ORIGINAL

----------X

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

----------X

October 21, 2009
9:30 a.m.

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

B E F O R E:

R. Lawrence Swanson, Chairperson

Michael Kaufman, Vice Chairperson

RECEIVED
S.C. PLANNING DEPT.
2009 DEC -1 AM 11:50

Reported by,
Melissa Powell

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

James Bagg, Chief Environmental Analyst

Richard Machtay, member

Gloria R. Russo, member

Mary Ann Spencer, member

Dan Pichney, member

Joy Squires, CAC Reps

Richard Martin, Historic Society

Kara Hahn, Historic Society

N O T P R E S E N T

Eva Growney, CEQ

Thomas Gulbransen, CEQ

Daniel Pichney, CEQ

A L S O P R E S E N T:

Lauretta Fischer, Warner Property

Nick Gibbons, Suffolk County Parks

Nancy Lenz, Cashin Associates

Niamh Perrotta, Traffic Engineer, DPW

Scott Spittal, VHB, Senior Project Manager

Dominick Ninivaggi, DPW, Superintendent

Tim Hopkins, Suffolk County Attorneys Office

Steve Jones, CEO, Suffolk County Water Authority

CHAIRMAN: I would like to call our meeting to order. Welcome to the October of 2009 CEQ meeting.

For our members, the November 18th, meeting will be at the Legislature Auditorium.

The August 19th, minutes are on the web.

Any comments on them?

MR. MACHTAY: No. August, I read and they were fine.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Make a motion.

MR. MACHTAY: I will make the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is a motion to accept the August minutes?

MS. SPENCER: I will second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a second.

All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

HEARING OFFICER: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Jim, is there any other correspondence you want to call to our attention. I see we have a letter from the --

MR. BAGG: Yes. We got a letter from the Acting Commissioner of the Health Department in favor of the Vector Control Plan for 2010, so that is in everybody's folder.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then we can have this delivered today?

MR. BAGG: No, no, no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's for the next time; alright.

Historic Trust -- Director's Report.

MR. MARTIN: Good morning.

On our housing program, a quick update. We're still doing work at the Isaac Mills House. The roof restoration is taking longer than we thought, so the tenants, at this point, will probably be moving in on December 1. So that's a month later then we had hoped. But that

project is moving forward, so we will have someone there for the Winter and under the Historic Trust Custodial agreement, Jim Bagg had brought to my attention two resolutions that were going forward that I would like to give some background too and some clarification on.

The one is for a Custodial License Agreement with the Great South Bay Audubon Bonn Society for Brooksite County Park in Sayville. That is now going forward to the Legislature in order to go into contract with this organization.

This park is dedicated -- it was reviewed for dedication -- excuse me -- by the CEQ for both the building and the six acre property, and was also reviewed here at the CEQ to approve this organization and to occupy that site.

Jim, is that your understanding for that site?

MR. BAGG: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: So we have a reviewed

that and approved that group. They maintain the historic building there, and also provide programings and tours on the site and have done so for a number of a years. They have been a great group to work with, so I have no problems with that going forward. So that had to be reviewed and approved.

The other organization is the Custodial License Agreement with the North Fork Audubon Society for the inlet Pond County Park, and this is known as the red house out in Greenport on Route 48 and this contract -- I just talked to our contracts yesterday. I wasn't aware this was moving forward at this point. What they have done is since they're both Audubon societies and they both do the same activities --

MR. CHAIRMAN: The one you're referring to is?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, I am sorry. The Great South Bay Audubon Society and the North Fork Audubon Society are very similar situations. There is an

historic house there which we have listed as an historic property and I think as county parks and also there is property -- there's actually about 56 acres there, but they provide tours and keep the trails clear at that site.

They have been on-site for a number of years actually with the arrangement under the Town of Southold who had an management agreement with the Parks Department. The contract thought that they should have a direct contract with Parks and not through the Town of Southold, so they went ahead and drew up a contract and they moved it forward. I apologize that we didn't bring it to you first, but the group -- again, there's an historic house. It's an old farm house where they have their offices, and they provide interpretation programs and maintain the trails for us at that property.

So what happened was this contract mirrors the other one and they just put it forward and Jim also brought up

mistake in a sense in the "whereas clause" where it says, "Suffolk County Historic Trust is authorized the North Fork Audubon Society to act as custodian of Inlet Pond County Park via resolution 129-2007." That is actually a mistake. That resolution only refers to the fact that we approve the building being listed under the Historic Trust. It did not approve that group going into that building.

I don't know if you would like any more information on this site. It was just brought to my attention just this week or if you feel comfortable moving forward on it.

Jim, if you have any comments?

MR. BAGG: I have no problems. I just wanted to point out to the CEQ that it is an Historic Trust and that's what's going on.

MR. MARTIN: And we need to correct that resolution.

MR. BAGG: I have a question. The Brooksite has not been dedicated to

Historic, yes?

MR. MARTIN: Right, it hasn't been. It just been reviewed by the CEQ and needs to go forward to the Legislature for full dedication.

MR. KAUFMAN: How large is the inlet?

MR. MARTIN: It is about 56 acres. There are different parcels that were bought overtime. I think the total now is about 56.

Nick, does that sound about right?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any concerns about what Rich has told us to go ahead?

MR. KAUFMAN: It's pretty --

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will move ahead.

MR. MARTIN: Would you like to possibly do a resolution to approve the North Fork Audubon Society, and let the Legislature realize that you're okay with that when it comes forward?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Would you feel more comfortable if we did that?

MR. MARTIN: I think -- just as a --

MR. KAUFMAN: I will make a motion. We have to do it as Historic Trust, so that's not a problem. What exactly should we be saying? What do we need to say? It's obviously not SEQRA language or anything like that. We simply just approve of the lease and the project?

MR. MARTIN: Of the use, yes, park and historic site.

MR. KAUFMAN: I will make a motion as the Historic Trust that we approve of the use and the project as described by Richard Martin -- to approve their use.

MR. CHAIRMAN: North Fork Audubon Society too.

We have a motion?

MR. PICHNEY: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A second by Dan.

Any further discussions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Anything else?

MR. MARTIN: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jim, anything you want to call on -- call out on the extensive list of resolutions laid on the table?

MR. BAGG: Yes, there is one thing in here that I did notice. There is an action in here. Basically, it is requiring or suspending funds for a dog run at Southaven County Park.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Which number?

MR. BAGG: (No response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're looking forward to the dog run.

MR. BAGG: Something like that. Also another thing -- 1922 -- before we get to that one is a law authorizing the sale of 249 acres in Yaphank to the Legacy Village Group for a mixed-use development that is Type I Action. It will require an EAF to be submitted to you which is in the process of being

prepared by a consultant, so that will be on your agenda next time.

MR. CHAIRMAN how about if we move on and maybe Christine can identify it and then come back to it?

MR. BAGG: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, so we will delay that.

Now, I can tell it's October. Nick is here and we're going to discuss vector control.

Dominick, would you please identify yourself for the stenographer?

MR. NINIVAGGI: I am Dominick Ninivaggi. I am the Superintendent of Suffolk County Department of Public Works Division of Vector control, and I wish I could say that may be I am Mr. October, but that title is already taken.

(WHEREUPON, there was laughter.)

MR. NINIVAGGI: We have submitted our 2010 Annual Plan of work. We are basically following the same procedures as for 2008 and 2009.

Since 2007, the long term plan -- an EIS was put into effect. This plan of work is materially the same as last years, again, especially on the water management. We're currently doing minor maintenance type work while the wetland stewardship plans develop.

The only change, I guess, you could say since the long term plan was put into effect is the State Department of Health has changed Public Health Law slightly, in that, they no longer declare a public health threat on each year that they redetect West Nile Virus. They basically changed the Public Health Law and determined that it's an ongoing threat.

We still will declare a health threat from -- just from the SEQRA standpoint. If we need to spray in freshwater wetlands for West Nile Virus and what that does is it allows us to spray under an emergency authorization instead of a freshwater wetlands permit.

So that is the procedure we have

been following. We are attempting to put together a follow-up procedure. We submitted an application to DEC for freshwater wetland permits which would essentially replace these emergency authorizations with an actual permit, and operationally it would be very similar to what we have been doing the last few years, but the advantage is that we have -- can have all our spray plans -- all our spray parameters -- most of our no spray zones in place, in the Spring, before the season starts so if we find a virus, we don't have go through the emergency authorization process and all the parameters are in place.

As part of that permit application, we filed maps with them of areas that we treated in the past for West Nile Virus activity and for eastern equine encephalitis virus activity, and what we're hoping is that if that permit does go through, we will have all these pre-approved maps and pre-approved spray

parameters and will not have to go through the emergency authorization process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I know that makes your life easier, but does it make it too easy with regard to how readily you can begin to use your techniques? In other words, is it like a shoe horn where you can start spraying, what have you, more easily then in the past and we're taking some of the steps of watching the environment out of the loop?

MR. NINIVAGGI: No, the surveillance and the indicators of when we need to spray would still be the same as in the long term planning and EIS. One of the things we have put in this permit is we have a particular problem area in the southern part of Brookhaven Town. Basically, the area is within the flight range of the Fire Island National Seashore where we get very high numbers -- usually a salt marsh mosquitos, and what we've asked the DEC to do there is

-- as you may know, we have two scenarios under which we apply materials for adult mosquitos. One is virus response and the other one is what we call vector control -- response to high numbers of mosquitos. I've already discussed the virus response which again would be essentially the same only under permit instead of emergency authorization. In this area of southern Brookhaven Town, we have asked the DEC for a limited approval to treat for vector control purposes in an adjacent to some of the freshwater wetlands there. Again, this is not a countywide authorization because we don't really need this to be countywide, but these communities get a lot of mosquitos and people live in the freshwater wetlands and it's very difficult to bring the mosquitos under control without spraying it or near freshwater wetlands. So under the vector control scenario, we would -- it would be different and more restrictive than if there was a health

emergency. We wouldn't be treating DEC lands just most wetlands. Most salt marshes would not be treated, but we would be able to get closer to freshwater wetlands. So we're waiting to see if that application is still pending with the DEC.

MR. CHAIRMAN: While we have you, could you give us an update on what conditions were this past Summer with regard to mosquitos?

MR. NINIVAGGI: Well, I guess every year is an unusual year in mosquito control. This year we had very wet and cool conditions in the early part of the season. June and July we had about double the normal rainfall which produced a lot of freshwater mosquitos, but we were kind of fortunate on the virus front, in that, it was also relatively cool and one of the things we have seen is that when the conditions are cool, virus activity seems to slow down.

So, while in some years we might

have 40 or 50 positive mosquitos samples for West Nile Virus, this year we had a total of 17. So it was relatively low year for virus activity. A lot of what -- I guess 13 out of those 17 isolations were in one area. One area was the Carl's River Corridor in the Town of Babylon and that's where we did one aerial adulticide treatment.

As far as human activity, there is one state confirmed case that we just find out about late last week. The person -- an elderly person in the West Babylon area and this person apparently was hospitalized September 24th. The person is now out of the hospital but in a nursing home, so it is apparently a fairly serious case. We're reviewing that case. We want to find out exactly where it is located and whether there is anything we could have done differently. It shows that even if a year with very low virus activity, you can still have some human involvement but the other interesting scenario, as a region, is

there is a lot of activity for eastern equine encephalitis Triple E, and there was a human case in Oswego County. Upstate, a lot of virus activity there. There was a human case in New Hampshire. There was human activity as far as Nova Scotia which is very unusual. There is a lot of activity in New Jersey but for some reason we didn't see any Triple E virus activity here in Suffolk County.

We don't have a good explanation for that. The main vector species was relatively low in numbers this year, but we're happy that they have not had Triple E activity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you also tell us -- based on what you just told us concerning mosquitos, how did that impact your activities? Did you reduce them?

MR. NINIVAGGI: We were able to main our surveillance activities. We had a lot of viral control this year. We did a lot of larviciding which is the acreage figures are at the end of the

plan of work, so we did more larviciding then we did last year and less adult control, and those numbers can fluctuate with weather and virus activity but they generally remain pretty steady.

We once, again, treated more acres with a bacterial product particularly BTI and then with grow regulators. So basically we followed the procedures. We followed the long term plan and we continue to do so in 2010.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you get any complaints?

MR. NINIVAGGI: We got a lot of service calls and a lot of calls about stagnant swimming pools, and we did put in place an improvement coordination procedure with the Health Department to try to abate those. We had an outbreak of salt marsh mosquitos in early August which generated a lot of phone complaints for about a week and caused us to do adult control.

Around Labor Day weekend, we had a very large outbreak of salt marsh

mosquitos and we kind of suspected they were coming but, of course, they didn't show up until Labor Day weekend itself and we got a lot of service calls as a result of that. And for better or worse, after Labor Day weekend, we got a lot of requests for adult control in these areas, but we did very little because the weather conditions were not contusive and our criteria called for us not to spray because we don't think it is going to work, so we had some unhappy people in that respect because they were asking for us to spray and we had to tell them that we couldn't but by about the third week in September, that plea declined.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now next year, we have to revisit the long term plan; is that not correct?

MR. NINIVAGGI: Yes, I guess it's a triennial report.

THE CHAIRMAN: And part of that, as I recall, is it is suppose to have a wetland management plan. Can you tell

us what the status of the development of that plan is? Are we going to be on schedule to properly review the triennial report?

MR. NINIVAGGI: The triennial report will be completed in, I believe, late 2010. If I am --

MS. DEMPSEY: Around 2010, we'll have a draft and what's nice about the whole process really is we are working very closely with the Health Department and the health educators in providing the information required in the findings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can you identify yourself for the stenographer.

MS. DEMPSEY: Mary Dempsey, Biologist of Suffolk County Department of Environmental and Engineer.

MR. NINIVAGGI: Mary has been, obviously, working very closely with my Department and she has been taken the lead on coordinating this vector control standpoint and, of course, we have been working closely on the -- a consultant

team has been hired for the wetland stewardship program. We have been providing them information that they need. We met with them in the field, and we're continuing to work with them as they develop their -- particularly their criteria for wetlands health, and we have given them a lot of feedback on that, and we're trying to anticipate some of the questions that might be asked based on our experience with the long term plan. So, hopefully by the time everything comes in, we will have a good product for you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My concern and I know this is not under your control, but my concern is that the wetland managements plan should have been well underway by now -- probably for a year and-a-half at least and that next year we're not going to be in a position simply because of not having a sufficient amount of time to have all the proper documentation to move forward with what you need to do.

So, is there a way that we can get this process functioning more efficiently?

MR. NINIVAGGI: We like to think that we're working as sufficiently as we can be. I think it's an appropriate thing to remind the appropriate commissioners about how anxious you're to see this. I know we have been working closely with the consultants and kind of holding their feet to the fire on there. We're going to continue to do that because we -- from our standpoint in the vector control program, we think there are a lot of opportunities for reducing pesticide use from good wetland management and the hang up is basically defining what good wetland management is which is what this project is supposed to do for us, so we're anxious to see that as well.

I should mention that we have been working very closely with the State DEC, and I would say that the relationship with the DEC has improved significantly

over the last year or so in particular and we have been working with them on getting funds for a project at Indian Island County Park, and I am very pleased to report that the DEC has actually been working with us on the preliminary design face of that project which if it ever does get funded and gets to you guys, it will have their input which will be tremendously helpful because when you have the permitting agency in on the early stage, by the time you get to the permit process, all the problems should be solved so that has been very positive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Jim, can we write a letter to the Director of Energy and Environment pointing out that it's imperative and that we have a wetlands management plan and in order to properly move forward with the vector control process in 2010?

MR. BAGG: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Michael, I know you want to ask a question.

MR. KAUFMAN: First off, I was looking at the pesticide use list in 2009; is that up or down compared to, let's say, 2008 in terms of total usage?

MR. NINIVAGGI: Larviciding is up because of the extremely and most of those acreage figures come from the aerial larviciding program. Adulticide acreage is down because we have had less virus activity and we had relatively higher salt marsh activity. It is an interesting -- it is very common that when you have a wet year there is sort of seesaw effect. Your freshwater mosquitos will be up and the saltwater marsh mosquitos are down. We had relatively little virus activity, so that drove the adulticide numbers down, but the marshes were very wet this year. They were wet almost every week, so that required a lot of larvicide by helicopter.

MR. KAUFMAN: The second question.

On Page 10, you talk about you're able now a little bit to differentiate

culex salinarius and I think it's culex pipiens.

MR. NINIVAGGI: Pipiens, yes.

MR. KAUFMAN: Has there been any changes in strategy that you're looking at? I mean are the bugs two different species? Different enough in behavior to justify the different type of strategy or are they functioning similar to each other?

MR. NINIVAGGI: Basically, what we're finding is that based on some of the research we did and had published, is that culex salinarius can breed in a lot of different locations but in Suffolk County, it seems like the major sources are the upper parts of salt marshes, and one of the interesting things when we looked at different types of salt marshes in that paper, we found that some of the relatively undisturbed salt marshes seem to have the largest numbers of culex salinarius. So I think that, that has implications for wetland management in the sense that culex

salinarius is not a tremendous biting problem compared to some of the other salt marsh species because it tends to not fly as far. It tends to bite mostly at night, but it's an excellent vector of West Nile virus. So it's an interesting situation there where it was relatively undisturbed marshes, you have a species that is important vector -- its an important public health mosquito, but its not so much a major so called nuisance species. So I think that when we start looking at what we might want to do in terms of wetland management, we need to pay attention to the areas where culex salinarius breeds.

MR. KAUFMAN: You were talking about the Mastic Shirley area as being an area of special concern. Is that because of the physical layout of the area? It's basically finger sticking into the marshes and things like that or does that prompt a different approach?

MR. NINIVAGGI: Yes, there are a lot of issues there. Part of it is that

it's -- there are a lot of small salt marshes -- degraded salt marshes associated with the Mastic Shirley peninsula. There are wetlands up among the residential areas. You will find houses that are actually in mapped freshwater wetlands and your also adjacent to the federal wilderness in Fire Island and we occasionally have outbreaks of mosquitos from Fire Island reaching the Mastic and Shirley area and even into Bellport and Brookhaven Hamlet.

We did establish a New Jersey light trap at Smith Point Park just inside the federal property, and that trap, by far, we get the highest numbers of mosquitos by one to two orders of magnitude in that -- which is reflecting mosquitos coming out of the wilderness.

As a matter of fact, they did a CDC light trap in the wilderness this year and they caught about 80,000 mosquitos in single night and our criteria for treatment is 100. So that gives you an

idea of the number mosquitos that can come out of this wilderness area.

MR. KAUFMAN: Basically pointing Mastic and Shirley as areas of special concern. When I was looking from the findings statements, et cetera, it seemed as if looking at it as an area of special concern, would be consistent with a plan?

MR. NINIVAGGI: Exactly. The other thing that the DEC asked for, and I think that was very appropriate was in terms of what is the virus activity in the Mastic and Shirley -- the southern Brookhaven area, and we looked that up and there are substantial numbers of virus isolation of West Nile virus, Triple E, and there are other viruses of relatively minor importance as far as we know such as Jamestown Cannon that have also showed up in the Mastic/Shirley area.

So the reason the DEC is considering issuing a permit is not just because of the quality of life impact,

but primarily because of the public health threat and it is documented by the virus activity in the area.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's what I was trying to lead up to. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

MR. MACHTAY: Just set my mind at ease.

Are we required to do SEQRA on this every year? Why else did it come to us is what I am trying to figure out?

MR. BAGG: It goes before the legislature and the review plan and basically the plan has to be reviewed to find out if it's compatible with the EIS and if it is, then it is complete.

MR. MACHTAY: The other question is and correct me if I am wrong, I do believe last year there was some problem with New York State DEC giving permission to spray on DEC property or State property. Has that all been resolved?

MR. NINIVAGGI: That has been resolved. This year we got our

larviciding permit from them for the DEC land and that permit is called a temporary revocable permit or TRP and the special conditions and criteria on the TRP are now identical to the criteria for elsewhere in the County. So we were able to resolve our differences with DEC and have a consistent program on the DEC land and the non DEC lands.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As I recall, a judge ruled that the DEC could not say that it was permissible to do vector control everywhere in the State except on their property.

MR. MACHTAY: So what are we required to do in terms of resolution today? What must it say?

MR. KAUFMAN: Find it consistent, if you will.

MR. MACHTAY: And is it consistent? Do we all agree that it is consistent?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes, it is.

MR. MACHTAY: Then I make a motion on the resolution saying just that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

MS. RUSSO: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just want to go back, once again, to the wetlands management plan because as I understand it, if we do not have an agreed to wetlands management plan in 2010, your hands are essentially going to be tied and we will not have a vector control plan; is that --

MR. NINIVAGGI: That wasn't my understanding, but I haven't looked at that thoroughly. That's something, obviously, I want to take to the County Attorney's office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's why I am concerned that we get this wetlands management process moving because we know that when the plan gets reviewed after the third year, that we can expect a lot of concerned people.

MR. NINIVAGGI: I think that -- I actually would appreciate if you'd make that point in the letter you're planning on writing because it is always helpful to have support for this from the outside minds of the office.

MR. KAUFMAN: I believe that you're correct in most of what you just said that if the five-year plan is not met. I believe though that the Department would be allowed to continue a number of its activities such as surveillance and I believe larviciding as part of its normal activities, it would not be prohibited and adulticiding, I believe, would require emergency permits. So they're not shut out of business totally, but they would not be allowed to do many of the activities that they're otherwise allowed to do as part of the five year -- as part of this five year interregnum, if you will. So they're not totally shut out but, again, a lot of their activities would not be allowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor of the motion?

THE BOARD: Aye.

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Thank you, Dominick.

We're going to go back to our motion laid on the table about the item that Jim was pointing out to us which was Item 1866.

This is appropriating funds in connection with established the dog park at Southaven County Park.

So, do we have a motion to accept recommendations from staff concerning these motions laid on the table?

MR. MACHTAY: What is your recommendation on that?

MR. BAGG: The recommendation is going across the street. So on those two issues, IR 1066 is an Unlisted Action an EAF is required to be submitted to CEQ at a $50,000 expense.

We have no idea where it's going and the other one is IR 1922, which is the Yaphank sale of property which is a Type 1 Action also requiring EAF, but the Legislature knows that and that will be coming to you next month in Yaphank.

MR. MACHTAY: So with those recommendations, I make a motion to recommend.

MS. SPENCER: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion and we have a second by Mary Ann.

All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

We're going to go little bit out of order and go to the Recommended Type 1 Actions.

The proposed IR 1861 authorizing the granting of permanent easement of Suffolk County Water Authority and the production, distribution, and

transmission of drinking waiter.

Steve?

MR. JONES: Yes, thank you for taking us out of order.

Tim Hopkins, General Counsel to Suffolk County Water Authority. Tim is joining me here today.

HEARING OFFICER: You're Steve?

MR. JONES: Yes, Steve Jones. I am the CEO of the Suffolk County Water Authority.

What we're doing today is we are here to answer any questions you have about an introductory resolution which was crafted by Tim Hopkins of the County Attorney's Office and George Mullen (Phonetic) from the County Legislature.

What this resolution does is it basically has to do with properties that require one quarter penny of the sales tax revenue. Over the years, these are properties called "quarter cent properties" or "drinking water properties." What they are is they're an acquisition program that the County

has had which acquires land for drinking water protection.

The land is dedicated to the nature preserve -- county nature preserve with one exception. That is a deed covenant. That's in the deed and also the resolution -- the acquisition resolution and in the County Charter which specifically reserves the right to use the properties for production, transmission, and distribution of drinking water.

So what we're doing which is kind of unusual is that we have gone to the Legislature on one other occasion with two individual parcels. Those being what we call the Gus Gurrieri Well Field which is a functioning pump station across from the West Hampton train station at the south end of the Dwarf Pines County Park. The other parcel is on a drinking water piece out in Amagansett on Aquabonic Road.

These are two functioning pump stations where we have worked with the

Legislature and then subsequently with the County Parks Department when we established the pump stations.

We would like to think we have had a good experience in these two locations with the County Parks Departments in terms of very limited clearing and doing exactly what the Parks Department wanted us to do in keeping to the site plan that we submitted and in those cases, to see CEQ and Parks Trustees and to the Legislature.

We have two other instances now on drinking water properties where the Parks Department has given us authorization for test wells. One is on the side south side of Nugent Drive west of the county jail and the other parcel -- help me out, Nick?

MR. GIBBONS: Huntington.

MR. JONES: There is Huntington -- there is three. One over there on Pulaski Road and near Oakwood Road is the Wicks Farm area and there is a third test location at the Laurel Valley

County Park on Deer Field Road in Noyac.

So getting back to what the resolution is all about. It is somewhat unusual in that we're looking -- concerned about 34 easements on 34 parcels. We don't need these right now. What we're doing is we're taking the opportunity of the fact that the County is willing to entertain us in doing it in one fill swoop -- pretty much all the easements that we will need going forward in the future perhaps for the next 50 years or even more than that. It may even be after Nick is retired at this point but who knows.

At any rate, we're basically -- this resolution authorizes us to enter into an agreement with the County, pull all these easements forward in terms of their value, pay for them, pay for the value of the easements now, and to have this agreement and the essence of it is that -- perhaps one important component from your standpoint is that it reserves the right for everything that is in the

charter now for the exception of the legislative authorization that gets done once now and then in the future. Every time we want to use a piece of property for drinking water purposes, one of these 34 locations we go through the rest of the process as it stands now which, of course, involves the CEQ, Parks Trustees, Parks Department in terms of intensive review of what we actually want to do at with this particular piece of property. So the only other thing that's -- perhaps, if you weighed through it and you wonder, "It's a lot of acreage? What's going on there?" What Tim Hopkins of the County Attorney's Office did was create an easement which basically has a five acre parcel that floats anywhere within a particular drinking -- larger water drinking parcel. Once that easement lands at a particular location on a larger parcel, if the Parks Department says, "Yes, we want to it over here and not over here," and we say we need to

have at this location because we need to be near existing water main or whatever it is, we worked it out with the Parks Department and then that easement is solidified on that parcel and it's extinguished on the rest of the property.

So I brought along a map which I will just pass around because you really can't see it, but the bulk of these 34 properties are in the Town of Brookhaven and the Town of Southampton. So they're mostly in the Pine Barren areas, but you will see a few in Islip, and you'll see maybe a few in north Brookhaven outside of the pine barrens and one maybe out in the eastern portion of Southampton or East Hampton.

Tim is here to answer any questions that you have and I'll be happy to do so, as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think you better sit down.

Michael, you want to --

MR. KAUFMAN: I have a bunch of

questions on the SEQRA aspect of how it is being done.

I looked at the resolution and it's basically going with permissive segmentation. Under SEQRA, I guess, segmentation as long as it is identified as such, and as long as site specific environmental review is preserved and if you're upfront about it, it's basically permissible. That's always been my impression. I think CEQ has done that in the past and that's evidently what you're trying to do today. Basically, go with the planning steps now and granting, if you will, a general in total easement of a couple of hundred acres -- something like that and preserving the right for site specific review; is that an accurate statement?

MR. HOPKINS: Yes, that is an accurate statement.

MR. KAUFMAN: Looking at the resolutions here, it is basically going to be a coordinative review based upon what you were just saying and then also

looking up here. Lead agency, right now today is the legislature bill. After that, it's -- Suffolk County Water Authority runs it.

MR. HOPKINS: It would be the lead agency on any type of specific review. It will be coordinated with the County.

MR. KAUFMAN: I just get a little bit jumpy about segmentation. That's why I am trying to pin down exactly what is going on and make sure that the review for all of these is preserved. Obviously, the County has been buying Pine Barrens land over the years, but for preservation purposes and with a reservation for drinking water as you pointed out.

MR. HOPKINS: Presumably at the time of purchase, they did a review to consider the fact that the property should be utilized for drinking water purposes at that time.

MR. KAUFMAN: I believe most of the time that, that is done. Again, I am just trying hone in on the environmental

reviews. I think we've established that.

Question, obviously in the Pine Barrens there are patches here there and everywhere where there has been clearing that has already occurred and also vegetation has already been disturbed. If you find a well site that's near to previously disturbed areas, but is not in of itself disturbed at this point time -- in other words, if the vegetation is intact, are you guys going to be able to move your equipment around to maybe have a preference for cleared land as opposed to taking out pine barrens vegetation?

MR. HOPKINS: We would do that to the maximum extent practical under the circumstance.

MR. KAUFMAN: The reason I bring that up is because there was a pipeline along the LIE a while back and the County was sued on that one.

MR. HOPKINS: What kind of pipeline?

MR. KAUFMAN: I believe it was a LIPA gas pipeline. I think it took out a total of 14 acres along the LIE.

MR. HOPKINS: Well, that's LIPA.

MR. KAUFMAN: I understand that. Nonetheless, I am -- I was also uncomfortable with that -- it went fairly far away from the LIE -- a couple of hundred feet and they took out a fair amount of pine barrens. It was only 14 acres and the County did get sued. The County did lose the battle on that one. Here, we're talking about the potential of 170 acres or something like that. I, personally, am going to recommend that we put in a recommendation that you stick to previously cleared areas, if possible, to the maximum extent possible.

MR. BAGG: The resolution says that.

MR. KAUFMAN: I didn't catch that then. Question, do you guys have slant drilling ability at this point in time?

MR. JONES: We do directional

drilling for our distribution piping to get across roads to get under wetlands. We used it actually in the Farmingville County Park to get from point A to point B, so we wouldn't disturb any vegetation. But when we do pump stations and you'll see this at Aquabonic Road and also at Gus Gurrieri Well Field in Dwarf Pine Planes, but the problem is when you're drilling the well, the minimum length of pipe is a 20 foot section of the steel casing and when you're doing the well, you need to clear -- temporarily clear sufficient areas so you can move the pipe sections around and put them up vertically and put them down. So what you see on a typical five acre site which, I think, Gus Gurrieri would be a good example of, is that you see an initial clearing and then you see a contraction after the pump house -- after the well has been established and the building is up and that sort of thing. We only need the large open area for -- you'll see on

sites like that, by the way, that buying large we only clear about two out of the five acres even initially we only clear about two out of the five acres.

MR. GIBBONS: It might help but I work most closely with staff at the Water Authority in terms of laying out the site and choosing the location of the site.

In terms of getting back to your previous point about utilization of previously disturbed areas, we do, do that whenever possible but for a great majority of these properties, there are no such sites within the intact parkland. So the next criteria we use is proximity to road because often times unfortunately the results of those tests are quality that does not measure up to the standards of the water authority, and they abandon the site. They do not go to the next phase which is permanent development and establishment of the permanent easement there.

So I always plan for the worse case

scenario because I would rather they disturb an area that is more expendable then not. I don't want a fragmentation of another parkland.

MR. KAUFMAN: I hear what you're saying, and you and I have discussed that point in the past and that's also why I bring up the issue of slant drilling.

I know down in Texas in an oil field they have different types of cams and they have the ability to literally, at the well head itself, drill directionally. They don't have to have a vertical approach, and I know we went through this with the Dwarf Pine Plains -- Dwarf Pine Barrens in West Hampton a while back -- say four or five years ago, and at that time Mr. La Grande said that there was simply an impossibility. Yet I know that --

MR. JONES: That's correct. For extracting water from the aqua-ford it is not -- you have to have it totally vertical because the turbine and the

well pump and everything is actually down in the column, and it's pushing the water out of the ground and it's got to be vertical.

MR. HOPKINS: Anyway, that's not part of the plan.

MR. KAUFMAN: I was suggesting it, obviously, as an alternative to the site since I know a little bit about how it works.

MR. HOPKINS: It's not part of the proposal.

MR. JONES: But like I said, we have used directional drilling for the transmission and distribution for water and --

MR. GIBBONS: That is for previously existing facilities.

MR. KAUFMAN: I understand what you're saying. I am simply saying that it may not be part of the proposal. You may not have the equipment around here and you're saying there is a technical objection to it. I understand the difference between pulling the water

verses oil and gas fields where it has underground pressure, but I have heard and I have seen some specks for equipment that -- for well drilling where you can do a directional approach.

MR. HOPKINS: How would that help the situation here because here you have to directionally drill from somewhere, correct?

MR. KAUFMAN: True, but what happens if you have a cleared area 200 yards away and you want your well and have your freshwater over here, 200 yards away it is cleared and you just pump in that way.

MR. HOPKINS: 200 yards isn't going to make a difference with respect to the quality of the water. There is little in the area that would hold economical and most economic environmentally sound under the circumstances. Drilling them vertical or horizontal or at an angled level from 200 yards away is not going to make a difference.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, yes, it could.

It could minimize the clearing. That is the point he was getting at.

MR. KAUFMAN: Also, frankly, if you hit a clay lens -- let's say you're at this side of the table and you hit a clay lens so you might want to punch through it in a different way.

It's not -- you can't just out now say that it's uneconomical or it's not a good idea to avoid the directional drilling if you have the capability simply because it's not part of the plan. I just don't think that is --

MR. CHAIRMAN: He's established or he is telling us that they don't have the capabilities.

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, that's why I am bring it up. I have seen it. It's something -- if it comes across your desk, you should take a look at it. That's all.

MR. BAGG: Michael, any potential well site has to be reviewed in the future and wells going on the property whether there is clear or not clear area

or whatever -- I mean, at that time, when you get to the individual review if there is clearing area next to the area that is proposed, I assume, you could request -- bring that up at that time and say is this feasible to do some type of -- you know, directional slant drilling to access that.

MR. KAUFMAN: I just don't think it should be precluded at this point in time is what I am getting the feeling of.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a resolution that we have to keep clearing apparently --

MR. KAUFMAN: I see that in the eighth paragraph so --

MR. JONES: I would say and, Nick, can either bail me out or not that the Aquabonic Road -- Red Dirt Road is an obstructive example where the Parks Department said, "You know what? We prefer that the Red Dirt Road being a very narrow kind of an area with not much activity can you go around the

corner to Aquabonic Road," and we work together on the location there and then as for Laurel Valley County Park we were too close to -- the Parks Department felt we were too close to the trail that goes to that area so we said, "Okay, we will move away from the trail and we will reconfigure the well house and the treatment building and --

MR. KAUFMAN: Steve, I am not doubting your intent or anything like that. I know between Nick and your department that both Parks and Water Authority are environmentally sensitive. I do see that. I see it in the resolution, et cetera. I am suggesting that there may be another thing that can be done possibly in the future and it should not be precluded which is one of things I am getting jumpy about. That's all I am saying.

MS. RUSSO: Steve, what do you preserve as a ten year plan? How many new well heads do you think that might actually have functioning on these 170

acres?

MR. JONES: The big question mark for us is the drinking water standard. We have in the central pine barrens and already have now are well fields that no matter what the drinking water standard goes down to in terms of its restrictions, we can meet it and exceed it --

MS. RUSSO: Without any treatment?

MR. JONES: (Continuing) -- in a positive way because of the fact that there are vast areas now in the central pine barrens that are protected. So what we do know is that we are still on a continuum where our customers are installing automatic sprinkling systems. So while our customer growth has been fairly flat, it is now down to maybe 500 or -- between 500 and 1,000 new customers a year which is next to nothing compared to the growth that we had in the past. Our consumption has continued to climb because our existing customers are putting in automatic

sprinkler systems. So we are going to continue to need some additional water to go for peek design demand so that we can provide water to our customers when they demand it, and still have adequate fire protection.

With that all being said, out of the 34 properties maybe in the next 10 years, we might use five, six, seven something like that.

MS. RUSSO: You really don't think it is going to be in the double digits upon how many use or develop one?

MR. JONES: No -- what we're -- we're also on a continuum where it is far less expensive for us to go to upgrade our permits with the State DEC on an existing well and go for maybe 750 gallons a minute to 1300 gallons a minute and drop a new well -- a new turbine and pump in the column and put a new electric motor on the top and just pump more water out of an existing well is far cheaper than -- you know, one of these new pump stations they will run

out generally a couple of million bucks each, so we try to do other things first to max out on our capabilities in our existing systems rather then just opening up new wells and the other thing, of course, is when you look on that map, you will see that these locations -- many of them are not near any growth and there's never going to be any growth because it is in the central pine barrens so that is a good thing. Our customers generally get their water within two or three miles of the source, so it's not -- we're not on a fast track here by any means to develop this.

MS. RUSSO: But you mentioned earlier as far as the customer increase and its really based on in-ground sprinkler systems and not so much on new customers and increase in supplies. I know the County Water Authority does put out little packets trying to conserve water and they put it in the mail and stuff. Has the water authority or even Suffolk County have ever looked into the

possibility of maybe just outright banning these automatic sprinklers and making sure that if they are used, the code is written that they must have the automatic rain sensors because I go for walk in my own neighborhood and everyday it's raining, you see these sprinklers running. Just this morning, I saw the sprinklers and we had one inch of rain this weekend and these numb nuts that live next door to me have their automatic sprinklers running. I can't even take a shower in the morning at 6 a.m. because the water pressure drops from April to October because so many more people are putting in sprinklers now I am thinking that the long term picture is that we should really ask the County to look into maybe just banning these things completely.

We get 46 inches of rain a year. We get enough rain to basically have a green lawn except for maybe August and our temperate season grasses can withstand dying back in the August

drought and heat. They bounce right back in September when the rain returns. So I am thinking we should look at this at a more holistic view and maybe not even need more well heads.

I understand if the population is increasing, et cetera. But I am looking at it from another perspective and it's really time to get serious about these automatic in-ground sprinklers.

MR. JONES: We have two thoughts right now on the subject. One is that we have had a rebate program for rain sensors for our customers. We had that two Summers ago. This past Summer as Dominick said, "Not a big barrier for us" at the water authority in terms of selling water.

The other thing in terms of conservation is conservation for the Suffolk County Water Authority has more to do with limiting the amount of water that people are polluting because we have to pay to clean it up. So it's not conservation in terms of quantity and

availability. It's conservation in terms of quality. The less water the people use, the less water they foul when it goes back into the ground. So that's where we're coming from.

MS. RUSSO: I understand that.

MR. JONES: And I would suggest that the green lawn is up there with the God given right to an automobile and few other major things that are the rights of Americas and you're going to have real tough time if people can't have a green lawn.

MS. SPENCER: I second that motion.

MR. PICHNEY: I just had question for Michael about general language law. When they're drudging like this, do they taste the perpetuity?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes. They can if it's written as such and it's written as such a legislation.

Just a quick follow up on Gloria's issue. I know out west, for example, Vegas and several place they have water districts with those kinds of

limitations on them. You have to go to a uroscopic -- I think it is -- basically, they have no water use allowed. Vegas is a perfect example of that. Clark County has an absolute maximum amount of water that they can withdraw from the Colorado River.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. MACHTAY: Motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To --

MR. MACHTAY: To approve this resolution as a negative declaration -- Type 1, Negative Declaration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion that this is a Type I, Negative Declaration.

Do we have a second?

MS. RUSSO: I do second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

THE BOARD: Aye.

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Steve, thank you.

MR. JONES: Thank you for taking us out of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I gather your Summer lawn water consumption was down from what you said?

MR. JONES: Yes, in April or May, we were down about $3,000,000 in projected revenue. In June, we were down another $2,500,000. It started to pick up a little bit in July and August, but we budget it based on a five-year historical average consumption. We don't go with the weather. It is what it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do think Gloria has a good suggestion that the long term water availability is probably going to be an issue and we ought to be doing what we can to conserve and maybe working with the Legislature to put some limits on these water delivering systems for lawns would be a good idea. There is a very interesting little book out

called, "How to get your lawn off grass."

MR. JONES: The serious irony for us is that we only have one system so the stuff that people put on their lawns is just the highest quality water you can imagine and it has to be treated that way and to me, what a waste that is. It is such a -- it kills me to see what kind of money we spend on this.

MR. KAUFMAN: One last comment.

I didn't want to put this in the recommendation, but as new technology comes along with drilling and, again, you can do a lot of thinking, and I am not going to get into the technical aspect of drilling wells and things like that but as it comes along, it something to look at.

We're talking about destruction of potentially a 170 acres at the outer limit, and I know at 14 acres that there was a whole big controversy over -- we're talking a 170 even though it was permissible by the legislation and even

though you guys are going to be throwing along with the Parks Department to avoid destruction, it is something to consider.

MR. JONES: Yes, we're always open to new -- any kind of new technology relating to the water business from drilling to setting up treatment -- trains, filtration trains, filter, and everything else that could be in the history since we are one of the largest water companies in the United States. We do a lot of experimentation with a variety -- people are always knocking on our door wanting to do full-scale pilots for various things and we do much more directional drilling then we ever have in the past, principally, to avoid wetlands and river circumstances where we can do that.

We will continue to apply that and if it makes sense to do it at a pump station, then we will do it there too. Why not?

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Proposed Smith Point County Park Master Plan Update.

MR. GIBBONS: Nick Gibbons, Suffolk County Parks Department.

Just while Nancy gets set up, I wanted to call your attention to the fact that we have been through this process before at Smith Point County Park. Just for the benefit of some of the Members here who have not been around since that time, there is an initial park Master Plan which dates back to 1997. It was referenced somewhere in the presentation this morning and again in the updated plan that you all received as part of your package.

If, at any time, any of the Members want to take a closer look at some of aspects of that plan, I will be happy to make some copies of it. It is not the kind of thing we have boxes of it laying around. So if there is a particular point of interest that you would like to see more of, I would be happy to provide

that.

Subsequent to that 1997 plan, there is something we call the Addendum Report which dates back to April of 2003. This dealt primarily with erosional issues within the park and presented a management plan for beach sand -- primarily sand management at Smith Point County Park. So that's a little bit of background here.

Today we're taking a look at the update to the Master Plan. It takes under consideration both these previous reports of the consultant for this plan as was the case for the initial Master Plan from Cashin Associates. Today we have Nancy Lenz here. She is a Registered Landscape Architect with Cashin Associates. She has a power-point. I would like to start with that and then we can jump back into the plan itself and the EAF, if that is okay?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sure.

MR. GIBBONS: On the back of the

EAF, there is an overall site map of the park, but that's probably not going to be of much interest to you as the proposed improvements. We have slides up here, so we can stop at anytime and take a closer look if you have any questions.

MS. LENZ: This is a power point of what we went through to prepare the Master Plan. I think probably a lot of you are familiar with Smith Point. It runs all way from the bridge at William Floyd all the way to the end. We also included in the Master Plan the marina site which was not included in the earlier 1997 Master Plan, so that was included in this plan.

The goal of this master plan when we were given a task to update it was to look at making -- how to enhance the visitor experience plan and to provide additional facilities that would enhance that experience. It's a little different. The 1997 plan actually was the one that generated more revenue and

that wasn't really one of the goals of this. We just wanted to make sure that we would make an attractive facility and that in itself increases the user-ship.

So we reviewed the existing resources and conditions. We reviewed the current facility uses and assessed the 1997 implementation of what was done and what was not done, and then we developed recommendations and conceptional plans for the assignment.

Going through this quickly -- inventory natural settings, the main beach facility, the campgrounds, the outer beach, the marina, utilities, traffic circulation, and health and safety concerns about the park.

Just as a quick usage, Smith Point is the most popular park in the County. On Memorial Day through Labor Day, the main beach had almost 300,000 people and the campgrounds last year booked 45 -- almost 45 plus thousand nights of camping. So that is another major use out there.

It brought in an average over the last past few years of about 1.6 million dollars in revenue each year. So it's popular and it brings in quite a bit of money into the County.

So the main thing that we did here was we looked the 1997 plan and we also looked at the addendum that we mentioned, and we reviewed what was implemented and what was not implemented. This is pretty basic but in the EAF, we give you a detailed list of what was implemented and what was not implemented, but the things that were implemented are the fish pier which is currently under construction.

MR. GIBBONS: Just began.

MS. LENZ: Just began finally and is under construction. The pavilion access road which was redone and the toll plaza was repaved, but other recommendations like the traffic circle, a facilities operation building, and parking lot reorientations were not implemented. For the main bathing

beach, there was a boardwalk worked on -- the June restoration was done and the Flight 800 Memorial was installed but the nature center, exterior lighting improvements, and additional landscaping were not.

The pavilion implemented landscape renovations directly around the pavilion such as additional woman's restroom. They also updated the existing men's and woman's restroom and the roof replacement was done. The exterior refurbishment and electrical improvement for police and lifeguard facility upgrades improvements were never completed. The campgrounds were built and we put up some fences to preserve the embankment between the levels of campsites. We put in dunes -- pedestrian cross overs to keep people off of the dunes going to the beach in that area.

Again, exterior lighting was not done. A lot of the landscaping that we had proposed initially was not

implemented and a bay access beach was not implemented.

I should say that -- the things that we're talking about that are not implemented are things also that we think, for the most part, should be implemented. I think we will just go back to make sure. There is a traffic circle and we're not recommending that. The active recreation area -- I am familiar with that. It is directly adjacent to Finn's and it has put in basketball courts and things. A lot of things were not implemented there because of the mosquito control. It is interesting that you just had that discussion because it is right next to the Finn's facility and there is no mosquito control, and it is almost impossible to use those facilities because the mosquito levels are so high in that area. So they haven't looked to do much with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that the primary reason, mosquitos?

MS. LENZ: Yes. They told us not to locate -- it is a great location for some of the active recreations uses, but the people cannot use it -- you know, the levels are just too heavy so we put it in from the 1997 report -- we put in two basketball courts, handball wall, and a volleyball and they are used minimally. They are still used somewhat and we're not looking to get rid of them, but they don't want additional facilities down there because there is just not enough of a draw.

When they originally put them in they were used for the DARE program, but I think that program has pretty much stopped. There is even more limited use to that area, but also there are some groups that are going down there and using them.

MR. GIBBONS: This is the location that is immediately west of William Floyd Parkway when you come over the bridge. It was our original campground in the '70's and '80's before we had all

this infrastructure down on the beach itself east of the pavilion, but it is fair to say that there are different management approaches, at the time, at Finn's that made that area useable and those are no longer the case and the site is large unusable to the general public.

MR. KAUFMAN: Have you talked to Finn's at all about -- you're not going to cannot? I wonder why?

MS. LENZ: For the outer beach, we implemented vehicular regulations and restrictions and they put -- what they didn't implement was the formal fishing pier areas out at that the --

MR. PICHNEY: The inlet.

MS. LENZ: (Continuing) -- yes, the inlet. The word was escaping me at that point and then additional guidance or maps or signage to help people stay on the designated roadways.

So then we analyzed everything that was there and what we felt and came up with was a series of recommendations,

and I will point them out to you on this map. Hopefully you will be able to see enough, but mainly what we're dealing with right now is the main -- what we call the main bathing beach and that's from coming into the park at William Floyd all the way to the end of the campground facility.

So the pavilion is located central to the main parking area. The pavilion is located central to that. We recommended that they maintain the pavilion in this location and continue with the refurbishments that have been ongoing there. They still need to do the exterior refurbishments. The lifeguard facility which is on this side of facilities is really degraded and doesn't meet the current need of the lifeguards. One of issues is you now have female and male lifeguards and the facilities don't accommodate that so that is an uncomfortable position and the facilities are very small.

The redesign of the food concession

-- I think that is going to be ongoing now. They're going to create a more open eating area under the overhang without so many tables inside the -- unusable space inside the building and then maintenance, and our first aid facility needs refurbishment and then the police and the administration offices are also in here. They are very small offices that need upgrade too, but they have done the bathrooms already so those were major upgrades to facilities. So they spent quite bit on it.

The utilities upgrades for the system and the upgrades to brining in the electrical service upgrades to give better service.

That was the main facility, but the traffic circulation coming in -- the 1997 asked to rebuild this entire and took out the traffic circle and we actually looked at it -- it wasn't built and we don't see a need to take it out and with the traffic circle, people are becoming more familiar with them now and

are much more comfortable traveling through them. So we're recommending it stay in place. It is a major cost that we don't think is that much of a return at this point.

What we did was we recommended that a bus stop lane or a drop off lane be put in at the traffic circle. Right now, most of the traffic is coming in and it needs to drop off in front of the pavilion which will be a very tight facility which makes them drive all the way down to turn around to go back out again. If they can drop off here -- if both the buses and people dropping off visitors to the park here, that would really cut down a lot of the traffic issues that we have along the section of the road with the people waiting to get into the park and the campground entrance over here. (Indicating.)

Along with that -- the traffic upgrades and the -- we recommend that they expand the toll plaza and redesign the entire parking lot and the parking

lot is basically original to when the park was built in the '50's. It had some pavement repairs, but there has never been a major overhaul. It is completely asphalt. I think it is a 3700 car parking lot completely asphalt. I don't know if there is any drainage. If there is, it is about three. We're recommending that they reorientate the lanes that currently run this way to this way which is standard practice for parking facilities -- the way people are walking are the ways you want the lanes oriented.

Putting in types of swales to collect some of the drainage to the area, and it actually ends up reducing the parking by about 600 spaces which we think is based on the usage and not a problem in the facility.

The other thing we're doing in the parking lot is we're creating a separate little parking area for the fishing pier which we just mentioned is currently being constructed right here, and that

will allow the park facility -- if fishing is done 24 hours a day and permits allow access 24 hours to segregate this parking area and allows people to pull out of it separately from the main parking lot so that -- if you have a permit, you can park there overnight and then you will have a separate way to entrance if the park is closed. When the park is open, they open the other gates and it functions the same way as the main parking lot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I ask you question on your parking space reduction.

Reducing it by about 1/6 is really significant. Is that because the original plan overestimated usage or usage down?

MS. LENZ: I think probably both. I think that it -- I think that the parking lot -- I doubt it ever was filled up, but usage is down at the park over -- not so much over the past ten years, but in 1997 Plan, I think, it was

ten years before that -- before that, it was more popular. I think the lack of beach space and the smaller beach also effects the amount of people going to the beach because it gets filled up that much more quickly. It is pretty much a larger beach.

MR. PICHNEY: Again, in regard to the parking lot -- I mean, it is an awfully big lot, and I do believe that the usage is down. Is it possible to, let's say, not pave or remove the pavement from maybe the northern quarter or so or fifth of the parking lot along the bay side -- the north part of the parking lot and either -- you know, return it natural or make it a gravel lot that can be -- you know, what do you call it overspill parking?

MS. LENZ: I guess that's the potential. The paved material that they use in the lot, I guess, it had potential to be something else. We looked at it from the point of view of needing to treat the drainage from the

existing -- from the main section of the lot. So instead of taking away a portion of the lot, we looked at creating a lot more green spaces within the lot that could take the drainage from the lot and then not have to put as many -- because we don't have depth groundwater either so trying to put in any type of leeching pool or something. We tried to go with the swales and minimize the need for leeching pools within the lots. There will probably still be some, but this will give us a lot infiltration area to that drainage and that's kind of how we approached it. The potential, I guess, could be to maybe shorten it a little bit but you still need to treat this -- and for the most part, it is a large lot and you really have to pave a majority of it.

MR. PICHNEY: The analogy was sort of like a mall parking lot during Christmas. They're designed for Christmas, and that's the only time the lot gets completely filled.

MR. GIBBONS: This is designed for four or five months out of the year, but that's the nature of the Parks business. I think that 3,100 resulting lot of this project, Parks would not be interested in entertaining something significantly smaller than that. I understand what you're suggestion to increase the buffer from us to narrow the bay and --

MR. PICHNEY: That is correct.

MR. GIBBON: (Continuing) -- if you look a little bit closely at this later on, you will see -- I am not sure if have you been to the site before. There is an existing buffer of what I would call a degraded wetland habitat, and other species. There is -- we're not right on top of the bay for the large majority of the parking area except for the northeast corner which is where the fishing pier is being sited which is ideal because it doesn't impact any existing wetlands, so to speak of, and the proximity of parking to that facility is very close.

MS. LENZ: This is about 150 feet. The location is much wider here, and then it gets tighter.

MR. PICHNEY: It just seems to me as opposed to, let's say, Robert Moses Park which very easily every spot will be filled at any given parking lot even under the best of circumstances -- even on the 4th of July, this lot is completely full.

MR. GIBBON: We're trying. Yes, it can be filled. We've had concert events and various carnivals which take up a significant portion of the paved areas and in those cases, yes, we absolutely do turn people away.

THE CHAIRMAN: Richard and then Mary Ann?

MR. MACHTAY: I am just curious. I am looking at the EAF, and I see 77 acres of something and three acres of marina and then I see 35 acres of asphalt removed from here. If you're putting in new islands and there is going to be 35 acres of asphalt taken

out --

MS. LENZ: What page are you on?

MR. MACHTAY: Page 2 of 3.

MS. LENZ: I think that is if you --

MR. GIBBON: That's what is going to be generated.

MS. RUSSO: If you replace the whole parking.

MS. LENZ: Right, it is an entire replacement. The parking lot is from the 50's and it is in very poor condition.

MR. MACHTAY: So you're going to rip out everything and start over?

MS. LENZ: Our plan is to redo the entire parking lot.

MR. MACHTAY: So the parking lot is 35 acres?

MS. LENZ: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: So what's the 77 acres?

MS. LENZ: Where is 77?

MR. MACHTAY: 1C -- what's SPCP?

MR. GIBBON: Smith Point County

Park.

MS. LENZ: Yes, because the marina is across the bay so developed areas within Smith Point County Park is 77 acres and that includes the parking lot and it includes the campground, and it includes all of the development.

MR. MACHTAY: And you're going to increase that by three acres?

MS. LENZ: No -- yes, I am sorry. I am reading across the other way. Yes, develop three acres, right.

MR. MACHTAY: And the marina will go from three acres to four and-a-half acres?

MS. LENZ: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: Where is this area that you're going to increase to three acres?

MS. LENZ: It's just really --

MR. GIBBONS: Accumulative.

MS. LENZ: Right, what's happening is --

MR. MACHTAY: Accumulative number?

MR. GIBBON: She will explain a

little bit more where the marina is and get you better oriented up to that facility specifically.

MS. LENZ: Yes, I had that at the end -- the marina comes up at the end and it is a little bit less.

There is just -- like here we're putting in additional road and here. So three acres of additional is not -- we are putting three acres here. It is a little bit in a lot of location.

MR. KAUFMAN: So your net result -- your net increase will be in the area -- along the general beach area, it will be increased by three acres?

MS. LENZ: Right, we haven't said, "Okay, this three acres now we're going to develop it." It's not like that. It's looking out within --

MR. KAUFMAN: "In-filling" is maybe a good word for it.

MS. LENZ: Maybe that's a good word for it. There is a few locations. Like I said, there's roads here. (Indicating.) Actually, I did not

mention, but there is an access road we're looking to expand to one more lane because it's a very bad backup in the Summer here between the traffic that has to go in here and the traffic that goes this way into the campground and onto the outer beach. So we're actually recommending another lane in here. That's an additional green median in the middle, so we're using that space. We're not taking additional -- the lawn area right now. So we're using that, so that would be some additional pavement area.

MR. GIBBON: With some of all these features though, that's roughly where we are coming up with that number, but I think there will be more as she gets through the rest of the --

MR. MACHTAY: I am sorry. I have to leave a little early so one more quick question.

Sanitary sewage existing 55,000 gallons and on the next page is the total water usage gallons per day which

is 65,000 gallons. Is that what we expect it to increase to?

MS. LENZ: I would say that we're not really expecting anything. We're doing a big increase in water and we're not increasing campgrounds. We are not increasing any of those things.

MR. MACHTAY: One should match the other, shouldn't it or it should come pretty close to the other? If I drink water there and leave --

MS. LENZ: I don't know. I can't answer that question as to why they're separate. I would imagine it wouldn't be 100 percent --

MR. GIBBONS: The operation of the facility itself is water irrigation, other vehicle maintenance, general parks maintenance, as well.

MS. SPENCER: So correct me if I am wrong. You have an existing parking lot that you occasionally you have to turn people away from. You're going to reduce it in such a way by putting in these drainage swales that, that will be

a permanent reduction so that ten years from now your usage of the park doubles and it is simply very hard to the expand that to what it is now?

MR. GIBBONS: Correct.

MS. SPENCER: I don't see the point in reducing the park lot that already has some days where you turn people away and without looking at the projection for use at a public like facility and the fact that, that park isn't full every day all Summer days, doesn't mean it wont be full every day all Summer five, ten years from now and I would like to see the projection before you reduce that parking.

The second thing is on expanding the access lane. I think that the traffic circle and the access to this parking lot -- you might notice that I use this facility -- is well designed in that it slows people down. People who are going to Smith Point Park are not on their way to work. They're not going to a fire. They're going to the beach.

The fact that they have to slow down the traffic circle and the fact that there are only two lanes and they it may backup sometimes, I don't see why we're spending money to change that.

MR. GIBBONS: There is a couple of safety concerns relevant to emergency response at the park.

Nancy, I don't think you touched on the exit lane? Can you -

MS. LENZ: What we did look at doing is currently all of the traffic that leaves the park has to come back this way also and come around and that's creating another conflict with the outer beach traffic coming off -- they all converge at this point where this backs up sometimes and this is really the bottle neck of the park. So what we're looking at is putting a new exit lane in this location bringing people out here and then out of the park so that the majority of this traffic would no longer -- all of the traffic would no longer be coming out this way which would reduce

the traffic here and make this an easier move to come out from.

MS. SPENCER: I guess my point is that other than an emergency -- if there is really a problem in an emergency situation then by all means mitigate them but in terms of using this park, I don't see spending the money to do this.

MR. GIBBONS: Let me go back to your earlier point about reduction of the parking lot size. The events that we have, whereby, we're turning people away. They used to be more poplar and thankfully now they're not so much. Parks -- we hate these things. There never our idea. We just always host them. A majority of the parking is taken up by the infrastructure setting up of the carnival or the fireworks display or concerts. We've had all those things there but not recently, but the recommendations made with this new parking lot are they reflect all the engineer -- the evolution of engineering over the past 40 years, in that, we

don't handle any of our stormwater now the right way. It simply empties out into the bay or by extension buffer that we're talking about. So the reduction is largely taken up by things that Parks has continue to develop is the fishing peer which takes off maybe 100 spots and we corner those off for that use.

The swales themselves, I would have look more closely at the analysis, but that in and of itself also takes up some of those spots, but they also serve as a traffic calming measure, and that gets back to your -- the mad rush that everybody has when they come over the bridge and there is an expectation. They park -- they're on beach within a matter of minutes. It doesn't happen that way but it's still long.

MS. LENZ: It's a traffic problem in the parking lot. We have people going in every direction.

MR. GIBBONS: This will force people to drive in a more responsible way where as now we have just this

compliment of everybody who leaving roughly at the same time. Within 90 minutes, 80 percent of the people leave the park around the same time in the afternoon. This forces everybody in an orderly way as best we can figure, but they have to come into a central exit lane and leave the park. This is more similar to what they have at Robert Moses where there is an access and there is a need for that. That's what we're trying to handle with this.

I will just go back to the Robert Moses example. Those parking lots, for what those facilities are, are pretty small. Where as at Smith Point our park is relatively smaller and our parking lot is much larger.

MS. SPENCER: Well, what about my point of five or ten years down the road? What if the use at Smith Point doubles? What happens?

MR. PICHNEY: I think it is a crap shoot issue for beaches because you can have hurricanes there and there could be

no more Robert Moses and no more Smith Point after a while.

MR. GIBBONS: But we have 40 years of experience there which is more than we have at some other places. Actually, the park is 50 years old this year, but the Parks Department didn't even exist at the time and it is still a condition. Since the Parks Department conception, we have about 40 years of experience at the park. We actually have seen a drop-off since a peek in the 80's but even in those cases, in the 80's, it wasn't as if we were turning people away everyday, whereas, at Cupsogue on the other side of the inlet, we turn people away every single weekend and day throughout the entire Summer, and that's an example of a facility that's far smaller than Cupsouge, but the parking lot it limits the use and because we have about 700 or 800 parking stalls there, we could never have anymore of the proximity to the, again, Moriches bay to the north impacting the areas to

the west, the ocean to the south. So there is no opportunity to expand parking there either as there is not here, but in this case we see this as --

MS. SPENCER: Is that really true that there is no way to expand this? That this is it for the parking?

MR. GIBBONS: There would be no -- you would have a tough time making the argument from an environmental -- from the CEQ.

MS. LENZ: Obviously, there is a lot of land, and there is locations where you can see but --

MR. GIBBONS: You would have to take away existing recreation facilities to do that and that would be a very heavy risk.

MS. FISHER: Some ocean issues over the last 30 years have reduced the beach areas and --

MS. SPENCER: Right, it may be at mood point and I recognize that.

MR. GIBBONS: And if you have been going there for that long, in the 80's,

the beach was far wider in that area and you can accommodate a lot more patrons than we can today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Michael?

MR. KAUFMAN: One of things, Mary Ann, that you should consider is that the park may have reached capacity. Again, we're looking at erosion of the beach. We're looking at environmental factors, the beach exits, and things like that and the reduction in parking spaces may be a logical response to that.

MS. SPENCER: I understand. It just seems to me that this is a kind of contradiction that you're reducing the parking spaces but then expanding the access and I would --

MR. KAUFMAN: I hear what you're saying. I am just throwing out another angle too.

MS. SPENCER: And I understand that the future is unknown.

MR. KAUFMAN: And that is something I have seen in the master plan. It

looks like there are capacity issues over these issues. For example, people are going through the dunes and going fishing all over the place and blowing the dunes apart and that worries me in that sense. So that's just something I am throwing out that's a tenor that I saw int here.

Also regarding the traffic flow, it's terrible down there. I agree with our Parks analyst that Robert Moses flows much better.

MS. SPENCER: I don't think the traffic flow is a big issue when you go to the beach. I understand the emergency --

MR. GIBBONS: The bridge doesn't help. We have a single lane of traffic going in either direction. That is a separate project, frankly, that's DPW's facility and not ours, but they will be coming to you at some point. The end is near for that bridge. There was just emergency repair done on that bridge. That bottleneck needs to be addressed

one way or the other, but the existing conditions are not appropriate for such a large public facility with very limited access for emergency service.

MS. SPENCER: For emergency services, I am totally on board.

MR. GIBBONS: This is not all about designing and convenience for the park patrons.

MS. SPENCER: Fair enough.

MR. GIBBONS: Nancy is not finished, I don't think, with the presentation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I just want to follow-up since we're talking about parking lots.

When you put in new paving since you're redoing the whole lot, are you going to put in the permeable type of asphalt to enhance the proper drainage?

MS. LENZ: I think that would be considered at this time with the design. Some of the issue there and I know the Parks personnel haven't had a problem with the swales as it is consistent with

the sand in the area and will back clog it up and how are these things going to work? It would be a consideration. At this point we find it to be significantly more expensive then the regular asphalt. We think it's a good solution in a lot of ways to create a more aesthetic look at that parking lot. That's part of what I think creates a better experience. So, you could do a permeable pavement. It is certainly an alternative that could be considered when the design is there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gloria?

MS. RUSSO: As far as permeable pavement, many of these permeable paving are designed to be over a bed of gravel 18 inches deep and you still need an area that is groundwater. Did you say groundwater was two feet?

MS. LENZ: Yes, right on the beach and that's what makes them so expensive is that material. So looking at the size of the area, you can use that in certain areas also and not -- you can

use that in your traveling paved and do your parking spaces permeable. That's a way to handle that. It can handle the capacity of the road also. So there are ways to do that and it wouldn't have to be the whole lot, but it still a consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nick, on the emergency vehicles issue that has come up several times, is that the issue that emergency vehicles just continue to grow in size or what is the issue with the emergency vehicles?

MR. GIBBONS: The issue is that on some Summer days, under ideal conditions, the traffic backs up over the north side of the bridge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it doesn't have anything to do with turning radiuses or anything like that?

MR. GIBBONS: No, it's simply a matter of getting there.

MS. LENZ: I will just add to that. In terms of moving the bus stops into the circle part of that is because the

bus has to pull in front of the pavilion and people are dropping off in front of the pavilion and the emergency vehicles come through there because that's where the first-aid is. They need to get to the pavilion. There is some congestion in front -- directly in front of the pavilion that moving the bus location and the drop-off -- outside of that area would keep that area more open for emergency vehicles.

MS. RUSSO: Nancy, real quick -- as far as -- I know that extra lane is for the drop-off over there at the pavilion but will the access from that new area to the pavilion and the main sidewalk be ADA accessible to somebody on the bus that needs it?

MS. LENZ: Yes, our intention would be for it to be ADA accessible, and I think I am getting a little bit out of order, but I will just mention that what we show here is actually -- there is a well that's no longer used because it is we use public water at the park --

removing that, but also creating a boardwalk entrance at this location for the people who get dropped off and then creating a boardwalk that ties into the boardwalk that's over by Finn's facility all the way across into the pavilion and then back down to campgrounds and cross over and that would be all be accessible and that, we think, would actually get people to use this location because right now people like to drop-off over here which also gets congested, but if you had this direct connection, we think, that would help a lot in getting people dropped off here and right into the beach, so that's what we're proposing there -- to work within that circulation.

The only thing in the parking lot I wanted to mention is we show a building here. (Indicating.) Originally, there was a facilities operation building called for. That was going to be the administration building and that was going to be the maintenance offices.

That was never constructed and there are issues because of the flood location and everything -- that wasn't going to be built, and we wanted to reuse this facility, however, what we show here is a maintenance garage which wouldn't be an occupied facility. They can store their equipment and work in this area, but this would be their offices. This would be their bathrooms. This would be their showers. This would be maintained up in this corner. (Indicating.)

There, right now, if you see what they're storing in the pavilion itself -- if you walk through these rooms, they have -- in the Winter all their equipment. Bathrooms have equipment in it. Everything has equipment in it. They really need some additional space. So this is -- we thought we would reuse that location and just have the garage in that location. We also have identified this as an potential alternate location for that. If for some reason they decide they don't want

to go ahead with all the changes here -- you know, if it didn't happen -- if things didn't happen in the 1997 plan, it could be located in this and you would maintain -- you could maintain your circulation in this location but that's just a potential alternative use. Everybody in Parks is in agreement. They like this because this gives them people in the vicinity at the toll both also which is a consideration that I have -- you know, for security and not to be so alone in different areas of the site.

Along these boardwalks, we also are calling for continuing dune restoration along the front pavilion and maintaining the concert area. I think they -- Nick, did they build the new playground?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MS. LENZ: There is a new playground already in this area and some potential in the picnic areas -- maintaining those picnic areas and such things.

We show on here potential other uses for this area and it could be a picnic overflow. One of the things Parks has talked about and is a miniature golf course, but they also identify that as potentially being at the marina site, and I will get into later because I think that's probably a more likely site for that.

The last thing -- this was in the 1997 Master Plan. We still think it's a good use of the site. It is to create a nature center and then tie that into the boardwalk and we would locate it between the pavilion and the campground so that it draws from both sides.

I think that is pretty much everything on this side of the plan. I will just mention that this is the DARE area, and it shows nothing really going on here except that we are recommending that they reconstruct the bathrooms here. These bathrooms get used for special occasions by Parks -- you know, if they're having a walk-a-thon, I guess

or something, they open it up.

MR. GIBBONS: But mostly for Finn's.

MS. LENZ: But Finn's uses it because they don't have public facilities, and since a lot of the people are using -- this parking is going into Finn's, it creates a good use and it's not ADA accessible right now and that needs to happen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Dan?

MR. PICHNEY: I am just curious. Not that I am opposed to nature centers, but why would you have a nature center when Finn's has a nature center?

MR. GIBBONS: We don't like Finn's. They know that. Have you been to Finn's nature center? It is not particularly accessible. It is certainly not ADA compliant.

One of the things we like about the location of this nature center --

MR. PICHNEY: It's not a hostile question.

MR. GIBBONS: It's on the extreme

western end of our park and what we envision for this site is something that we can run more programming for even off hours for the camp -- the campers that are there, and I think that would be -- quite far, the most exciting aspect of this plan, for me, is this boardwalk concept with the nature center and that, I think, it could serve both visitation -- both the day trip use at the pavilion with proximity to the community beach area. They could come up to the nature center for a program or take a walk and those people coming from the campground can take this walkway through the -- behind the primary dunes to get up to the nature center for this programing idea. It just gives people more to do then just the playground that we have down in the campground -- get them out of their campers. If you can call it "camping." The center, just like any of these other things, will be a phased in program so it really can't come before the boardwalk.

MR. PICHNEY: I am going to agree with you. I think the educational potential is enormous.

MR. GIBBONS: We're losing that. We used to do some limited program and now we do none. We rely on other groups that can come in. I would envision that there be a common area that different groups -- Audubon society or the nature conservatory or what have you could organize events, walks, that started from the nature center and set out from there. This is a multi-use space.

MS. LENZ: Originally, the nature center was located at the entrance to the campground. One of the things, I think, that people still felt was that they wanted it centralized between the two so that it would provide for the two because it always was identified as just for the campground and with the off-hour program in the evening you can do star watching and star -- you can a lot of things like that, but this location can feed more then just the campground.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nick, looking at the long term usage of the park and not the area of the beach itself; is this included in the Corp of Engineers Report or study where they might widen the beach?

MR. GIBBONS: It is -- like everybody else, we're waiting to see what the FIMP ultimately will say about this site. Without getting too much off topic, the Corp of Engineers is very sympathetic and understands the park operation as it's currently laid out. It's worth mentioning that the entirety of Smith Point County Park is roughly six miles long. It is within FIMPS national seashore regulatory boundary. That is unique. On the far west end at Robert Moses, they are not; they're excluded form the boundaries. So with that additional layer of regulation comes a lot more opinions about how -- what the future of the Smith Point Park would look like. One of things that has been discussed many times is abandonment

of the existing civilian location and either going in a totally different direction with the park -- with no primary facility such as that or moving it to a different location within the park that is not subject to concerns that they have raised relative to global warming and what have you. I don't know if there is any site within the park that would fit those criteria. I personally doubt there are, but the County's position is the pavilion, for the next -- for the foreseeable future it will be located in its present location and that's what this plan endorses.

The next panel here is the campground.

MS. LENZ: Yes. this is the active part of the park. It has a few additions to it.

This section is the campground expansion that was done based on the 1997 Plan, and these sites are very large and they have full facilities.

They have sanitary hookup and everything such as electric water, but we're not calling for any additional facilities at that campground location site, but we are looking for upgrades. They need to upgrade their sanitary system. The dump stations are undersized so they have to put two in and the existing one has to be upgraded. They no longer reach the facilities, so these are some of the types of electrical upgrades -- from the older bathhouse upgrades, but it's generally upgrading the existing facilities. We're not really calling for a lot of new facilities in the campground itself. We are upgrading electric service to the yellow site. They don't have service right now. They would get service. As for the pink ones, they upgraded the service to 50 amps because now everybody's got everything in their campers and they need even more electricity to go out and camp on the beach.

The other thing that we're looking

to do is this is the campground office that was rebuilt -- that was in the 1997 Master Plan. That was built and it is functioning but what has happened there is a lot people are using the outer beach and on busy Saturdays that backs up and a lot of the traffic here, so Parks has put in a new access location so if you have the permit to go to the outer beach you can use that when it is open -- that secondary location. So that pulls in here along side the fence of the campground and then fades into the existing roadway that goes out there. That's just used on the weekends when it is very busy, but they needed that on tide deflating areas. This is the boardwalk that extends from the other screen and runs all the way along here. (Indicating.) These are dune cross overs that we built as part of the initial master plan. This one was damaged on the -- that one has to be rebuilt but this was the existing boardwalk which would extend all the way

there so you could walk from the campgrounds all the way back to the pavilion and to the actual life-guarded beach which is something I know they're trying to encourage, but I think the boardwalk will make it more attractive to do that.

The other thing we're looking is new dune cross over down here at this end of the campground because they turned out to work very well. So there is one more down over here and it keeps people off the dune area. (Indicating.)

So that's really all that is recommended for this section of the beach. There's not much going on.

Anybody have any questions on this area?

MS. FISHER: Just a question on the bus drop off area. Does that -- in getting closer to the ocean there, are there issues and concerns with regard to the dune structure in that area?

MS. LENZ: I guess no matter where you are there might be but that is --

actually, right now, there's the Well House that's built on that site. So we're only going about 15 feet further south. There is an existing structure in the area right now, so we are removing the existing structure and putting in pavement so we are as far back as you could be. Obviously, there was not --

MS. FISHER: Wasn't the inner circle cutting into the outer circle because there isn't a lot of buffering and -- you know --

MS. LENZ: We actually -- we didn't and I realized later on that, that's -- you would have to tighten that simple radius of the traffic circle. It has to flow a certain way around. So you would have to look -- it could be smaller, I am sure, but you would have to do the whole thing which would be a much more expensive proposition.

MS. FISHER: Also, how far is it from that bus stop to that main pavilion in feet because that is substantial, I

mean, if there is people who are older and walking all that distance to a restroom, I find it kind of disconnected from their main use patterns and lifeguards and all that other --

MS. LENZ: It is -- it is and I don't know that everybody might use it, but a lot of the people who are dropping off, are dropping off at the Finn's site and taking that boardwalk to the beach. So we are really trying to --

MS. FISHER: Right, but if you have a public bus, it's a different kind of situation with each individual -- you know, I just think there is a disconnect there with people taking the bus would want to go to the main facility of the park rather than go to the offshoot areas.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, it is a place holder for now. Ultimately, it will be up to the bus company and the authority to determine whether or not that meets their standards. It may not but that drop off point would still accommodate

the general public use. I could see where we would prohibit -- we have plenty of handicap parking up at the pavilion itself, so this would not apply to them but the general public's drop-off -- the "kiss and ride" concept that's is where we want that because we currently have so much traffic right at the pavilion and they have to meander through first Park Police parking, then park staff parking, and drop-off -- it needs to be addressed. So the vast majority of those being dropped off there could be accommodated to other sides and they could walk a couple hundred yards.

MS. LENZ: The outer beach we looked at -- basically, the outer beach -- obviously, we're not developing much out there and I have pictures coming up after but I -- I mentioned the secondary access to the permit holders at the campground area and expansion of also the outer beach pump station facilities.

The designation of emergency access

route -- so I will just mention -- they have some issues when they have to get out there in a hurry and there are some -- when the tide was very high, they need to get out there in a hurry. They can't always get to the campground when it is busy, so they have a long -- this location here -- right along the back we're looking to create an opening for emergency vehicles if they have to go in. It is pretty much there already. It is just not designated as such. They don't have the cleared vegetation for it.

Then the proposed closures of excess trails. You can read through them and I'll show you -- direction signage for open trails, fishing parking out at the inlet, and redesign of maps and improved signage for people who use beach and that is the -- it is very long. I have four slides here, but this is the emergency access in here. I just mentioned right along the back currently they come down here and go back up

again. Sometimes the tide creates they have no passage here and they --- if this is a busy weekend, it is very difficult. So they would like to have an emergency access to come through here through the outer beach.

The color is the areas of over wash. Also there is a symbol in here where they did the dune restoration, so they kind of tie together when you look at the two areas. I may be saying one as the other. I cannot read the text on the lower part. There are other areas in here where we crossed off -- we X'd off where we wanted to close off the trails that people tend to get out there and then go wherever they want, and we would like to close them off and then have the signage to tell them, "You have to keep going or these are the only routes you can use."

MR. KAUFMAN: Nancy, that, in my opinion, those closing off of the trails is the -- has a rank thing next to beach replenishment as the highest priority.

That's where you have the most damage. Two things: You create basically a vocal wash point where you people have broken through the dunes or, frankly, you have an over-wash that goes right into the tidal wetlands. If I make the motion, for whatever I am going -- I am seeing all of the costs involved, and I know something has to be done with the park. That will be my highest priority on all of this -- the closed beach exits, again, I have seen the damage over there. It's nice to be able to march through and go fishing but there is a cost to the park and I am glad to see that somebody finally has recognized that and is trying to do something about it.

MS. LENZ: And it's not an expensive fix, really. You just have to keep up on it.

MR. KAUFMAN: I looked at the cost factors. Even if you get some of Dan's leaves -- little blue stem leaves like that -- I checked. Dan has a book on

weds and the native vegetation weeds around here. It's the best thing we can do. Putting in poison ivy also may not be a bad idea. I am not allergic so I would try it.

MS. LENZ: The blue shows either where the beach is not there or there are over wash in those locations and then -- then you can't see it in a lot of them but they show it where the beach nourishment was done -- it is also shown on the map and they kind of coincide to a certain extent -- those two things but that's just --

MR. GIBBON: These figures are all taken from the fold out from the back of -- in Section 5.

MS. LENZ: Yes, they're in the master plan.

This is, again, the inlet looking at -- identifying the two parking areas confining that so that people are not driving all over out there and parking wherever they would like to.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's Moriches

Inlet?

MS. LENZ: Yes.

Then there are a couple of spots that we do maintain access to for fishing purposes. So we are saying, these are the ones you can use and the rest we were proposing.

This is the marina site and, again, the map is in the back. The existing, right now, they have three boat ramps here -- three and they're pretty popular and then they have parking that's existing and what we're proposing at this point is to add one more boat ramp and to increase the parking. The facility has been popular enough to say they need this. They right now don't have any other facilities. They're bringing in bathrooms in season -- like porter potties -- trailer type bathrooms and then take them out again at the end of the season.

What they are looking to do is to look at a marina for this area, but they would doing it as a finding someone to

run that facility. Parks has put out a letter of interest to --

MR. GIBBONS: That's right.

MS. LENZ: (Continuing) -- to see if anybody is interested in operating the marina in that area.

The channel exists. The channel is in good shape. It's there and it's really missing an opportunity for additional access there.

MR. KAUFMAN: One quick question on that, Mr. Chairman.

The area to the right as the map is presented to us, that's upland? That's not marsh land?

MS. LENZ: This is all upland.

This is preserved. This is a marsh. (Indicating.)

MR. KAUFMAN: Let me put this on the record.

You're not going to be eliminating or taking out any marsh land if this marina complex is constructed?

MR. GIBBONS: This is all previous dredged soil from a variety of projects.

MR. KAUFMAN: So the marina complex would be in the disturbed area?

MR. GIBBONS: This has been contemplated several times over the years and, of course, this Council has seen some of the top proposals, as well.

MR. BAGG: If I might add a point that in '88' and '89' the council reviewed a full marina facility in this area and they said it was a negative declaration on it.

MS. LENZ: And it was the same thing. It was on this side.

MR. BAGG: Soccer fields to the north and issued a negative declaration in that disturbed area.

MR. KAUFMAN: I could see a negative declaration on this as long as this is a disturbed area, but touching wetlands, at this point in time, that's where it starts being problem.

MR. BAGG: You're off base.

MS. LENZ: This is a whole bulk headed channel and we're not touching anything on that side.

MR. KAUFMAN: Just making sure that's where you're going.

MS. LENZ: And this area, again, dredged soil which has been tested and it really doesn't appear to have any real value to it either. We haven't really addressed -- you know, how it would be developed because they're looking for someone to do that for them. So that would have to come in as a separate -- you know, use if that was what they wanted.

This area up here which is also upland and it's also disturbed was originally going to be housing. You can see the clearing of the streets. The County owns that, and that's what we're talking about any type of active recreational use. I mentioned maybe miniature golf. Any type of -- skate park, at one point, someone talked about at Smith Point. I think in the earlier -- in the 1997 Master Plan, they actually recommended a skate park or -- roller hockey was in there, I think.

We're not looking for those uses now at the beach park, but if they wanted to do something like that, that being located within a community gives you a location to have that type of facility or a regular park -- adjacent to the community that we're using; not down across the bridge. So that's the orange area. Those actual uses haven't been identified at this point. It just that's where we felt you should focus putting those types of uses rather then at the beach park.

MR. BAGG: That area was proposed for a soccer field and received a negative declaration.

MS. LENZ: It hasn't been developed -- the uses may be a little bit different now, but still staying within that active recreational type of use would be in that location.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you have any transportation from the main park over to this park?

MS. LENZ: They don't. In fact,

the park personnel tells me that people like to park because it's free to park at the marina site and walk to the beach. So, you see a lot of people walking to the area --

MR. CHAIRMAN: So it's safe to walk across the bridge?

MS. LENZ: Yes. It is narrow -- there is a sidewalk there, but it is narrow. So it's a little bit -- when there are bicycles and pedestrians and cars, it is tight. There is discussion that bridge needs to be updated and when that would happen, hopefully they will have a wider bicycle lane and a wider pedestrian lane and that would really -- you know, it is a beautiful bridge to walk over actually. It is really pretty and you people see there in the morning quite often and they're walking over, around, and back up again.

MR. PICHNEY: Nancy, shuttle buses are extremely expensive to operate and for a situation like this where people are carrying all their beach

paraphernalia you're going to need like a larger bus with plenty of room and then when you add in the handicap thing -- it's always a nice idea, but I think it would be sort of out of the question for the Parks Department budget and so forth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. FISHER: Wouldn't there be a conflict of use on the parking if people are using free parking but there is other multiple uses on the site -- there is possibly going to be the conflicts down the road when those sites are developed for the marina or active recreation, soccer fields -- how are you going to deal with those conflicts when those things are developed?

MR. GIBBONS: The current parking requires a permit. You need to buy a seasonal permit for boat launching purposes and you need that to park there. With that being said, with many of our regulations, there isn't enough enforcement to enforce all these rules.

So there is -- I wouldn't say significant but I wouldn't be surprised if over here that people are bypassing the fee or the traffic to park there and walk across. If at such time we decide to develop this northern portion for athletic use, that concept would need to be further developed and parking would have to be addressed at that time. The current parking would not be adequate for a soccer facility of any scale given the popularity of those types of activities.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nancy, are you finished?

MS. LENZ: Yes, I am finished.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One question. Behind your name is the initial's R.L.A.?

MS. LENZ: Registered Land Architect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: What are we supposed to look at, at this point in time? What is the SEQRA aspect of this lovely

presentation? Are we doing a negative declaration on this? Theoretically, are we going to do an unlisted negative declaration?

MR. BAGG: Well, basically, as I mentioned, it is going to be a physical alteration of 2.56 acres in total so it would be a Type 1. Basically, I don't see anything really significant here. It's upgrading existing facilities and making some minor improvements. Some of them are beneficial and other are just park --

MR. KAUFMAN: The main southern area doesn't give me any problems. I think that it is well thought out and a decent master plan. The marina gives me a little bit of pause. I mean we can put in a condition basically that says, "No wetlands be removed." Normally with a marina development, I know we have given negative declarations in the past such as the 1980's.

MR. BAGG: It's a pretty substantial marina too.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes. The question will be whether that negative declaration has validity today and whether we might want to look at this in the future.

MR. BAGG: Well, we can give a negative declaration that any future marina proposals will have to have separate SEQRA reviews to begin.

MS. LENZ: I think that's what he intended in the EAF.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's what I also just wrote down. I would feel comfortable going with a negative declaration on this situation with that review done and also on one other condition that I would like to put on there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What about any suggestions that were made to consider by various members?

MR. KAUFMAN: Well, yes, we should throw those in. Whoever makes the motion, there is a couple of recommendations that I think should be

added in there.

MS. SPENCER: You make the motion.

MR. KAUFMAN: Type 1, Negative Declaration, recommendation that priority be given to closing of the beach exits and the protection of the dunes as a first priority. Also that the marina, if it is developed in the future, be subjected to additional environmental review by this council.

Any other conditions that anyone else wanted to throw in?

MR. PICHNEY: Nick answered my question to my satisfaction. The issue of increasing the buffer area or anything like that or reducing the lot -- you know, I will pass on that.

MR. KAUFMAN: I was going to say land banking is the way they in classic development but I --

MR. PICHNEY: I don't think that's appropriate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mary Ann?

MS. SPENCER: Well, I do think that emergency access trumps all of my

concerns and they remain that, but the bridge is narrow and on the weekends the traffic is great and while --

MR. KAUFMAN: So you're willing to go with it?

MS. SPENCER: I feel that it trumps, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gloria?

MS. RUSSO: No, I am okay with what so far.

MR. KAUFMAN: Larry, that's my motion and I am sticking with it.

MR. GIBBON: Larry, do you want us to consider at the time of the development of the parking lot the concept that leaves some analysis and some attention be given towards a permanent pavement or some suitable alterative to that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

MS. RUSSO: I think the swales and putting in those 600 spaces of parking certainly -- geographically, as to what's there, can fill the spaces with gravel and the cost wise, I think, is

better.

MR. GIBBONS: It's always helpful for us, on our end, to have these incorporated within the negative declaration because ten years down the road when we finally get to this parking lot, this is going to come up so whatever the issue is, I appreciate the comments.

MR. KAUFMAN: Straight out, I don't think that permeable paving given the location, et cetera, is maybe the best.

Frankly, with the sand blowing around during the wintertime, it's going to get into the little spaces that we might have over there. It's going to be a maintenance thing.

MR. GIBBONS: I personally didn't care either way. I just wanted to remind Larry in the event that he wanted it included but thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's my motion and I am sticking with it.

MS. RUSSO: I second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Second.

Any further discussions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nick, we didn't talk about painting -- painting of the building. You mentioned in there, I guess, because of the sand and so forth blowing on it that the building needs attention and just out of curiosity, what are you doing with regard to that? For example, you said skylights are badly scarred and not letting light in and that kind of thing. So are you going to replace them? If they're functioning, are you going to do away with them?

MR. GIBBONS: The pavilion is an ongoing project. We just replaced the roof. Those shingles were original for the building. We definitely got our monies worth there, but each time we tackle projects at the pavilion, we understand that renovations there are almost sacrificial. Given the conditions and the environment immediately surrounding the pavilion and

the year around weathering that goes on there, fair more than any of our other locations. It's always a work in progress. In the case with the skylights, we've gone with glass block. We replaced entire -- most of the fixtures in some of the restrooms, but to get more light into the building, we had glass blocks. Some of things that we tried in the past have failed and some have worked out better than we anticipated. So the paint is another issue. Any of the exterior finishes to the building are always a toss up.

MR. PICHNEY: Nick, can I ask you a question regarding things like skylights and so forth?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

First, I hope that I don't sound too dumb but is it possible to have a glass skylight and then something that's like -- an erode -- a wearing surface like something plexiglas that once it gets abraded, you toss it and you still have basically primary infrastructure of

the skylight in place.

MR. GIBBONS: I don't know enough about it. We're trying translucent panels over at Cupsouge, as well over our dining area for our concessions and that's a big expense for the concessionaire in that case, but we're skeptical. The Parks Department is financially skeptical of introducing new technologies and new materials of the buildings that we know from a maintenance standpoint require additional care and given the staffing levels that each of these parks has, it's hard for us to maintain systems that require more periodic maintenance than some of the more traditional materials, but I don't know enough about that topic to comment.

MS. RUSSO: Well, I know you're looking at the solar tubes instead of the skylights for more daylight, and I know there is a solar tube company right in Oakdale who has installed many in south shore houses with solar tubes that

have --

MR. GIBBONS: That's like a periscope effect, right?

MS. RUSSO: Right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a --

Mary Ann?

MS. SPENCER: One more slight point. The nature center that you talked about. Now I hope that's not ten years down the road the way the parking lot has --

MR. GIBBONS: Well, its already been 12 because that was part of the original plan.

MR. KAUFMAN: Listen, if it can hurt Finn's, he will put it in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion and a --

MS. SPENCER: We use that park often -- almost as often as we do on season in the nature -- if you put in nature center, it would be nice to see offseason programing in a nature center for that location.

MR. GIBBONS: The park has become a

12 month operation more than ever especially in the campground. You cannot get a camping reservation on New Year's Eve. The campground is full. So there are -- there is a lot of use year around at the park that people don't even realize. So, yes, the point is well made.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion and a second.

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Nick, I know we also have on here updates on County Parks. We have heard enough from Parks for today.

(WHEREUPON, there was laughter.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will take 5 minutes for our stenographer.

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

(Time Noted: 12:00 p.m.)

HEARING OFFICER: Proposed Multi-Use Recreational Facility at the Cherry Avenue County Park.

MR. KAUFMAN: Negative Declaration.

MR. GIBBONS: I did the short form and, obviously, you can see that. I did not think there was much value to doing a long form of it.

The site is located in West Sayville, Town of Islip. The entire site is 2.78 acres. I believe I attached an aerial with the submittal. This shows the conditions. At the time we were near and close to the property so you will notice some abandon vehicles towards the far western end of the property. Those have been removed by the seller at the time. I will also call your attention to the fact that the site -- at least that -- well I will call it the western part of the property is significantly disturbed. That will be incorporated and utilized within the dog run area. It's for the purposes of -- if you're thinking in your head in

terms of how much property is going to be cleared to accommodate this project -- although the entire 2.78 acres isn't used with the exception of a buffer area around the perimeter of the athletic field, a significant portion of the property is already disturbed and cleared.

The final page is a rendering that illustrates how we intend to use the property. On the western half, roughly half of the property is the proposed dog run area. That is somewhat rectangular -- a little bit irregular in shape. You will see that it utilizes the existing wooded area. That's something we did up at Blydenberg -- just across the street we ran a chain linked fence through existing wooded areas. It enhances the experience -- my understanding of how these places are used and I am not a expert but we never got an education in a couple of other locations.

Part of the experience is to use the wooded area for the dog and their

owners -- it is a recreational enhancement as opposed to a strictly cleared open area that has --

MR. KAUFMAN: Don't the dogs need to have their view established?

MR. GIBBONS: This is not for waterfront views as some of our other unauthorized locations do.

The eastern half of the property which fronts Cherry Avenue is identified here as a soccer field but it's actually a multi-use athletic field. It was expanded at the request of the Town of Islip. It was originally 300 feet and that's a standard soccer field. It is 330 feet and evidently that accommodated other uses including but not limited to Lacrosse. Again, I don't know a lot about that but it wasn't a significant change for Parks to incorporate that. Our partner not so much in the acquisition, but the management of the site with respect to the athletic field will be the Town of Islip and by extension of a third party -- I don't

want to complicate things too much -- but the Bayman Soccer Club operates a facility on town property to the immediate north of this facility. If you flip back to the aerial you will see the extreme southern portion of the Bayman Athletic Complex there. When funds are available to the Bayman Club and/or the Town of Islip, development of that athletic field will commence. Until that time, we don't expect any change to that area for that designated use.

MS. SPENCER: Do you have a partner for the dog run?

MR. GIBBONS: No, we don't.

MS. SPENCER: So it will be maintained entirely by Suffolk County?

MR. GIBBONS: Correct.

MS. SPENCER: For the residents of that community?

MR. GIBBONS: Residents of Suffolk County who see fit to use that facility.

MS. SPENCER: And if it's not -- so no one --

MR. KAUFMAN: They don't have a partner is what it boils down to.

MS. SPENCER: There's no partner but if the residents of Suffolk County don't use the receptacles provided, et cetera, there is no way to rescind this dog park if people are not responsible for --

MR. GIBBONS: This is not a pilot project as the others are if that's where you're going with this. Some of our other sites --

MS. SPENCER: I want it to be contingent upon -- in other words, if it becomes a problem, nothing in the language establishing this as saying all the neighbors around it complain and it's not maintained and it's costing the County a lot of time and money to maintain it and, therefore, in that instance, the County can rescind it.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, that's true of many of our sites. I mean the difference here, which we heard in some of the other dog runs locations, is that

they're pilot projects. Meaning they are subject to the results of how they work out. In the case of Blydenberg and where we have our formal fenced in dog run, the County, as you heard earlier, its running about $50,000 to $80,000 to fence those facilities. So those are really -- they're permanent facilities in a sense, whereas, a place like -- recently we did a pilot project down in East Patchogue, Roe Avenue, and Brookhaven Town -- it is Mud Creek County Park and that's the great south bay. That is a former dredge soil area where it is a pilot program. It's a remote, by Long Island standards location, there are no facilities to speak of. There are no garbage cans. That's different than here. This is more of an active recreational facility where there won't be -- it is true. We don't have staff at this site and we never will, but it will be another site that we're responsible for maintaining.

MS. SPENCER: That's right and so

my preference is that all dog runs be pilot programs.

MR. KAUFMAN: Mary Ann, let me jump in for a second.

I don't think by giving a SEQRA recommendation that we're going to lock ourselves in forever to the dog run. In other words, if Parks changes its mind on the use, the negative declaration will not lock them in forever. In other words, if the park becomes a menace -- if the parks becomes a problem as your looking at, I don't think it is going lock them in and they can change the use and withdraw the -- shut it down.

MR. BAGG: They can shut it down at any point.

MS. SPENCER: They can?

MR. KAUFMAN: Correct.

MR. GIBBONS: The extent of our commitment is this capitol program that earmarks money for the facilities.

MS. SPENCER: Thank you.

MR. PICHNEY: That was going to be my next question. I guess you can use

your maintenance money any way you see fit and as long -- if it gets out of hand and you say you can't do this anymore, then you can back out of the dog run.

MR. KAUFMAN: It's not like it's a dedication to --

MS. SPENCER: That's what we're asking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion is Unlisted Negative Declaration.

MS. RUSSO: I second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion and a second.

All those in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Loretta?

MS. FISHER: Loretta Fisher, Suffolk County Planning Department.

Before you today, we have one proposed acquisition for the Naftal

property. It is Peconic River County Park Addition. The property is located south of Middle Country Road and east of Peconic River County Park. We have extensive holdings in this area -- actually both to the north and to the east is the Pine Barrens core area. This is in the compatible area, but adjacent -- actually LIPA is between our property and the property south of Middle Country Road.

It's 6.5 acres and we're acquiring this under the new drinking water protection program. It's within the central Suffolk SGPA for groundwater protection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Michael?

MR. KAUFMAN: Looks good to me. I have no questions.

I am going to make a motion as a Unlisted Negative Declaration.

MS. RUSSO: I second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Sorry it took so long today. We had controversial issues.

MS. PERROTTA: My name Niamh Perrotta. I am Traffic Engineer for Suffolk County Department of Public Works and I work in the consultant management unit. I am here today to present CR-13 intersection improvements at 5th Avenue in Bayshore.

We're working with VHB on this one and Scott's going to continue on it with the presentation.

MR. SPITTAL: Scott Spittal. I work for VHB Engineering as a Project Manger on the project portions of Suffolk County.

This project before you is known as Suffolk County DPW Capitol Project 5538.10. It is known as CR13/CR13A Roadway and Intersection Improvements located in the Town of Islip.

The project limits are bounded on the south by 27A -- New York Route 27A

and to the north Spur Drive North.

The project originated from a corridor study that was commissioned by the County a few years ago to address operational delays and safety concerns for the corridor. The length of the subject corridor is approximately 2.3 miles.

The project proposes to upgrade existing traffic and pedestrian signal equipment at the intersections within the project limits. It also proposes to construct sidewalks where none currently exist, thereby, providing a continuous sidewalk section and meets ADA requirements and standards.

Finally there is some minor widening being proposed at the intersections of Spur Drive South and Spur Drive North to accommodate right turning lanes on the side street that approaches at Spur Drive South. These right turning lane additions will address, again, operational delays and improve safety intersections.

Any questions?

MR. KAUFMAN: Any dog runs?

MR. SPITTAL: No dog runs. No in-ground sprinklers either.

MR. PICHNEY: Everything will take place is right away?

MR. SPITTAL: Actually, we are assessing one of the improvements along a Town easement along Spur Drive South but other than that, yes. I think what we are going to have to do is work out an agreement with the Town of Islip and the Parks Department both of which will be coordinated with and we are going to get their approval.

MR. KAUFMAN: Basic single aliment traffic crossing areas and things like that just to make the area safer?

MR. SPITTAL: Yes.

MS. RUSSO: Where is the area on these drawings that you're going to coordinate with the Town?

MR. SPITTAL: It is the north side of Spur Drive South is where we are doing some widening.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anybody want to make a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: Unlisted Negative Declaration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion as an Unlisted Negative Declaration. Do we have a second?

MS. SPENCER: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a second from Mary Ann.

Any further discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Thank you very much.

Do we have a motion to adjourn.

MS. RUSSO: Motion to adjourn.

MS. SPENCER: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a second. We're adjourned.

(WHEREUPON, this meeting of October 21, 2009, was concluded at 12:14 p.m.)

* * *

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

STATE OF NEW YORK)
:ss
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

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

That the within transcript was prepared by me and is a true and accurate record of this hearing, to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or by 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 30th day of Nov 2009.

MELISSA POWELL