG: We don't have any.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And so now we'll move on to the public portion, and today we have with us Ms. Kathy Larsen, and she's here to tell us a little bit about some of the activities that are going on at Cupsogue Park, and to ask our assistance in reviewing the program.

So, Kathy.

MS. LARSEN: Is this here okay?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes. And please identify yourself for --

MS. LARSEN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- the stenographer.

And I should say, Kathy is a colleague of mine at the State University of New York and also, formally with the Three Village Historical Society. So I know Kathy quite well.

MS. LARSEN: Okay. My name is Kathy Larsen. Thank you for allowing me to speak today.

I'm a Suffolk County resident. I'm here today to discuss the Cupsogue beach entrance project.

The project calls for the widening of the road, additional lanes, and putting a turnabout to a seaside dune. The project is on Suffolk County land and in the Town of Brookhaven and a

small piece from the Village of West Hampton Dunes.

The permit attached to the plans -- the village hired the engineering firm -- is designated Wetlands SEQR Type II. The village also had applied for the permits. Both Suffolk Parks and DPW indicated that the Village of West Hampton Dunes was considered to be the lead agency because the village had requested the plans be drawn up and had applied for the permits. Based on the consideration, many of the standard practices of Suffolk County with regard to this type of project were not addressed, especially by the county, for property not even located in the village, which included reviews by this committee.

There are fundamental issues with the redesign of the traffic flow. Elements of the plan and the underlying traffic issue is unknown at this time, from the county's perspective. There

are also serious questions with regard to the DEC permit attached to the plans and the lack of a coastal erosion consideration for the ocean side of the project.

In 2005 the village approached Suffolk County and offered to help with traffic issues and offered to hire an engineering firm for the same -- firm about the same time the village started planning on desires to construct on property adjacent to the park and owned by a not-for-profit, the Barrier Beach Preservation Association.

In March of 2007, a set of plans were released by the engineering firm for the park entrance.

A permit received by DEC on May 18th of 2007 was put on the DEC application system with a description of "Add new entrance to the Cupsogue Park and turnaround, completeness determination due as of June 4th, 2007."

A permit was received by DEC on

June 28th of 2007, some 40 days after the initial permit, and was put on the DEC application system with the description of "Widen roadway, Widgeon Way to Cupsogue Beach Park, and reconstruct park entrance."

The June 28th, 2007 permit was issued on January 18th, 2008, and is the permit that's attached to the plans.

The village sent a letter for the village residents on August 21st of 2008, indicating the plans would be discussed September 6th, 2008, effectively three months after an Article 78 could be filed.

On September 6th at the village meeting, the project was identified as two separate projects. The first from the beginning of Widgeon Way, on the separate permit issued on April 3rd, 2006, and a second separate project was then identified as the one to be done by Suffolk County, from Widgeon Way down to the park entrance.

I asked Suffolk County representatives what traffic studies, traffic analysis, vehicle turnover rates, or beach utilization studies had been done.

I was told, since the village was lead agency, Suffolk County did not conduct any of the studies I asked about.

So what data supports these plans?

How do we know if the new traffic patterns will resolve the traffic issues?

Who from Suffolk County reviewed the DEC permit?

Did Suffolk County and Brookhaven agree with the SEQR Type II designation even though it appears to be contrary to DEC policy?

Why weren't the plans reviewed by CEQ? Again, the village was the lead agency; therefore, my understanding is, Suffolk County -- some Suffolk County offices weren't even aware of the plans,

and other ones felt that the village is lead agency -- was responsible for those actions.

A portion of the project is to put a mini or small urban turnabout into a seaside dune. The secondary dune will be eliminated, and after consideration for grading and the required setback, will most likely be in conflict with the coastal erosion zone, including the 25-foot conservation easement required by the Stipulation of Settlement agreement.

As a state agency, DEC is required to consider coastal policy matters with advise from DOS. When I bring up these two agencies, there appears to be a lot of resistance for consulting these agencies with regard to this project.

I issued a FOIL request to DEC so I could review the application folders, and there was some others that I was requesting. At this time I've been informed verbally that the application

folders for the permits indicated above cannot be located at DEC for review.

If DEC is unable to locate the folders, the permits should be considered null and void as it will no longer have a record to support the SEQR Type II designation.

The village is moving forward with its attempts to build a village hall on property adjacent to the park, on the property owned by the Barrier Beach Preservation Association. The minutes of both organizations, the Barrier Beach Preservation Association and the village, over the past year, have numerous references, and plans were recently posted on the Barrier Beach Web site.

Is Suffolk County aware of the village's intentions to build a village hall adjacent to the park?

The turnaround is not necessary. If the fields are full, the simple solution is to direct traffic back in,

using the existing turnaround.

How would these plans then facilitate the resolution of the underlying issue for the plans, which was the traffic?

The plans set forth will not resolve the traffic issue and may worsen the situation as they create a dead end and limit alternatives by moving the booths 75 feet out on to Dune Road and locking it in to two lanes.

The turnaround that they're planning on putting in to the seaside dune, by different sources, is too small to accommodate some of the vehicles that they wanted to accommodate. Based on my conversations, the traffic hasn't been as much of the issue over the past two summers since the sign at the end of Jessup's bridge and an extra booth was installed at the park.

After observing traffic for about eight years, I believe the main problem is the rush-hour effect. The bathing

opens at 10:00. The parking fields can accommodate 660 cars. The staff can accommodate about 250 to 300 cars an hour if both booths are open. Traffic backing up is almost a given regardless of where the booths are located, and the proposed hard road surface will not accommodate more than 20 or 30 cars.

What other plans were provided by the Village of West Hampton Dunes with a lesser environmental impact?

What other studies were done by Suffolk County?

Solutions for the traffic with a less dramatic impact to the environment could include expediting cars through the payment process, move the booths farther back in to the park by 40 or 50 feet to allow a better separation from the turnaround, and see if the road could be widened or the building set back a little to allow a better traffic flow.

The commissioner of DPW recently

was quoted as saying he hopes to cut the traffic issue down one-half. To understand the value of one-half, you need to have data.

Given the desire of the village to build on the Barrier Beach property, having the traffic circle in the seaside dune would be most beneficial to the village. Having a way to effectively close the park and direct traffic into the turnaround is also very beneficial, potentially in conflict, though, with the public access with regard to the settlement agreement.

So, I mean, those are the issues I see with regard to the project that seems to be very supported by the Parks Department.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So you will leave your notes for --

MS. LARSEN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- the record?

MS. LARSEN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. And you

have some pictures that you wanted to --

MS. LARSEN: Yeah.

(WHEREUPON, the Honorable Jay H. Schneiderman joined the proceeding in progress.)

(Time noted: 9:48 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: This is Cupsogue Park.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

MS. LARSEN: I didn't make -- at the time of the environmental exam, so -- basically, some of the fundamental blow ups with the plans also include -- they refer to a spigot statement -- a spigot location in the park. So spigots are actually the sanitation dumping station where the campers come out and they must dump their waste.

And -- I don't know, should I just pass them around or --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MS. LARSEN: Okay (handing).

This is just showing that -- the sign next to the Cupsogue Park entrance

(handing).

This one picture you can actually see where the coastal erosion zone is. All the decks of the backs of the houses cannot go into the coastal erosion zone. So you can clearly delineate where that line is (handing).

A picture showing traffic backing up. This was on Memorial Day weekend. It wasn't a busy weekend, it wasn't a nice day, but traffic still backed up because they're not processing the vehicles fast enough (handing).

Some pictures of when the breech happened in the late '80s, early '90s (handing).

The Army Core of Engineers restoring the dune (handing).

Some additional pictures of the Army Core of Engineers restoring the dune (handing).

The dune as it is now, on the top, and the dune as it was in January 2008, where the water was right up in to that

primary dune again (handing).

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So your purpose in being here today is, number one, to inform us of what's going on, since -- at least I was not aware of what was going on, and to ask what the county actually knows about the development of the project, and also to see whether or not some environmental regulations or guidance may be violated by building a road into the dune; is that correct?

MS. LARSEN: That's correct.

I've been writing to County Executive Levy, and copying some other people. I also -- so this is the last letter I sent to County Executive Levy (handing), and the next letter is the letter I sent to Tom Isles, Gilbert Anderson, and John Patterson (handing), as well as the questions that I had with regard to the project, and some other additional photos for support.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Jim, what can you tell us --

Will you leave this for the record, too --

MS. LARSEN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- in addition to your statement?

MS. LARSEN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Jim, what can you tell us about what's going on?

MR. BAGG: All right. Well, this was submitted by the Village to West Hampton to the county, and they had a request that they wanted the project completed by Memorial Day --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Of this year?

MR. BAGG: -- of this year. All right.

MR. PICHNEY: Excuse me, West Hampton Dunes?

MS. LARSEN: The Village of West Hampton Dunes.

MR. BAGG: West --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. BAGG: The Village of West Hampton Dunes.

The county is in receipt of the plans; the Parks Department has had it, the Department of Public Works has had it. It's been up to the county executive's office, so it's now under review. And it's the County's -- Parks Department's determination, at this point, and DPW, that we're not bound by the village or DEC's Type II Action.

So from the county's perspective, this is at least an Unlisted Action that is going to need a long environmental assessment form and a complete review with submittal to CEQ. I -- and -- and these questions I will make sure get resubmitted to the Department of Public Works and the Parks Department. And we start to discuss exactly, in filling out the EAF form, that these questions are addressed before they come to CEQ.

So the county isn't committed to anything at this point in time because, in essence, they were given the plans without really any input into it, and --

and the Department of Public Works, at this time, is still reviewing the plans -- or the Parks Department is still reviewing the plans.

They know -- a determination from the Department of Public Works said this is not an -- a Type II Action; this is an Unlisted Action at the very least. So we have to do an environmental assessment form.

So that is the stage the county is in at this particular time.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. So one of the reasons that it was considered Type II is it's less than four acres; is that correct?

MR. BAGG: Well, the Type II list is less than 4,000 square feet. This was rehabilitation of an existing road, pursuant to the village, and also DEC said -- under their Type II designation, it said that that was essentially what the project was. However, at the county level, they're talking about a new lane;

they're talking about use of the county park property. So from the county's perspective, it cannot be a Type II Action. It's, at the very least, an Unlisted Action which requires a full environmental review -- an environmental assessment form, plus coming to CEQ, comments, and then final determination.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: What about the project of cutting into the dune? Isn't that --

MR. BAGG: Well, that's going to have to be investigated as to what that status is. Most of that area, the whole Barrier Beach in there, is so disturbed with all those houses that line both sides of this particular road, that those -- except for the primary dune, everything else has -- has been eliminated. And when they put in that pump-out station, to some extent, that dune wasn't near those things. So that has to be really looked at, from the county's point of view.

In addition, the county attorney's involved here, because part of this project, the -- the village is seeking easements from the adjacent property owners -- all right --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. BAGG: -- or they're going to go to eminent domain and condemnation. So the project can't proceed until the village does that, and -- and the county cannot spend any kind of money, you know, on private property, unless it's been released from a legal point of view. I mean, they're not going to go near it.

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: Is part of the proposal to build a new village hall on parkland?

MS. LARSEN: No, the -- part of the proposal -- and it's not a --

MR. MACHTAY: Or is that --

MS. LARSEN: -- part of this

proposal --

MR. MACHTAY: -- a separate proposal?

MS. LARSEN: There are separate actions being done by the Village of West Hampton Dunes, if you review their board minutes and the Barrier Beach Preservation board minutes. The intent is they want to build -- it's been everything from a research center to a community center to -- I believe the latest -- latest classification is a village hall.

MR. MACHTAY: On parkland or --

MS. LARSEN: No, on the Barrier Beach Preservation Association property, which is a not-for-profit 501C. Sitting in the wetlands, established for the purpose of supporting and maintaining and preserving the wetlands.

MR. PICHNEY: The project that you're giving us information about, does that have to take place first before the village can do anything? Is one

predicated on the other?

MS. LARSEN: I don't think so. I think -- I think -- I don't think so. From my perspective, I think the county needs to understand what the county's issues are, and the county needs to resolve its issues and separate it from the village's.

MR. PICHNEY: Okay. So in other words, if -- if the county didn't do anything, then at some point, if they got the approval, the village can proceed and build the building they want to build? No problem.

MS. LARSEN: Well, they would have to get through DEC also. The property is sitting in a wetlands up against the canal.

MR. BAGG: I mean, Larry, if I -- if I might add to this.

What this situation is, is that Cupsogue Beach is a very popular park. And especially during holiday seasons, they have a lot of people that want to

go to the beach. And when the parking lot fills up -- all right -- basically, a lot of these people who come from Brooklyn, and some of them from New Jersey and everything else, have been in a line waiting for hours, get up there, and they say, The beach is full and you have to go turn around, that they don't want to. They say, We will wait. And they're very obstinate about it. So the parks people who are working at the park are dealing with these individuals who are now lined in traffic. Now, meanwhile, the road backs up.

Now, Suffolk County Department of Parks put a sign at the bridge to say the beach is full. And that's three miles down the road, and these people don't read it or they don't pay attention. They say, Well, we'll take a chance.

So they come up; they're not handled probably as expeditiously as

possible; people are waiting; the traffic is now backed up. It's only a two-lane road, so now, all those houses, people can't get out of their houses.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Their driveways, yeah.

MR. BAGG: They can't get out of their driveways.

MS. LARSEN: And if I could just interject. Also, at this point in time, the -- and I talked to numerous residents out there about the traffic issue and how bad it's been. And since they put up the sign at Jessup, and since they put the extra booth in, it's helped facilitate things.

You do have a problem where the booths are tangled up with the turnaround. And I would say, this past weekend, 30 percent of the vehicles pulled up, decided the weather wasn't nice enough, and they actually drove out. Every time I've been down there watching, you have a certain percentage

that pulls up and drives on out.

My issue is that this set of plans is not going to resolve your problems, because you're still going to have the people that want to drive up and pull out. These plans don't even address that.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: What do the set of plans do, create a turnaround?

MR. BAGG: It creates a turnaround to facilitate getting the people back -- moving back out down the road, but also, they've created a -- a staging area that would accommodate roughly 25 vehicles for people who wanted to wait.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: But it was --

MR. BAGG: It's not there now.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Not queued up before the booths, but somewhere on a --

MR. BAGG: Would be to the --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- side road?

MR. BAGG: -- to the -- to the side of the road and the en- -- loop road. So that --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: The waiting area.

MR. BAGG: -- once that queues up, they'll say, I'm sorry, the queue is full, you have to proceed around the loop.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: It sounds like a good idea. So what the prob- -- the problem with it is?

MS. LARSEN: Well, the problem with it is, I can probably count on these two hands --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: And are you -- are you a property owner in that area or --

MS. LARSEN: No.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay. What's -- so what's -- your interest is just environmental or --

MS. LARSEN: My interest at this point, with regard to the turnaround and this idea for the -- the land, is environmental. It's unconscionable that you're going to take out a seaside dune

to put a turnaround in and change the whole configuration of the park entrance.

This park's open 24/7. Twelve months out of the year, seven days a week. The way this park -- aesthetically, as it's going to appear, you're going to come down Dune Road, instead of the beautiful open park that you currently have, now you're going to have booths down at the end that people are going to have to go through.

Currently, in the wintertime, people go right into the park because they don't collect a fee. When you had a nice summer day, back in April, which is amazing, you had 400 veh- -- people go into the park. You didn't have a traffic jam.

Your traffic jam is not because people are trying to get into the park and are queued up because the park's full; the traffic jam is because your people in the booths don't process the

transactions fast enough.

The other problem is that the booths are tangled up into the turnaround.

And the final thing I'll say is that, if you don't know how many people leave in a course of an -- an hour, queuing up 20 or 30 cars to allow them to sit and wait, when you don't know how many people are coming out, how do you determine how many vehicles are allowed or should be queued up?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Now, this queuing -- just to think this through, this queuing area that already exists, it's an old -- like a dirt road?

MR. BAGG: No.

MS. LARSEN: No.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: It doesn't exist. There's no -- they'd be cutting --

MR. BAGG: So, in essence, they're going to have to -- they're going to have to widen the existing road in order

to accommodate the queue. And I -- I think that, basically, they said, Well --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: So it would take --

MR. BAGG: -- how do you figure how long the queue is? Well, I mean, you could put a queue the entire length of the road. So the question --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, no, I think --

MR. BAGG: -- is -- well, we want to make --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- some of my people --

MR. BAGG: -- an effort --

THE REPORTER: Wait, wait.

MR. BAGG: -- to try to.

THE REPORTER: One at a time, guys.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I was going to say, at some point, people see the queue and say, Okay, I'll turn around. So the idea is basically to get the queue into a spot that would still let people look

at it and go, All right, I'm going to make a decision here, either I'm going to get on that line or I'm going to turn around.

MR. BAGG: Right. Or if the queue's full, you have to turn around.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MR. BAGG: In other words, you can't wait.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Right. So there should be a maximum of like 25 cars that could wait --

MR. BAGG: Right.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- and the other cars would turn around.

MR. LARSEN: But that's --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: And you're saying that the loop cuts into the dune, or the queue cuts into the dune, or --

MS. LARSEN: No, the -- the queue's going to be on the -- the wetlands side of this road. It's going to be on the northern bay side.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: And what's there

right now where they're trying to --

MS. LARSEN: Just the --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- put the queue?

MS. LARSEN: -- Dune Road, and there's really --

MR. BAGG: The village property. The village hall is --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Village property. But is it --

MR. BAGG: -- two --

MS. LARSEN: Well --

MR. BAGG: -- two --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- what is it?

MS. LARSEN: -- actually --

MR. BAGG: -- and there's two private lots in there, I believe.

MS. LARSEN: Well, actually, it's not --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I'm sorry. She's trying to -- she's trying to write down everything we say.

All right. We'll pause.

MS. LARSEN: All right. So the

plan -- I actually have a miniaturized set if you'd like to see them -- is to open up a third lane at Widgeon Way. We're going to have two westbound lanes at Widgeon, one eastbound lane at Widgeon.

You're going to go up approximately to where the Barrier Beach property starts. The northernmost westbound lane is going to jog to the north a little bit more. It will go down a little bit, span out into two lanes, and those two lanes would go into the booths that are now 75 feet out on to Dune Road. So once you've gotten to the point where you've made the decision to go into the park, there is no turning around. You're now locked into these lanes, locked into this queue.

The other westbound lane is going to go directly into -- go down, about where the booths are, go into the seaside dune, and turnaround and head back eastbound.

So, I mean, I'm not a traffic expert, but before you -- I'm not the traffic expert, but I know human nature. If I'm in a left-hand lane and I realize that I should have been in the right-hand lane because I want to go into the park, I'm going to cut in front of probably 15 or 20 cars to get into that right-hand lane.

The other thing is, once they're queued, they are queued. There is no unqueuing. They're locked in.

So at the point that you actually have these 20 cars backed up in this queue -- or 25 cars backed in the queue, and you're number 12, and it's going to take better than an hour or an hour and a half to move up to be able to get into the park entrance or just get a parking spot, you could have some very angry people waiting in traffic now, with their cars idling because it's going to be a nice hot summer day. So unless somebody in the car's willing to stay

behind and just wait and hope that they can get into the park and get their parking spot, you're going to have a lot of angry people sitting in that queue waiting because you have idea of what your beach turnover rate is.

What's the traffic study, where's the traffic analysis?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, maybe they're planning a pilot project of some kind --

MR. BAGG: Well --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- to see if it works.

MR. BAGG: -- I think that the county is committed to doing the environmental review, so these questions have all been --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Right. They're all policy, and --

MR. BAGG: They're going to have to be looked at; they're going to have to be responded to and answered, you know, and -- and possibly the project may have

to be changed based on what they find.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Has this project even come to us for --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Not yet.

MR. BAGG: Not yet. Parks has said it's an Unlisted Action, an EAF will be --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: All right.

MR. BAGG: -- filled out and will be submitted to CEQ, but they still, at the point, have to, you know, look into all these questions. They have to look into -- to the issue where the village wants to either get easements from certain property owners, or actually --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah.

MR. BAGG: -- condemn the land.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Board of trustees probably will have something to say on this.

MR. BAGG: So it's really in the early stages of review, at least at the county level.

MS. LARSEN: But then keep in mind,

this project was supposed to be done by this Memorial Day.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, it's obviously --

MR. BAGG: But that was --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- not happening.

MR. BAGG: -- according to the village. That was according to the village, not the county.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Mr. Chairman, could I just ask what the baseline condition is?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: (Indicating)

MR. GULBRANSEN: I think I understand that there was a booth and then another booth was added.

MS. LARSEN: Uh-huh.

MR. GULBRANSEN: How many people work in the booth?

MR. LARSEN: Okay. There's one person in each booth --

MR. GULBRANSEN: Right. So we had one person in a booth --

MS. LARSEN: And then we --

MR. GULBRANSEN: -- and it was a --

MS. LARSEN: -- extended to two.

MR. GULBRANSEN: -- bad condition. Then a second booth came into place, and there was a -- there was a noticeable improvement; correct? You said there was a noticeable improvement when a second booth was put into practice?

MS. LARSEN: According to the people I spoke to, the sign at the end of Jessup, as well as the second booth, seems to have helped the traffic.

MR. GULBRANSEN: So --

MS. LARSEN: One of the residents that's a year-round resident said that the traffic backed up possibly six times last year. It was only for an hour or two, and I think that's your rush-hour effect.

MR. GULBRANSEN: I guess my questions is, what is the baseline that this project starts to get engineered and built and planned for? Is the

baseline two booths working all the time, or might the baseline be two booths working all the time and one more person? At $40 an hour for two hours for a whole season, that's $8,000. You could pay that person for ten years and it would cost less than --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I'm not sure it's a question of adding another person.

MR. GULBRANSEN: But my question --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: If the window's on one side of the booth, a car pulls up, what's that other person going to do?

MR. GULBRANSEN: Like you do at many queues, you work the queue itself and process them before they even get to the booth.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Oh, so get out of --

MR. GULBRANSEN: So my question is --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- the booth and

collect the money.

MR. GULBRANSEN: -- what the baseline condition is that the park has committed to that this plan then starts to try to work around. That's a simple question.

MS. LARSEN: I don't -- I don't know.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: They should do easy pass.

MR. BAGG: I mean, one of the problems here is -- is the village hired the engineering firm that planned the project, the county did not have the input. The plans were then prepared, and the village sent them to the county and said, We want this constructed before Memorial Day.

MR. GULBRANSEN: With the assumption that they have one booth or maybe two booths and there's nothing else that's changeable.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Is this your district?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: It's my district. And, you know, normally, for the extra booth, they came to me first on this. This one, they didn't -- you know, they haven't consulted with me on the design here. So it's really the first I'm hearing of it.

MR. BAGG: So, basically, the county just received this, and it has to be reviewed at the county level.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Richard, do you have any comments?

MR. MARTIN: Relating to this project, no.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: Nick Gibbons, obviously, would. But I'm -- I'm just listening, so I really don't have any info on this.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

So at least we can be assured, from what you said, Jim, that the county is now very actively involved, that they -- Parks and DPW are both going to get

involved in the review of the existing proposal and perhaps have some comments on -- on it, or modifying it, or whether it should be done at all; is that correct?

MR. BAGG: That's correct. Or how it should be done. You know, I mean, if they can put in signs and they can try to head the traffic off before it gets to the beach, and put in an additional booth, or -- you know, without the additional travel lane. I mean, it's going to have to be looked at.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

And it seems to me that Jay should be --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Well --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- brought into the loop a little bit.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- I'm wanting to talk to the village board there and the mayor.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. BAGG: Also, would you request

plans from them, since they're the people that have them?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. PICHNEY: I just wanted to say one more -- I just wanted to support Tom here.

I think the village interest is looking for an engineering/construction solution. And they hire an engineering firm -- you know, what are they going to come up with? An engineering solution rather than a personnel management or -- sort of solution in terms of, you know, more booths that might, in fact, be -- be cheaper --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. PICHNEY: -- and handle the issue. And then, the same things Jim mentioned, they could -- if the village has its own police force, they could certainly post a policeman, you know, a

few times a summer, way up the road and make -- just be -- make people turn around. There are -- there are a number of ways to attack this problem.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MS. LARSEN: And if I could just --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Very good point.

MS. LARSEN: -- just reiterate, and I totally agree with both those statements.

I think part of your solution could be taking your existing hard road surface, moving the booths a little bit farther back into your parking space to allow little separation with your turn- -- existing turnaround. And then you should allow a certain number of cars to queue up, you're not denying everybody, but you're going to sit there and say, you know, you have six or seven cars currently queued, and at this point in time, there are no additional cars that can be queued because it's going to take the better part of the hour for

those people to get in.

So I think there are other solutions and alternatives, but I think you need to understand the dynamics and do the analysis of the traffic to understand how the traffic's behaving to understand how you need to resolve your problem.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right.

Kathy, thank you for coming and making us aware of the issue. And it sounds to me like, at some point, it will be coming to CEQ for review.

MS. LARSEN: Okay. Well, thank you very much. And I'm sure the CEQ review will also include the coastal erosion issue?

MR. BAGG: Yes, that's being looked at.

MS. LARSEN: Is that a separate permit? Does it have to be --

MR. BAGG: It depends if they're in the zone. I know that the Parks Commissioner John Pavacic, who used to work for DEC, has touched base with DEC as well as the coastal erosion people and the Town of Brookhaven to find out if the proposed project is actually within that zone or not.

MS. LARSEN: Given the history with the U.S. Army Core of Engineers and the 30-year contract that they have with the state, Suffolk County, and the -- the town, as well as the village, hopefully they'll be consulted also with regard to this project.

So thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

MR. PICHNEY: Jim, does a project like this also go before the Suffolk County Planning Commission, since it's within 500 feet of a county road and a county park?

MR. BAGG: Basically, the Suffolk

County Planning Commission has notified the Department of Public Works that county road projects, pursuant to State Law, are supposed to be submitted to the planning commission.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So it should go.

MR. PICHNEY: It should go.

MR. BAGG: I believe so.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

All right. Historic Trust. We have a report from the director.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. The housing program, we have not scheduled the next meeting --

MS. SPENCER: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: -- which we need to do soon.

We have asked -- the Parks Department has asked the Division of Real Estate for an additional appraisal at the Isaac Mills house in St. James, which would include the dining room on the first floor and, essentially, create an apartment on the -- the west wing of

the building, and then the -- the main block of the building would be reserved for public use. And so this -- they have prepared a couple of scenarios of we could fit an apartment in the house, but we asked for a third apartment design which we thought would work out better. And then we will decide which configuration works best for the building and get the appraisal for that, then that will go forward to the Housing Committee for review. And that's the building we're most concerned with right now to get tenants at that site.

We're working with the Town of Huntington for two agreements over at Coindre Hall. We're looking to renew the existing agreement for the use of the gym for the town's recreation program, and a separate agreement, which we've been working on for a while, for the use of the boathouse.

The town is looking for some designated space for their kayak program

in that building in order to give the county $600,000 towards the restoration of that building. They're also interested in the use of what can be the classroom space on the second floor. That would not be available for a while, so we are now offering the town space possibly in the main house, which might include the -- the vacant apartment which we have not been able to rent in that building. And that would be for both office and classroom space for that program.

So these are -- we just met yesterday on site. These are new developments, but we're trying to see what would satisfy the town space at that park so they can go ahead and bond the $600,000 towards the restoration of the boathouse.

And we're looking to go ahead with that project this year. The county has already appropriated 1.2 million towards the restoration of the boathouse, but

that will not complete the job, so we are hopeful we could get the 600,000 which would allow us to -- to essentially complete that project.

Next, I think we're going to review the historic trust motion.

Jim, did you want to --

MR. GULBRANSEN: If I may --

MR. MARTIN: -- speak to that?

MR. GULBRANSEN: If I may just --

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MR. GULBRANSEN: -- ask a question, following up to those progress notes.

In the past there were some discussions about the timeliness of the support for our legal agreements. It sounded like a few of these had legal agreements in the mix. Has that been happening at a better pace, at an --

MR. MARTIN: Well, this --

MR. GULBRANSEN: -- effective pace?

MR. MARTIN: At this point, with the Huntington -- the Coindre Hall project, it's really the town's fault

that has dragged their feet, in a sense, on telling us what they need to -- to go into agreement. There's been different opinions over the past couple of years, actually, on this.

MR. GULBRANSEN: So the support that we asked for from the planning and the county's counsel has been --

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. GULBRANSEN: -- on the mark.

MR. MARTIN: On that agreement, yes.

MR. GULBRANSEN: I hear what you're saying.

So the next would be to the motion that you have before us?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. And, Jim, did you want to speak to the motion?

MR. BAGG: We sent the motion out for people's review and comments, and Mr. Machtay commented back to us, so we revised the motion that was sent out. A copy is in your folders with what Mr. Machtay suggested it be revised to,

so the final motion is this revised draft before you at this point in time.

If you have any changes, we would be glad to make those changes. And then, hopefully, the CEQ will approve the motion and it will be sent to the legislature and the county executive.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Can I ask for a clarification on it?

MR. BAGG: Sure.

(Laughter)

MR. GULBRANSEN: This calls for further detail about the costs. Is -- pursuant to the discussions that we had before.

Does the motion need to specify how those costs will be prepared?

It says that they should be evaluated.

MR. BAGG: I --

MR. GULBRANSEN: I imagine it's conceivable that the seller could provide some kind of input into those cost estimates, or the buyer could incur

expenses to find out what those cost forecasts are.

Do we have to be explicit about where that -- those numbers come from?

MR. BAGG: Well, basically, during the planning steps process -- in the county's procedure to acquire property, there's a planning steps process in which the legislature directs that the Division of Real Estate in the Department of Environment and Energy, you know, approach the property owner, see if they can come to an agreed upon, you know, price, and then do the necessary surveys and -- and work for acquisitional property before it goes back to the legislature for acquisition, which is before the Environment Planning and Agriculture Committee, which is -- Mr. Schneiderman is -- is the chair of.

What the CEQ would like to have in that review -- in planning steps process is for the county to look at the -- any structures on the property, number one,

and -- and find out what state are they in. Can they actually be used for public purposes? Because a lot of the times the legislature -- we're going to acquire this and use it for a museum, and use it for this. And the Department of Public Works, after the fact, goes in there and says, This building cannot be used for public purposes because it does not conform to the New York State Building Code, or -- or you can only use it as a rental, or you can't use it at all.

And that -- some of these buildings, when the county acquires them, I think it's the -- the Historic Trust Committee feels that they should be reviewed as part of the planning steps and, really, the expenses that it will cost to bring that structure up to building code and allow the county to use it should be added to the property -- or the legislature should be aware that those costs are probably

going to need to be incurred over the next ten years in order to do what they say, you know, the acquisition or preservation of property will do. So, really, those costs are not identified at this point in time.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Yeah, my --

MR. PICHNEY: And it -- excuse me. It doesn't seem to be identified in this draft, too. The way it's written, it seems to me that, you know -- you're saying that the cost of demolition and removal of debris, but for the other things, for security and stabilization, it -- it -- it says it should be evaluated. The word "cost" is not included in there anywhere.

MR. MARTIN: Well, the last line says, "This evaluation should include attendant costs" --

MR. PICHNEY: Oh, I'm sorry. Right. Okay.

MR. MARTIN: -- of the first paragraph.

MR. PICHNEY: Okay. So it refers back. Okay.

MR. GULBRANSEN: So to my question -- I understand and agree with what you said about the -- on the use of those numbers, the value of understanding that's going into the acquisition decision. But my question was simpler.

Where should those cost estimates come from?

MR. BAGG: It's the Department of Public Works that has to go in and review the structure in terms of whether it confirms to New York State Building Code, and if not, what it's going to require and what are the potential costs to bring it up. Or -- or they can go out and hire a consultant to determine those costs, like we did.

MR. MARTIN: Public Works could hire a consultant.

MR. GULBRANSEN: At county expense.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other comments?

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. PICHNEY: Yeah. I -- since I did make that -- you know, make that mistake in reading it, there was a little confusion, I really think then that that last sentence should be brought back to the -- the top, after public use, and then -- I'm sorry, no.

The sentence that begins, "Structure on the site deemed not to be fit for historic" -- "should not be historically fit for demolition," that should be the last sentence. And the sentence that says, "This evaluation should include ~~attendant~~ costs," should be moved up and preceded.

So -- so then consequently, the evaluation and -- the sentence discussing evaluation and the sentence that says, "The evaluation should

include attendant costs," will follow each other.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Can you --

MS. SPENCER: I'm -- I'm sorry --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- give us a marked up copy?

MR. PICHNEY: Do you know what I'm saying?

MS. SPENCER: I agree. I think that does clarify it so that it -- it would read, coming down -- all right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Could --

MS. SPENCER: The sentence -- he's really transposing the last sentence --

MR. PICHNEY: With the italicized --

MS. SPENCER: -- of the first paragraph --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MS. SPENCER: -- will -- will go back where -- where it was, and there will be a new sentence.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MS. SPENCER: In other words, take the last sentence --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MS. SPENCER: -- move it up so that it's -- it's an ultimate sentence, and then the last sentence will be, "Should a structure on a site be deemed to be not historic and fit for demolition."

So that --

MR. BAGG: That's the last sentence.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MS. SPENCER: It is -- that does clarify the motion.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. PICHNEY: Thank you for being my interpreter.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I just have some minor things (handing).

Do we have a motion?

MS. SPENCER: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a second?

MR. GULBRANSEN: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a second per Mr. Gulbransen.

And any other discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

Okay.

MR. MARTIN: And --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So --

MR. MARTIN: -- that's all I have for the report.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Very good.

Project review, Type II Actions.

Ratification of Recommendations of Legislative Resolutions Laid on the Table.

Jim, you want to call any out for

our attention?

MR. BAGG: No, I think -- nothing's in the packet. I gave something in putting your folder -- Larry, about Legislator Viloria-Fisher has legislation in there to encourage the use of recyclable, you know, grocery bags, which is kind of a solid waste --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MR. BAGG: -- issue. But other than that, everything's fairly straightforward.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. I went to the hearing, which was a week or so ago.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: And it's on that nickel tax --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah. And I think there were rough- -- it was roughly -- evenly split with regard to who was in favor and who was opposed to -- to what they said, yeah, it was the plastic industry that opposed it --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: The grocery stores.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- and the grocery stores. Most other people that were there supported it for lots of reasons. So I -- it was -- I guess it's being revised at this point, and then it'll come back again.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Come back again.

MR. PICHNEY: Larry, may I ask you a question?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. PICHNEY: There was something in the paper the other day, how the shopping bags that you could purchase and -- and reuse that are made out of cloth can become contaminated and so forth with germs and so forth.

Was there any discussion of -- of, you know, producing those --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Did that come out of the grocery industry, too, or --

MR. PICHNEY: Pardon me?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Who came up with that?

MS. SQUIRES: It was -- it was

interesting, because I took my bags, which I use all the time, and stuck them in the washing machine. Because --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MS. SQUIRES: -- I had never thought of that, and they were kind of disgusting --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MS. SQUIRES: -- in the bottom.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Oh, really?

MR. PICHNEY: And the other thing, you know -- you know, we were in France this past summer, and -- and in their supermarkets, the bags that they sell are made out of plastic. So they're -- they're easily -- more easily rinsed out, rather than have them be thrown in the washer. And that would make the plastic industry happy.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: There wasn't any --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Probably not.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- discussion of public health, but I'm sure if it comes

back again, they'll get out all their guns.

I don't know if you recall, but when the original plastics law came into effect, the food industry, the plastics industry came here and made a really big scene out of it. Suffolk County was in the papers all over the -- the country at the time, and they might well do that again.

Anyway, it'll be interesting.

Do you have any idea whether --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: It's just not a -- you know, I -- I don't know, it's not a very good time to be introducing more taxes. And they won't call it a "tax," it'll be called a "fee," a surcharge, or whatever it is. You can get around it by bringing your own bags.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: But I'm not sure it's going to get the votes it -- it needs, at least, not in this climate.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. So we'll

see.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: It might get close. It might get close.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right. Moving on to sludge.

MR. BAGG: Can we have a motion?

MS. SPENCER: Do you want a motion?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Oh. Do we have a motion to approve the recommendations of staff?

MS. SPENCER: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a motion.

Second.

MR. MACHTAY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Second by Mr. Machtay.

Any further discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

Proposed Sludge Thickening Enhancement at Sewer District Number 7 in Medford.

Anybody here to speak on that?

MR. WARREN: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Please.

MR. WARREN: Yes. Ron Warren from the Department of Public Works, Director of Operations and Maintenance.

The project is to install equipment to reduce our sludge hauling that we bring to Bergen Point. We take about 10 to 15 loads of sludge, 7,000 gallons, in a tractor trailer a week. And we're hoping that this project will reduce our hauling by 50 percent or greater.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Sludge you're taking from there?

MR. WARREN: Yes, from the -- from that -- from the --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: From --

MR. WARREN: -- Sewer District 7

plant to Bergen Point.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Oh, I see. Okay.

MR. WARREN: Yeah. And right now we use -- we haul one percent sludge as a waste product from the plant, and we're hoping that we can get to three or five percent depending on the process that we're -- that can be purchased and capital funds that are available.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: And what's -- give me some more details on what the project is specifically.

MR. WARREN: We're hoping to install membranes into this -- the -- the sludge tanks that will -- the water will be processed from the sludge out of the -- out -- in the tanks, and the water then will be treated at the head works again through the plant. We're utilizing this process at a smaller plant in Woodside. It's the same district, Sewer District 7, and we have seen, again, you know, at least

50 percent to 75 percent reduction in hauling at that facility.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So --

MR. WARREN: So the process is -- you know, they -- there's different vendors and make and manufacturers. But it's a -- you know, a very fine four that is -- you know, that the water can pass through and the sludge stays behind and, you know, it just -- it thickens by that process.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So it's expensive to haul water, basically.

MR. WARREN: It is, and it's -- and the CO2 -- Ben Wright told me to let you know that there's like five pounds per -- five pounds of CO2, I think, per mile with a tractor trailer. So there's significant reduction of CO2 by --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: And we come out ahead?

MR. WARREN: -- reducing our haul.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Do we come out

ahead cost-wise? I mean, are we save- -- we're saving on, I guess, the hauling to Bergen Point and the hauling from Bergen Point --

MR. WARREN: Right. But there's --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- by reducing --

MR. WARREN: -- tremendous --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- the --

MR. WARREN: -- tremendous -- there's -- you know, there's -- the costs are, you know, personnel. You know, we have -- we have 23 sewer districts that we have to haul sludge from. And all these plants all have to have sludge done regularly. And -- and, you know, it -- with -- the more we do -- the more sludge we haul, the more breakdowns we get with our equipment, the more manpower we need. So we're hoping to reduce our manpower. It's -- it's an overall reduction, and we're -- we're trying to, you know, at all our facilities, reduce our sludge hauling.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Have any other questions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Have a motion? This is Type II.

MR. BAGG: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah, Jim.

MR. BAGG: I would also -- now, this deals with the installation of equipment?

MR. WARREN: Yeah. There's -- there shouldn't be any structure necessary, depending on the manufacturer that we're going to utilize at this point.

MR. BAGG: But you're going to -- this is a piece of equipment that you would be --

MR. WARREN: It can be installed --

MR. BAGG: -- installing.

MR. WARREN: -- in the tanks.

MR. BAGG: So it's recommended that we add 25 to that Type II, because that's for the purchase of equipment.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Have a motion?

MR. MACHTAY: Type II.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Type II.

Okay. Second?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Have a second?

MR. GULBRANSEN: (Indicating)

MS. SPENCER: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And all in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Abstentions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

MR. PICHNEY: Larry.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MR. PICHNEY: I have a question for the gentleman that's -- that's related but off topic.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. PICHNEY: As you're probably

aware, the City of Milwaukee processes their sludge and sells it as a -- as a fertilizer called "Milorganite."

Did the county ever look into anything like that in terms of, you know, making money from sludge or at least a portion of it?

MR. WARREN: Well, the sludge is all processed at Bergen Point, and I think there has been studies done in, you know --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: What's going on right now, actually. Yeah, we hired a consultant and we're looking at various technologies as to how to process it. I mean, years ago, maybe 20 years ago, we actually incinerated it there at Bergen Point --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- you know, in a waste energy facility --

MR. PICHNEY: Right. Uh-huh.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- they used to produce --

MR. PICHNEY: Yeah, we were able --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I'm not even sure that that was actually -- was producing electricity, but there was some talk about having that be used -- incinerated and converted to electricity.

Right now we pay about $80 a ton to have it, basically, trucked out of Bergen Point, and then it gets loaded onto a train in New Jersey, and ends up in Georgia --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- at a landfill.

MR. PICHNEY: Uh-huh.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: There has been, you know, lots of people who come around saying, Hey, we could do something with that; we could turn it into Biodiesel, you know, we could turn it into compost. They looked at -- for a while there was a -- the idea of turning it into fertilizer, these little pellets --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- but I -- I think the smells associated with the drying beds killed that idea.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: So -- you know. Now we're looking at all the various technologies, and a recommendation is going to be made in terms of what to do with it.

MR. PICHNEY: Yeah, I would be curious to know, you know -- you know, since Milwaukee is -- is a major midwest city where -- where they handle the actual processing --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah.

MR. PICHNEY: -- drying and so forth. And supposedly they -- you know, there are no heavy metals in the product other than iron. I mean, there are no toxic heavy metals in it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Well, they have a lot of beer waste in theirs.

(Laughter)

MR. PICHNEY: No, beer --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Seriously.

MR. PICHNEY: Seriously.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And it's brought into New York State as a product --

MR. PICHNEY: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- and when -- I was involved in looking at it probably ten or so years ago --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I have a feeling --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- it would not pass DEC's criteria for using it in a matter that it is actually used. But because it's a -- a bagged product, it can come into New York State and be used.

MR. PICHNEY: I see.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, I think Suffolk County's waste probably has a lot of beer waste in it, too.

(Laughter)

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: My -- my suspicions.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: The other thing is that, you know, these things -- creating products out of a sludge, you have to be very careful. And it depends on where the stuff comes from. Obviously, if it comes from an industrial area, it's going to be far more contaminated and so forth.

So you're going to have to -- we would probably have do set up several separate forums of dealing with sludge instead of one, I would presume. If you were going to say this is going to be okay for farming, and this we'll have to landfill.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And it's also interesting that the F- -- Food and Drug Administration -- oh, no, the Centers for Disease Control, I think it is, has opposed using sludge on crops in many instances, and --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: That's human waste.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- they will not allow it to be labeled as organic.

MR. PICHNEY: Oh, that's really interesting.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And EPA --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: You could use it on flowers and things, just --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- not edibles.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

EPA and -- and Food and Drug or Centers For Disease Control, I forget which, have had a number of heated arguments over that, because EPA has the problem of getting rid of this stuff.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And, of course, the other has more to do with protecting health.

MR. PICHNEY: I see.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: That's a good question, though. And I -- you know, the way we do it now is not environmentally responsible or

economically responsible. It's a fortune. There's a lot of greenhouse gas, there's a lot of waste of diesel fuel, you know, non-renewable resources. So, you know, we -- we really do have to find a better way.

MR. PICHNEY: Uh-huh.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: So --

MR. PICHNEY: Okay. Thank you, gentlemen.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. We have another --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Not to mention the traffic.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- sewage. This is Sewer District Number 5, Strathmore Huntington improvements. And there is a letter in your packet concerning that from the Department of Planning Environment in the Town of Huntington.

MR. WARREN: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Please.

MR. WARREN: Yes. The project is for the installation of, basically, odor

control, and if there's funds available afterwards, on infrastructure improvement. The plant is 40 -- over 40 years old, and the concrete is in serious -- had some serious problems, and we're hoping we can have -- do some repairs on that after -- after we do the odor control.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: What the odor control --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, I didn't hear your question.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I'm just curious as to how they're approaching the odor problem. Is it through like a Biofilter or through perfumes or what are --

MR. WARREN: We're going to cover the tanks that we feel are producing the odors, and then we're going to use -- you know, again, we -- there's many manufacturers who do scrubbing. We're utilizing a few of these devices. Port Jeff -- the new facility at Port Jeff, we have -- that we're happy with,

and we feel it does a very good job.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: It's a cover?

MR. WARREN: No, it's a scrubber system.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I know I -- you know --

MR. WARREN: There's covers and scrubbers.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I've seen the misters, I don't like those.

MR. WARREN: No, we're --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: The ones that --

MR. WARREN: I think they're illegal.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- the odor neutralizers. Yeah.

MR. WARREN: I think they're illegal. I think they're not --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Are they now?

MR. WARREN: -- at facil- -- at our facilities. Depending on -- I know many years ago was -- they were illegal because they were utilizing numbing of your --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Odor neutralizers. Yeah, they --

MR. WARREN: Right. And now -- but now they have organic ones, they say, that -- you know, that -- that can be considered legal, but we haven't even considered them.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah.

MR. WARREN: Because, you know, we have -- you know, you have such a great area that you have to try to mask the odor.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah, the Biofilters actually work pretty well to -- where they percolate the gas --

MR. WARREN: Uh-huh.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- through a bed of organic matter.

MR. WARREN: Yeah, we have -- we've utilized small -- small manhole -- we put them over manholes where -- in areas -- collection systems where people are complaining that the odors are being admitted by -- at the manholes. So we

take those -- it's bark, cedar bark and some other --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MR. WARREN: -- type of bark, and you put it in -- in this package that sits inside the manhole, and that reduces the odors, too.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. The Town of Huntington asks that the county take into consideration Tuscany Estates with its proposed 30 residential lots, parkland, conservation, and recreation areas --

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- and recharge basin in the developing plans for Sewer District Number 5.

Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: Is Tuscany Estates within that sewer district, or are they asking that it be included in that sewer district?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: It says it's

adjacent to, apparently --

MR. BAGG: It's not in the sewer --

MR. MACHTAY: It's adjacent to, but it's not within.

MR. WARREN: There -- there's a golf -- you know, it's right next to our facility. They're going to turn it into homes.

MR. MACHTAY: It was a golf course.

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MS. SQUIRES: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Joy.

MS. SQUIRES: Just a couple of comments or corrections to this. And -- and Rich is really better at this than I am, but I think it's Dix Hills Water District, not -- on Number 5, I don't think it's Suffolk County Water Authority; I think it's Dix Hills Water District. Just to correct.

MR. WARREN: Okay.

MS. SQUIRES: And Number 19 on the zoning category, it says "single family residential is" -- "is R-40," and then

it says "R-2."

Is there R-2?

MR. MACHTAY: No, not in the Town of Huntington.

MS. SQUIRES: No, not in the Town of Huntington.

MR. WARREN: Okay.

MS. SQUIRES: It's -- it's just -- it's just inaccurate.

MR. MACHTAY: But all -- all of that is irrelevant if this is a Type II Action, Mr. Bagg.

MR. BAGG: Yes, you're correct.

MS. SQUIRES: Okay. It may be irrelevant, but --

MR. WARREN: No, I appreciate the information.

MS. SQUIRES: -- you would want to --

MR. WARREN: I'm sorry.

MS. SQUIRES: -- need to be --

MR. WARREN: It's not correct.

MS. SQUIRES: -- you would want it to be correct, just -- just say.

MR. WARREN: Uh-huh.

MS. SQUIRES: And -- and Strathmore Park is right adjacent to --

MR. WARREN: Right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So you're going to have a -- it says here, a 200-foot -- square-foot building in order to house this --

MR. WARREN: If it's necessary, yeah. It depends on, you know, the -- again, we're limited funding. We have to evaluate whether we can -- you know, we can purchase it with fully winterized -- and insulated, so we can just have it -- it's just a piece of equipment outside. If it's neg- -- if it's -- if we can't do that, then we're going to have to build this building and -- and --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So this is a planning study.

MR. WARREN: Right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

Any other comments?

MR. BAGG: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Jim.

MR. BAGG: In the proposed recommendation for Type II, it's suggested you add 25 to that, because they will be purchasing equipment as part of this.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So it's 617c7 and 25?

MR. BAGG: (Head gesture)

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: If they do want to include this in the sewer district, I guess it's the applicant that has to apply to the district; is that correct?

MR. BAGG: That is correct.

MR. MACHTAY: At the town?

MR. WARREN: Yes, Ben Wright asked me to respond that we -- we would have to have a -- a separate study. This -- the funding that we have is for what we -- what we're planning, not any other -- and we would definitely

prob- -- almost definitely, we would have to expand the facility in some way for additional flow.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: That's to include this Tuscany Estates that you're talking about?

MR. BAGG: You know, usually the county procedure is -- and correct me if I'm incorrect, but if the town requires that the proposed subdivision has to hook up to a sewage treatment facility, then the applicant has to apply to the sewer district, and the county would work out an agreement. And if they have to expand the sewage treatment plant, the developer will pay for the expansion of the sewage treatment facility as well before they can be hooked up.

MR. MACHTAY: Well, there's key money at the -- at the beginning to get in; right? To pay for that --

MR. BAGG: Yeah, I mean --

MR. MACHTAY: -- to pay for the expansion if it's necessary?

MR. WARREN: If -- if --

MR. BAGG: Right.

MR. WARREN: If -- yes. If -- if we can -- if we feel that we can handle the flow before the expansion. I mean, you know --

MR. MACHTAY: The thing is it's one-acre lots. So you're well within the Suffolk County Health Department's guidelines for cesspools.

MR. BAGG: Well, that would be up to the town to determine whether or not they felt it should be hooked up to a sewage treatment facility. You're right. I mean, it's not -- it doesn't supercede any of the two weight requirements for a sewage treatment facility.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: But in my reading of the letter, this is not a request to become part of the sewer district. It's simply to take into account that they won't be affected by odors or whatever else. Maybe I'm

interpreting the letter wrong, but that's my interpretation.

MR. WARREN: Well, you know, that's what the project is to do, to handle --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MR. WARREN: -- the odors, so hopefully there will be no problem.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MS. SQUIRES: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes, Joy.

MS. SQUIRES: This is irrelevant, but I just have to tell you that Tuscany is faced on Ryder Avenue Golf Course. It's so sad that it's going there. It's a piece -- Ryder Avenue Golf Course is one of the most beautiful places you can possibly see. You can see all the way to Robert Moses. And the people wanted a subdivision, they didn't want the golf course preserved.

We talked about the county and the town, you know, purchasing -- so it's very interesting because you all know how much it costs to create a new golf

course. And this was one beautiful rolling terrain, sitting there very happily. And that, of course, has nothing to do with what we're talking about, but an unfortunate change in land use.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

Okay. Can we have a motion, Type II, with the correction by Jim of adding 25?

MR. GULBRANSEN: So moved.

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mr. Gulbransen, Mr. Machtay.

Any other discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Abstentions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

MR. WARREN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

Lauretta.

Nice to see you.

MS. FISCHER: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So the first one is Proposed Acquisition for Open Space Preservation known as the Overton Preserve, Belonzi.

MS. FISCHER: Yes, this is one of the two proposed acquisitions I'm bringing before you this morning in the same area.

This is the smaller acquisition of 3.76 acres in the Overton Preserve area, which consisted of approximately 400 acres when it was first proposed for acquisition.

This is -- these two parcels in total will now provide for you majority of the properties that we proposed for acquisition. We only have one or two smaller pieces left in the puzzle to acquire. So after we acquire these two acquisitions, we've pretty well sown up

our acquisition in this area.

This is a -- a smaller lot on Mill Road -- south of Mill Road. It actually connects county-owned property, parkland on the northern side of Mill Road, so it makes a nice connection between our properties to the north, and then connects down in to the properties that we're acquiring. As well in the second acquisition before you today and those others that we've acquired previously.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Any questions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Have a motion?

MR. PICHNEY: I'm sorry, just a quick questions.

Lauretta, this is for groundwater protection?

MS. FISCHER: Yes, this is in the Central Suffolk SDPA area, and that's one of the criteria that this program -- one of the criteria that can be met to

acquire properties within this program.

MR. PICHNEY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Have a motion to accept?

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. We have a motion by Dan.

Second?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

MS. FISCHER: Thank you.

And the second one before you is the Overton Preserve, Stanton Avenue properties. This includes over 162 acres, including a large old file map area delineated on your map before you in red, and a -- another larger lot, almost at the same size to the east, also outlined in red.

Again, same environmental issues

and descriptions as the previous one.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right. I just had a question.

On the photograph to the right and south is --

MS. FISCHER: That's a -- a subdivision that's already --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Oh, it is?

MS. FISCHER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. So it --

MS. FISCHER: It's already developed and we will not be acquiring that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

Do we have a motion to accept?

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a motion from Dan again.

A second?

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mr. Machtay is second.

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

MS. FISCHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: You have one more; right?

MS. FISCHER: No, not from me.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Who's doing the schoolhouse?

MR. MARTIN: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Oh, you are. Martin.

Okay.

MR. MARTIN: You ready?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. This is to start the capital program to restore the Elwood Schoolhouse, and it's also known as our "Little Red Schoolhouse."

This site was purchased by the county in 1987 and was planned to be restored. It was in our rental program

for a number of years. It is now vacant.

If you look at the pictures, the last two pages of your handout, you'll see the interior space. The Parks Department has already gutted the first floor, taking out all the partition walls that the school district had put up for office use when they owned the building. And on the next page, you'll see also a couple of interior shots that -- you can see the original metal ceilings, and we took out all the drop ceilings. And we're planning, just basically, to restore it to a schoolhouse use. We are going to be retaining any school improvements that were both done in the 1930s and the 1950s.

This has been reviewed by the New York State Office of Historic Preservation and to be declared eligible to the National Register. We're currently working on the nomination.

And the state did see what we exposed here, that's why they could see there was enough of the original fabric in the interior and agreed with our assessment to go ahead with the restoration of this building.

If you look at the exterior view, you can see what's painted white or like plywood coverings over the existing original windows. Those will get removed as we restore the full ceiling height on both the first and second floor. So we do have the original windows, but they need restoration work, and we'll be adding storm windows to the whole building as part of this project.

The rear addition, you see the little bump out there is the rear entrance. That -- I think we -- we've already taken that down. That was a later addition to restore the -- the entrance at that point. That will become our handicap access entrance. The front door has a stoop and steps in

that location.

So we are looking to have public assembly on the first floor, and a combination of office and classroom space on the second floor.

Legislator Stern started this project off by appropriating $20,000 in planning funds in last year's capitol funds, and he has requested that we continue with the restoration project. And there are three local community groups that have approached him for possible use of the building, and also approached the parks commissioner for that use of the building.

At this point, it's really not usable. We need to upgrade -- upgrade heating and air conditioning, the bathroom facilities, the plumbing, the electric, and restore the interior.

What we're looking to do now is to kick off the restoration by appropriating $170,000 in capital funds, which will be used towards what we're

estimating from Public Works to be about a million dollar project.

Excuse me?

MS. SQUIRES: I just wanted to -- 170- --

MR. MARTIN: 170- is what we're looking to appropriate in this year's capital funds from our Historic Services 75/10 account to start the restoration. We usually do not have the luxury of appropriating the full restoration costs upfront, so we do it in phases working with Public Works on the design. And we're also looking to appropriate an additional $80,000 to the planning, to add to the Legislator Stern's appropriation of 20,000 from last year's capitol fund.

We'll be working with Public Works on the design and planning of this. We'll see what we can do with county contracts inhouse for the first phase, but eventually we'll have a complete set of plans that will go out to bid as we

appropriate more funds to restore the interior of the building.

The county has already put on a new wood roof and reshingled the exterior. And so the exterior of the building is intact at this point, but we still can't use the building yet.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Richard, correct me if I'm wrong, but this is one of our properties that was severely vandalized. I think somebody turned water on and flooded it.

MR. MARTIN: Well, God did.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Huh?

(Laughter)

MR. MARTIN: The building ran out --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: The pipes froze.

MR. MARTIN: Well, with a little, I guess, park staff help. The building ran out of heating oil and the pipes froze. The sprinkler system and the interior plumbing, the pipes froze and then they burst, and when -- the water,

you know, flooded the building. And that was kind of the motivation at that point to remove the partition walls to restore the flooring that had buckled. But we -- we only got to the demolition point, now we really need funds to do the restoration.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I guess my concern is that, what's going to prevent this from happening again?

MR. MARTIN: Better supervision by park staff, until we can get occupants in the building, of course. Our Historic Preservation program is reduced. It's based on community use. So we need to get an occupant into the building to really take care of any vandalism or maintenance issues that might come up in the future. We do not have any staff that we can put at this location. So we will need to, you know, get the building into a certain point that we can bring a group into the building.

MR. BAGG: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. BAGG: Is this dedicated to the Suffolk County Historic Trust?

MR. MARTIN: It's -- I think it is. They -- the initial resolution put it into the historic preservation program. And, Jim, we could take a -- a look at that to see if we need to do any further dedicating resolutions from -- that was the resolution for a county acquisition that directed it to be restored. And so I have -- I have used that for direction of the property, but we can review it to see if it needs a more formal dedication from the CEQ.

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Dan.

MR. PICHNEY: Richie, going back to Larry's question.

Are there going to be security alarms and low temperature alarms in the building, too, so at least somebody's notified --

MR. MARTIN: There's definitely --

MR. PICHNEY: -- if they run out of oil again?

MR. MARTIN: There's definitely a security alarm. I'm not sure if we'll be switching out to the gas system -- a high efficiency system at this point.

MR. PICHNEY: Even -- even gas systems, a part goes and then it goes out. So I would certainly recommend having low temperature alarms, too.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: You mentioned, I think, three groups that you're working with?

MR. MARTIN: (Head gesture)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Are they involved in helping to actually design the floor plans?

MR. MARTIN: Not at this point. They've just expressed interest.

MS. SQUIRES: Who are they?

MR. MARTIN: They're the Elwood Taxpayers Association, Elwood Veterans,

and the Elwood Civic Association. And they've all sent letters to the commissioner expressing interest, but we're not sure how this will play out, to be honest, with -- you know, we'll have one group in there or all three. But we're really not at that point, you know, to provide the space for them, but we're just discussing it with them.

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Richard.

MR. MACHTAY: The local library has been looking for space for ages. They're now situated in the old Blockbuster store in the shopping center.

MR. MARTIN: They had --

MR. MACHTAY: Have you considered them or --

MR. MARTIN: Yes. They approached us first --

MR. MACHTAY: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: -- and they were looking to move into the building. When

the engineers looked at the structure and the weight of the books and the files and everything they would need to move into it --

MR. MACHTAY: Can't do it.

MR. MARTIN: -- the cost would -- they -- the -- the library just simply would have -- would have paid for those improvements, and they --

MR. MACHTAY: I guess the only thing that I'm really concerned about is, you know, these civic groups generally don't have any money, so they're going to want the space for free. They're going to want the maintenance for free -- who's going to clean the bathrooms, who's going to sweep the floors, who's going to empty the trash -- and they're going to want free run of the building. Okay. Whether it's one civic group or multiple civic groups. And not that I have anything against civic groups, I've worked with them for over 30 years. And

those ones you mentioned are some of them that I worked with.

I don't know how this works in the favor of the county in that it seems to me that it's going to cost the county a lot of time and expense and management, aside from what it costs to renovate the building.

MR. MARTIN: Well, two points.

This is a county building that the county acquired and directed Parks to restore it until we have that obligation. At this point we have been declared eligible to the national register. So it -- you know, it -- it has that historic status at this point. So it's really Parks' responsibility to restore the buildings that are under its care.

Second, we do have -- the only way we can occupy these buildings -- historic buildings is with community groups involved. And the contracts that we do provide -- yes, we do take care of

a lot of the maintenance, but we do not provide the daily maintenance that you suggested in the sense of cleaning the bathrooms or the interior. That is definitely put on the local group. There is no daily maintenance provided from Parks at any of these sites.

So if they cannot abide by that stipulation or that requirement, then they really can't go in a contract with us.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So you don't require a civic group to pay rent?

MR. MARTIN: No.

All right. Well, this is a different situation.

All of our historic sites right now, they're not required to pay rent. What they are required to do is through an interpretation program at the historic site to open it up to the public and provide all that access. The County Parks Department does not provide that access.

Deepwealth, Sagtikos Manor, Meadowcroft, the Van Morgandean house, all these contracts are similar, and those groups in the contract are required to open the building a certain amount of time and to provide the public programming.

As we go forward with the program, yes, people are looking at the costs, the heating costs and things to get revised from that face point that we're at now. But at this point, we do provide the building with that programming and staffing --

MR. MACHTAY: Did you say the Elwood Veterans?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: Because the VFW took the building right across the street, B&D.

It's not the VFW, is it?

MR. MARTIN: I -- I don't have the exact name with me.

MS. SQUIRES: The --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I don't understand. If a Suffolk County policeman wanted to move in here, you would charge him rent. But if a group goes in, you'll give it to them?

MR. MARTIN: We give it to them if they provide the programming that I explained. Like Deepwealth, I would not be charging the historical society to rent the building and then ask them to staff it and then provide all the programming without any compensation. And all of our historic sites are the same way. So that would be a hardship.

They do have to pay for their own insurance to cover them there, and they are required to invest in the restoration of the site, and especially the interior. So all their fundraising that they do on site -- if a civic group went into the Elwood Schoolhouse and had fundraising, it would have to go back into the building.

Especially at the Scully Estate

with having the environmental center, that's -- you know, also, any fundraising there has to go back into the building. So that's a stipulation that all these groups have, but they -- they're necessarily required to pay rent at this point. That could change.

MR. MACHTAY: Yeah, most of these civic groups are not set up like that, though. I mean, they're set up to be very self-serving and very -- you know, this is our goal and this is our mission, and that's what we're going to do.

MR. MARTIN: If they were not willing to provide the public services that we're asking for, then they would have to pay rent. That's --

MS. SPENCER: (Indicating)

MR. MARTIN: -- that's the agreement.

MS. SQUIRES: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I think Mary Ann was first.

MS. SPENCER: Could we revisit the library? It sounds like that would be a wonderful use for the building. You said they were -- the first people who were approached, and -- and they just didn't have the funding?

MR. MARTIN: They approached us and --

MS. SPENCER: They approached you.

MR. MARTIN: -- what they would have to do to upgrade the building, the costs involved, they were not willing to move forward on it and they decided to go into the rental space that they went into.

MS. SPENCER: Could they be approached again? It seems like a --

MS. SQUIRES: Could I --

MR. MARTIN: Anything's possible.

MS. SPENCER: -- a very nice marriage.

MS. SQUIRES: -- answer that?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MS. SQUIRES: They did an

evaluation and they were looking for someplace to move from the storefront they were in.

The structure would not handle the weight of the books. There was, I think, a careful evaluation of it.

They then, just recently, moved on the Blockbuster corner. They just made that move.

We -- and the we I'm talking about now is the Open Space Committee. We had another area that we thought would be appropriate for them to look long range into, rather than just renting.

They are now focused on staying where they are.

I wanted to -- to point out, in terms of security, what Rich said, the VFW is across the street at the purchase we called "B&D Farms." It is our Bright Horizons Camp. It will be eventually a handicapped camp. And then our -- we have another park that's adjacent to it, and it's just down from the school.

But all three -- I would investigate which veterans organization this is, because if you have one across the street, there's got to only be -- that's the VFW. So the one across would have to be American Legion.

I think that -- that I'd be careful to get them to provide upfront, I'm going to take care of this maintenance, because as Rich said, they are --

MR. MARTIN: Well, all I can say is it's required by contract --

MS. SQUIRES: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: -- and if they don't provide the maintenance --

MS. SQUIRES: Got it.

MR. MARTIN: -- either we do not go into contract with them, or we would have to establish a rental program and set up a -- and then the county could maybe provide maintenance.

Right now we do not have the staff and --

MS. SQUIRES: Exactly.

MR. MARTIN: -- to provide any kind of --

MS. SQUIRES: I know that --

MR. MARTIN: -- daily maintenance.

MS. SQUIRES: -- that Mr. Stern is very involved in the community, and I suspect he could help find a viable tenant --

MR. MARTIN: And these --

MS. SQUIRES: -- somebody else.

MR. MARTIN: -- groups, just so you know, they just sent letters of interest. So that's as far as it's gone, and it could be another group that might come forward that might have, you know, a different approach or more of an interest in the public use that we require. But this has just I guess kicked off the interest in Legislator Stern's office, and he approached us to please move ahead with the restoration and not to leave the building vacant.

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Dan.

MR. PICHNEY: You know, two points. It seems to me that a building like that would be good for specialized uses for a library. Either for like a -- every library has -- has a program director with various programs that they have practically every day of the week. That would be good for that. A periodicals room. A -- I don't know --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Historic archives.

MR. PICHNEY: -- like a -- yeah, historic collections.

What a lot of libraries are doing are, you know, making it into little, you know, Starbucks where people can come and read and -- and have, you know, coffee and so forth, or to have computers in there and have it just be for students, and for -- what do you call it? -- the tutoring of students. So I think there is a number of ways to go for a library district to use a

building like that without having to, you know, move lock, stock, and barrel with all these heavy books and everything.

And then secondly, because of the accessibility of this building, as opposed to a Meadowcroft or a Sagtikos Manor, you know, it -- it seems that -- the building I'm familiar with is the Harriet Acampora Center on Montauk Highway in Blue Point where groups come in, like our garden club, has to pay for every time we have a meeting. So, you know, you go in there and you -- you pay for an entire year of meetings, and a number of groups meet there.

So, you know, that covers a heck of a lot of -- of the costs for maintaining and overhead of the building. And I think, you know, you might want to look in that direction. You know, periodical use of the building by community organizations that will, in fact, pay a fee to use the building.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah, I think --

MR. MARTIN: And that's a possibility. In all of our planning and discussions on this, the floor would always be open for outside groups and not be occupied by any one group. The second floor we can possibly provide, you know, the office space. But that always -- that concept could always be incorporated no matter what direction we go into. It would be open to the public.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right.

So I think there are two issues. One we can vote on, Richard's request to approve the funds to move forward. But as Jim points out, this is not in the historic trust, and we might want to, at this time, move to put it in.

MR. BAGG: Or make a recommendation. It would be the legislature --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MR. BAGG: -- that choses to put in

place the historic trust, but it's not dedicated for any further uses.

MS. SPENCER: Wow, wow, wow, slow down. If you want it dedicated, you need to take it back. It has to be looked at a little more.

MR. BAGG: It should be. The first today starts --

MS. SPENCER: Yes, it should be.

MR. BAGG: A dedicating resolution has to specify the purpose or purposes for which the property may be used, and that's the category we're using.

MS. SPENCER: Right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So you're willing to do that?

MS. SPENCER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So we'll throw it back to the committee, and then we have a motion to accept this Type II.

MS. SQUIRES: I'll make that motion.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a motion from Joy.

Second?

MS. SPENCER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Second from Mary Ann.

Any further discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Nobody.

We'll do it, Richard, but this time make sure that it doesn't get flooded out.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We can only do this so many times.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right. I think that completes the agenda.

Any other business?

MS. SQUIRES: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Joy.

MS. SQUIRES: I had something

briefly that -- I went to the New York State DEC update, which all of our -- on CEQ are invited to, as our CACs throughout the state. There were a couple -- there were many expert presentations, because what they do is they give department heads to all of us. But I just want to call your attention to two things.

There is a large push on the climate smart communities pledge. There are several communities -- 35 throughout the state that have taken this pledge, including some from Suffolk County. And I'll give you -- this is -- is the pledge. I won't read it all to you, but it's very interesting.

And the goal is to decrease -- keep to global temperature increased to less than 2 degrees and from the 1990 level by 2050.

So what they're saying is -- 80 by 50 is the logo, with the by -- you know, the multiplication (indicating). And --

so there is this -- there is a strong push throughout New York State.

Some communities belong to Icli, which has a similar pledge -- it's I-C-L -- Icli -- L, I guess -- I-C-L-I. And there are 40 communities that belong to this. But there's going to be a big push for this. But in conjunction, seeker updates, which are coming out this summer, are going to focus on this (indicating). And I'm going to hand this to you, Jim, because there are three things that they're doing in the SEQR update.

They're making part one more -- imposing a better structure in part one. Part two will be brought up to date, and part three will become negative declaration.

And in addition to the standard forum, there is going to be a companion workbook online. It's first coming out online this summer. The workbook will not be part of the rules, so that it can

be constantly corrected and upgraded. And they're trying to collect -- as they rewrite in this, that the information in this that's collected will be repeated once and not repeated over and over again. And supposedly in the next couple of weeks, there'll be a first draft update in PDF form online. And I'll just hand you, Jim, this --

MR. BAGG: Thank you.

MS. SQUIRES: -- this thing. It's just an outline.

MR. BAGG: I have a question for you.

How does this (inaudible).

MS. SQUIRES: I think that they are trying -- from what I've gathered, because when -- when Betty Ann Hughes, which is, I think, the one that everyone talks to when they're looking for -- when she came up and started talking, she said, Things are going to be tied to the climate change initiative, to the best of their ability. And I don't know

the answer to that.

MR. BAGG: I mean, because the county --

MS. SQUIRES: Right.

MR. BAGG: -- requires lead certification --

MS. SQUIRES: Yes.

MR. BAGG: -- on major structures, as they did across the street --

MS. SQUIRES: Yes.

MR. BAGG: -- you know, use our values and -- I mean, if -- if technically they're going to have someone become involved in a leed program, then technically I think the county should be involved.

MS. SQUIRES: I -- I think -- I think there are going to be changes there. One of the things they said was what we all know, there is no money. You know, DEC has no money; New York State -- nobody has any money.

So a lot of these enforcement things, like the requirement, for

instance, everyone will need a marine license now. That's happening right now, it's been covered in the newspaper. But you drop a fishing line of anything that involves salt water, you need a marine license, as well as a ready -- reel -- you know, a regular fishing license.

So that's a big change in terms of what people are expecting, you know, people don't think of a license. For kids -- you know, under 16, you're excluded, but everybody over 16 years old will need a marine license to go fishing.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Jay, before you walk out, can I ask you to give us an update of what you think the status of taking the money out of the Open Space program.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: In East Hampton you mean?

MS. SQUIRES: No.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: As far as

county-wide, I think.

MR. BAGG: The tax --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Taxes, yeah.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. First, it would have to get out of the committee. I mean, the bill was basically to put a referendum on in November that would redistribute the quarter penny program for -- basically suspending for three years the money that would go to open space and putting it into the general fund to offset tax increases.

It sounds like it might be popular on its face, but there's a lot of us, including myself, who have strong objections to it.

It was not assigned to my committee, which I'm a little upset about. It went to Budget and Finance, even though it seems like it should go to Environment.

There might be some more sympathetic ears in Budget and Finance,

but I still don't see it getting out of committee. If it does get out of committee, I don't see it passing on the floor. I'm fairly confident the county executive is opposed to it at this point, and enough legislators are opposed to it that it -- it doesn't have a shot, I don't believe.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Thank you.

Joy, I didn't mean to interrupt you, but I wanted to get --

MS. SQUIRES: Oh, no.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Don't pull back the lobbying pressure, because I think it's helping out.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. GULBRANSEN: In a related matter, with regard to the climate smart initiative that DEC is -- Joy has reminded us about.

As I understand that program, it's about reductions and -- and that's fine, but you also commented that there's no

money. And while that's true in some pots, internationally, climate change is all about exchanges and offsets and credits and trading and sources of money for good ideas and good actions, incentives. So that should be a large part of becoming climate ready or climate smart --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Oh, sure.

MR. GULBRANSEN: -- and I think the council should support whatever we can with regard to a regular committee on consideration of what we can do, whether it be --

THE REPORTER: Please speak up, I can't hear you.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, I don't -- I don't know about doing anything local. I mean, it's a federal program, the capital trade and --

(Overlapping conversations)

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: There are some states that have tried to do their own, and I don't know how much success

they've had. But if it's going to work, it's got to be a federal program, but that will create enormous amounts of funds to spur renewable technologies; energy. You know, suddenly the numbers will be in favor of renewables.

MR. GULBRANSEN: I think that our SEQRA process will consider mitigation and these offsets more in the future if we, at county level, can recognize the value --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah.

MR. GULBRANSEN: -- of doing it.

MS. SQUIRES: And I think that is exactly why, because, as I said, SEQR is going to look -- it -- there -- there are going to be links that are coming. And, in addition, I think there will be avenues of revenue, certainly, for all of this.

Just -- just -- if I can tell you one thing, my organization, NYSACC, the New York State Association of Conservation Commission, that I am

president of, we have a Web site that I like very much, and all the proceedings and all the technical data, the PowerPoint presentations from this full day, you know, 9 o'clock to 4 o'clock workshop from DEC, that will be online. They'll send us the disk and we'll list it under resources. And our Web site is nysaccny.org. So that rather than me going blah, blah with the rest of it, it's all going to be -- it's all going to be online.

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Dan.

MR. PICHNEY: I have a comment of general interest, and I'll make this fast.

For 15 years I gave talks on various gardening issues, horticultural to gardening clubs, historical societies, libraries, and so forth, and one of the things was on -- on butterfly gardening. And I took a lot of my photographs, 15 years ago when I worked

in this building, near the LILCO high-tension lines, just down the road here. There's an adjacent woodland, there was the -- the area underneath the high-tension lines. And when they let it grow, there would be wildflowers and butterflies good nectar on there, and then there would be native trees where they could lay their eggs and the caterpillars would eat and so forth.

So I got to thinking about that, and I approached the nature conservancy and -- and said, this might be a good idea if you can get LIPA not to mow underneath the high-tension lines during the summers. Just mow it, you know, in the late fall to provide habitat for both butterflies, other insects -- beneficial insects, and birds.

And they liked the idea, and supposedly they're approaching LIPA with that. And they also talked to Gloria to have the -- the railroad do the same thing, not to mow around the railroad

tracks.

When I first moved to Bayport, they didn't mow, and there were -- there was Butterfly Weed and Queen Anne's Legs and other plants that are beneficial to butterflies. And I think that this might be a good thing.

We're talking about miles and -- hundreds of miles of right of way that could be potential habitat that, you know, people have never really thought of as -- as being potential habitat.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: That's interesting.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I know in the past LIPA -- and I think the road could use the foliage along there, just like not knock those things down. But I think with the railroad, one of their concerns is sparks --

MR. GULBRANSEN: Right.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- you know, from the locomotives starting fires --

MR. GULBRANSEN: Well --

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- which has --

MR. GULBRANSEN: -- yeah.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: -- happened in the past.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Yeah.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: And visibility issues, you know --

MR. GULBRANSEN: Right. Yeah. But we're talking about things that don't get any more than -- than two feet high, really.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

MR. MACHTAY: Motion.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Second?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Nobody wants to give a second?

MR. GULBRANSEN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: There's no objection.

MR. MACHTAY: See you all next month.

(WHEREUPON, the meeting of the Suffolk County Council of Environmental Quality was adjourned at 11:22 a.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, THERESA PAPE, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New York, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the stenographic notes taken herein.

I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage; and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 17th day of June, 2009.

THERESA PAPE