ORIGINAL

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

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

September 16, 2009
9:30 a.m.

RECEIVED
S.C. PLANNING DEPT.
2009 DEC 11 AM 11:06

BEFORE:

R. LAWRENCE SWANSON, Chairman

MICHAEL KAUFMAN, Vice Chairman

REPORTED BY:

THERESA PAPE, Court Reporter/Notary Public

A P P E A R A N C E S:

HON. JAY H. SCHNEIDERMAN

THOMAS GULBRANSEN

RICHARD MACHTAY

GLORIA G. RUSSO

MARY ANN SPENCER

EVA GROWNEY

DANIEL PICHNEY

HISTORIC SOCIETY MEMBERS:

RICHARD MARTIN

CAC REPRESENTATIVES:

JOY SQUIRES

ALSO PRESENT:

JAMES BAGG, Chief Environmental Analyst

NICK GIBBONS, Suffolk County
Department ofParks

RUSS MACKEY, PE, Civil Engineer
Department of Public Works

TIMOTHY D. QUINN, Project Manager
Nelson & Pope Engineers

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: 9:50 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. We'll call the meeting to order.

Any comments on the minutes? Minutes for the 19th -- August 19th are available, and, actually, there was, I think, the July minutes.

MR. MACHTAY: The July minutes are read, and they're satisfactory, as far as I'm concerned, and I'll move them.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. We have a motion to accept the July minutes.

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the member voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So the July minutes are approved.

And I presume nobody read the August minutes yet.

MR. MACHTAY: I read the August minutes, I don't know if anybody else did.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I didn't.

MR. MACHTAY: Leave it for next month?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

(Discussion held off the record)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I'd like to remind all of you that there -- in your folder is the 2009 New York State Conference on the Environment Agenda, and we'd encourage anybody that can go to go. That doesn't mean that we can pay your way, but it would be nice if somebody could go.

All right. Any other correspondence, Jim, you want to --

MR. BAGG: No.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

Historic Trust. Do we have a report from our director?

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Just a brief report.

The Isaac Mills house in St. James, we do have a perspective tenant, which is -- was a Park Police person. And we're looking to move him in, hopefully, November 1st. We are restoring the roof -- the new wood roof on it, and we're hoping to get that job first -- done first, and some interior improvements before he can move in. But that'll be a great presence at that site. That was a long-term employee with the Parks Department.

And other housing issues, we're still looking to fill our other vacancies at this time, but we were very concerned with getting someone into that house.

The update on the custodial agreements. We are still working with the Town of Huntington on an agreement

for both the boathouse and the main house, which would then allow the town to trans- -- to provide for $600,000 towards the restoration of the boathouse. We're trying to have the timing coincide with our -- putting this project out to bid, which we plan to do this October. So we're going forward with those plans, and we're hoping that the funds will be able to add to that. But our plans have enough alternates that we can add additional work to the project and to get that done.

And we're also just getting up to the point of allowing the Babylon Town Historical Society to move into the Van Bourgondien house. We had to do a complete alarm system and upgrade the electric in that building before they can move in -- before we can get the CO for the -- so they can move in.

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Dan.

MR. PICHNEY: I just have --

Richard, that -- all that graffiti that's on the boathouse --

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. PICHNEY: -- is that a chronic problem?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. We're hoping, you know, with -- we're going to actually have a whole construction fence as part of this job. That will be taken care of, and we'll just have to keep monitoring it. We're going to be putting a -- we're going to be re-coating the building with new stucco that should be resistant, so this will be able to be cleaned off --

MR. PICHNEY: Cleaned easier.

MR. MARTIN: -- you know, easier. And with additional lighting and supervision --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- we're hoping that will take care of the problem.

MR. PICHNEY: Do the kids come in by boat or --

MR. MARTIN: No, they just walk in on the --

MR. PICHNEY: They just walk in from -- oh, right.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Question on the Isaac Mills house. You said it's a wood roof.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Wood shacks or -- I'm unclear on that.

MR. MARTIN: Shingles.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: I've seen -- oh, wood shingles.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: What type of wood? I'm curious.

MR. MARTIN: Cedar.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: I've seen it from -- the reason I ask is, I've seen it from a distance, I've never been -- was not aware that it was wood.

MR. MARTIN: It actually has it's original wood roof underneath, layers of

asphalt.

MS. GROWNEY: Wow.

MR. MARTIN: And we find that many of our buildings -- so no matter what, we have to strip it down to the framing. And we try, with the museum-quality buildings, to go back to the original wood design when we can.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Thank you.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Do you have more to your report, because I was going to ask --

MR. MARTIN: No.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- you a question about Third House and -- if anything is going on to finish the interior of the building.

MR. MARTIN: We actually have a meeting today with public works. I would -- would like -- I'm going to bring that up as to the timing. We did have to wait, though, until the Gator site was completed, because we have to move all the maintenance facilities and

operations out of Third House before we can really complete that interior, because a lot of it has to do with work down in the basement.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Is Gator almost done or --

MR. MARTIN: It's -- I won't say almost done, but it's -- it's started. You know, its on it's way.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: On its way.

MR. MARTIN: Yes. I would say -- I'll say the beginning of the year to be complete.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: And is there money -- any money in place --

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- to finish Third House?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. We have 500,000 in the capital fund for that, from the last go around, which we can use to complete the interior.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: So I can give an update on that at the next meeting.

MS. GROWNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva.

MS. GROWNEY: Since we're talking about Third House, I have another question that has to do with the Montauk Observatory.

Are they going to another county property, or they're looking for another county property, or they're going someplace else?

MR. MARTIN: They are taking a -- a look at some other sites. I don't know if Legislator Schneiderman could -- he was at the last meeting. And there's, I think, some new property the county's looking to acquire that looked good to them. And I think there was a six-month kind of --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah, I mean --

MS. GROWNEY: To stay in Montauk?

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- the

group is certainly very frustrated in the amount of time it's been taking to -- to get established. Third House was the place they wanted to be, but we can't seem to get past the -- whatever issues are still remaining, you know.

MR. MARTIN: It was design issues, really, at that site on literally fitting in the observatory into the historic district that we have there.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MS. GROWNEY: May I make --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: What about if it went further up that hill, away from the buildings?

MR. MARTIN: Well, all those ideas would have to come back to the CEQ for review, and the whole park has been declared eligible to -- to the Suffolk County Historic Trust and the National Register. So there would just always be concerns --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: It's a really beautiful, though, old-looking

observatory building.

MR. MARTIN: Well, we were told they -- there was no way, they could not have the dome design. That was the final --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: No, they could do without the dome. But I'm won- -- thinking if you went further up the hill, away from the cabins, and -- you know, maybe you could do a dome and it wouldn't interfere with anything. It would, you know, look really nice up there on that pasture.

MR. MARTIN: It could be proposed, you know, it -- but, essentially, it would be a new project that would have to come back to CEQ for review to the Historic Trust. And I thought you'd have to -- so that would have to mean that they were comfortable looking at alternate --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah, they're looking. I think they're going to look at the state -- at Camp Hero

facility --

MR. MARTIN: Uh-huh.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- as a possibility.

MR. MARTIN: Yes. What about the parcel you looked at --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: They looked at Boys Harbor property as --

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I'm not sure that that's going to work out there.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. Because I think the other issue, besides the observatory tower itself with the classroom space and what their needs were for that, and then some of these other locations, they could essentially build new without these guidelines and restrictions of --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MR. MARTIN: -- a historic area.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, I think -- yeah, one of the hurdles was the Long House -- Bunkhouse I think they

call it.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: And the county's desire to have the Montauk Observatory pay to refinish that building, which the numbers --

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- we're looking at several hundred thousand dollars.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I think that is a volunteer organization, it just can't do that. So, you know, one possibility is to take out the requirement in any kind of license agreement that they would have to refurbish that building.

MR. MARTIN: I guess that all could be looked at.

MS. GROWNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva.

MS. GROWNEY: Just so you know that the Web -- I -- I have to say that I did

do the study about going up the hill, and the issues that came up about that has to do with the trails, and that -- up that hill, there are some historic trails. Because when -- I was trying to separate it from that building.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I'm sure you could find a spot, though.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: It's just an open field.

MS. GROWNEY: And -- well, there was a -- then there was some other issues about protecting -- you know, because the horses -- the animals that get -- get loose up in that area. So there was -- and -- and also with them -- with the astronomers, the astrophysicists, they -- they didn't like the -- what was happening with the light that was coming from the harbor region. There was -- there was spill coming in that direction that became --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MS. GROWNEY: -- that presented a problem -- problem once you went over that hill.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: But that's why you have a dome. That's what the dome does.

MS. GROWNEY: I understand that. I understand that.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: It takes away the ambient light.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah. I understand that.

So that was some of the other things.

If I may suggest something to think about, and this would take it out of Montauk, but Hubbard County Park might have a spot.

MR. MARTIN: It might, but you also -- of course, run into historic district --

MS. GROWNEY: But --

MR. MARTIN: -- issues there also.

MS. GROWNEY: -- there are those

buildings that are use- -- the garages, there are several big garages which are perfect to be transformed into community space very easily. And you would not be impinging upon any of the historic buildings, because those are separated away from, actually, the historic buildings that are there. And since I worked on the study of that for two years, I know that could be a really good site.

MS. SPENCER: Are they talking about Smiths?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MS. SPENCER: That entire site has been dedicated. So these structures that you talk about are, in fact, listed, and they are historic --

MS. GROWNEY: The garages are listed?

MS. SPENCER: Yes.

MS. GROWNEY: The -- the --

MS. SPENCER: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: The contributing

buildings.

MS. SPENCER: They are listed --

MS. GROWNEY: The contributing buildings.

MS. SPENCER: Yes. Yes. And I find --

MS. GROWNEY: I didn't know that.

MS. SPENCER: -- Hubbard, in its entirety, far more sensitive than Montauk.

MS. GROWNEY: Well, I agree with you about the sensitivity, it's just that the buildings are concrete --

MS. SPENCER: The buildings are listed.

MS. GROWNEY: -- the concrete blocks --

MS. SPENCER: The buildings --

MS. GROWNEY: -- with metal.

I didn't know that.

MS. SPENCER: -- are listed.

MS. GROWNEY: I didn't know that.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MS. GROWNEY: All right.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I can, you know, see what went on at that meeting. I don't know what the commissioner feels, but I thought there was some agreement that those -- that parkland was a possibility, you know.

MS. GROWNEY: What about Sears Bellows where the old horse buildings are?

MR. MARTIN: Again, you know, there's -- there's a lot of parkland, you know, in the Flanders area that we could, you know --

MS. GROWNEY: Uh-huh.

MR. MARTIN: -- consider, I guess, but what are the group's needs and the sense of the area that they wanted to be in.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: What about the Linley House? Is anything going on there at the Linley House?

MR. MARTIN: I -- no. I think --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: For those of you who don't know, the Linley House

is a --

MR. MARTIN: Right.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- house within the Park System --

MS. GROWNEY: Right.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- way set back. It's an old, I guess, World War II structure. It's a --

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- concrete type of barracks or whatever you want to call it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Bunker.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Bunker.

MS. GROWNEY: Bunker.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Concrete bunker.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: That's the one that's on top of a hill in Montauk?

MR. BAGG: Yeah.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: No. It's kind of in the woods a little, you know.

MR. BAGG: Yeah, but it's on --

MR. MARTIN: It's on a --

MR. BAGG: -- like the --

MR. MARTIN: -- hill --

MR. BAGG: -- side of a bluff.

MR. MARTIN: A bluff, right, that overlooks --

MS. GROWNEY: But it's south -- south of the highway; right?

MR. MARTIN: North.

MS. GROWNEY: It is north.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Is that empty now or --

MR. MARTIN: I think the tenant is still there, and I know the commissioner was looking into the legality of that tenancy at this point.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: That could be a possible conversion.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: That was one with the lifetime tenancy?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MS. GROWNEY: Oh, right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MS. SPENCER: Is someone looking into Camp Hero? That seems like a -- the best --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: That's a --

MS. GROWNEY: Spot.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- possibility.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

MS. SPENCER: That's a large and not particularly historically sensitive --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: There's a lot of old buildings there that --

MS. SPENCER: Right.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- you know, even that old satellite --

MS. GROWNEY: Right.

MR. MARTIN: The radar.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- right on the top there. They're talking about getting rid of the satellite dish, which I hope they don't do, but it's

getting --

MR. MARTIN: Right.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- dangerous because it's rusting out. But that could be an interesting spot to put an observatory at the top of that building.

MS. SPENCER: Or some of the other abandoned buildings on that site. I mean, that's a --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MS. SPENCER: -- an underutilized site.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN:

Certainly.

So that's the next step, we're going to talk to the state. It's hard to believe that the state process might go faster than the county's process, but --

MS. SPENCER: Yeah, well, that's true. That's true.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: It's unfortunate.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right. Anything else, Richard?

MR. MARTIN: I don't have anything.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: What's the status of having a meeting at one of your park sites?

MR. MARTIN: Again, we've, I think, agreed that we're going to meet at the Isaac Mills House.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yup. When?

MR. MARTIN: So I guess that's your decision. All I'll need to do is move some tables and chairs, and, you know, the heat is on.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

So, Jim, let's make arrangements to do that.

MR. BAGG: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right. Thank you.

Suffolk County Parks. We're going to have an update.

MR. GIBBONS: Whatever you want, Larry.

(Laughter)

MR. GIBBONS: Good morning.

MS. SPENCER: Good morning.

MS. GROWNEY: Good morning, Nick.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Before we begin, has anybody told you what we wanted you to do?

MR. GIBBONS: No. Let's start with that --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. GIBBONS: -- and I'll work from there.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right.

Several months ago now, we got into a discussion with Parks and sort of what the status of various parks were with regard to maintenance, use, all aspects of it. And so we decided that informally it would be helpful to us if we could get an informal assessment of what's going on at some of the parks around the county. And just to bring us up to date, because we're pretty much in the dark. And, as a consequence, you

were volunteered --

MR. GIBBONS: Here I am.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- to do that. And, you know, we didn't want to make this an onerous task of having a formal written report or anything, but just --

MR. GIBBONS: Oh, no worries there.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Pick a park for a meeting, and tell us what's going on, and what the problems are, what we need to do, if anything.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, I'm not necessarily in a position to say everything I'd like to.

(Laughter)

MR. MACHTAY: Just as an aside, having read the minutes --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. MACHTAY: -- okay -- you were particularly interested in one park. To get a report on that, and as well as a

general report on everything. And that was Theodore Roosevelt --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MS. GROWNEY: Yes. Third House.

MR. MACHTAY: -- and also what the Nature Conservancy had done -- what John Turner had done, or the Nature Conservancy, whichever, where they were supposed to be burning -- I -- I know so little about these parks. Where they are or --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. MACHTAY: -- you know, what they are. And so I highlighted everything in the minutes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Well, thank you.

The burning, we haven't heard anything about for several years, and, of course, that was a very contentious issue for --

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, it was.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- a decade.

So that's, in general, what we want to do and --

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. We can -- we can certainly start in Montauk.

We haven't burned there, so there's very little to report on that.

We have -- you may recall, we went to the EIS process with this group. There is a -- as part of that, we identified a 290-acre grassland management area. It's not strictly a burn plan. We talked about a lot of different tools that may be available for the county's use as they see fit with our partner out there, which is the Nature Conservancy.

Among other things are mechanical treatments of -- particularly to preserve a graph on habitat areas. So we're talking about trying to reverse some of the natural plant succession that goes on in that -- within that 290-acre area.

We have done some of the mechanical treatments. They've been somewhat successful. I think at the end of the

day, at some point in time, we're going to have to get back to burning. A lot of that biomass is simply just cut and left in place, so it's impeding grassland colonization of the property.

One of the other things we talked about but what we -- which we have not enlisted, is the use of herbicide. That was a contentious item in that as well.

We have done it at -- in other parks, and, in fact, we're doing a project just this week. We can talk about that, too, but that has not been enlisted out at Montauk.

We did get a, roughly, 250- -- $300,000 grant through the -- our own water quality protection program, to not only advance the mission of that plan at Montauk but at three other sites within county parks. And these are existing grassland areas that we want to preserve in that state, if possible. But doing so is high maintenance and you're -- you're fighting natural processes, so

it's -- it's a tall task.

There are other sites, though, that are -- I won't say similar to Montauk, but similar in the sense that they are grassland habitats, we have identified them as significant, and we're trying to keep them in that condition.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So why was the burning stopped, because it was just such a contentious issue?

MR. GIBBONS: No, not for that reason. In fact, most of the contention came here, from this group, which was fine. But once we had that in place, we had -- we were in a position to move past that and actually implement the plan.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. GIBBONS: What happens, as is often the case, is identifying the resources to actually get fire, quote, unquote, on the ground. And the real sense is, it's a lot of work. There's probably six or eight months of

paperwork and, you know, behind the scenes, lining up those resources to actually get a couple of days of burning on the ground. So that -- that's tough.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. GIBBONS: In the interim, the Nature Conservancy saw fit to pursue with County Parks an agreement that would allow them and -- not indemnify them, but a recognition that we were in this together in a legal sense. So they went forward with an effort to get together a -- a management agreement, a cooperative agreement between us and them legally. So that involved not only their attorneys but, of course, the county attorney as well. And the process took nearly 18 months.

During that time, all operations in terms of burning were suspended at Theodore Roosevelt pending that document. That request came from the Nature Conservancy.

Prior to that, my former

supervisor, Bill Sickles, he was the senior superintendent of the Parks Department, and his equivalent on the Nature Conservancy side, they felt a letter sufficed between the two agencies, ourselves and Nature Conservancy, to allow for this, because we were really working hand in hand with them at the site. But Nature Conservancy got away from that. They were not -- no longer comfortable with that so they requested this management agreement be put into effect. So that process delayed us as well.

Without giving you too many more details, the Nature Conservancy also cut back staff. Locally here and nationally as well, but locally they cut their position with their -- what's called a "burn boss," that's somebody who can run these events -- these burns. So we don't have one locally at Nature Conservancy at this time. That happened at the beginning of this year.

So, in the interim, we got that management agreement finally in place between us and Nature Conservancy, and they're looking towards the spring of 2010 to finally get back to burning within the county park.

I know you personally have issues with that as well, but I think we've -- you know, inasmuch as they were identified in the EIS, and those comments were taken under -- under consideration that we're ready to move forward. Parks has -- we do have our own staff that are qualified to participate in these burns. We can't run them. I don't foresee the day where we -- we'll be in a position to run one of these on our own. So it's critical that we have these partnering agencies. And besides CNC, I should have acknowledged both the Montauk Fire District and the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. They also participated in

these events as well.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Couldn't Chuck Hamilton run it?

MR. GIBBONS: No, he's not a qualified burn boss, actually.

DEC does have one in their forest ranger division.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: You mentioned herbicides.

MR. GIBBONS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I'm surprised that we're still doing that in county parks.

MR. BAGG: Didn't we have a law against it?

MR. GIBBONS: Well, we have a local law, there's a pesticide phaseout law that was implemented fully. It requires -- you get an exemption if you want to do that. We get -- just as a point of information, annually, you have to get these exemptions to use any pesticide of any kind within county parks and, in fact, any county

properties. But I'll just speak to county parks. We get one every year for -- to treat poison ivy. That's a public safety issue, it's recognized as such. The quantities are identified and approved by this independent citizens -- Pesticide Phaseout Committee, which is a mix of both county agency personnel, I'm on that as well --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: So am I.

MR. GIBBONS: -- and also --

That's right, Legislator Schneiderman is on it as well, as is -- Citizens Campaign for the Environment, a local --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Cornell.

MR. GIBBONS: -- breast cancer organization.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Cornell Cooperative.

MR. GIBBONS: Cornell Cooperative Extension. They're actually -- they --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Chair.

MR. GIBBONS: -- run the program to

some extent for the county.

So, yeah, you're surprised, but I'll -- the way I'll explain that briefly is that we've -- we've sought the expertise of the Nature Conservancy, Cornell Cooperative Extension, and others, in terms of some of these invasive species that we're tackling. A project that I -- I mentioned previously.

The most environmentally appropriate way, and it seems kind of counter-intuitive, is to implement herbicide. And that was -- specifically, this is at Cedar Point County Park. It's in -- it's a population of Ailanthus, the tree of heaven. "The tree" that grew in Brooklyn. This is a very pervasive-invasive -- from Asia, and it colonizes disturbed areas.

And Cedar Point County Park has been identified as a "weed prevention zone," which means it's a -- a very

intact community of otherwise native vegetation. And it's been recognized regionally as such. And this is a -- an opportunity for us to sort of draw a line in the sand and combat any of these small, invasive populations within that weed prevention zone.

So Cedar Point has a plan, and maybe that's something you guys would be interested in seeing, that identifies invasives within the park, and then proposes management activities to tackle those issues.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Michael.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: In the EIS for the burning, didn't we put in a provision that herbicides could be used as an alternative control measure if the burnings were either ineffective or in place of the burnings; was that part of the EIS?

MR. GIBBONS: At least subject to

the comments we received here, the -- specifically within that area, herbicide use is prohibited. I'd have to check.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I know we wanted to try physical --

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- removal, and you say that's causing problems because you just -- you can't get rid of the brush?

MR. GIBBONS: That's right, and that -- that grant that we got from the county, we're considering purchasing our own equipment so that we can maintain that on a routine basis as opposed to bringing in a private contractor and paying on a per-acreage basis. So it's something we could tackle as time permitted.

There's a lot of off-season at Montauk. And while there's a lot of other priorities within the park, if we had a standing piece of equipment within

the Park System, as time permitted, they could sort of chip away at that.

MR. BAGG: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Jim.

MR. BAGG: Yeah. In Montauk, when the Nature Conservancy did a couple of control burns to begin with, they ended up with a lot of weeds coming in. They didn't get Sanplain Girardi (phonetic) coming in which they thought was going to repopulate the area, they ended up with a lot of weeds coming back up, and they didn't understand or foresee that.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, they did artificially propagate and reintroduce Sanplain Girardi into the park. So we do have a population.

MR. BAGG: But the burning didn't accomplish what they thought it was going to accomplish.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, I'll qualify that by saying the burn accomplished -- structurally, you have a grassland there. There are issues with the

composition of the species, that's true.

MR. BAGG: I mean, in addition, some of these other mechanical means -- like we're now reviewing Robinson's duck farm --

MR. GIBBONS: Uh-huh.

MR. BAGG: -- and you got a big field full of mugwort, I understand, that's been maintained mechanically. And we're starting to do research to say, You mow that stuff down, it causes the rye zones to spread out, and that entire field is now almost entirely mugwort.

MR. GIBBONS: That's true.

MR. BAGG: So that means of -- of keeping it afield may actually be causing the mugwort to expand rather than -- or even burning, because what they recommended is to take the top plant out and plow the field for a couple years so it exposes the rye zones when they dry out.

MR. GIBBONS: Right. Well, that

site that you're talking about, that's about a 40-acre grassland that's in Brookhaven, just south of Southaven County Park.

I -- it's -- it's under my direction that that's mowed once a year, and --

(WHEREUPON, Ms. Joy Squires joins the proceeding in progress.)

(Time noted: 10:19 a.m.)

MR. GIBBONS: -- yes, ideally, I'm -- there are -- there are better ways to treat it, but I would rather tackle sometime down the road 40 acres of mugwort than 40 acres of Russian olive or something else woodier that would have colonized the site.

So I'm trying to buy us some time at that particular site. But, yes, I'm -- I'm open to suggestions. It's just a matter of personnel and resources to actually do things the right way as opposed to deferring a decision to later on, whereas -- if I were to leave that

unchecked, I'm not sure we could ever tackle it if it were colonized by woodies.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Let's go back to Third House area.

MR. GIBBONS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: What other issues do we have with regard to just general environment?

MR. GIBBONS: Within Montauk?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MR. GIBBONS: We had -- we touched on it earlier, we're -- we're doing an adaptive reuse up at the Gator site.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: Another project that was discussed at length at -- at this body was the cellphone emergency --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

MR. GIBBONS: -- communications tower at Gator as well.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: Those two projects are somewhat running in parallel, but

I -- I sincerely hope that the -- and expect that the maintenance facility for our own park staff will be completed long before we ever get the emergency communications up.

There have been many fits and starts with that project. And I won't -- I won't take up your time with that today, but --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, just give us a sense of how long it's going to be before anything happens with that.

MR. GIBBONS: With the communications towers?

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: You can take the Fifth Amendment if you want to.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Nothing's going to happen in the next few months.

MR. GIBBONS: No. No. No, there won't be.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: What is the issue?

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Do they have a provider?

MR. GIBBONS: There isn't an issue, there are many issues.

When we came to you, we were in -- we had an agreement with the Montauk Fire District -- Parks and the Montauk Fire District. Everything after that was the fire district's problem.

Their cell provider and the Montauk Fire District just -- they had a parting of ways.

In the interim, the county has an agreement with T-Mobile to develop cellphone sites.

I believe the latest is now we're in a position where we have to get a separate agreement, again, through the county attorney's office, between Parks and T-Mobile that allows T-Mobile to come up to that site. It's not covered under their umbrella policy because that doesn't consider Parks properties.

Actually, Jim could jump in at any

time. He -- he sits on the cell committee. I -- I don't wish to, nor do I pretend to.

MR. BAGG: Well, what the problem is, is basically, CEQ said that it can be two monopoles. Roughly, I think they're 80 feet tall. On that side, to replace phone poles, they have to be brown. So that's --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: So they're going to look like the poles that are up there.

MR. BAGG: Right. So they'll look like.

So those are the parameters within which they're discussing it with T-Mobile. But now, because T-Mobile puts up their own phone lines, now the fire districts want their equipment in there, they want to put their phone lines up there, there's a question as to who's going to pay for that. The police department, you know, want their phone equipment up there, and -- and their own

shelters and everything. So now we have a whole group of players, of which T-Mobile has to get together with, to determine what they can and cannot do and who's going to pay for what.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So it's really out of the county's purview at this point. It's between T-Mobile and all these other users?

MR. BAGG: And the county attorney's office and -- and the cellphone staff over there. We've had meetings, but -- there's going to be another meeting out there with T-Mobile to find out exactly what T-Mobile is willing to construct and the monies they're willing to spend, and where monies will come from in terms of the fire district and the police department --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, we started out --

MR. BAGG: -- and everything else.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- as a

way so people could make 911 calls.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I mean, there was a certain sense of urgency --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yup.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- to getting this done because there was no cell communication in this area. Whatever can be done to expedite this thing, because they've been waiting a long time now.

Certainly, I just wanted to say, I recall this project from really the beginning of when I first came here. So it's like six years --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MR. BAGG: Oh, yeah, it's been a long time.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: You know, it seems to me that a lot of peripheral issues are being tacked on to the basic objective that we had, and that was to get 911 calls.

MR. BAGG: Right, but it was

supposed to be constructed by the fire district and I believe monies from the Town of East Hampton, and now that's --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Dried up. They have no money.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

MR. BAGG: -- that's up in the air --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: They can't find it.

MR. BAGG: -- so now the question is -- is --

I mean --

MS. GROWNEY: But T-Mobile can find it.

MR. BAGG: -- we're going to have another meeting out there --

MR. GULBRANSEN: You're asking the county to provide funds to build this tower?

MR. BAGG: No, no, no, no. T-Mobile would build it, but the question here is, is they want to build it for their own service and then

they'll lease out parts of the tower to other service providers.

MR. GULBRANSEN: I hope you have the right --

MR. BAGG: But now you got -- you got a fire district that wants to put their own equipment in there, you got a police department. The tower's only 80 feet tall, so how many antennas can you fit within the pole? I mean, it now becomes a little bit more difficult.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: I'll just say, though, that, Larry, my role is to make sure that whatever design comes up, it conforms to the conditions that were agreed to and established here.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: So in that sense, that project is -- it's moving, but it -- it's -- like I said, it's had a lot of mishaps.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: There is a tower now at Camp Hero, within Camp

Hero State Park. Not a huge one, but it's got a lot hanging on it. So --

MR. GIBBONS: Yeah. I wasn't aware.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah. Well, I was in the camp the other day, I noticed it. I didn't know it was there until I went hiking, but --

MS. SQUIRES: Does it provide the service that's needed?

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I guess not, because I still --

MS. SQUIRES: Can you tell?

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- I think it's still needed over there at the Gator site.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: What is the situation with Rusty Lever (phonetic) and the horse show -- horse farm?

MS. GROWNEY: Horse show.

(Laughter)

MR. GIBBONS: What situation?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Is that still an intact --

MR. GIBBONS: Status quo.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- agreement?

MR. GIBBONS: Actually, his agreement is either expired or --

Do you know?

MR. MARTIN: I'm not sure, but I think it's either expired --

MR. GIBBONS: Or eminent.

MR. MARTIN: -- or extended to early next year.

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Can we get an update on that?

MR. GIBBONS: I can find that out, yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And are you happy with him as a tenant?

MR. GIBBONS: I'll look into that.

(Laughter)

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Now, take the Fifth.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I didn't mean this to be a -- as a sensitive issue --

MR. GIBBONS: Would you like the

commissioner at the next meeting, is that what we're getting to?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Well, this was --

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- a big issue that was before us many, many times on --

MR. GIBBONS: That's why these contracts expire, so that we have an opportunity to renegotiate the terms and see whether or not the concessionaire is still interested in -- that's an opportunity for Parks and the concessionaire to put everything on the table and try and hammer out the next term.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. I think we would like to know what the status of that agreement --

MR. GIBBONS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- is --

MR. GIBBONS: I'll find out, yup.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- and whether

the county is happy, and what are the issues.

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. PICHNEY: Since I wasn't here when -- a couple of years ago when all this discussion about herbicides and so forth, I don't know who can answer this question.

One thing I -- I guess I just don't understand is that, some of the herbicides that can be used -- you know, like the active ingredient in -- in Roundup -- what is that, just a phosphate?

MR. GIBBONS: Glyphosate?

MR. PICHNEY: Is that how you pronounce it? Okay.

Still persist in the environment, you know, all that long. So, you know, we're not talking about, you know, a silent spring sort of a situation. And why can't something like that, you know, be used just, you know, to be able to --

you know, to tackle the mass of effort we have with invasives in all our parks?

I mean, in just what Jim was saying with the mugwort, I read in Weeds of -- of the Northeastern United States, and I think some people from -- from Cornell wrote the book, were saying that mugwort doesn't even reduce viable seeds. And -- and so it doesn't -- doesn't spread that way. It all -- it is all -- all rye zones. So when you cut it, you're propagating it.

So I guess what I'm -- what I'm getting at is, what was -- was the decision to -- to ban herbicides -- I don't want to use the term "knee jerk," but, you know, in -- in terms of, we're going to ban all herbicides rather than thinking about what a particular herbicide does in terms of its -- how it affects the environment, you know, microorganisms and so forth, and how it would affect -- and how long it lasts in the soil, all these considerations that

would make it a very viable tool for the battle against invasives.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We did not ban herbicides. I think that the issue is bigger than just --

MR. BAGG: It comes from the legislature.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- this committee. But we certainly did, you know, raise concerns about its use, and, you know, we -- we were -- in this case, there was burning, there were herbicides, there were physical processes.

MR. BAGG: Right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And, at the time, there was sort of this overwhelming march to -- we're going to burn down the East End, and --

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- we tried to put the brakes on that --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: That was the approach.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- a little bit, and encourage, in particular, physical processes.

MR. PICHNEY: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And that's my recollection of it.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Also, at the time, there was a rather large comprehension that the county was using a lot of chemicals indiscriminantly.

MR. PICHNEY: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: And this also tied up with a county golf course proposal.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: And, basically, a lot of people became very, very concerned that the indiscriminate use of chemicals without further analysis might start destroying parks.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: And so that sort of snowballed. It got a little bit, shall we say, holier-than-thou in

certain ways --

MR. PICHNEY: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- and it went a little too far, in my opinion. Basically, we would ban most chemicals in county parklands to try and set an example for the rest of the county, and also start managing them more carefully by setting up a committee to look at this stuff, and basically authorize them more as an exception rather than anything else. So that's why you got fertilizers being reduced on county property, you had pesticides being reduced on county property, herbicides and things like that.

MR. PICHNEY: Uh-huh.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: And, again, this happened seven, eight years ago, something like that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Certainly, between yourself and Gloria, we have a certain amount of expertise here. And, you know, if you want to raise that as

sort of a project that we should look into, we can -- we can do that.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, let me just jump in here, Dan --

MR. PICHNEY: Okay.

MR. GIBBONS: -- and just explain that.

I think there was an expectation that at some point in time it was -- the use of pesticides within county parks would end. It would sunset and that would be it, we would move on pesticide-free.

MR. PICHNEY: Uh-huh.

MR. GIBBONS: There was this committee set up, but I think that there was an expectation which proved to be unrealistic that that group would disband, too. There would be no need for them.

Well, the reality is, there's more of a need for them now than ever.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: And with the science

that has now caught up to -- to the county level, we're beginning to understand that there's going to be more of these, not less.

County golf courses, that's -- forget about that. That's a totally different animal compared to what we're talking about here in terms of environmental restoration.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: The focus of that was really on the county golf courses, our four golf courses and their use of herbicide, and when.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: And that'll continue as well. But if you take a look at their annual reports, you'll see that the use has significantly diminished from when we started this in -- I think it's '99. So it's ten years now.

But now places like Cedar Point, Montauk, places we never would have thought of before to use herbicide are

becoming the more appropriate ecological means to tackle these things.

MR. PICHNEY: Uh-huh.

MR. GIBBONS: So -- and it's a -- it's a very hands-on process. Because it's only a year, you have to come back to them every year, and that just forces your hand to provide for them a report and convince them that this is still the appropriate way to go.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: I won't say it's particularly onerous, it's a good -- it keeps us honest and it -- it just -- like I say, it forces that communication between us and the group.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: And that -- that is helpful.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: And I don't feel like they've stood in the way, they've asked good questions and they've made sure that we -- we're in a good position.

You could imagine that coming into Cedar Point County Park in East Hampton and beginning to apply herbicide, there's a public -- you know, we post it there, there are signs that explain what we're doing. But the public -- there's a shock element there, and it's helpful to be able to point to an independent body that says, Well, this is just not Parks going out on their own, this is something that's been endorsed by this group of ten individuals.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

Well, you know -- you know, we have -- we have -- you know, we have discussed in -- you know, in the past, like a -- you know, combining, you know, mechanical means with the herbicide. Like, you know, cutting the Ailanthus trees and then applying something to the -- the stump that'll kill the root. So it's -- it's not aerosol --

MR. GIBBONS: Right.

MR. PICHNEY: -- it's concentrated

and they're systemic, and, you know, the -- the chemical doesn't, you know, last more than a few days in the soil. And that's that, and you don't -- and you don't have an issue.

And, again, with the -- the mugwort, mostly, it -- it seems to come into disturbed areas, and since -- as I've mentioned, it doesn't produce any viable seed. Once you get rid of it, you know, there's a good chance -- a very good chance that it doesn't come back. And then you look at -- we were talking about that before, native plants can -- can colonize.

So -- and, you know, to make decisions based on golf courses, when we -- when we have parks and historic sites being swallowed by Bittersweet, literally, and -- and -- and other plants, it's just -- you know, it's just crazy to me.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Remember what I said, though --

MR. PICHNEY: I know.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- it was a holier-than-thou attitude --

MR. PICHNEY: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- a while back, in 1999, whatever --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- it was. And it was an entire movement to ban everything where possible. And I don't think it was a nuanced approach. I don't think --

MR. PICHNEY: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- it was the best approach at the time.

MR. BAGG: Well --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: I think we went a little too far overboard.

MR. BAGG: But that's why they formed a committee to grant exemptions.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: That was a safety valve on it.

MR. BAGG: I mean, the first thing that came to mind with the county and

how they -- and the health department was, is how do you get rid of bedbugs and lice in the jails if you can't use some type of pesticide? I mean, that was the first thing that came to the forefront.

I mean, since that time, we've had some things with phragmites. I mean, phragmites is also, you know, a plant that propagates through rye zones. And to get rid of it, I mean, you have to dig up half the wetland.

So the idea is, is Nature Conservancy, in some areas as well as parks, wanted to go and, what they call, take Roundup or Rodeo, and with the plants -- in other words, you only put it on the plants in order to kill the plants in the rye zones, and then go back in and replant with something else.

MR. GIBBONS: At Cedar Point, I should just add, we're -- we're ignoring phragmites. Just --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: The population is stable, it's not expanding, and it's not something we're looking to tackle at this point in time.

So that -- that is one outlier, we're just too -- not considering --

MR. BAGG: Because that was an alternative on the Peconic River when they did the restorations, how do you get rid of the phrag- --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. So we better move on.

MR. GIBBONS: Sounds good.

MS. SQUIRES: I --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes, Joy.

MS. SQUIRES: I just had a couple of good things to tell you, if I may, regarding Parks.

First of all, when we look at land at CEQ and we approve the purchase of open space, sometimes you have questions in regard to (inaudible). And Nick and I want to tell you quickly about two very positive uses. These were county

acquisitions with the Town of Huntington, and then the Town of Huntington was required to do the infrastructure.

In one case, the first case, the Prominock Wetlands (phonetic), which is adjacent to Walt Whitman High School, just south of Jericho Turnpike, we -- our requirement was that we provide programming trails, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. So with the committee that includes Nick and Alex MaKay who's the Huntington Suffolk County Park Trustee, the Town of Huntington has a consultant, they're working with Walt Whitman High School, with the teachers there. I think it's going to be a model of several different -- the county, the town, the school district all working together. So that's happening, and the trails will be cut.

The other is a very huge allocation of money that went for Veterans Park.

That complex, which is a very large, active, and passive recreational complex, is getting rave reviews. For use and people talking about it, it's a model, and -- and it's being used all over. There are two synthetic fields --

Now, Jim's going to ask, what's going to happen? Who knows what the -- what -- you know, they researched it, they did the best with the synthetic fields. But that's also getting rave notices.

So when the county and a town work together, good things can happen.

So thank you, Nick, for your help.

MS. GROWNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva.

MS. GROWNEY: I want to talk about something, Dan, that you mentioned, the application of how these chemicals are used. I think the general public -- certainly I don't understand what you just said. I mean, didn't know that that's the way things are done. And so

I know my first knee-jerk reaction is no pesticides, no chemicals.

So, perhaps, there is an educational component here that needs to be addressed. Because if things are done in such a way that -- that -- as you said, it's applied directly to the plant, to, perhaps, the stem, or whatever, and it's a -- it's a small period of time that it exists, that it -- if it dissipates, I don't know how -- I mean, it goes into the atmosphere I'm sure, I guess, and not just the soil or whatever. I think that is probably the biggest issue that people don't understand. It's -- the word just gets so -- it's scary. But when you understand really what -- what the whole piece -- all the pieces are, and what the final results is, then I think that makes a -- a more -- a knowledgeable -- a base of knowledge that may be is -- is a -- creates a better understanding and acceptability.

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Rich.

MR. MACHTAY: I think it was Dan at the last meeting, and I think it's in the minutes, who said we should get some kind of a general overview of all the parks. I know if you ask me to name all the parks or tell you where all the parks are, I couldn't do that. I can barely do that within the Town of Huntington. I doubt that very many people know the parks outside their own local vicinity.

Nick's job is probably daunting enough without --

MS. SQUIRES: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: -- having to do anything else, all the meetings he goes to and what have you, but is there such a list with locations and a little synopsis of what is available at a particular park?

MR. GIBBONS: There is a list. The county parks holdings are approaching

roughly 50,000 acres of property within Suffolk County. In -- in your area, those run the gamete from West Hills County Park, several hundred acres, to a property we have in Halesite that's roughly the size of these tables, at the intersection of Route 110 and Park Avenue. Literally in the middle of a traffic circle.

MR. MACHTAY: It's going to be a traffic circle when --

MR. GIBBONS: It will be -- that's right. That location. And I'm begging DOT to take the whole thing instead of leaving the piece that's roughly the size of this table.

(Laughter)

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: And Nick -- Nick, we're required EIS.

(Laughter)

MR. MACHTAY: But -- but I'm not talking about --

(Laughter)

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: We're

Pos Decing it.

MR. MACHTAY: -- about -- about, you know, the Town of Huntington, which I --

MR. GIBBONS: Well, I just say -- I use that example number -- be- -- primarily because you're from there, but I could provide those examples to each of the ten towns.

MR. MACHTAY: Yeah.

MR. GIBBONS: So I'm -- I'm not sure what the value is to an exercise like that, but there is a list. It's as complete as I can make it. Which is to say, it's outdated, the minute we pick up a new piece of property, we add it to that.

MR. MACHTAY: Well, I -- I can't hike quite as much as I used to, my legs are -- aren't quite as what they used to be, but I know I go out to Sag Harbor -- Harbor on a -- on a regular basis, East Hampton on a regular basis, out to Montauk on a regular basis, and, you

know, if I knew there was a park where I could do a little hiking or where I could take my bicycle with me and -- and perhaps ride my bike, that would be wonderful, you know.

MR. GIBBONS: We have a park guide --

MR. MACHTAY: But I don't know that it's there.

MR. GIBBONS: We have a public -- we have publications that we provide to the general public.

Oftentimes, this group is focused on properties that, for the vast majority of the residents of Suffolk County, they will never use, see, or know of. And for good reasons that the county's purchasing these anyway. This site in Halesite, notwithstanding, but there are many of those as well.

But for a variety of reasons, we've purchased properties for watershed protection, what have you, those types of programs.

So, yes, I can provide to each of the members our Parks User Guide, and that's kind of a jumping-off point. And -- and then different activities are allowed in some places and not in others. So there's -- there's definitely a learning curve there. But it's -- I don't think that's something I could pull together and do efficiently for the group.

MR. MARTIN: Nick, do you want to just mention what we're working on at the Scully estate?

MR. GIBBONS: Sure.

The Scully estate, are you familiar with that?

MR. MACHTAY: No, I'm not.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay.

That's a relatively recent county acquisition. I'm sure it predates your membership here, but that is -- has been adopted as the -- officially, the Suffolk County Environmental Interpretive Center.

What we want to do there -- this site is a -- is a historic estate property. It's very limited in square footage that can be dedicated to an environmental interpretive center of that scale, you know, I think of what was originally envisioned.

So what we'd like to do is make that more of a -- a general visitor center for the universal park holdings. So you would come to this site, you would learn about the types of things that you're asking me --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: -- and learn about the parks in a virtual way; see what they had to offer in your area of interest. And then you could use that as a jumping-off point to explore the rest of that.

MR. MACHTAY: Okay. That sounds interesting enough to --

MR. GIBBONS: That's coming in 2014, give or take.

MR. MACHTAY: Well, if I live that long.

MS. SPENCER: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Quickly, because I want to move on.

MS. SPENCER: I know you do.

One quick question came up, Historic Trust, last week, and that was -- the question is, are -- are the kettle holes in Suffolk County identified and/or listed in some way?

MR. GIBBONS: Wetlands are identified and inventoried by New York State DEC. So there are -- in a very basic sense, there are two different kinds of wetlands. There are those that are regulated and those that are not.

Kettle holes are a particular type of wetlands. If I had to guess, I would say the vast majority of those are regulated by New York State DEC.

In my experience, it's very infrequent that I encounter a wetland that is not mapped by DEC. That may

have to do with the fact that it's on Park's property and they took a closer and harder look at those properties when the maps were developed in the '70s and early '80s. But for -- for the vast majority of the time, DEC has identified, and those wetlands are regulated as such under Article 24, which is the Freshwater Wetlands Act under the Environmental Conservation Law. That's administered by DEC.

MS. SPENCER: So by DEC and -- and -- in your opinion, does this include most of the significant --

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MS. SPENCER: -- kettle holes in Suffolk County?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. And there is a process by which you can petition the DEC if they're -- if a particular wetland is of interest and people feel that that may have been missed, there's a procedure by which you can have a map amended. It's a big deal, it takes a

lot, but it can be done.

MR. BAGG: (Indicating)

MS. SPENCER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Jim.

MR. BAGG: Yeah, if I might point out, not all kettle holes are wetlands.

MS. GROWNEY: Right.

MR. BAGG: The predominant one -- the biggest one I've seen, next to Lake Ronkonkoma, is out in Riverhead. As you turn into the Suffolk Community College in there, it drops like a hundred feet straight down off the road. People don't even know it's in there.

But, also, people don't realize that kettling came -- topography is a direct result from glaciation. And although we have them on Long Island, the glaciers went entirely across the entire United States, and that topography is entirely across the whole country. It's just not unique to Long Island.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MS. SPENCER: Thank you, Larry.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So next month if you could give us an update on Rusty Lever.

MR. GIBBONS: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Another part that I would be interested in, and I don't want to -- maybe other people have some suggestions, but one that was certainly -- we talked a lot about here was the Black Duck Lodge, and suddenly it's -- to me, it's just dropped off the table. And I'd like to know what's going on there.

MS. GROWNEY: Me, too, Larry.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, it's more Richard's purview than mine, but --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Well --

MR. GIBBONS: -- in the sense of the building, but we could --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I'll let you sort that all out.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right.

MR. GIBBONS: Black Duck Lodge, just to be clear, Larry, that's -- that's within Hubbard County Park, which --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Right.

MR. GIBBONS: -- includes Smithers -- so are you talking about Hubbard in the general sense then or --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: You know, we were going to make that a bed-and-breakfast in --

MS. GROWNEY: Right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- that --

MR. GIBBONS: Right. That's a while ago, but -- okay. We were not planning on that at this time, no.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. But, you know, that sort of the last we hear of it, and then --

MR. GIBBONS: All right. But that's --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So what do we do

do?

MS. GROWNEY: Well, we did do a study -- there was a study done on it --

MR. GIBBONS: There --

MS. GROWNEY: -- by the architect.

MR. GIBBONS: There's an update to provide --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Good.

MR. GIBBONS: -- so we'll do that. So is that sufficient then or --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yup.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay. Great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right. Recommended Type II Actions:

We have ratification of recommendations for the legislature.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Motion to accept.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a motion to accept staff recommendations.

Do we have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: I'll second.

MS. RUSSO: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

The next item on our agenda has been postponed, that's the Love Learning Center.

Recommended Unlisted Actions:

Proposed sidewalks on County Road 92, Town of Huntington.

Thank you for your patience.

MR. MACKEY: You're welcome.

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Good morning.

MR. MACKEY: My name's Russ Mackey. I'm a licensed engineer working on behalf of Suffolk County, Department of Public Works in the Consultant Management Division.

Alongside me here today is Tim Quinn from Nelson & Pope consulting firm, and he will further present the projects.

MR. QUINN: Okay. I guess we'll do these in order.

Just as a general overview, the project includes four locations where we're putting in sidewalks along county roads. All right. One location has already gone through CEQ, that's Park Avenue in Huntington. The three that we're going to discuss today obviously need a CEQ review.

The first one is Oakwood Road, CR 92 in Huntington, from Jericho Turnpike up to the railroad. Included on that route are Stimson Middle School and quite a -- Oakwood Park and a dense residential development.

The proposal is to construct a sidewalk along the west side of the route -- I'm sorry, the east side of the route --

Are we on the --

MS. SQUIRES: You're right --

MR. QUINN: Yes.

MS. SQUIRES: -- it's the east side.

MR. QUINN: The east side of the route, which is the bottom here (indicating). What you see in purple is the proposed sidewalk. The yellow is where existing -- there is existing sidewalk.

So the idea is to provide a continuous route for pedestrians, generally, to schools, to commercial areas, et cetera. And that's -- we're accomplishing that on the west -- on the east side. And then there are -- there is a gap in the sidewalk in the area of Oakwood Park along the west side, which we're looking to fill in.

Also included in the project will be minor pedestrian signal improvements at the two signalized intersections, 19th Street and 22nd Street.

Finally, we are coordinating with Long Island Railroad for pedestrian crossing gate improvements at the railroad crossing, where there's already a sidewalk, but -- and -- and the gates, but we're talking about putting pedestrian -- pedestrian-type gates.

So that is Oakwood Road.

If you have any questions --

MS. RUSSO: Yes. Looking at your drawings, the pink new sidewalks -- and this may be strictly the constraints of the GIS and -- and mapping --

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry, Ms. Russo, I can't hear you.

MS. RUSSO: It may be due to constraints of the GIS system and mapping to show the new pink sidewalks, but it looks like part of the east sidewalk goes through some islands instead of actually staying on this other little side road. So they have to cross over all -- these two side roads -- three side roads and go --

MS. SPENCER: Right there (indicating).

MS. RUSSO: -- through the island?

MR. QUINN: Right. There is a --

MS. SPENCER: That's what she's talking about, right there (indicating).

MR. QUINN: All right. There is a median, a grass median there. The area to the south of that median was the old Oakland Road, before they realigned the road. So the county right-of-way is actually in front of those houses on the south.

We're putting this sidewalk to the island, which is --

MS. RUSSO: Oh, you are. Okay. So it is accurate then. All right.

MR. QUINN: Yes. It's --

MS. RUSSO: So this is accurate. So the new sidewalk will cross these medians or islands, and be along the busier highway part of Oakwood Road.

MR. QUINN: Correct, because we believe that's the way a person would

walk.

MS. RUSSO: Okay.

MR. QUINN: If they -- they're going from here to there (indicating), they would probably not walk 30 feet down the street --

MS. RUSSO: Yeah.

MR. QUINN: -- and, as you see, in front of these houses, and walk 30 feet back up. That's why we're putting it along the county highway.

MS. RUSSO: I'm just curious, because I wasn't sure if that was just a glitch of the mapping.

And then why are they not pursuing to put a sidewalk on the west side south of the middle school?

MR. QUINN: Mainly, the idea was to provide a continuous route. I can tell you that it's -- I can just tell you that that's -- that's what the RFP we -- we were given --

MR. MACKEY: It was --

MR. QUINN: -- called for, but the

funding constraints may be the one reason why.

Do you have anything to add, Russ?

MR. MACKEY: It was a combination of funding, and as long as there's a continuous route from Jericho Turnpike all the way up. And with the pedestrian enhancements at the existing signals, that people could cross to the side where there is, you know, a sidewalk. And part of it is also to be where there's enough room to install a sidewalk as well within the right-of-way.

MS. RUSSO: Okay. Because I was concerned because it's a middle school and the kids live south of the school, obviously, they're going to be walking home from there. And I'm thinking that the sidewalk should be on the same side as the school, it would be safer for the kids I thought.

MS. SQUIRES: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MS. SQUIRES: I had several comments.

The sidewalks are desperately needed. Gloria, your point is well made. Also, there is a small park that doesn't show here at Woodoak Lane. It's just a little tiny neighborhood park with a couple of benches in it. But it would be great to have sidewalks there.

My other question -- and, again, this is desperately needed.

My other question says, you say "provide a safe route for recreational walking and exercise." I understand this is a sidewalk. I also understand it is absolutely illegal to ride your bike on the sidewalk. But does this include anything -- any marking of bike lanes --

MR. MACKEY: No.

MS. SQUIRES: -- along this area?

MR. MACKEY: No, this is all off-roading purposes.

MS. SQUIRES: What can we do about

that?

If you pull out the beautiful map that we have, the Long Island Bikeways and Trailways, western half, the one that Jim gave everybody, it indicates that this section of Oakwood Road is a connecting road on the bicycle route. And, specifically, we've got one park here, we've got the middle school, we've got Oakwood Park, and right up the road we have Breezy Park, the former Mohlenhoff property that we discussed last month, that the road is going to have bicycle -- those road improvements and sidewalk improvements aren't going to have bicycle paths.

Is there anything that can be to mark a bicycle path here? This really is -- is where people would ride their bikes.

MR. MACKEY: Again, you know, it's --

MR. BAGG: We're talking about two different --

MR. MACKEY: -- you would have to sit there -- for this -- this is not -- that was not the intent of this project. The intent of this project was to provide a safe --

MS. SQUIRES: Okay.

MR. MACKEY: -- safe walking --

MS. SQUIRES: Not safe bike riding?

MR. MACKEY: No --

MS. GROWNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva.

MS. SQUIRES: And, of course, Walt Whitman High School. The area that I was telling you about with all this stuff we're doing in this map is right adjacent.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva.

MS. GROWNEY: Thank you.

With safe walking in mind, one of the things that occurs to me, and I think Gloria brought this up already but I want to just punctuate it. Those two islands -- those two long islands, when you talk about a pathway that somebody

would walk, most people would walk in a straight line. And what I'm also anticipating is that, why not can -- can this -- I mean, if I was walking on that pathway, I'd rather be walking away from the traffic. I'd rather be walking more -- either in the middle of those islands or closer to the populated housing which takes me away from the traffic. So my inclination as a -- you know, somebody who's concerned about design issues is that it be brought away from the roadway and tighter towards the housing.

And just to reiterate Gloria's point about the continuation of a pathway by the school. It seems to me if there's someway to -- to do that, that's also a very powerful and important factor to do on that island that sits right in front of the school. But not bring it near the road, bring it away from the road.

MR. QUINN: But that would be on

school property, so --

MS. GROWNEY: Well, I --

MR. QUINN: -- we couldn't do that.

MS. GROWNEY: -- I mean, you would do -- there is that one little piece that's across from the -- the road -- across from the school that's -- you know, going towards the Jericho Turnpike, there's that little existing piece. I don't know. I mean, is that -- is that whole island that's in front of the school part of the -- of the property, is there a portion of that that is owned by the county?

MR. QUINN: There's an eight-foot strip. More than likely --

MS. GROWNEY: Eight feet is big enough for a sidewalk.

MR. QUINN: Oh, it certainly is.

MR. MACKEY: But again -- again, the intent is, again -- we're very limited on budget. And the idea is if someone is walking on that side, then, just like you said, if you want to be

away from the traffic, they can walk along the school property and then go -- go down that way.

MS. GROWNEY: Well, eight feet, you could still put four foot back, you could put a -- a strip and -- and so they're away from the -- because you're sending them into the traffic lane that drives around the school.

MR. MACKEY: What I'm trying to get at is that we're severely limited on budget.

MS. GROWNEY: I get that --

MR. MACKEY: So we -- we tried picking the less applicable locations --

MS. GROWNEY: Well, then --

MR. MACKEY: -- on this.

MS. GROWNEY: -- then the shortest route, which to save money to make a straight line, is right through the middle of those two islands.

MR. MACKEY: But we're not putting in. The school -- you see, the school --

MS. GROWNEY: No, no, on the other side. Now I'm -- I'm back on the other side.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: The south side.

MR. QUINN: Right --

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

MR. QUINN: -- the shortest -- that's the shortest route.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah, and that's --

MR. QUINN: And that's the logical route.

MS. GROWNEY: That's --

MR. QUINN: And I believe if you build a sidewalk in front of the homes, you'll wind up with a -- a dirt path through those islands of people walking in a straight line.

So that we're trying to use county funds, I guess, most expeditiously, and --

MS. GROWNEY: Right.

MR. QUINN: -- from a commonsense approach, the islands in front of a

school, you can see that there are -- are sidewalks from the street to the school. So people will cross at a street, Tipping or -- or 19th where the light is, 21st, 22nd where the light is, and they'll -- they'll head in, you know, straight toward the doors of the school. But I guess you -- you're looking at --

MS. GROWNEY: I'm looking for a dry point of view to -- to put them -- then that would put them on the other side. If middle of the road -- if middle of the island is not something that you would like to consider, then I would like you to consider the other side, so you're away from the road.

MR. QUINN: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Oh, before we go on, I guess I have a more generic question.

It seems to me that there have been several issues raised here, and that has to do with the overall planning concept

of what to include and what not to include to make this more acceptable.

It was raised, what about the bicycles and the linkage between several parks.

It was raised that maybe it would be more appropriate to have the sidewalk on the side where the schools are.

It seems to me like there -- we're missing sort of the holistic part of the planning process here, and instead we're saying, Well, this is only a sidewalk project and we can't listen to these other issues.

How do we get these broader planning issues on the table?

MR. MACKEY: As far as installing sidewalks on both sides? I mean, we've looked at from an engineering and --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: No, no, no. Just to be able to sit down and say this is an ideal spot not only to have a sidewalk, but it's to have a bicycle path; is the sidewalk most appropriate

on the side where the school kids will be going or is it not; to look at the very broad issues.

MR. MACKEY: The bicycle path aside, because that's -- when this project comes down, you know, through the Department of Public Works, that was not part of this -- the RFP for this, that was not part of the capital project.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. My question is, how do you make it part of it?

MR. MACKEY: I guess you'd either have to start with either the legislature or go to the commissioner or to the -- to the chief engineer who come up and -- come up with the concept for the capitol programs.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. It just seems to me that this is an ideal situation where some real planning -- instead of just saying we're going to put in a sidewalk and that's the end of

the project, we could have done some real planning that it would have been a much better approach than, perhaps, what has been done.

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Rich.

MR. MACHTAY: Yeah. I -- I was just curious why the bulk of the sidewalk was being put in on the east side as opposed to the west side where the school is and where the playground is. It's more likely that people are going to be walking on the west side --

MR. MACKEY: It was --

MR. MACHTAY: -- than on the east side.

MR. MACKEY: Looking out there and driving up there, you know, maybe backing up, was -- there is an existing sidewalk or kind of a walkway --

MR. QUINN: Asphalt walkway --

MR. MACKEY: -- asphalt walkway --

MR. QUINN: -- about three feet wide.

MR. MACKEY: -- on the south -- on the east side. So from an engineering standpoint, a funding standpoint and everything, it made more sense to go on that side.

We looked at the people crossing the road, which is why we're doing the pedestrian enhancements at those two signals to them across the way. Which is also why we're continuing it from the school down to the -- down to the park, which is I guess right next to the school there if you look, and continue linking up to the other sidewalk that's on the west side north of the school.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mike.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: I'm looking at this now with a designer's eye, and I don't see some of the objections that some of the other members have raised around here.

You're talking about putting it on

one side of the road or the other. Right now there's more likely pedestrian traffic on the east side of the road than there is on the west side of the road. You've got Stimson talking up about half of the --

MR. QUINN: Frontage.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- frontage. You've got more people on the east side going to go up. And if the sidewalk is flipped over to the other side, those people are going to be losing pedestrian access.

To my eye, it looks like -- and I'm guessing here, it looks like there's a choice made as to -- the bulk of the money servicing the most people. I think the east side is most serviced by this. I think that they get a deficit in here, and they get -- actually get cut off if you flip it to the west side.

Second off, looking at the west side, there is a connection between Jericho and Woodoak and what appears to

be a little strip of parkland over there, and then you do have fill-ins near Stimson. You also have traffic signals that are going to be incorporated in here.

I don't see, if you will, the deficit of service that some of the other members are seeing. It's a small area on the west side that's serviced, much larger on the east side. So in that sense, that's where -- if I was designing the project, I would focus my funds.

Second off, the islands, it may be --

Well, question. Who owns those islands right now?

MR. QUINN: They're within the county right-of-way.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Okay.

How wide are they?

MR. QUINN: The width of the --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Of those two little --

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- islands that Eva was talking about.

MR. QUINN: They vary, but I think it's -- the widest are about 30 and the narrowest are about eight.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Realis- -- we're talking about flipping the sidewalk from one side to --

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- the other.

MS. SQUIRES: Gloria wasn't talking about --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: No, no, no.

MS. SQUIRES: -- flipping --

MS. GROWNEY: I was.

MS. SQUIRES: -- she said why can't we have it on both sides. She said why -- I think, or --

MR. MACHTAY: And I --

MS. GROWNEY: Yes, I did.

MR. MACHTAY: And I think you're missing --

MS. SQUIRES: -- didn't you put it -- both sides.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: No, I was --

MR. MACHTAY: I think you're missing another point --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: No, I was --

MR. MACHTAY: -- Michael.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: I was just asking what it was. Okay.

MR. MACHTAY: I appreciate what you're saying, but right now, people who live on the west have -- if they're going to go to Stimson, they have to cross the street twice. They have to cross Oakwood Road twice. Okay. That's like crossing a four-lane highway twice.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Yeah, but if you don't --

MR. MACHTAY: Right?

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- if you don't have --

MR. MACHTAY: If you have it --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: The eastbound people have the same problem if you don't flip it to the other side.

MR. MACHTAY: They only have to cross this road once. From the east to the west, they only have to cross it once if the sidewalk is on the west.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: But what if -- looking at this map, the people on the east side, if there's no sidewalk access for them to traverse along Oakwood, they can't even get to those traffic signals. That's what I'm saying right now.

All I'm saying is, I --

MR. MACHTAY: They're doing it now.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: They're doing it now, but we don't know how many --

MR. MACHTAY: And they're crossing at the school where there's a crosswalk.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: All I'm saying is, I don't think that this plan, as presented, has such a deficient as

some of the other members are --

MR. MACHTAY: Quiet Michael.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- seeing. I don't see this --

MR. MACHTAY: You have to be there --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- in a design sense, as being --

MR. MACHTAY: -- and you have to walk it.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- terrible.

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: I think there's a reason behind it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Dan.

MR. PICHNEY: I don't know whether it -- it was -- town policy in the Town of Islip where I live or it's county-wide, but in our school district we don't have bussing --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: That's the other reason.

MR. PICHNEY: -- so over the years

they've built sidewalks in. I think the only point that they tried to achieve was to have contiguous sidewalks. And I know, just on my block, which is a very busy, you know, development, a busy residential street, the sidewalks are just on my side of the property -- my side of the street, there are no sidewalks on the other. But they do connect throughout the community -- okay -- and there are points where the children can cross and so forth.

So, you know, again, I think that as long as there are contiguous sidewalks where the kids can get to school in -- in safe crossing areas, in the light -- in -- in light of limited funds, I see, you know, no need to have sidewalks on both sides of the street.

The second point I'd like to make, you know, while I agree with you with regard to -- when you have a planning opportunity, Larry, because I certainly -- we had that with -- when I

was in DPW between our transportation division and the highway division in terms of putting bus stops and bus shelters -- trying to have that integrated in -- into the -- the highway planning, I certainly realized in -- in most places in the county, there is very limited right-of-way, and you're very lucky just to be able to get the -- the sidewalks in.

And, you know, the only way I would consider a bicycle path, if it was segregated from -- from -- from traffic, that having been painted on the street. And certainly, though, for children in -- in that kind of situation, is -- is absurd. And I'd rather see children bicycling on the sidewalk -- you know, I don't think the police are going to be out there giving them tickets. I think that's a very safe environment for them to be bicycling in this situation. It's not like it's a CBD where they'll be running into other people, I think that

is just fine.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Gloria, you had your hand up --

MS. RUSSO: Yes. I forgot what I was going to say before he went on.

(Laughter)

MS. RUSSO: I just want to reiterate my first thoughts with no sidewalk on the west side to the middle school, children walking. Only because my daughters had to walk just about a mile and a half to our middle school and it's a very busy road, and the main sidewalk is only on the side of the school, which is just south of Sunrise Highway at Johnson Avenue. Most kids, when they come out of the school, they go right to the sidewalk there and they stay on that side. It's just safer for them. And if I lived in this area and had to have my daughters walk through this and cross twice to cross Oakwood Avenue, let me tell you, I would not be happy with it. I'm surprised the

homeowners and the parents of the kids that go to that school haven't been screaming to put in sidewalks on both sides.

MS. GROWNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva.

MS. GROWNEY: To address --

MR. QUINN: Well, I think you -- I'm sorry.

I think you -- that is the genesis of the project.

MS. GROWNEY: Yes, but --

MR. QUINN: If you read between the lines --

MS. GROWNEY: It needs a little more.

MR. QUINN: -- I think the legislature will be hearing it.

MS. GROWNEY: Okay. Good. I would be very unhappy and screaming if I --

(Overlapping conversations)

MS. GROWNEY: Barring, whether or not that happens, flipping it to the other side. If it stays on this -- on

this side, I still -- my -- to expand on my point, to bring the sidewalk closer to the houses so that the kids are bicycling on them as well as walking on them, then they're -- again, they're not in the -- in the next -- right next to the road, they're next to a grassed area. So the potential of any kind of inadvertent accidents happening, it's going to happen on the grassy area versus out in the middle of the road.

So I strongly feel -- and, also, because it is the shorter distance. If you're trying to save money, you know, design-wise, it's the shorter distant to keep it tighter to the houses.

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Rich.

MR. MACHTAY: I'm just curious about something. Every time New York State DOT is going to do a major project or any -- almost any kind of a project, they have meetings with the local community. And they say, you know, This

is what we're going to do. We're going to put a turn lane here, we're going to put a traffic light there, we're going to whatever.

I can't recall in my 30 years with the town, the county holding public hearings like that with the local community.

MR. MACKEY: We do have public hearings with the community on larger scale projects.

MR. MACHTAY: Yeah?

It would be nice to have a meeting at Stimson Middle School on this particular project to see what the community -- they would probably want it on both sides of the street.

MS. SQUIRES: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MS. SQUIRES: I -- I just appreciate and would like to follow through on your point of the integration of some of these comments. I mean, last week -- last month we heard about the

Pulaski Road project and the integration. I know it was a road, but it was the size of the road. We have the same issue here. We have just almost a continuation.

I'm still back to these bike lanes. And, honestly, it is illegal to ride a bicycle on a sidewalk. I -- you can say, Well, no one's going to ticket a kid. They may -- that may be true, but it still is illegal to ride a bicycle on a sidewalk.

And if you look at the bike lanes that are marked in the area of Huntington, that are marked on the map, and we can pull the map and you'll see, it's on Oakwood Road, and it is on the side of the road. And you're saying you don't want someone to ride on the side of the road because it's not safe, but they're going to ride it anyway. So why not give them at least a marking on --

MR. MACKEY: Because --

MS. SQUIRES: -- the street?

MR. MACKEY: You can't give them a marking because you have to look at the different type of -- there are several different types of bike lanes. Some of them don't --

MS. SQUIRES: I -- I am --

MR. MACKEY: -- have the markings --

MS. SQUIRES: I'm aware of that.

MR. MACKEY: So you can't just throw markings out.

MR. QUINN: The bike route -- just the --

MS. SQUIRES: No, I --

MR. QUINN: -- bike route.

MS. SQUIRES: -- understand that. But, go back to what Larry said, why not -- you're looking at this, you're doing this. Why not at least consider all the aspects of this road?

MR. QUINN: We will certainly take that back to the county, I mean, but I think -- I'm at risk of putting my foot in my mouth, is there a bicycle -- like

county bicycle route project?

MS. SQUIRES: Jim, would you address that?

MR. BAGG: Pardon? Could you repeat it, please?

MS. SQUIRES: Repeat the question to Jim.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Is there a county bicycle route project?

MS. SQUIRES: Is -- about the bicycle route.

There certainly is legislation in the Town of Huntington in terms of bike routes. County has --

MR. BAGG: Yeah, I understand that. But, you know, the Town of Huntington, you know, in their plan that you came out with, you designated county road bike paths. And we talk about going to the public and have meetings as part of the community getting their input, well, did the town come to the county and say, Do you think it's a good idea for us to put bike -- or mark these as bike paths,

and what is the --

MR. MACHTAY: Jim, I wasn't with the town, but that master plan was sent to the planning department here and asked for comments.

MR. BAGG: Yeah, but that's -- we're not -- that's not DPW. DPW --

MR. MACHTAY: Okay.

MR. BAGG: -- is in charge of these roads.

MR. MACHTAY: Are you independent from DPW? Don't they -- don't you --

MR. BAGG: Yeah. To some --

MR. MACHTAY: -- don't they plan --

MR. BAGG: -- extent, yes.

MR. MACHTAY: Don't they plan with you?

MR. BAGG: Yes, we are independent of DPW.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Ding, round one.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Let's draw this to a conclusion.

It seems to me, from what I'm hearing, that there's a certain amount of dissatisfaction with the plan. And, in part, it has to do with communication.

And I'm wondering if it is possible that the county -- to get together with the town and maybe go to the residents and ask for their input as to what -- what they would like to see in terms of transporting kids by foot from the various schools and whether they're satisfactory with the sidewalk on the east side or the west side.

MR. MACKEY: I -- I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MR. MACKEY: I can't make that call. That call is, you know, higher up, obviously, the chief engineer I think. I can't say, you know, we're going to hold a public hearing, I don't have that authority to do that, that would have to be the chief engineer. I could bring it up to him and see what he

says.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN:

(Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Mike.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: I think that's a good idea on this particular project, we're obviously seeing issue that exist. My only concern is when and how the planning process begins. I don't know how this particular project was generated. I don't know the genesis of the need or anything like that. But what concerns me is, when you bring various elements of both county government and local government into this, you can end up basically with these projects being jammed up forever, or else people looking at them and reviewing them at a stage when maybe it shouldn't be reviewed until later.

In other words, right now we're reactive. We are being presented with a plan, it's been developed somehow, my guess is there's been some input to it,

and now we're assessing it. One of the questions here was, well, should it be assessed -- and some of these concerns that have been -- should they be assessed earlier. I'm not sure when you can do that without getting a group like this into the actual planning and design stage as opposed to the review stage. I'm not sure what out proper structural role is.

We've always been review. Only in certain selected areas when we have an EIS going do we get into the design stage of things. So that --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I'm not asking that we do the design --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Well --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- I'm saying --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- in this particular situation --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- this was an ideal situation where instead of just narrowly saying we have some money to build a sidewalk --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- if they had looked at the overall --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Well, I don't know that they haven't.

MR. MACKEY: I believe -- and, you know, don't quote me on this, but I believe that these projects came down from county legislators as requesting to put the sidewalks in on all of these projects.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: That's true.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I understand.

MR. QUINN: As a general safety improvement --

MR. MACKEY: As general safety improvements --

MR. QUINN: -- for their constituents.

MS. GROWNEY: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: And that becomes an issue.

MS. GROWNEY: But design factors

are still important to incorporate, and design means you look at the overall picture and really assess it.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MR. MACHTAY: Well, there's nothing that says you -- you can't approve one part of a project while reviewing other elements that might go into it.

MS. GROWNEY: As long as it's been --

MR. MACHTAY: Okay.

MS. GROWNEY: -- but those elements have been --

MR. MACHTAY: And we --

MS. GROWNEY: -- addressed somehow. You can't just --

MR. MACHTAY: -- brought up those elements, which --

I'm sorry, I don't know your name.

MR. MACKEY: Russ.

MR. MACHTAY: Which Russ is going to bring back to his commissioner and -- and talk about it, and maybe get back to us as to what can and cannot be done, or

will or will not be done.

MS. GROWNEY: Well, design safety is the issue, and that's why I'm still saying that there's things to be taken away from this because that's a --

MR. MACHTAY: I don't want to lose part -- this part of the project, because I think it's important -- okay -- while waiting for something else to happen which may take months or years.

MS. GROWNEY: But some of this --

MR. MACHTAY: Okay.

MS. GROWNEY: -- won't take months or years.

MR. MACHTAY: Well, I don't know that, and --

MS. GROWNEY: I mean, moving the sidewalk from one side of the median to the other --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: It actually, Eva, could. You could actually -- theoretically --

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- if this is brought before the wider community, you could have a sea change in opinion, and it will stall the project, the money may not end up being allocated.

That's a problem we face often when something is brought -- when the legislature sets up something and says, We want to have X, Y, and Z done.

MS. GROWNEY: But he didn't say put --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MS. GROWNEY: -- put the sidewalk here --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We're going to take a break so she can fix her tape.

MS. GROWNEY: Okay.

(WHEREUPON, a brief recess was taken, after which the following transpired:)

(Time noted: 11:20 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. We're back on the record.

MR. MACHTAY: I think what's more

prudent, right now, with this project, is not to lose this project. Not to hold it up six months, a year, or two years, or lose it altogether because funding goes away --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: That's the question to ask Russ.

MR. MACHTAY: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: And this is the typical question we ask, which is, are we going to lose anything if we delay for a month or two to find out the additional parameters that have been brought up here?

Is this project at risk?

MR. MACKEY: I have to relook at the funding, but since there's county funding, I don't think you -- it would be at risk. But, again, it's something -- I haven't looked at the appropriations in a -- in a recent while.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Does somebody want to make a motion?

MS. RUSSO: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MS. RUSSO: I'd like to make a motion that this be postponed and revisited as far as really looking a little more carefully into, if they could, put it on both sides. Juggle how they show where they want the new sidewalk to be.

MS. GROWNEY: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a motion. We have a second.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I'd like to comment.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, you know, two things are going through my mind.

I mean, the question about is the money at risk, and, frankly, all money's at risk. This was not -- you know, as somebody who serves on the legislature, I remember getting this money put in,

some of it, because one of these sidewalks are within my district, and it was a very tough list. You know, sidewalks are nice, but right now, the county has, you know, major priorities, and new sidewalks probably aren't one of them. So it's very difficult to get money for something like this. Could this money evaporate as we do the capital budget? Absolutely. So I think it is fair to say that it's tenuous at best. So I hate to see a project like this stall.

Now, this group which is charged with determining -- you know, doing the State Environmental Quality Review Act component, I think the input is terrific on bike lanes. I actually want to put in a bill to designate CEQ as kind of the official advisory committee for -- for bike lanes, but it doesn't exist yet. And I'm concerned about stalling a project like this. It may not be perfect, but I'd hate to see it die

because it got held up. So I'm not going to support holding this up.

I'd like to see these things move forward while we have money in place, because having the county fall $150 million short in sales tax revenue is devastating right now, and, you know, we're doing our best to provide the services -- the current level of services, but it's not easy, and funds that are discretionary like sidewalks are -- are apt to be raided. You know, I think we should do our best to keep these things moving along.

MR. MACHTAY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Rich.

MR. MACHTAY: Well, I have to agree. You know, I watched a building get built for 12 years because allocation of funds that were supposed to be there evaporated back in the 1980s. And it took 12 years to get the building built at our local recycling center. So, you know, I -- it makes me

nervous with something like this that -- you know, because we want more, we may lose the whole thing.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: A bad sidewalk's --

MR. MACHTAY: The only --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- better than no sidewalk.

MR. MACHTAY: Yeah, well -- okay. But the only -- the only way I would agree to holding it up for another month is with some kind of a proviso that it doesn't get held up any longer than that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: How about if the motion was modified to be something like we approve with the provision that the county explore whether the sidewalk is on the proper side of the road --

MS. SQUIRES: I'd like that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- or should be on both sides of the road.

MR. MACHTAY: And report back to us.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And report back to us.

MR. MACHTAY: And report back to us in some way.

Would that be fair, Russ?

MR. MACKEY: Sure. And I guess I would address the concerns --

MR. MACHTAY: So what do we need, Jim? We need a -- an Unlisted Action --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: You know what? We have a motion --

MS. GROWNEY: But --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- that's on the table and it's accepted --

MR. MACHTAY: Yeah, well, it wasn't -- it wasn't seconded.

MS. GROWNEY: It wasn't seconded.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: It wasn't seconded?

MS. GROWNEY: I was trying to, but it wasn't -- but it wasn't quite -- it wasn't acknowledged as second --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MS. GROWNEY: -- let's put it that

way.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Would you be willing to --

MS. GROWNEY: I will --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- modify your --

MS. GROWNEY: Yes.

Okay. So I make a motion that we accept this project, but we would like a report back within a month to the feasibility of adding the sidewalk on the west side and make it --

MR. MACHTAY: Is that a Neg Dec?

MR. BAGG: It would be an Unlisted Action --

MS. GROWNEY: Unlisted Action --

MR. BAGG: -- with a recommendation that the Department of Public Works will look into putting sidewalks on one side of the road, the other, or both sides of the road, and come back to CEQ and explain the choice.

MR. MACHTAY: The reason why.

MS. GROWNEY: The reason why.

MR. MACHTAY: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: Can I -- can I --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah.

MS. GROWNEY: I want to just make one qualification, and explore the positioning of the sidewalks.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Meaning what?

MS. GROWNEY: Meaning that, whether it should be along the roadway that -- where heavy traffic is, or to the other side where --

(Overlapping conversations)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So you want to modify it to also include that --

MS. GROWNEY: Examine those islands.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- examine --

MS. GROWNEY: The position of the sidewalk --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- the position --

MS. GROWNEY: -- on the --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MS. GROWNEY: -- islands.

MR. QUINN: Would you be satisfied with going through the middle --

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

MR. QUINN: -- of the islands?

MS. GROWNEY: Not -- yeah. Either the middle or the other side.

MR. QUINN: Okay.

MS. GROWNEY: Either one of those. That's fine with me.

MS. SQUIRES: But couldn't Gloria's motion just be modified to say design?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MS. SQUIRES: Just use the word "design," and you understand what we mean by design?

MR. QUINN: (Head gesture)

MS. GROWNEY: Well, with regard --

(Overlapping conversations)

MS. GROWNEY: Design and placement, because design also addresses how the actual sidewalk is designed itself.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Can you read --

MS. GROWNEY: Design and placement.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- read back the motion.

MS. GROWNEY: Poor thing. Poor things.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Don't you wish you were back in traffic?

MR. MACHTAY: Off the record.

I guess what I --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: She's reading it.

MR. MACHTAY: Go ahead.

(WHEREUPON, the requested portion of the testimony was read by the court reporter.)

MR. QUINN: Would you rather have it say more on the design modifications --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. QUINN: -- suggested at this meeting?

MS. GROWNEY: Perfect.

MR. QUINN: All right.

MS. GROWNEY: Excellent.

MR. MACHTAY: Once again, off the record, if I may.

(Discussion held off the record)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. We have a motion. We do not have a second.

MS. RUSSO: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. We have a second.

MS. SPENCER: Discussion?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Discussion, yes.

MS. SPENCER: I completely concur with the Honorable Jay Schneiderman. I think that this should go forward. We've made some comments, if you want to put comments on the record, I don't think it should be held up, I don't think it should come back to us.

You have a situation in front of a school, going through Jericho Turnpike, north, through the Long Island Railroad, with no sidewalks. At the end of this project, you will have a full sidewalk on one side, and a partial sidewalk on the other, and improvements to safety.

And one would hope that having built the sidewalk on the east side, that the parents would come back to their legislator and ask for continuation on the west side. But I don't think that we should slow this down. I think it has the funding and we should let it go because it's a fast safety improvement.

MS. SQUIRES: But --

MS. SPENCER: I don't disagree with the concerns.

MS. SQUIRES: But we are letting it go.

MS. SPENCER: I don't disagree -- well, I don't think we should --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: She's reinforcing it.

MS. SPENCER: -- hold it up.

MS. GROWNEY: She's reinforcing it. She's reinforcing it.

MS. SPENCER: But they have to come back in a month.

MR. BAGG: No, no, no, no, no.

MS. GROWNEY: No.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: No.

MR. BAGG: The idea is to say it's an Unlisted Action with a Negative Declaration, however, the council wants DPW to further explore the issues raised in this meeting and come back to them. The project as is can proceed, but they -- DPW should look at the other things and say whether it's feasible to put a sidewalk --

MS. SPENCER: So this does not slow it down.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: No.

MS. GROWNEY: No.

MS. SPENCER: Okay.

MR. BAGG: It's a recommendation.

MS. SPENCER: All right.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. We have a motion. We have a second.

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Ah --

MS. SPENCER: I'm not voting. I'm not -- I don't believe --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Abstentions?

MS. SPENCER: Yeah, I'm abstaining.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. PICHNEY: Well, I'll be for it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. PICHNEY: I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So we have one abstention.

MR. QUINN: All right. Now, I'm going to do what Jim doesn't like to do, but Jay may not be able to stay with us and he -- there is a project that involves his town. So let's move on to the one dealing with Southampton.

Is that okay?

MR. QUINN: All right. So this is CR 79, Sag Harbor-Bridgehampton Turnpike, which, appropriate to its name, connects Bridgehampton at Montauk Highway up to Sag Harbor.

The portion we're looking at -- the portion we're looking at is from Montauk

Highway to Scuttle Hole Road, a distance of 1.7 miles I believe it is.

Okay. Are we good?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Come on, quiet.

MR. QUINN: Okay. Along this route, we have a number of public facilities. The Children's Museum recently constructed, the Head Start Facility, the Bridgehampton Senior Center I believe -- the Community Center.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Community Center.

MR. QUINN: Right. Several churches -- two -- two churches, and --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: There's South Fork Natural History Museum.

MR. QUINN: Right.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Across from --

MR. QUINN: And the -- churches and some residents pretty much along the whole route.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: There's also an affordable housing development that just occurred up the road there.

MR. QUINN: Huntington Crossway, yeah.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Something-Muse. Bridgehampton Muse I think it's called.

MR. QUINN: Okay. So our proposal up here is to construct a sidewalk primarily on the west side as a continuous route, from Montauk Highway up to new -- the existing sidewalk that was built for the Children's Museum, and continuing on the west side through to Scuttle Hole Road.

Okay.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: It's about a two mile stretch there.

MR. QUINN: Right.

Filling in this side on -- on -- sidewalk on the east side, an additional 3,000 feet I believe, and I guess total -- total length of sidewalk is

about 11,000 linear feet.

The crossing at the Long Island Railroad, it will have similar pedestrian gates improvements, provided we can work that out with Long Island Railroad, we plan to discuss this with them, at -- just north of Narrow Lane.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And then you have to discuss with them whether they have the arms that come down over the sidewalk?

MR. QUINN: They have the arms. There's a pedestrian gate-type arm that would go across the sidewalk area.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I see.

MR. QUINN: That would --

MR. MACKEY: That work is done purely by Long Island Railroad. They don't give you a cost until -- or even let you know -- on our projects, an average, but the cost fluctuates. So -- but, again, that's all Long Island Railroad. They design it, they -- you know, I think they construct it, they do

everything. Maybe just -- they -- you basically foot the bill for it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. So they won't -- if you put the sidewalk in, they won't refuse to do it?

MR. MACKEY: We're paying.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We're paying. Okay.

MR. MACKEY: The only thing that might -- you know, might cause a little problem, but I don't think they have to do it on this one, is if they have to close down the line to do the work. But for the gates, I don't believe they have to. The only reason why they would have to is if they have to add extra pads to have people cross over. Which, preliminary walking out there, I'm not a train expert, I don't think they would have to do that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. QUINN: We have -- just to mention, we have a very -- in the EAF you'll see a very minor -- no concerns

on -- on the public -- on the historic sites, and a very minor issue, perhaps, with wetlands to get this -- Slate Pond I believe it's called. It's probably a kettle hole.

MR. MACKEY: That would require DEC --

MS. RUSSO: Most likely.

MR. MACKEY: This project would require DEC permits for that reason where within I think the 100-foot limits or --

MR. QUINN: Correct. And for only that reason, we will not be disturbing wetlands.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Uh-huh.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Now, is this no curbs, or is there curbs, or --

MR. QUINN: The curb is proposed, yes, as part of the improvement.

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Dan.

MR. PICHNEY: I just wanted to ask

Legislator Schneiderman if there is community support for this, because I'd hate to see a --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: No.

MR. PICHNEY: -- big brouha --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: No. There's a large minority community that walks down this area to access downtown Bridgehampton. So either -- this came from the community.

MR. PICHNEY: Okay.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: The urging of the community.

I do have a concern, though, about curbs in this area, particularly around those kettle holes. There's a lot of turtles over there -- okay -- sometimes you can see them crossing the road. And just from a wildlife concern, you know, those curbs sometimes can be an impediment to some wildlife.

In general, on the East End, we've avoided curbs. I know they're important for controlling road runoff. But at the

same time, it's kind of a suburban look that we have -- I think, much to the appreciation of the community, have avoided. So I --

MS. GROWNEY: Successfully.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah, successfully.

So I'm wondering if you can use maybe some rounded tip-ups, if that's the word, along the road --

MR. MACKEY: That's correct.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- rather than curbs.

MR. MACKEY: Again, I'll look into it to see what -- how we look in the past as far as -- the main concern is obviously washing -- undermining the sidewalk we just put in. So I'll ask --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MR. MACKEY: -- the maintenance department --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Just basically to minimize curbs as much as possible.

MS. GROWNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Because that's something that could get --

MR. QUINN: Through those areas only, or through --

MS. GROWNEY: The whole project.

MR. QUINN: -- throughout the whole project, he's thinking, the typical section.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, you know, it would be like the only curb around if you did it. I would probably say see if you can do it without the curb. It might actually reduce the cost of the project substantially, too.

MR. QUINN: It would. It would.

You know, we do need to raise the sidewalk above the road for the concern that Russ was talking about, it doesn't get flooded out.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MR. QUINN: So, you know, we'll follow the direction from above, I

guess --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: You know, I'd also want to -- you know, maybe to consider the input of the town. You know, we own the road. It's within the Town of Southampton. I think they would probably feel the same way --

MR. QUINN: Okay.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- about the curb issue, but you'd have to ask them.

MR. QUINN: Yeah. It's not -- not as permanent. It does require --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah, but once we had final designs for maybe -- you know, or at least preliminary designs, maybe that's a good time to sit down with some of the town board and say -- and they're also partially funding this. I think they're contributing 100,000 toward this project. So --

MR. QUINN: I'm not aware of that.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: This is a county road. Didn't you say you own it?

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: He said -- yeah, he did say -- referred to it as county.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: County owned.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Oh, yeah.

MR. QUINN: You're speaking as the county, I guess.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah, county.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: The county owns the road, but the town -- that's fine.

Partly, how I was able to get the county on board with this is that there was a contribution also from the town.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Okay. I see.

MR. MACKEY: I'm sorry, Jay. Was that included in the resolution, because I'm just going by my --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: It may not have been, but it was part of the

deliberations.

MR. MACKEY: Is it possible to forward me any information as far as the town funding?

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yeah, it's in their town's capital budget. So you just -- can you contact me after --

MR. MACKEY: Sure.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- the meeting?

MS. GROWNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva.

MS. GROWNEY: I support what Jay's saying, being a resident out on the East End. And there are many very successful placements of sidewalks on -- on roads out there that do not have curbs. And so the softer version, you know, where necessary only, not the whole length, sounds good to me.

I just wanted to get a -- a clarification of the piece that's on the east side, just a -- a little -- a description as to the purpose of the

east side. I'm assuming it's because of all these buildings that are -- the community-type buildings that are on there.

MR. QUINN: That's correct. It's the Natural History Museum --

MS. GROWNEY: Right.

MR. QUINN: -- the Child Care and Recreation Center --

MS. GROWNEY: Right.

MR. QUINN: -- and a senior center at this location.

MS. GROWNEY: And where is the -- where is the crossing going to be, though, for -- from one side to the other so those two are linked? Is there a specific designation?

MR. QUINN: The crossing was going to be at Sunrise Avenue, which is unsignalized. Totally unsignalized.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: So just -- you're just going to mark the road as a --

MR. QUINN: Yeah. The county's

certainly not --

MR. MACKEY: We'll have to go back to the traffic department. But I also believe -- wasn't there a stripped crossing in front of the Children's Museum?

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah, the Children's Museum had something there, but I don't know that it goes --

MR. MACKEY: I thought -- believe it had a stripped crossing there. So we --

MS. GROWNEY: I don't think it goes across, though. And there's -- there's a designation for a turnoff there somehow, but I don't really remember exactly what's there.

I do support this --

MR. MACKEY: Well --

MS. GROWNEY: -- it's just that there's some sort of description about the connection --

MR. MACKEY: Obviously, we'll look for it, a state crossing point --

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

MR. MACKEY: -- you know, that's part of it. But I believe --

MS. GROWNEY: Okay.

MR. MACKEY: -- you know, and I drove this back in March. So I -- I thought there was one out there --

MS. GROWNEY: Memory's not -- not perfect about that.

MR. QUINN: Right. Well, an unsignalized crossing is just sometimes problematic.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Michael.

MR. QUINN: It's requires additional signing, flashing beacons that, you know, are somewhat effective.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: There's lots of unsignalized crossings on the East End.

MS. GROWNEY: We do have --

MR. QUINN: Right.

MS. GROWNEY: -- a lot of them.

MR. QUINN: Right.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah, and they're --

they're fine. I think they're fine.

MR. MACKEY: Again, it's something I'll bring up, I'll bring this issue up to our Traffic Department.

MS. GROWNEY: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mike.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Given the issue of turtles that was brought up, where exactly does anyone know these turtles cross the road?

MS. GROWNEY: Everywhere.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Everywhere.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: They're by -- by the kettle hole.

MS. GROWNEY: They're everywhere.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: They are everywhere.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: You see the two marked wetlands (indicating)?

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Yeah.

MR. BAGG: They're by the kettle hole.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: There's

two --

MS. GROWNEY: They wander.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: They inter-stately cross right around where the South Fork Natural History Museum is. You know, which --

MS. SQUIRES: Those are clever turtles.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- the largest benefactor happens to be a herpetologist, so --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Okay.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- maybe they're coming to visit him.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: All right. The reason I'm asking, now, we switch to the technical aspect --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Why did the turtle cross the road?

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: I wasn't going to go there, Jay. Wasn't going to go there.

But, nonetheless, while we are talking about turtles crossing the road,

obviously you'll have to try and figure out where we might have to place -- God, help me -- turtle crossings or lower dips in the road if we're going to have curbs.

MS. GROWNEY: It's in East Hampton.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: There are signs.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Okay. There are --

(Overlapping conversations)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All right. Do we have a motion.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Motion, Unlisted Neg Dec, with following recommendations --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: As much as I'm in a hurry, I have one more question, and it had to deal with -- there's some really large old trees along the sidewalk route, and --

MR. MACKEY: Obviously --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- just an effort to not cut these trees down --

MR. MACKEY: Yes.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- but to move the sidewalk actually around the trees.

MR. MACKEY: We will do our best. We may not have to move the sidewalk. What we might do is -- and it's within ADA requirements, is neck it down to three feet just to get around the side- -- around the trees, so we won't cut them.

MS. GROWNEY: Okay.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Continuing with the motion;

Neg Dec, Unlisted, following recommendations;

1. Elimination of curbing wherever possible;

2. Protection of identified areas where turtles cross so that interdiction does not occur;

3. Preservation of old trees as far as possible.

MR. MACKEY: (Indicating)

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Yes.

MS. GROWNEY: I'll second.

MR. MACKEY: All curbing or concrete curbing?

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Well --

MS. GROWNEY: I say all curbing.

MR. MACKEY: Here's what I'm getting at, and I understand fully where you're coming from, is that, in this area, we're probably going to have to raise the road a couple -- you know, not the road, the sidewalk to bring it up for the sidewalk level. So we're going to need some sort of protection to prevent undermining of the sidewalk.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

MR. MACKEY: Now --

MS. GROWNEY: Minimal.

MR. MACKEY: -- normally, we do concrete curbing because it's easy maintenance, it lasts longer. Tip up doesn't last as long, you have to come back. Again, that's why I say I'll go

to our maintenance department and see. We'll try -- if feasible and if possible, we definitely --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: That's fine.

MR. MACKEY: -- you know, to accommodate you, we'll put tip up.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: So how do we word that?

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Minimization --

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- of concrete curbing --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: -- as far as possible.

MS. GROWNEY: Use tip ups wherever possible.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a second, Eva.

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.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Thank you for taking it out of order.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Just a question. Going around trees, as the trees grow, and they tend to raise and --

MR. MACHTAY: Buckle.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- buckle, yeah --

MR. MACKEY: My -- and I'm not a arborist or anything, but my thought is it also depends upon what types of trees. Some trees have roots that go straight down, other trees have roots that spread across the top. Again, it's something -- I mean, we might be limited by a right-of-way as well. So we're going to do the best we can to provide

that continuous walkway where we can.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. MACKEY: Obviously, if we have the right-of-way, you know, to get around the tree, we'll try and push it as far away from the tree. Because I know, I've been out there, some of those trees look like they're probably -- I'm not an arborist -- very, very old.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

MR. MACKEY: And we don't want to cut down those trees.

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Those people would be screaming.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Let's move on before we lose our quorum.

Next --

LEGISLATOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I've got to scoot out.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a quorum?

MS. GROWNEY: Bye, Jay.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: One, two, three, four, five. Yeah, as long as Eva stays, we're okay.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah, I'll stay.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Okay.

MS. GROWNEY: I'm not going anywhere. I'm just organizing.

(WHEREUPON, Legislator Jay Schneiderman left the proceeding.)

(Time noted: 11:44 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Next one.

MR. QUINN: Okay. This location is -- I apologize for the -- quite a lengthy section of CR 85, Montauk Highway. I have some blowups of these areas --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Is this a turtle-free zone?

MR. QUINN: I mean, I don't know. We haven't done a turtle study yet.

This is Oakdale-Sayville in Islip, and the project limits go from -- from Idle Hour Road -- Boulevard on the west to West Street on the east.

You can see that the yellow is showing -- if you have it in front of you, the yellow is showing the existing sidewalk (indicating), the pink is -- the magenta is the new sidewalk (indicating).

The objective is the same as in our previous projects, is to improve the connectivity, provide a continuous route through -- through certain areas, the areas of busiest pedestrian activity.

Okay. This is the area of Oakdale Avenue to the Long Island Railroad (indicating), where there is an existing sidewalk.

The area from Bayview to Canterbury on the south side includes a -- a BOCES center, residences, and some businesses (indicating).

And then the last section would be to connect on the -- on -- the existing sidewalk in the area Ockers to -- back to the commercial area on the west (indicating).

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Do we have a motion?

MR. PICHNEY: Just again, do we know what the level of community support is for this? Because I know the Oakdale Civic Association is extremely active, and, once again, you don't want disruption the day that the construction equipment shows up.

MR. QUINN: Disruption as far as? I'm sorry, I couldn't --

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Riots.

MR. PICHNEY: Riots.

MR. MACKEY: Again, this is another project that came down from the county legislature. There have been certain aspects of this project that we have been -- that has been shiltered down to me that they are looking for, especially in the vicinity of kind of the Oakdale train station area --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. MACKEY: -- and so forth. So I would have to say, as far as my

knowledge, that they have been for it. We've gotten -- I personally have gotten several phone calls from people that live within -- in the area that keep asking -- because over to the east of this on Montauk Highway, sidewalk projects through Sayville had been completed, asking --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. MACKEY: -- when, you know, theirs is coming on.

MR. PICHNEY: Uh-huh.

MR. MACKEY: So I'm going to assume that they are looking forward to doing this.

MR. PICHNEY: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: I have some comments relating to this section. On Mon- -- on -- where you see the bus stop in front of St. John's University -- there are a lot of obstacles, I'll say, from the -- starting at the traffic light in

front of the shopping center and going past both entrances to the main entrance of the university. The one thing that's outstanding of a historic artifact, let's say, is the -- the pier from the original gates is I think within this route, and should be taken a look at if that could be preserved --

MR. MACKEY: Sure.

MR. MARTIN: -- and not taken down.

There's also the signage for the university and a historic, I'll say, hedgerow, this whole lane, and a chain-linked fence behind it.

There's also a steep, for this area, hill from the bus stop towards the traffic light, so I don't know how you're going to be cutting into that.

MR. MACKEY: Yes. If you could forward -- if you could send me, you know, your concerns via e-mail or whatever.

MR. MARTIN: Okay.

MR. MACKEY: But, again, we're not

doing -- we have no plans to take down signage or -- right now --

MR. MARTIN: You might need to, though, as like --

MR. MACKEY: We could relocate it.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. MACKEY: That's not a problem.

MR. MARTIN: It's going to have to be a coordinated project with the university because they probably have some of their signage in the right-of-way.

MR. MACKEY: It's on our property, though --

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MR. MACKEY: -- so they would have to remove it.

MR. MARTIN: But it could cause some excitement, like Dan said.

MR. MACKEY: Well, the reason why that part -- that part of the project was included was that we were -- we were -- it came down to me that there's a -- a percentage of people that go to

the university take the bus, and they live in a safe access to walk to the university from there, that's why it was included.

I was unaware of the pier, so -- and, again, that's -- we'll at all costs try and figure that out as much as possible. And from driving the job, I think it was far enough -- far enough behind where we want to do.

MR. MARTIN: There's two. One is set back; one is tight to the road.

MR. MACKEY: I'll have to --

MR. MARTIN: Take a look at the -- it's the -- of the west entrance. And --

MR. MACKEY: And I believe that hedgerow was far enough back where we wouldn't have to --

MR. MARTIN: Okay. It changes, you know, the location. And just -- is there any plantings, if that's taken out, to replace or do anything like that?

MR. MACKEY: The hedgerow?

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MR. MACKEY: Right now --

MR. MARTIN: Are there any plantings at all?

MR. MACKEY: Right now, in preliminarily looking at it, we will not have to effect that hedgerow. But, obviously, since it is county property, if we -- we touch that, we will try and replace it.

MR. MARTIN: I think -- and I would even -- I walked it myself, I -- I would meet with you, but I do have concerns how that would affect the historic frontage of the property.

MR. PICHNEY: Richard, is the St. John's Church there in that study area?

MR. MARTIN: The church is on the other side of street, and this has an exist- -- that church has an existing sidewalk.

MR. PICHNEY: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: So it's not affecting that at all.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Just a question, a comment that you made, and that is that you would try to accommodate the historic structures as much as possible.

I guess my question is, do the historic structures trump the sidewalk?

MR. MARTIN: I -- well, just my opinion from walking that area, I understand the need, I -- I don't question that, especially if you have students and that bus stop is -- is used. I just think it needs to accommodate the historic elements there.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yeah, but there's a difference between him trying to do it and -- and him doing it. And I'm just wondering --

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: -- does the historic nature of these facilities -- are they -- is it such that his sidewalk cannot -- can -- cannot disturb them?

MR. MARTIN: I'd have to meet with them on site to see the exact layout of where the sidewalk's going, to be honest.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay.

MR. MACKEY: I believe --

MR. MARTIN: Because there's a lot going on there.

MR. MACKEY: We have no problem meeting with you and taking your -- you know, taking your concerns. When I say try -- is -- is -- you know, obviously, we've got to try and look at both parts of the problem. We're not interested in ripping out anything historic, don't get me wrong.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. GROWNEY: (Indicating)

MR. MACKEY: You know, we want to work with -- and make what's feasible and, of course, what's best.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Eva.

MS. SPENCER: But, Larry, question. If you meet on site --

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MS. SPENCER: -- and the historic structure is in the middle of where they want to put the sidewalk, and there's no more -- there's no room to put it into the row, how do you feel about that?

That's his question, I believe.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MS. GROWNEY: Yeah.

MR. MACKEY: It's something --

MR. MARTIN: I think there's a --

MR. MACKEY: It's something that we would come to -- come across --

MR. MARTIN: Yeah.

MS. GROWNEY: I think it's a problem.

MR. MACKEY: -- obviously, in the field, and when things get a little more finalized, then, you know --

MR. MARTIN: Yeah, but that's not in the right-of-way, because I think -- you know, you have an old historic road there. I don't know what the county right-of-way exactly is at all these

points.

MR. MACKEY: We haven't -- as part of the project, we haven't -- I believe this one is just -- we're dealing with tax map overlays. It's not cost effective for us to get a -- a -- it's very expensive to get a right-of-way survey, you know, down pat within, you know, a tenth of an inch. So on these, we can allow them to have sidewalk -- you know, existing, you just follow along, and, you know, from the tax maps, you can see --

MS. GROWNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva.

MS. GROWNEY: Just to reiterate, because I think Richard was also saying not just the hedgerow, but he did say plantings. So I think that -- to make sure that they're also looking at the plantings -- plantings can be moved, but I think preserving somehow the general feeling of this -- of this place. Maybe not the exact position, but the general

feeling --

MR. MACKEY: And that's the --

MS. GROWNEY: -- design feeling --

MR. MACKEY: -- what we're going to work --

MS. GROWNEY: -- I think that's -- yeah.

MR. MACKEY: Yeah.

MS. GROWNEY: So I would rec- -- you know, make --

MR. MACKEY: For me to say right now that --

MS. GROWNEY: -- that that's incorporated somehow.

MR. MACKEY: For me to say right now we're going to, you know, hit something is -- is -- it would be foolish --

MS. GROWNEY: No, I understand.

MR. MACKEY: That's why we'd be more than happy to meet with him in the field, and when we have more -- further on in the plans and, you know, take into account --

MS. GROWNEY: Okay.

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

MR. MACKEY: -- you know, his input and his expertise as to how to (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Dan.

MR. PICHNEY: If there is a -- some sort of small historic structure there, there's always a possibility of getting a dedication from the property on a -- you know, with, you know, no cost -- a no-cost dedication.

MR. MACKEY: Yeah, no.

MR. PICHNEY: And, you know, this university or something like that, they would be happy to do it, and, you know --

MR. MACKEY: And --

MR. PICHNEY: -- that process would go really fast.

MR. MACKEY: And we've done it in other places --

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. MACKEY: -- and it's something

that we come across once we progress planning further.

MR. PICHNEY: Right.

MR. MARTIN: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Do we have a motion?

Oh, you --

MR. MARTIN: Just a question to know, is the university asking for this, or is this from the legislative --

MR. MACKEY: This came down from -- from the legislature, and from a visual of how many people -- and I think Suffolk Transit had a -- you know, how many people actually use that bus stop and walk to the university. And when gas -- I guess gas prices were high, a lot of people -- more people were taking public transportation. So it's a safe way of getting them into the university property.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Okay. Do we have a motion?

MS. GROWNEY: I'll make a motion to

proceed with the project given that the considerations from the historical aspect is incorporated it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a second?

MR. BAGG: Unlisted Neg Dec.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Second?

MR. PICHNEY: (Indicating)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a second from Dan.

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries. Thank you.

MR. QUINN: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: CAC concerns.

MS. SQUIRES: Oh, I thank you for distributing this (indicating). This is the conference in November. It's in Watkins Glen. This is the first time it's been in November, for years we've had it in October. It is on Seneca

Lake. It -- it has some good -- I think, it has some good field trips. It has, I think, an excellent schedule. If you want to know more about it, you can go on NYSACC's Web site, which is right on the right-hand corner, and you'll find more detail on the conference. And it's three counties -- it's sponsored by three. So that should be interesting.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Just to let everyone know, it's a gorgeous area up there. Beautiful for a weekend trip.

MS. GROWNEY: Which three counties?

MS. SQUIRES: It's Schuyler, Steuben, and -- Schuyler, Steuben, and Shamong, I think. I forget.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a motion to adjourn?

VICE CHAIRMAN KAUFMAN: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Second?

MS. SPENCER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

(WHEREUPON, this meeting of the Suffolk County Department of Planning Council on Environmental Quality adjourned at 11:56 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 16th day of September 2009.

Theresa Pape

THERESA PAPE