ORIGINAL

----------X

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

----------X

February 16th, 2011

9:30 a.m.

William Rogers Legislative Building

725 Veterans Memorial Highway

Hauppauge, New York 11788

S.C. PLANNING DEPT.
2011 MAR 11 AM 11:50

B E F O R E:

R. Lawrence Swanson, Chairperson

Gloria Russo, Vice Chairperson

Reported by,

Melissa Powell

****

FIVE STAR REPORTING, INC.

90 JOHN STREET, SUTIE 411

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10038

631.224.5054

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

2 James Bagg, Council Member

3 Mike Mule, Suffolk County Planning Department

4 Richard Martin, Director, Suffolk County Historic Services

5 Michael Kaufman, Council Member

6 Mary Ann Spencer, Council Member

7 Michael Pitcher, Legislative Aide for Presiding Officer

8 Eva Growney, Council Member

9 Legislator Viloria Fisher, Legislator

10 Thomas Isles, Suffolk County Planning

11 Richard Machtay, Council Member

12 Joy Squires, CAC

13 Thomas Young, Suffolk County Attorney

14 Kara Hahn, Director, S.C. Department of Communications

15

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

17 Nick Gibbons, SC Parks

18 Tom Iwanejko , Triennial Report, Department Public Works

19 Ben Wright, Suffolk County Department Public Works

20 Camilo Salazar, Department Environmental Energy

21 Stephen Astuto, Historical Site Project Manager

22 Dr. Scott Campbell, Department of Health Services

23 John Donovan, Department of Public Works

24 Keith Larsen, Assistant Architect

25

1 CEQ Meeting Minutes 021611

2 (Time Noted: 9:36 a.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Good morning,

4 Ladies and Gentleman. I would like to

5 welcome you to the CEQ Meeting of

6 February 16th, 2011.

7 Just as a reminder to all of us

8 sitting up here, we have to push the

9 button to speak in order for our

10 Stenographer to get our words precisely.

11 Just as a point of information, in

12 case there is anybody here in the

13 audience who wants to listen to the

14 discussion about the proposal of

15 Yaphank, we will not be discussing that

16 today. There was a subcommittee that

17 went over the draft -- the EIS and gave

18 comments. It has been returned to the

19 consultant for their comments to be

20 considered and possibly inserted, and

21 then we will probably get new documents

22 sometime within the next month. It is

23 our intention, perhaps, to do it, if we

24 get it on time at our March meeting. So

25 everybody who is here just for that, we

1 won't be discussing it, and it will save
2 you some time being here.
3 I would like to take just a minute
4 to say to Gloria welcome as our Vice
5 Chair. We look forward to working with
6 you. Also, I would like to say thank
7 you to Mike Kaufman for his years of
8 service that he contributed as Vice
9 Chair. We're looking forward to
10 continuing to work with you, as well.
11 There are no Minutes. There are
12 some correspondence in your packet.
13 Mike, do you want to talk a little
14 bit about that?
15 MR. MULE: There is a letter in
16 your packet from the America Institute
17 of Architect. It is about the Peconic
18 Chapter. It is a notification that
19 they're holding a symposium on small
20 community sewers on April 6th, at
21 Suffolk Community College Culinary Arts
22 Center in Riverhead. It's just to
23 introduce some new guidelines and new
24 development projects by the DEC and the
25

County. It also takes look at all the initiatives on septic systems.

You will notice that on the agenda for it, they mention the participants from the Health Department. I don't know -- last I heard, I didn't know if that was the case, but it's certainly a possibility.

MS. GROWNEY: I am on the committee -- the Planning Committee and as of yesterday, the Health Department has said they will be attending. So, we're very happy about that. It's good to see the exposure of all the efforts being done. There are many efforts.

MR. KAUFMAN: I have a question for Eva and also for Mike Mule.

There was a report recently given out by the Peconic Baykeeper regarding new technologies proposed for the south shore. Is this particular conference going to be looking at any of that stuff or is it all going to be concentrating on what the DEC is talking about and

what Suffolk County is talking about?

MS. GROWNEY: Well, the primary focus is about sewage. That's the primary focus. The Baykeeper will be monitoring one of the events. I am not sure if -- this is the time first time I am seeing this particular document, so I don't know all the details on it yet. I do know there will be discussions about the effects of water realms and that's all I can tell you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: There's one item here that I skipped over. Vivian is not here to talk about it. That is the Charter Law requiring verbatim minutes; however, when she comes in, we will go back to that.

Triennial Report on the Vector Control and Wetlands Management Long-Term Plan. It's in your packet.

Anyone here to talk about it?

MR. IWANJKEO: Good morning, my name is Tom Iwanjkeo. I am here

representing Dominic Ninivaggi who is in Washington D.C. today. Hopefully everyone received the Triennial Report.

Just briefly, the Triennial Report is required from the findings statement of the EIS long-term plan. Every three years it is supposed to be submitted to the Legislature in a report of our activities. This report covers the period from 2007 to 2009.

Did you want a summary of the report?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: A few minutes.

MR. IWANJKEO: Maybe I should call up Dr. Campbell from the Health Department. Some of these aspects of the program are commenced through different departments and myself. We have Vector Control, Department of Public Works, as well as the Health Department which works on the mosquito surveillance and the Wetlands Stewardship which is covered by the Department of Environment and Energy.

I believe Camillo is here representing the Department of Environment and Energy.

The first section is from Department of Public Health, and I will let Dr. Campbell cover that section.

DR. CAMPBELL: If you look at the finding statements. There were several aspects. One was to increase education which was targeted at various aspects of airborne diseases such as West Nile and Encephalitis. There's also the fact that we increased the amount of exposure that are educator reached out to a variety of communities, civic groups, and school districts. Those are the groups that our general educator targets. It is basically open to anyone that requests it. She puts into our schedule and makes attempts to get to those locations.

Another aspect was to increase surveillance. We have two programs. One is a population surveillance where

we actually look at the amount of mosquitos that come out of different areas. That is basically in a effort to see where vector control is needed for both larvicide side and adult control.

The other aspect is the arbovirus surveillance which targets both the West Nile Virus and the Eastern Equine Encephalitis virus. Those two viruses are the primary airborne diseases that we have in Suffolk County. We have increased the surveillance for those diseases and primarily for the West Nile. It has a greater range. It's found in all of the townships, but in a greater propensity in the western region -- western Brookhaven to the western County line.

We have the capability that talks about approximately 105 traps per week. We have the capability -- we actually exceeded that capability this year which is not this Triennial Report which only goes to 2009. For the year 2010, we had

a very prominent year for West Nile Virus; so we're able to do that, but we don't necessarily do that to extend the resources if they're not needed. We look at the situation in all the townships and provide surveillance where it's required.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I have a question on the process for your Public Education.

On Page 53, you have a table that tells how many people you reached out too. I was wonder how that was advertised? You have 200 people here from St. James and I live in St. James, and I don't recall ever hearing anything about it. So, in what ways do you contact people that something is going to go on?

DR. CAMPBELL: I'm not in charge of that aspect of the Health Department. We do have an Education Department. It is usually word-of-mouth. There are districts that reach out on a routine

basis. There are letters that have gone out, from the Commissioner, to different organizations, schools, and civic groups in the past. I don't know if it is a routine procedure, but it's on our website and we have many different aspects.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

Any questions concerning the public aspects or suggestions?

Gloria?

MS. RUSSO: Dr. Campbell, how is that they chose -- I read through the whole report and saw that they would choose individual homeowners. How do you go about finding homeowners who want to do that?

DR. CAMPBELL: That's the population surveillance. It tracks household currents. We look for locations that are problematic or produce large numbers of mosquitos. Basically, we go door-to-door. We look for a house that doesn't have a lot of

lighting around it because the trap runs on a light bulbs, so we don't want competition for outdoor lighting and things like that. It is a combination of the proximity of the house to the area that we're testing and what they have in their surrounding areas.

MS. RUSSO: Generally, how do they react when you do ask if you can set traps along their property?

DR. CAMPBELL: Usually they're pretty receptive. Once we educate them and let them know it's not going to create more of a problem with mosquitos coming into their property -- you know, many homeowners think it is going to draw them in. We do let them know we're going to catch the ones that are going to come into their yards, they're generally receptive. We had some that have been in the same yard for 30 years, and then we have some that will start for a couple years and then they grow tired of it. They think it is more of a

hassle. We have to go there at least three times a week to pick up the samples. We do it in the morning -- early in the morning and it's a sacrifice for them. Some are very receptive and some are not.

MS. RUSSO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

MR. IWANJKEO: In terms of the long term plan, we identify about 25,000 historic sites that have been known for the past 30 to 40 years in the past. The crews regularly check on them and return every two weeks depending on their breeding history. We also take complaints from the public. We have expanded our catch basin program which is outlined in the report. We treat approximately 25,000 catch basins each year.

Ecologically proposed were mentioned in the recommendation. The DEC changed their history usage of biological control because of the

history of the viruses found in the fish, VHS and such. They do not want fish stocked in the pond. They have really been limiting the amount of biological control. New Jersey is doing some work and such but right now it is very limited and it doesn't seem like a viable option on the long wide scale usage. So ever since then, they have been resistant and testing and we have continued to rotate our pesticide uses in the BPI and alternating the larvicides and depending on the stages of the mosquitos and the locations, we're trying to rotate which pesticide uses in those areas.

Water management has pretty much been restricted due to the Wetlands Stewardship Program which we will talk about in a minute. We worked on two small pilot projects. The DEC works on the property where DEC requests that we come in help mitigate some sites mainly due to the poor water circulation and to

the DEC on wetlands where we opened up or removed pipes and continue to monitor those sites for the DEC. That has proven to be ecologically beneficial. There are two sites such as lime marsh in East Patchogue and Namkee Creek in Bayport.

The adult pesticide varies year-to-year. It depends on the tides and the majority of the salt marsh population. Approximately, 89 percent of our programs revolve around salt marsh seasons. So, if we have normal storm tides and such, it can vary with intense breeding within the salt marshes year-to-year and so we have water management working on restoring some of these wetlands that are predominantly breeding sites. We're looking to reduce pesticide use and we're trying to work with the Wetland Stewardship to see what kind of changes we can make to eliminate the breeding of the propensity of the salt marshes.

In terms of adulticide, we have the Wingman System now. This technology helps minimize the drift out of the spray block. The helicopter goes to an area and this directs the helicopter, based on the temperature and the wind, and it projects to the pilot where he should release the product.

DEC targets which areas need to be treated in regard to virus surveillance. In regard to water management, we continue to monitor the Wertheim Wildlife Project. We continue to see positive results from there where it eliminates pesticide use from one area and greatly reduces and uses comparison to controlled these areas. It was written up in a five year summary of what we found at that particular project.

MR. SALAZAR: I am from the Department of Environmental Energy.

The Triennial Report is from 2007 to 2009 and for that timeframe. It is

an update of work that these three departments of Suffolk County have been conducting to all of this time .

The Wetland Stewardship Program is a wetland management part of the Triennial Report. It became a recommendation of the long-term plan. It has been conducted or managed by the Department of Environment and Energy.

These programs started in 2009 -- June of 2009. It was supposed to start in 2008, so we had almost a year delay. We don't have that much written in the report.

The problem that we had was reduction of the funding for the program and some contractual dealings with the consultant and the Department.

The program includes developing of tools for the salt marshes in the County and specifics for the County. It's not intended to be generalized for different states or different counties. It is just for Suffolk County.

Another part of the program is to identify salt marshes in the County. After the tools are used, we will identify different kinds of marshes in the County and create reference with sizes for restoration programs.

Part of the program pilot project is to develop a pilot project that the County will purchase the implementation of the project. Also, included in the review are the BMP or Best Management Practices from the long-term plan and they're also to ensure that this program is consistent to the Montauk Point Program and the field work of the program including 1,000 acres of Suffolk County marshes. The consultant started working there in 2009. Up to this point they have 1,000 acres of Suffolk County marshes. We were basically focusing on the primary size from the long-term plan. We have identified that there were many during that time and so the program was focusing on that size

primarily.

We have a website that you're welcome to visit www.acwetlands.org which we intend to update constantly or at least as soon as we have new information, it will be updated.

Part of the program includes the Wetland Stewardship which has been shared by the Suffolk County Department of Energy. The Commissioner of that committee was formed by different agencies and members of the New York State DEC and we have different stakeholders from the state unit. The reason for these committees is to evaluate and provide feedback to the County on any kind of projects related to the wetlands in the County. Part of this committee is also the wetland work group which is a smaller group created to provide technical feedback to the consultants conducting these stewardship programs. The goal is also to create a wetlands stewardship strategy which will

provide technical guidance for main goals and for the production of 75 percent of larvicide in the County. That is the uses that the BMP will provide in the long-term plan.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you, Mr. Salazar.

Question about the BMP's: If I recall correctly, we were not using BMP's like number 10 or 15 or something like that for a particular point. One of the reasons we were not using them was because we're waiting for, I guess, the assessment of the long-term management plan. So until your study is complete, the County will not consider using BMP's 10 through 15 or whatever you agree too?

MR. SALAZAR: That's correct. The wetlands strategy as documented is still in a draft form at this moment.

As I said before, we were unable to start the program as it was intended to start in 2008. We have been waiting for

feedback from different stakeholders and different agencies and environmental groups to get this strategy in good shape.

The strategy is divided in phases. Again, it is a draft, so we don't have a final version of it. We intend to implement the BMP's in gradual mode starting with 75 percent as I was explaining before.

We did some work with the DEC at the marshes at Namkee Creek. Some of the BMP's did apply in the wetlands, so we're taking data from previous -- from before the maintenance work and after the maintenance work to gain more strength to the tools that we create.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: You say that you're a year behind, but in a year from now, we will get the plan?

MR. SALAZAR: No. Actually, we're working in fast pace with this project because the long-term restrictions or limitations is in a timeframe. We are

trying to get a final document by the end of July of this year.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

MR. BAGG: Specifically, when the long-term document -- the draft becomes available, what are you going to do with it? I mean is it going to come before the CEQ? The original generic environmental impact statement says that some of those Best Management Projects proposals had impact associated with them, and the GEIS calls for supplementals; so being the GEIS is an environmental impact analysis, how is that going to be handled?

MR. SALAZAR: Once we have the final the document -- are you asking if we're going to come to CEQ for a presentation?

MR. BAGG: Yes. When does it become final? Does it come to CEQ first? Does it get some type of environmental review in terms of the impact of those Best Management

Practices that were considered to be more invasive on the marsh? What is going to be your procedure for handling that?

MR. SALAZAR: Well, the procedure is based on the recommendations that were already adopted by the long-term plan. It's already been accepted by the County. The two committees have that function to revise these strategies and provide feedback and the County will adopt that feedback inside the document. We're trying to go along with the long-term plan, yes.

MR. BAGG: Well, I understand that, but some of those original BMP's were withheld because of the potential environmental impacts and the generic environmental impact statement says there will be "supplementals" to what those impacts will be. How is that going to be handled?

MR. SALAZAR: Yes, that is correct. In that case, once the project -- once

the strategy is finalized, it will be presented to the CEQ. It is a strategy. It is not an implementation of a restoration project. It would be the basis to start a new restoration project. In this case, if the County decides or intends to implement the project in any of the marshes in the County, we would refer to those documents and then have to go to CEQ either way.

MR. BAGG: I understand that, but you can't finalize a process until SEQRA's complete and the GEIS calls for a supplemental EIS; correct?

MR. SALAZAR: The final document will go to CEQ, yes.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mr. Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: I am member of the Wetlands Committee and what Camillo has stated and to answer Jim's question, yes, according to the documentation in the wetland long term plan and according to some of the data we have been given

here, the plan itself will come to CEQ for review. It will also eventually be adopted by the Legislature.

Second off, the actual work plan where they talk about doing an actual project also has to past muster of the CEQ. That is part of the documentation from four years ago, and that's inside these documents.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you, Mike.

Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

I know that Chris Schubert is here. Chris, do you have anything you wanted to add with regard to the wetlands long-term plan?

MR. SCHUBERT: I am Chris Schubert with the U.S. Geological Survey. I am a Supervisor with hydrology and I oversee the Environmental Hydrological Investigation section.

We have been working with a variety

of County Health Departments and provided some information that went into the Triennial Report. We are simply here to answer any questions about that work with regard to sampling or specific pesticides or for carrying out a toxicity work and the effects of pesticide and sediments. Some of that work has been summarized in this final. I believe there are also recommendations in that plan to continue some aspects of this work.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any questions of Chris?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

Dr. Dempsey?

MS. DEMPSEY: Good morning, my name is Mary Dempsey. I work for the Department of Environment and Energy. My brother is a doctor. I just have my Masters.

I just wanted to reiterate what was

said before. I was involved in the writing of the Triennial Report and I wanted to reiterate what Mike Kaufman said in regards to the BMP's.

Within the long-term plan document under the BMP's 10 through 15, we have structured it so that the Stewardship Committee receives yearly notices if we think the BMP's are going to be used on a project.

Also, the recommendation from the Stewardship Committee are then provided to the project sponsors, the CEQ, and SEQRA, the lead agency, so we do realize that SEQRA will be involved in any of these BMP's because they are usually more likely to have a potential major impact. So, once again, I just wanted to reiterate that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So you said that the BMP's 10 to 15 are going to be implemented and the Stewardship Committee is notified?

MS. DEMPSEY: Yes. On any wetlands

projects, the Stewardship Committee will be notified and it will be brought to their attention especially when any of the BMP's 10 to 15 including things like breaking internal burms, tidal channels, removing dredge spoil, et cetera. So, yes, we would probably have a meeting on that -- I would assume.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So does the Stewardship Committee have the authority to say no?

MS. DEMPSEY: I think they have the authority to provide suggestions.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: So, ultimately, the authority is to reside with the Health Department?

MS. DEMPSEY: I think the authority is in front of the CEQ, and not any individual department.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Is that not a little bit cumbersome if they want the use of BMP's such as 10 or 15, that they have to come to the CEQ and then the Legislature to get permission to use it?

MS. DEMPSEY: Well, there's a activity that could have a potential impact and under the long-term plan, it could involve having a supplemental EIS.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: This just seems to be very cumbersome giving the time it takes to get stuff through to the CEQ and the Legislature. If you really need to do so, then it is very unlikely that you would get it done during the mosquito season.

MS. DEMPSEY: : Well, I don't -- I doubt we're going to have a lot of projects that will be using these BMP's that would be a major project. I think Mike wanted to add something.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mike?

MR. KAUFMAN: The restrictions that you were talking about that were cumbersome aspects of it were set up specifically to guard against projects that might cause problems. The plan itself, back in 2005 or 2006, which you, I, and Gloria worked on extensively was

set up to not place obstacles, but to have enough review because marshes were very, very delicate and are very, very delicate ecosystems. We did not want to make a mistake. The way the procedures are set up is that the Wetlands Committee gets the first look at it and it goes onto the proposing project inside the system. Once a plan is developed utilizing those BMP's or possibly livening those BMP's, it will then come before the CEQ for a primarily environmental review and then to SEQRA itself which is the Legislature. We can make that a negative declaration or we can positive declaration it. At that time, if we make it a positive declaration and say that is something the EIS required and that it is a full blown study looking at that particular individual marsh. Remember, that's the critical conception that was conducted a number of years of ago which was the fact that EIS' were on each individual

marsh and if it looked like there might be an impact, could you require or recommend it by us and require it by the Legislature.

If we have a full blown plan before us, which is one of the other requirements of the long-term plan, we can assess it at that time; for example, today we're going to be assessing a plan that's up there right at Terry's Creek which will be very kin to what we would be looking at with stuff coming out under the vector control and the Wetlands Management Plan. At this point in time, we can say we like the plan and we do not see an environmental impact from it such that it would cause the need for an EIS to be prepared again. I am looking at the power point that's in front of us right now. If we have enough information and it is a requirement to the plan, then we can assess what has occurred and is it theoretically possible for us to give it

a negative declaration and move it through the process fairly quickly?

Again, I show you the Terry Creek situation which we will be asked here today to either give it a positive declaration or give it a negative declaration it. We an either say there has been enough timing involved with it and we don't any environmental problems suggesting that an EIS is needed or else we can positive declaration it and say, "Hey, there's issues here that we want to take a look at." That is essentially what is going to be happening with any project that comes out of the vector or the wetlands management control plan itself. It's review is not necessarily cumbersome.

MS. DEMPSEY : We're prepared to provide information on any project.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

Anybody else have any comments on the plan?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response

from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I want to thank you for the Triennial Report. It is very informative and very helpful; so thank you very much.

MS. DEMPSEY: If anyone wants a CD of it, I can pass them around.

(WHEREUPON, CD's were passed around the table.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mike?

MR. KAUFMAN: I would like to add my thanks to the people that worked on it. I have been involved with the pesticides and the Wetlands Committee. I have seen the amount of work that these people have done. It is enormous in just collecting all the data and working on it so I would like to congratulate them.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Legislator Viloria Fisher just arrived.

I would like to go back and ask what the status is of trying to eliminate required verbatim minutes.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: It's in Committee -- Wait, I think it passed? Did it pass? I have to check and see if it passed in January's meeting.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: This is the public portion of our meeting so if people have any comments or want to participate in any way, please feel free to do so.

Historic Trust?

MR. MARTIN: Good morning.

On the Housing Program, we are basically in the same situation we were in last month. We still have the two vacancies at the Huntington West Hills County Park. The rents were reduced from the last committee meeting. We still have not sent out a countywide memo stating that those rents have been reduced and are still available. That still needs to be done from the Park's Department, and I am hoping that it will be done by the next meeting.

As for the contract situation,

we're still working on the contracts with the Maritime Museum at West Sayville that works within the Parks Department. The contract for the group Flashes of Hope, which is at Condre Hall has been sent out to the group and we're still waiting for their comments. The contract for the Long Island Chapter of the U.S. Lighthouse Society which is looking to restore the Cedar point Lighthouse has also been sent to the organization and we're waiting for their comments. We're working all of those at the moment.

I would like to discuss the revised plan we have for the restoration of the Condre Hall boathouse. It was reviewed by the CEQ in 1997. That resolution is in your packet -- in your folder. The reason I am bringing it forward now is that there's some big changes to the scope of the work from what was originally planned.

If you will notice in the first

"whereas clause," it mentions repair of the exterior damage masonry. At this point, the architect is recommending that the two chimneys actually be removed and taking down and rebuilt --

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Just a minute. Council, what he's talking about as far as the "whereas clauses," that was included in your packet.

MR. MARTIN: (Continuing) -- so that has been changed. Also, in the back which is attached to your EAF, the architect's report that's dated December 11th, 1996, is attached to the last two pages. If you look at the first page of Number 1, Foundation, it makes the statement, "No evidence of structural failure of the foundation and/or under the Chimney exist." 15 years later, that is definitely not the case at this point and we have some serious concerns.

The project has been bid out. We do have a contractor on the site that has started the job and site conditions

have been furthered discovered as he has been working on the site. He asked the architect to come up with an alternative plan and that is the report that was sent to you that's attached with the pictures. I would like to run through the pictures to explain the project to you and then Steve, from DPW, who is the county architect on the job, I would just like for him to give you a brief background to the site conditions and why they're making this proposal.

If you look at the pictures, you will see two large chimneys and there is a good picture of it -- a black and white picture on the third page on the bottom which shows a decorative design to these chimneys. These are proposed to come down and be reconstructed. The proposal from the architecture is to not use a regular masonry method, but to use a brick face. I would like to pass this around which is the new product that we're recommending at this time.

(Indicating.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Will they be functioning?

MR. MARTIN: They will not be functioning. It's just part of the architectural design. It's the same design that we have at the main house. If you look at the last page of the pictures, you will see the additional architect drawings for these chimneys and also you will see two pictures of the main house which shows similar chimneys there. We feel this is an important element to the architecture of the boathouse and we don't want to lose that element.

Also, the tower section which, again, is the black and white picture on the top, you can see the top portions of the tower with the windows -- the square windows. That is now proposed to be taken down. Originally it was to be restored in the same place and be rebuilt. Again, we're not using the

terra cotta blocks that we originally used. It was not put up properly and they're proposing a new method for the reconstruction.

At this point, Steve, if you could just come up give an explanation on the site conditions that brought us to this situation. Also, if you could explain what's proposed for the reconstruction of these elements.

MR. ASTUTO: Good morning, I am Steve Astuto. I am the Project Manager for this project.

During the construction, it became apparent that both chimneys will need to be removed. Both chimneys were deemed by the architect to be in eminent danger. We determined that there is a need for them to be removed. The question, at hand, is how do we replace them? We have three possible solutions.

The first one is to replace it with the existing brick, taking it down, dissemble it, and reuse as much of it as

possible. The second solution would be to replace the chimney using all new brick. The third one that we're proposing is to use this thin brick system.

In both the first and second situation, the problem becomes a soil condition of such that there is a clay of soil. As you know, the boathouse is buried near the water and basically the footing sits in water. So the expansive clay soil with expands and contracts and makes it very unstable.

The slenderness ratio of these chimneys is such that we probably wouldn't build these chimneys with such height today. We're proposing the thin brick system where it will look -- we can use any brick and even have brick manufactures match the existing conditions. It's just not a full size brick. It's a thin brick. I think a half inch thick which allows us to build this tall structure stronger and

basically be formed around the same type of steel column in the center of the chimney and that will allow us to replace this and look exactly the same.

MS. GROWNEY: My question is, will the color of the chimney look the same? Also, will the size of this brick element be the same as what's there? So, generically, it will look the same even though you're going to structurally make it sound?

MR. ASTUTO: That's correct. We intend on matching the size and color of the brick.

MR. MARTIN: Steve, would you also explain how the tower can be reconstructed?

MR. ASTUTO: Similarly, the tower is made from a clay tile which is a very brittle material. There's a lot of steel in there that we need to replace so we want to take down the existing masonry tower to the steel and replace the steel and instead of putting the

clay tile back, which is not a very common material, it will be a metal stud with chafing on the outside and then we will stucco it to match the existing building. So, again, on this side it will be totally different as far as the framing structure, but on the outside it will look exactly the same.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mr. Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: Steve, question for you.

In the report that you gave us it talks about using mild steel. We are in a costal environmental over there and the mild steel rusts very, very quickly especially if you're going to be attaching this kind of brick to it. You cannot have protective materials on a mild steel like structure. You have to -- you cannot have an epoxy coating or anything like you will have here. There is a potential for rust in there. Is this going to be safe to rebuild using a mild steel? Also, I guess, with that, I

am looking at wind sheer issues. I have a boat docked in that area. I pass by there 100 times and never noticed the chimneys. Now, looking at these pictures, I see how proud they stand out there. While we haven't had too many hurricanes here recently, if you're using a mild steel, I am concerned about the construction aspect of it. Is it going to hold off in a storm? Is it going rust out very quickly?

MR. ASTUTO: Well, by using the steel, it would actually allow us to make it stronger. It's like having masonry sitting there on a substandard soil and that will give use to a stiffer and stronger tower. As for the steel, we can galvanize the steel, but as long as it is kept dry and as long as it enclosed and kept dry, we should have no problems.

As for the existing situation, that steel is rusted because the building was not kept dry. We had many roof leaks

and the steel has gotten wet over the years and has rusted.

MR. KAUFMAN: So, you're saying you would cap it off on the top and you would cap off at the bottom and not allow moisture in there?

MR. ASTUTO: Absolutely. It will be totally enclosed.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva?

MS. GROWNEY: Would you discuss the option of treatment for the steel point?

MR. ASTUTO: There are different coatings that can be applied to it to preserve it. As matter of fact, the existing steel in the boat storage section, we just applied a coating to it to help preserve it over the years.

MS. GROWNEY: Is there a reason why you wouldn't do that in this particular instance?

MR. ASTUTO: We can do that and I am sure we will apply some kind of coating. I don't know if we really looked that closely at how we're going

to protect it. It was just a matter of getting approval by the DEC to look at before even considering doing it.

MS. GROWNEY: My assumption was that you were going to start doing it. That would be something to consider.

MR. CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other comments?

Michael?

MR. KAUFMAN: This applies to Eva.

Sometimes its been my experience that when you have steel attaching other materials to it, it does not always occur all that easy and that was the point of my question. The epoxy coating and your rust resistant and anti-valve paint and things like that are not necessarily always useful in this situation. Basically, if they put this type of brick in and utilize some sort of mortar or something like that, it does not that it also adheres to steel.

MS. GROWNEY: There are a lot of new methodologies and things that can be

done. It's really a question of how all the details are carefully combined in a way that doesn't foretell any variance reaction, et cetera. The architecture, I am sure, will make sure that is all addressed.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Anything else? Michael?

MR. KAUFMAN: Aside from chimneys, there is talk about footings resting on clay I think about 30 feet down. You guys have been digging, apparently, in there; have you found out how deep these foundations go?

MR. ASTUTO: Yes, I saw an e-mail yesterday. They did reach the bottom of one. I believe it was six foot six. The footing starts at six foot below the top of the foundation. In the one location that we did get to the bottom of which is under water and we did have to de-water. There was a crack in the foundation wall yet the footing was solid which was very encouraging.

Currently, right now, they're in the field of work looking at a second location.

MR. KAUFMAN: You don't know if you have to pour more concrete down there or do cement footings or anything like that?

MR. ASTUTO: We probably won't do concrete in there because of the nature. We may have to do some type of tile system to support the footings, but I don't think we're going to be pouring concrete underneath the existing foundation.

MS. GROWNEY: Do you have a point in which you're sitting on soil of some sort that is stable? Might you be using wood or steel for those piles footings?

MR. ASTUTO: The piles are going to go done about 30 feet -- sorry -- the clay goes down about 30 feet so the pile system probably has to go a little lower than that. We also recommended several years ago when we first started looking

at this project a micro pile system where they actually place smaller piles on a angle and it gives the structure stability.

In these situations, I think any type of pile systems, in the water, and it could be salt water could pose problems. We are keeping our fingers crossed that the rest of the foundation -- the foot -- we know there is a crack in the foundation, but if the footing is good, we're happy with that even though the building is sitting on this substandard soil. As long as the building moves together, we're okay. That's what we're hoping for. If the footings are all still intact, we're happy and confident that the building will last decades longer.

MS. GROWNEY: So, if you're not going to pour anymore concrete then, what kind of pile would you use?

MR. ASTUTO: Like I said, it's a micro pile system. I am not that

familiar with it. They actually bore on an angle in opposite directions -- two small holes and then reinforce it. They would be concrete piles, but it's not major concrete work; it's not huge slabs of concrete.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other comments?

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: Rich, as you know, I voted on a lot of money going into Coindre Hall property. I was looking back for the place where I had read yesterday about who had been using that building -- the Rowing Club? Could any of this had been avoided by using a maintenance schedule? It seems that this is a tremendously big project and this building hadn't been used until when was this Row Club came in.

MR. MARTIN: The Sagamore Association has been given permission to use the building. They had been in the building since the County purchased it in the early 1970's, but I can say the

situation we're finding now -- you know, it hurt over time. Yes, if the County had started this restoration years ago, it probably wouldn't have gotten as bad as it is now, but a lot of these situations occurred decades ago and continued. The organizations for the Sagamore Rowing is interested in coming back in the build; in fact, that is the primary reason we undertook the restoration. They will be coming back and storing their stuff. Also, the Town of Huntington, which is contributing $600,000 towards the restoration, also has a contact with us now and they will be running their recreation programs -- their kayak program out of the boathouse. We will have two groups in the boathouse. The $600,000 from the Town of Huntington is going to the next phase of restoration. The first phase that we're working on now which is fully funded and underway is to stabilize the building, and we just did not anticipate

the condition that we found when we started. That's why I wanted to bring this to your attention. The Historic Trust did review this design change which was not brought forward to you before.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: It had been part of our plan for maintenance in the capital program for historic buildings and that plan was that put together, but what priority did this house take place in? I am talking about the plan that, I guess, it was completed two years ago.

MR. MARTIN: This building rated very high. I don't know exactly the rating. The Blydenberg Mill was number one and the Homan House in Yaphank was rated number two. This project eventually funding wise and design was underway when we did that survey. It's just taking a very long time to get to this point. If you notice the paperwork had to be approved. This project was

from 1997; so in order to get all the design work done and the additional funding, it took us a number of years to accumulate the money we needed to start the project.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

Any other comments?

MR. ISLE: One quick question.

You mentioned that the color is the same as the brick piece and the size is the same. In terms of the details, corbel effect is all that the same too?

MR. ASTUTO: Yes, exactly.

MR. ISLES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Richard, I want to thank you for calling our attention to the changes to this building. It's important to have you keep us informed.

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Chairman, just a quick question.

The presentation that was made to us has essentially changed us in some sort of discussion about the different type -- are we supposed to make an

action here today? Rank it? Type it? Approve this to the Historic Trust? There is just some question as to that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: It's up to the Council, but it's probably not needed.

MR. KAUFMAN: I am still unclear. We were presented with these two options. One of them is to rebuild the chimneys, and the other is to drop the chimneys down, if I remember correctly.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do you want to make a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: I don't know what we should do at this point in time.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: It's just information.

MR. BAGG: Basically, the original resolution calls for restoration of the boathouse. This has been before the CEQ for over 20 years. We're finally getting to the point of restoration. What is being proposed, I think, falls under the term "restoration" per se which is benefiting the property. I

1 don't necessarily know at this point in
2 time whether you need to do anything
3 else from an environmental point of
4 view.
5 MR. KAUFMAN: Well, if it is
6 classified as a restoration, then I have
7 no problem with the proposal but, again,
8 I thought I saw something in here to
9 worry about how it would be rebuilt and
10 things like that, but if it is
11 restoration, then I am not going to -- I
12 don't need to --
13 MS. SPENCER: The reason he brought
14 this to us today was because this will
15 not be in core of the restoration. The
16 material that will be used will appear
17 like the original, but because of the
18 extraordinary circumstances, it will not
19 be a true restoration with the original
20 material and because of that Richard
21 wanted all of us to know; is that
22 correct?
23 MR. MARTIN: Yes.
24 MS. GROWNEY: They said the
25

appearance would still be the same, and I think that is really key here. I think that the visual aspect would remain the same even though the materials are being done differently. The fact that it could be stabilizing, I think is really critical as long as the final appearance has the same and is going to have the same effect as if we never touched it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Michael, in essence, this is information. It is informational and it would be redundant to do anything.

MR. KAUFMAN: Not a problem, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you very much.

Anything else?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Propose Acquisition for Open Space Preservation Purposes Known as the McLaughlin

1 CEQ Meeting Minutes 021611
2 Property Beaverdam Creek, Town of
3 Brookhaven.
4 Good morning, Lauretta?
5 MS. FISCHER : Good morning, Mr.
6 Chairman and Members.
7 I have two proposed acquisitions
8 before you today. Both are located
9 within Beaverdam Creek in the watershed
10 area in the Hamlet of Brookhaven.
11 The first proposed acquisition is
12 the McLaughlin property. There are four
13 parcels outlined in red and --
14 CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Lauretta, mine
15 are only gray. I cannot even tell what
16 properties you're even talking about.
17 MS. FISCHER: There might be a color
18 one with your second packet. There both
19 on the same map, and it might be in your
20 second packet.
21 So, on this map, the four
22 properties outlined in red are the
23 McLaughlin properties that are before
24 you. They total .59 acres in size and
25 are situated adjacent to other County

holdings in light green throughout this area. As you know, we have been coming to you for a number of parcels in this area. These are more additional properties to be included in this area for acquisition for passive recreational use.

The EIS has been completed on the property, and there were no hazardous or toxic materials identified on the site. This is a pine barrens habitat -- woodland habitat south of Sunrise Highway, and we're trying to continue to acquire these old file map areas to complete our acquisition.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any questions on it?

MR. MACHTAY: The first one is .592 and the second is seven tenths of an acre?

MR. BAGG: The total is .59 acres.

MS. FISCHER: .59 acres is the total of the four lots.

MR. MACHTAY: And the second one is

seven acres.

MS. FISCHER: The second acquisition is seven acres. We haven't discussed it yet which is the yellow attached acquisition. The one before you right now is McLaughlin which is in red before you.

MR. MACHTAY: I understand.

I will make the motion.

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

MR. MACHTAY: I will make the motion as an Unlisted Negative Declaration.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

MS. FISCHER: The second one before you is the Fasce property in yellow --

bright yellow. It is seven acres. It is one lot just south of Sunrise Highway. We did acquire the property to the east as we are acquiring the property to the south, as we speak. This is seven in total for the one lot.

MR. BAGG: I make the motion.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a motion by Jim Bagg.

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Second from Eva.

Any further discussions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

Proposed Tidal Wetland Restoration Project at Indian Island County Park.

MR. CASTELLI: My name is Frank Castelli of the Water Quality Environmental Project and Coordinator of the Water Quality Improvement Division with the Department of Environment and

Energy.

I would like to thank the Council this morning for allowing us to present this environmentally official project for SEQRA review. We also want you to know that a SEQRA coordination letter has been sent out on February 3rd, to the DEC region asking us for the County to take on the lead agency status of this project.

This project has been planned for several years and it has been an coordinated effort, thus far of several Suffolk County departments. Besides my department, we also have the vector control people from public works, the Parks Department who owns the property, the Health Service Estuary Program. We also have been working very closely with DEC on this project. In fact, regarding the Peconic Estuary Program, this is one of the five sites that we're cited in the 2009 update to the Peconic Estuary Program Habitat Restoration Program.

I would also like to thank the Nature Conservancy for also contributing some funding towards this project. It also should be noted that this project fully conforms to the recommendation of the vector control and wetlands management long term plan.

This project conforms to the BMP Numbers 10, 11, and 15 of the long-term plan.

Now, the reason this project has taken so long to even come before the Council is that we have been waiting for the necessary funding. The County applied in 2009 under the Water Quality Improvement Project for this project entitled Indian Island Creek Wetland Restoration. The proposal was approved during this past November, and the New York State DEC had approved it to receive $788,000 in State funding.

Right now, we're seeking determination with respect to state environmental review, SEQRA 66NYCRR or

Part 672. The project contains an area that is, approximately, seven acres and thus be greater 2.5 acres on public parkland pursuant to 617.410. This has been preliminarily classified as a Type One Action for which we would receive a negative declaration today.

Now, to get to the project itself, the project is located at Indian Island County Park which is in the Town of Riverhead. If you look at this slide, the old area in red represents the area that is proposed to be restored. It sits on Indian Island County Park just south of Terry's Creek and north of Saw Mill Creek. Just for your reference, the outlet to the Peconic River would be just to the south of where you see Saw Mill Creek at the bottom of figure and the actual Peconic River outlet that was just discussed is going to pretty much be just northeast of downtown Riverhead.

Historically, the area that has been proposed for restoration contains a

marine tidal -- marsh tidal wetland. This aerial photograph from the 1930's indicates the marsh that existed prior to any major disturbance. There are two other aerial photographs here that show what was done after the 1930's. The photograph aerial on the left shows the park of this area as it appeared during 1962. You can see the evidence of ditching that was done prior to 1962. The photograph on the right is the aerial from 1978. Now, most of the evidence of the ditching has been eliminated due to the depositing excess dredging sediment. This area was used as a replacement area for excess dredging material from the 1940's right up until the 1970's. It has been estimate that approximately 1,000,000 cubic yards of excess dredged material was placed on this site.

Now, the next slide here shows what the area looks like today. On the bottom left, you can see the area from

the aerial. That is pretty much devoid of any vegetation. Much of the area is openly classified by the State and the DEC as dredged spoil -- this specific area. You can see the two close up pictures in the center right which show the barrier nature of the current conditions of this area of the park.

I wanted to bring up one more item. While this site is not designated by DEC, currently, it is a fresh water wetland. The DEC does specific it primarily as dredged spoil and while this is true, the Federal Government and U.S. Fish and Wildlife designated this site as containing both estuarine and freshwater wetlands. The fish and wildlife map do classify the area as a marine tidal wetland and some freshwater wetland. The restoration will integrate both intertidal and high marsh wetlands to this site as part of the restoration.

Now, the slide that is up there now shows a schematic of the proposed plan.

The striking aspect of this is that you can see a tidal channel is proposed to be dug out. That will reconnect the tidal flow to the restored wetland from Terry Creek. The overall project area is, approximately, seven acres but of that seven acres, approximately, 5.15 acres are plants that are to be regraded. The breakdown of that is that the tidal channel and the tidal creek will cover about .5 acres. That's the dark blue in the schematic tidal channels and the creeks between the pond.

The ponds that are proposed to be created will cover approximately 0.7 acres. The plan also proposes to create 1.8 acres of intertidal marsh and an additional 2.25 acres of pine marsh. The intertidal marsh will be that circled area that surrounds the channels and the creeks and the high marsh will be in the mustard color area.

The project includes the removal

of, approximately, 25,000 cubic yards of material. I really didn't want to get into the financial details of the project, but it's slated that we're going to need about 1.2 or over somewhat over $1,000,000 for total cost of the project.

The $788,000 is coming from the State DEC and water quality protection and restoration program which is through the County sales tax which had committed and recommended an additional $300,000 of County percent funding. This was under the recommendation of the Water Quality Review Committee last Summer and it has not gone to the Legislature for approval as of yet and we're waiting the SEQRA determination. Once we have the SEQRA determination done, we can do a couple of things.

First of all, we can meet and have the SEQRA determination based on the Legislature before we can execute a contract with the State for a $788,000

plan. We also need a determination of SEQRA before we can bring forward a resolution the County Legislature for the $300,000 in County funding.

TNC has also put up some funding. Some of the projects costs are going to born within kind services like from DPW using their labor and equipment. The majority of the cost involved with this project is going to be offsite disposal of sediments.

Tom, do you have an estimate percentage wise of what the off-land disposal would cost?

MR. IWANJKEO: Yes, offsite costs is 80 percent of the cost of the project and mostly the other costs would be in the concrete culvert which is approximately five foot by six foot by forty foot long concrete box culvert to restore flow through the dirt road. That access road will be an active use of park facilities.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Could you tell

me where you're taking this material that is being removed?

MR. CASTELLI: That has not been determined yet.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I guess one of my concerns is, I would like to know where that is, so you dont come back and say we moved it somewhere else.

MR. IWANJKEO: We're trying to talk with Brookhaven Town for landfill cover or if there is a private company that specializes in that type of sediment which has to be approved by DEC.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Before I forget, we received the letter from the Town of Riverhead Planning dated February 14th. Can you address the questions that they asked?

MR. CASTELLI: Yes.

Regarding the questions from the Planning Department, Town of Riverhead, yesterday we submitted a revised Page 7 and 9 of the long form EAF to the Council recognizing the fact that

Peconic -- this area has been designated as a critical environmental area and also to recognize the fact that the Town of Riverhead has a local wetlands law contained in their Chapter 7, of the Town codes.

Regarding their specific question as to what we already talked about which was the upland disposal, but that was a question from the Town regarding preventing fragmities being evasive from colonizing and dominating new restored wetlands and our answer to that is that part of the intention of the project is to restore a tidal marsh. If it is done properly, that should minimize the threat of invasive like fragmities and the solidity content of the marsh in itself should go a long way toward minimizing colonization by invasives.

The questions regarding control measures, I think there were some concerns about long term erosion control structures and would there be any

shoaling of Terry Creek as a result of this project? We maintain that the project will be designed to try and minimize any such effect at Terry Creek. I am not a hydrological expert, but the amount of flow that we're talking about coming out of this tidal channel would be such that it should not result of shoaling within Terry's Creek.

Is there anyone else that can speak to that?

MR. IWANJKEO: Once the project side becomes re-vegetated and such, that would minimize any erosion force of the creek itself and the amount of exchange getting through the creek system itself. It should not cause excessive deposition out into the creek during construction or erosion control will be in place and sediments bales and such; so we don't anticipate any of the large deposition of sediment out in creek.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: It seems to me that this is actually an excellent

experiment you're undertaking. I am wondering whether or not if you have plans to treat it as an experimental document changes as they go along. This would be invaluable to the Wetlands Marsh Restoration Program.

MR. IWANJKEO: There will be some post-monitoring at the site, but unfortunately the site because it's a dredge spoiling site, it's not really the type of project we want to put in the wetlands stewardship as a pilot project. It is more of something occurring within the wetlands itself that prolongs the wetland dredge spoil. We're not really looking at it as a pilot project, but we are looking at it as a separate pilot project of restoring dredge spoil which is pretty much a DEC cut and dry menu in restoring hydrology so vegetation will take place. Unfortunately, the wetland stewardship is not looking at it in that aspect but it is a five acre mosquito breeding site

that is treated by helicopter aerially for larvicide, approximately, five to ten times a year. There will be a reduction once we restore the site. We will reduce the pesticide usage at about 75 percent in the long-term plan.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Jim?

MR. BAGG: I have a couple of questions.

Basically, what does the dredge material consist of? Basically, in the old days they dredged duck sludge, and I think this area was used for duck sludge and that material was really hot and that's why nothing has come back into it. We have other areas with duck sludge disposal at Smith's Point County Park. So what is the nature of this material and where is it going and is there any kind of toxicity associated with it?

MR. IWANJKEO: We're still working with DEC. TNC gave us funding with nine or ten initial samples. It shows the

sediment that the DEC thought was borderline and they're requesting additional sampling once the project moves forward. TNC, again, put them on hold for additional sediment testing, but that's why the we're putting the material offsite and we're looking for places that would approve this type of material.

MR. BAGG: One other questions: You said this area is currently treated with larvicide but is anyone going to monitor this project to find out what the mosquito output will be and once the restoration project goes in, as opposed to what it is now?

MR. IWANJKEO: The site has been monitored. It's one our historical location. It's been treated the last 50 years or whatever, but it will be continued to be monitored also additional sites to such make sure everything is on the truck and such.

MR. CASTELLI: We were hoping the

the restoration will eliminate that necessity.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mr. Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: I have a couple of questions.

If there any water going into this site right now?

MR. IWANJKEO: No.

MR. KAUFMAN: How is the mosquito breeding in area?

MR. IWANJKEO: It's basically soup bowl shaped. It's all salt water and rain water collects to the bottom and causes dredge and high clay material. It just traps the water and it sits there until it evaporates. It has a wet dry cycle just like a salt marsh. There is some vegetation in there, but it's not functioning because it's only residual salt from the bay at the bottom, but it does create a solicitant which is a prolific greater and lighter as such a causes a undue hardship.

MR. KAUFMAN: When you open up the

tide channel, and when you occupy the tidal channel, what are the dimensions going to be?

MR. IWANJKEO: We're trying to work with a hydrologist and stuff until we get the project moving forward, we were holding off and trying to bring in the engineers but we're envisioning a ten foot wide channel going into the area.

MR. KAUFMAN: Have you looked at how this design is going to create floods? It's going to be out of synch with the Peconic because you have a narrow channel coming in, so there's going to be retention time issues and there is going to be drains differently from the way Terry Creek drains. It will flood differently; are you going to be taking those issues into account?

MR. IWANJKEO: Yes, it's also contained within the burm -- five foot plus burm around the site; so it generally shouldn't be a flood issue for the park itself but the water residue

time will be impacted due to the nature of the burm.

MR. KAUFMAN: My last question is, the mustard color area in the center which you term as high marsh; are you going to be grating that down so that a higher marsh can develop in the area?

MR. IWANJKEO: Yes. The idea is to grate the whole site for proper marsh elevations. We're going to take reference plans to the area just north of the site -- just to the left of where the tidal was cut out, there's a productive high marsh and low marsh and we will reference the elevations from that site to match within the area.

MR. CASTELLI: Part of the project that we plan for the marsh is to keep track of the elevations, specifically, on how the marsh responds to sea level rise.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Did you set tables in?

MR. IWANJKEO: Yes, a TNCCT table

is in.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other questions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from Council.)

MR. CASTELLI: The last slide just goes over the restoration summary of the action and the project benefits. The actions contain construction of the tidal channel to reconnect the tidal flow to the area and the construction of ponds and regrading the higher and lower marsh levels, replanting with native marsh vegetation, removal of some of the invasive species present, and fragmities; however, in summary, to restore seven acres of tidal wetlands and environment.

The benefits of this that we have seen are establishment of highly productive estuarine salt marsh habitat which provides nursery and spoil grounds for marine life, water quality improvement, and a nutrient site. There

is also a plan benefit of this restoration project, enhance recreational and educational enjoyment of this area of Indian Island County Park, and expected reduction or elimination of larviciding and mosquito control, and provide suitable land for marsh adaption towards predicted areas of sea level rise.

Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Before I forget, would you be so kind enough to supply Planning with a copy of your presentation and to Mike Mule?

MR. CASTELLI: Sure.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.

Michael?

MR. KAUFMAN: I have a question on the SEQRA aspect of this based upon what they're saying.

Originally I thought this would most likely be a Type One with a likely negative declaration, but we only have this plan before us right now and

they're basically saying at this point in time that they're more in the planning stages more than anything else and that they have not yet developed, if you will, a full plan. There are lose ends here and there. They're more going forward at this that point in time to get contracts signed and do coordinative review and things like that. The fact that they're starting coordinative review implies a Type One. I would address this to Jim and to Mike, but is it possibly a Type Two with planning and get another -- when they develop the actual work plan, at that time, we would say Type One?

MR. BAGG: Well, if you want to just consider the plan phase, then you could consider it as a Type Two; however, they're in the process of proceeding and because it's within a County park, Type One is a physical alteration and the County park threshold is 25 percent which makes the physical

alteration more than 2.5 acres. It really depends on where this Council wants to go. If you really want to bring this back and rehash it, you could do that. I don't necessarily think that is necessary at this point in time.

MR. KAUFMAN: Given the fact that this is a long term plan, it specifically states that these kinds of sites are the highest priority for restoration, I would not be inclined to try and hold it up or anything. It think it is probably a Type One, but that's why I was asking the question.

I will make a motion to a Type One negative declaration.

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

MR. KAUFMAN: We have a motion and we have a second.

Any further discussions?

MR. BAGG: I would like the reasons that they proposed benefits to be placed in a negative declaration. In addition, I would like to say that the dredge

spoiling material, after being tested, will be placed in an approved upland disposal site consistent with nature material.

MR. CASTELLI: Yes, we will do that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Will that include some of the options whether you're going to talk about beneficial reuse of land cover of the Brookhaven Landfill?

MR. BAGG: I wouldn't put that because if this material isn't contusive to that, that's why I said it is an improved disposal area consistent with material. If that is consistent, that's fine but if they find they don't want their land covered, they may just want to put the landfill someplace else.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: My whole point was that if this is acceptable for land cover, I would hate to limit them to putting it at an approved disposal site.

MR. BAGG: Well, I think that the

use would be an approved disposal site and everybody says it is consistent with covering the land.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a motion and a second.

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

Ratification of Recommendations for Legislative Resolutions.

Mike, any comments?

MR. MULE: Pretty straight forward. They're mostly Type Two Actions. There's one resolution that I would like to draw your attention to. It is IR2034 which appropriate funds in connection

with skate park in Sayville.

CEQ has reviewed this project in the past and they already recommended it as an Unlisted Negative Declaration at prior acquisitions. This is kind of reconfiguring of the park itself, but it's the same type of review that we had in the past.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other questions on resolutions?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion to accept staff recommendations?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other discussions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from Council.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

If there are people here interested in the Yaphank sale of the 255 acres, I announced at the beginning of the meeting there would not be any discussions on this today because of some comments that were received and are going back to the consultant to modify their document. We will probably take that up at the next meeting.

Proposed Addition to South Brookhaven Health Center, Town of Brookhaven.

Please state your name for the Court Stenographer.

MR. LARSEN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Council. My name is Keith Larsen. I am an Architect with DPW and to my right is Robert Hardy. He is also an architect. We're kind of a team on this project for the addition to the South Brookhaven Health Facility.

We're proposing a small addition as you can see from your exhibits. It is a

1300 square foot, one-story addition to the rear of the facility for the Mental Health wing expansion which is basically a grant from New York State Health that has allowed us to do this expansion.

Basically, the structure will blend in with the existing structure as far as the exterior of the brick. There is very little impact to the site. We are taking out a little bit of lawn area and a couple of shrubs and expanding the building by about five percent and offering parking slightly to accommodate that without the loss of parking spaces.

We are here for a Type Two, and it is a fairly a minor project. If you have any questions on it, we will be happy to answer.

We have a large graphic here of the aerial site plan which is one of your exhibits which clearly shows the addition and the characteristics of the site.

CHAIRMANS SWANSON: Are there any

questions?

Eva?

MS. GROWNEY: Approximately, how much interruption will happen to the existing services? In other words, how long will the project take and what kind adaption has been made to not interrupt the other services?

MR. LARSEN: Basically, the project timeline is that we're hoping to start this by late Spring and finish it within eight months. The addition is such that we're adding to the exterior of the building which will not really impact the interior. We have some minor alterations to the floor plan. We're awaiting bathroom or reconfiguring the bathrooms slightly, but basically there should be no impact at all with the operation of the services that they provide.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response

from Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a motion?

MS. RUSSO: I will make a motion as Type Two Negative Declaration.

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Just Type Two.

We have a second from Eva.

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

Proposed Sewer District Number 3.

MR. WRIGHT: Good morning. I am John Wright and we have John Donovan and we're both from Public Works. We have three projects from the County Sewer District, Number 2 Southwest.

There all listed in your agenda as a Type Two and the occurring treatment is basically that it is a maintenance rehabilitation repair and no structural

changes and some purchasing of equipment.

The first project is Capital Project 8181, which is titled Infiltration Inflow Reduction and Rehabilitation. This is to evaluate and take out some of the extraneous flows that enter the system through illegal connection sub pumps and in some cases in the collection systems.

We did come to CEQ back in 2006, for a similar project, but it was very specific and it was for West Islip and Brightwaters. It was more of our pilot program. Some of the recommendations were for a larger plan. This particular plan will look at the area where groundwater is high basically south of Montauk Highway and the Nassau County line. It could be as much 130 or 140 miles that we will be looking with, approximately, 2000 manholes. It's roughly 20 percent of the service areas that's connected to this particular

plan. However, our plan is to first look at the hydrological analysis of the system and then through either smoke testing or dye, we will look for illegal connections. We would do cleaning of and identify portions of the sewer system followed by closed circuit PD. During that part of the program, if we notice a small crack or a hole, it can be grouted, but the larger part of the program is to monitor the flow during wet and dry weather and then to make repairs whether it's lining or grouting or in some cases, it might be replacement sewers. The environmental impact is basically all benefited except for traffic maintenance and minor nuisances during the program; so we're looking for the Type Two determination to be clarified.

MS. RUSSO: Does anyone have any concerns or questions for Mr. Wright?

MR. KAUFMAN: I make the motion for a Type Two Negative Declaration -- Type

Two.

MR. BAGG: Correction. We can't have both.

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion Type Two.

MS. SPENCER: Second.

MS. RUSSO: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

MR. LARSEN: The second project that we have is Capital Project 8170.

This project has multiple uses and multiple phases. It's probably been going on since the mid-1980's. The listing of the type of projects that we want to address with this application is a reoccurring thing with renovations at the Waste Water Treatment Facility at Bergen Point which is located on the Great South Bay. It is a harsh environment with salt water and sewer coming in and the age of the facility is old so we're looking to ensure that the service life of that the facility has in place will continue to do that over the years.

The important thing to us on our particular list is to make sure everything is operable and has that service life. Such things as the electrical substation requires work with the protective enclosure, as well as, some material inside the emergency electric generator which is basically jet engines which requires some rehab and certain safety things like the staircase for the buildings; not just for modifications, but for protecting the workers and the people that are on tour there community wide. We have five large odor scrubbers -- odor control units that we want to upgrade and make more efficient and make up 200,000 per cubic feet per minute. So we don't see any nuisances with this plan. Within the application shows the number of buildings, but everything's on the site and within the building and we're looking again for Type Two determinations.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a motion?

MR. MACHTAY: Motion for a Type Two.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Second.

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

MR. LARSEN : The third project of the sewer district is the final pump station and the treated sewage which goes through the pump station where it is pumped and conveyed through a six foot diameter and it is about six and-a-half mile long discharge into the ocean.

Again, we want to extend the

service life as it is critical within the treatment plan and our plan includes replacing and improvements through three 500 horsepower motors with three 45,000,000 per day pumps. We have a situation where we want to ensure that we have redundancy at that facility and we require four pumping systems to do that. So when we replace the three, we will also be adding a fourth unit.

There are also some other pump controls that are more efficient and some valves that have to be replaces. It's all contained within this pump station structure and the cost would be pretty significant -- somewhere in the $30,000,000 to do that. That is the first phase of this particular project.

MR. KAUFMAN: One thing that I noticed on the project description is that right now there are 90,000,000 gallons per day and the way you got the configuration set up, is that it's going to increase to be 135,000,000 per day.

Is that requiring the DEC amendment to permits or anything?

MR. LARSON: We had an expansion going on to increase the capacity by 10,00,00 gallons per day. Also, the first project that was discussed here today to remove extraneous flow, we hope we're successful on that, but during extensive storm and events, we do get into higher flows than you would expect in a system that's just based on sanitary sewage mostly because of we have identified the sub-pumps. So, if you have three units, 45,000,000 per day, we have exceeded 90,000,000 gallons in a shorter period. So, that would mean all three pumps operational. So by having a fourth pump, we would be able to have redundancy. DEC has reviewed and commented on the report for the expansion, and we would also send this to them although we don't expect that they would have any concerns with increasing the capacity at this point

especially since it seems to oriented toward storms; is that a fair statement to make?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, the expansion that we're talking about is not because of storm events. It is because of future development that might be connected to the district. The service life and redundancy necessary to the facility is something that they're agreement with that we don't have the final report and design documents sent to them yet in a formal approval.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: Is this in order to provide the capacity Wyandanch expansion?

MR. WRIGHT: That flow, I believe, is around 380,000 gallons per day. It has capacity already so it's not really connected to that.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response

from Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: I just want to congratulate Suffolk County for their aggressive program of upgrades and in maintenance because our neighbors to the west in Nassau County are not too from this facility and are having a great deal of problems and potentially causing a lot of harm to the environment so this County deserves credit for being aggressive.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion.

MS. RUSSO: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion by Mr. Kaufman and seconded by Gloria.

Any further discussions?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, your response may be just for us to talk to Michael about this project. For example, the Project 8170 where it discusses improvements, we had CEQ determinations in the past. I am assuming that there is a certain time

period when we have to back even though it's similar type work in the same building, but is that something we would address with Michael or can you give us any guidance with respect for the need to come back?

MR. CHAIRMAN: With this Michael? (Indicating his left.)

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. MULE: I wouldn't think it's necessary if it falls within the scope of what you're presenting.

MR. WRIGHT: Maybe just follow up with memos from time-to-time to see if we are doing something in particular to the building rather than coming back to the Council.

MR. MULE: Sure. We can evaluate it.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We have a motion and a second.

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: We can close the public hearing but it has to go through committee and then a general meeting to be voted on. Nobody came to speak forward.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you. As for other business, I wanted to raise an issue with you all to see what you think. As many of you know, I really did not intend to run for Chair of CEQ this year, but nevertheless I did. I still think that there ought to be some time limits on offices of chair and vice chair. The reason being is that there are a lot of talented people on the committee that have something to offer. Also, the fact that the Chair and Vice Chair get stale after a period of time and so a rotation is not a bad idea. I would like throw out for discussion on the idea that we put term limits on the

positions of Chair and Vice Chair to not exceed five years consecutively. It doesn't mean you could not come back and do it again, but at least get a year off and get some new blood up here.

I guess I base that on not only my own experience, but also with the Chair before us who was Chair for over ten years. It's not the great pay that you get. I am not sure it is the perks, but at any rate, I think, we should move these offices around a little bit so I want to throw that out for discussion. If it is acceptable, then we can change the bible to reflect that.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: If I may, Mr. Chair, I concur. Being a product of term limits myself, and if it's a five year limit, I think that makes a lot of sense. I don't think it should be preclude more than five consecutive years especially if someone can always come back and return again. I think it does make a lot of sense. I

1 think we all get too comfortable if
2 we're in the same place for too long and
3 there are so many talented people around
4 this horseshoe. I think giving other
5 people a chance to step up, it is a
6 different learning curve when you're at
7 the Chair seat.
8 CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you.
9 Rich?
10 MR. MACHTAY: I think it's an
11 excellent idea that there be a limit to
12 how long someone is chairperson or vice
13 chairperson. Five years is too long.
14 I think too that concurrent years
15 or three concurrent years is quite
16 enough. I wonder though how you would
17 be abusive of that? By that, I mean, I
18 if someone is Chair say for two years
19 and someone else is Vice Chair for two
20 years, it's not unheard of for the Vice
21 Chair to become the Chair. It's also
22 not unheard of for the Chair to become
23 Vice Chair and give you a hiatus and
24 that's where I think you need a five
25

year limit. That is to say if someone is Chair and then becomes Vice Chair, that they must be able to become Chair again or Vice Chair again for five years. Am I reading too much into this? I can see it becoming a perpetual abuse.

The other thing is, where is it written that this Board can make it's own rules and regulations? Do we have to pass a resolution and pass it up to the Legislature to approve it?

MR. BAGG: No, the Council adopts its own bylaws. They did it right from the very beginning. They do have bylaws that have been amended. It's the Council that amends the bylaws.

MR. MACHTAY: The only thing that I would like to see is the length of timeline suggestions and that something be built into it to avoid recycling. The way I just suggested it, as a matter of fact, it would be five years before someone could run again for the same term.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Mr. Kaufman?

MR. KAUFMAN: I take some of Rich's points very seriously; however, I question one of them. I don't always support term limits. First off, term limits can sometimes be bad in another context. I mean you have a clearing detriment sitting at the table here. Vivian Fisher is at term limit after this year, and that is going to be a terrible loss of a Legislator.

Nonetheless, I think term limits should occur every year when we elect officers. The quality of the people we have seen every year and sometimes that would be -- sometimes it should be only those who do the work and know the documents and are able to do things and be positioned for an every year election. That's a philosophical thing.

I also know, frankly, that sometimes I have seen elected officials stay in office way too long. I take Larry's point on that. I am not sure I

would go as far as Rich would go. I know continuity is very, very important on this Board. There is a learning curve. I am not saying five years is good, and I am not saying two years is good. I would say something between that might work. Personally, I would say five years.

One point I do want to bring up is that none of this can be retroactive at this point in time. Everything has to start fresh and has to be looked at in terms of going forward. Anything other than that, I think, would be unfair in certain ways.

Also, I would like to point out one other thing. 11.01 has to be two thirds majority, and you have to have it written in front of you, so I don't feel we can vote on anything today.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Thank you, Michael.

Any other comments?

MS. GROWNEY: Being the new kid on

the block, I think the best way to do is not retroactively. That does not make sense to me. I like the fact that it is elected every year. That part appeals to me. Five years is a long time. I don't really know how everyone else feels about that. The shorter term may be five years off and that doesn't make sense to me as far as continuity. Maybe a year or two at most until you step down from the position. It makes more sense in terms of continuity to facilitate the assistance of who's new on the block.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Any other comments?

Gloria?

MS. RUSSO: I would lean towards three to four years. I think five is too little too long. Rich Machtay's comment as far as recycling, perhaps, after you're in the position whether it is three or four or whatever has been decided upon the term limit, and you may

not be allowed additional positions but perhaps in three years, you don't have to recycle all offices.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Rich?

MR. MACHTAY: Actually, our appointment to this Board is for five years. So if somebody comes on the Board brand new and is then, let's say, is on the Board for a year before their elected, they may not be here five years from now. You know what I mean? That's why I said two years. Two consecutive years as Chair and then if they get elected as Vice Chair, their an officer for four years and then there would be another year before they could return for Chair again and they may be off that board all together by then. I think a five year limit is way too long and without some built-in mechanism to keep them from running again for five years is the way it ought to go.

LEGISLATOR FISHER: One of the advantages of the five year term limit

is that because the board is made up of volunteers. Perhaps, the number of candidates for the position may have time constraints that people have as volunteers, and you may not have a lot of members who want to be in the position of Chair or Vice Chair; so that has to be considered. You have people who might have served as Chair and then Vice Chair and to have a five year hiatus before they can return again might be a long time and they might not feel equipped to be Chair. You may also have people who sometimes find it hard for them to go into leadership because of their traveling. People have there various constraints on their time and they might feel overwhelmed and if they could step up doing a good job after a five year hiatus, it is a long time for somebody to have able to return; so I like to see that be a little bit smaller.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: When you say,

"little smaller," what do you mean?

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: Maybe two years.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Two years between the time that you can?

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: Yes, to make it two years time out of the Chair position in order to make it nonconsecutive terms.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: But you would go through a five year term?

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: Four maybe.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We can compromise.

MR. MACHTAY: Is that position elected every year?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: In other words, four consecutive terms for one year?

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

I am not proposing you do away with election.

So if we're comfortable with four

1 years, we will ask Michael to draft a
2 resolution for us.
3 Eva?
4 MS. GROWNEY: I am just going to
5 say one year off works for me too. I am
6 still with one year off. If everybody
7 goes with two years, that's fine.
8 MS. SPENCER: Just a comment
9 listening too everybody.
10 It seems to me that these small
11 boards, in my experience, has the
12 following problems:
13 There are always a couple of people
14 on the board who want to be Chair and a
15 lot of people who don't. I think that
16 these term limits may or may not cause
17 problems and that's just an observation.
18 CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Counsel?
19 MR. YOUNG: Whatever you're going
20 to do, Mike just can't draw up a
21 resolution. You have to comply with
22 Article 9, of the Bylaws. The time
23 limit within which the written proposed
24 amendment bylaws has to be before
25

everybody in writing before it can be voted on. It has to be determined and it has to follow the existing Bylaws.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Two weeks before the next meeting, but we usually get the packets only a week in advance.

MR. MULE: I will make sure you get it before.

MR. BAGG: One more thing.

Basically, it has to be in conformance with Section C1-4, Functions of the Council of Environmental Quality which deals with adoption and organization of rules and that's within the Environmental Bill of Rights.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Eva?

MS. GROWNEY: One question:

So if we decide to take two years off in this position, and since there is an election every year, it still means for some reason somebody could go back on because we want to elect them for some reason and there will be some provision to allow that to happen.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Well, not at this point.

Rich?

MR. MACHTAY: So, if someone is Vice Chair for three years, then they can run for Chair?

MS. RUSSO: It's per position.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: My intention was per position.

MR. MACHTAY: Okay, so then that means they can be an officer for six years.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Yes.

MR. BAGG: In some capacity.

MR. MACHTAY: Either way?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes. I think that was going to be the details that they're actually drafting. I drafted this kind of stuff before, and it is not as easy as people think. The technicalities are going to pop out.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: We will work it through, and we may not get what we want by the next meeting, but certainly we

might have something by the next election.

(WHEREUPON, there was laughter.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: And I do think, Rich, with regard to being Vice Chair, I was here for as long as Terry was Chair and -- you know, other than running a few public hearings where she could not come, you wouldn't -- I was there other than when she had a conflict or had to go to the bathroom or something like that. So, as for Vice Chair, I don't think has that much influence on personality of the Chair and so forth, so I don't see any reason why you couldn't have the Vice Chair step up and take the Chair position for a full term.

MR. MACHTAY: But I still see someone being Chair for four years and being Vice Chair for four years and then going back to being Chair for another four years.

LEGISLATOR VILORIA FISHER: But you have to have two years between them.

MR. MACHTAY: Between what? Between being Chair or being Vice Chair?

MR. BAGG: It is up to the CEQ members on who they elect chair. I mean whether a person, if they were Chair for four years or Vice Chair and then Chair for four more years and then the Council wanted to reelect them as Chair again or Vice Chair, that's fine. We're all adults here. We can all evaluate whose proposed for Chair and Vice Chair and take a vote.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Let's have Mike draft something, and I will work with him and Gloria will work with him and see what we can come up and see what trouble we can cause next month.

MS. SQUIRES: Mike could draft several proposals and you could choose the one that you like best.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Good suggestions. We will double your workload.

Any other business?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: CAC business?

MS. SQUIRES: No.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Do we have a motion?

MR. MACHTAY: Motion to adjourn.

MR. BAGG: Second.

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

CHAIRMAN SWANSON: Motion carries.

(WHEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned on February 16th, 2011, at 11:44 a.m.)

* * *

1

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

3

4 STATE OF NEW YORK)

5 :ss

6 COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

7 I, MELISSA POWELL, a Shorthand Reporter and

8 Notary Public of the State of New York, do hereby

9 certify:

10 That the within transcript was prepared by me and is

11 a true and accurate record of this hearing, to the best

12 of my ability.

13 I further certify that I am not related to any of the

14 parties to this action by blood or by marriage and that

15 I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

16 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this

17 09 day of March 2011.

18

19 Melissa Powell

20 MELISSA POWELL

21

22

23

24

25