

HEALTH COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Health Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on Thursday, July 24, 2014 at 2:00 p.m.

Members Present:

Legislator William Spencer - Chairman
Legislator Kate Browning - Vice-Chair
Legislator Robert Calarco
Legislator Monica Martinez
Legislator Rob Trotta

Also In Attendance:

Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory - District No. 15
Terry Pearsall - Chief of Staff, Presiding Officer's Office
Lora Gellerstein - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson - Assistant Counsel to the Legislature
Craig Freas - Budget Review Office
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory
Bill Shilling - Aide to Legislator Calarco
Greg Moran - Aide to Legislator Trotta
Tom Vaughn - County Executive Assistant
Amy Keyes - County Executive Assistant
Walter Dawydiak - Director-Division of Environmental Quality/DHS
John Sohngen - Division of Environmental Quality/DHS
Robert Raab - Dvirka & Bartilucci Engineers and Architects, P.C.
Jeffrey Butler-Dvirka & Bartilucci Engineers and Architects, P.C.
Sweety Christian - Dvirka & Bartilucci Engineers and Architects, P.C.
Joseph Baier - Dvirka & Bartilucci Engineers and Architects, P.C.
Mary Finnin - Suffolk County League of Women Voters
Mary McLaughlin - Suffolk County League of Women Voters
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer.

Health Committee - July 24, 2014

*(*The meeting was called to order at 2:35 P.M. *)*

VICE-CHAIR BROWNING:

So we will begin our committee meeting, the Health Committee. If everyone could please stand and we'll start with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Calarco.

Salutation

Oh, I heard two little girls in the back of the room very clear, very well done. Thank you.

So we will begin. There are -- we do have one card, so what I'll do is we'll start with the Public Portion, and that is Mary Finnin.

MS. FINNIN:

Thank you. Good afternoon. I just wanted to share with the committee that Suffolk County Health Centers, which are still County clinics, has just received an award for Outstanding Quality Improvement, and with that award was -- the County received \$358,000, you know, to recognize that award. I'm hoping that money goes back to the patient care health centers and not into some other fund, because the staff in these clinics have been working short-staffed and they have still maintained very high quality of care to the patients that we serve.

In addition, I wanted to share with you that HRH, which is the agency that is being gifted with all our health centers, is currently holding meetings at Shirley, Patchogue and the Brentwood Health Centers. These contracts have not yet been finalized and there's no bill before the Legislature. So I think in terms of transparency and working with the public, we should have access to the information and the contracts before the contract agency literally is able to move in and, you know, advise the staff what their plans are.

In addition, I read in the paper that you've got a \$170 million deficit budget. Well, why are you giving away our buildings, such as Amityville and our other health center buildings, when you should be selling them if you're giving away the business? And I don't know what the value of Amityville, for instance, or our other buildings, but instead of paying the rent and subsidizing this other corporation, I'm questioning the use of taxpayers money for this purpose. You've got a deficit, you need the money, you know, why are you giving it away?

*(*Chairman Spencer entered the meeting at 2:38 PM*)*

One other thing, just in terms of concern for ongoing quality and services of care. I wanted to advise you that the Coram Center, which is run by HRH, currently does not have social workers, so that impacts the care for mental health and for our maternity care services there.

So I just wanted to put that on the record. I don't know if it'll do any good, but at least I can say I told you. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR BROWNING:

Well, thank you, Mary. And as always, you are probably one of the greatest advocates for the health care here in Suffolk County. And I'll be honest with you, I have not heard a whole lot about Brookhaven Hospital, where they are with Shirley and Patchogue. I've heard --

MS. FINNIN:

November 1st.

VICE-CHAIR BROWNING:

November 1st you've heard? See?

MS. FINNIN:

September for MLK and another date for --

VICE-CHAIR BROWNING:

Well, you need to come back on the -- at the mic. And just to let you know, and like I said, I haven't heard anything. I happened to be going to physical therapy right now and one of the employees came into physical therapy also and the employees are seeming -- it seems to me that many of them are not aware of what's going on and that concerns me. And I know I've reached out to Doc, because I know that there are a number of RNs, and I don't think there's anybody here from -- nobody's here from the Health Department, is there? Okay. Well, that could respond to the issue with health centers. But I have put in a request because I know that a number of RNs have gone to the jail. I don't know how many more RNs can go to the jail because the majority of them are LPNs. So, you know, I'd like to know where the Riverhead employees are going to wind up once this -- once that's privatized.

So again, we -- I think you know my position on everything, and I'm a little disappointed that there just doesn't seem to be enough open information for all of us.

MS. FINNIN:

Well, thank you very much. I agree. And the information we have back door is November 1st for the Brookhaven sites; they're already in, they've already taken over Tri; and I think it's late August for MLK. The point is that why are they meeting with staff? I mean, the staff needs to know. Why is HRH meeting with staff when we don't have a bill before the Legislature for Brentwood or Brookhaven Health Centers? And, you know, it's the transparency and lack of it. And then where's the money going? Because we're giving it away. Why are you giving away the business, the buildings, the equipment, everything, and then putting in the paper, *Oh, Dear, we have a \$170 million deficit?* I mean, it doesn't make any sense to me. And I read those contracts, I don't see where you're saving any money by the way you're subsidizing and giving away the business to this other company. Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

Thank you, Mary. I'll pass it over.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Good afternoon, everyone. I apologize for my delay, I had a medical emergency. But I appreciate Legislator Browning covering, thank you very much, as Vice-Chair. That's all the cards I have. Are there any -- is there anyone else that wishes to be heard? If not, we'll close the public portion.

Today we have a presentation and we're privileged to have D & B Engineers and architects who have joined us here today, and we have Robert Raab, Jeffrey Butler, Joseph Baier, Sweetie Christian, I see it listed. I'm going to ask if you would come forward to the center table, and one of the microphones you can press and it will stay on.

We appreciate you coming to present before the committee today. Thank you very much. And they're going to be talking to us about sewers of the future, sewer expansion projects in Suffolk County, and we appreciate you taking the time to kind of update us and kind of giving us a sense as Legislators of what we should be looking for as we continue to appropriately sewer Suffolk County. So thank you very much, and the floor is yours.

MR. RAAB:

Thank you so much for having us today. Our firm is Dvirka and Bartilucci, we're a firm -- we're located in Woodbury, New York. We have approximately 220 employees, with the majority of them living in Suffolk and Nassau County. We've been around for quite a while, we've have been here for about 50 years; actually, this year we'll celebrating our 50th anniversary. And we are basically an all-purpose civil/environmental firm and we specialize in wastewater treatment and sewers and a whole array of other type of engineering and architectural services.

Health Committee - July 24, 2014

The reason we're here today is just to briefly talk about a project that we've recently worked on; this was the feasibility study for the Southwest Sewer District sewer expansion. I'm sure everyone knows the Southwest Sewer District, this is basically north of Southern State, the area that's currently unsewered, and is currently -- we approximately have about 6,000 lots where everyone has cesspools.

I would just like to introduce who's going to be speaking. My name is Robert Raab, this is Jeff Butler, Sweetie Christian and Joe Baier; we're all engineers with the firm. Dvirka and Bartilucci has extensive experience in Suffolk County as well as all throughout the northeast in wastewater treatment and sewerage, especially even with the Southwest Sewer District. In 2013, we were fortunate enough to work with other firms on the completion of a feasibility study, as I mentioned before, for the Southwest Sewer District expansion area. We followed that also with an engineering report, and even previously to that we worked on a recent I&I study for the existing Southwest Sewer District.

MR. BUTLER:

Thank you, Rob. First we just would like to describe and define the problems that the County faces. There obviously are public health concerns related to failing and substandard and old, on-site treatment systems which are typically cesspools and septic tank systems. And we've shown a couple of pictures here, and I'm sure you're aware of this, many of you may have cesspools and septic systems on your properties. So that's one of the problems.

The other one that has been identified is some of the loss of wetlands and buffer areas along the South Shore shore lines and waterways, and some of this can be attributed to nutrient inflow into these surface water bodies. And the reason why that's important, as everyone knows with Hurricane Sandy and strong storms, the wetlands provide a buffer and a protection from upland areas and that they can dissipate, I think, upwards of 80% of a wave's energy. So once we lose those, the upland areas are more vulnerable to storm surge and wave action.

Another problem we face is that the Great South Bay, as you can see here from a brown tide, has been listed as an impaired water body by New York State DEC, and that can be attributed to excessive nutrient load into this water body and lack of flushing as well.

Belmont Lake is a recreational water body that is within the study area that we looked at for sewer expansion. It is -- it receives storm water and groundwater inflow from the project area, and at times in the summer that becomes completely inundated with invasive plant growth and so forth and it's really not usable. So sewerage would likely aid the water quality within the Belmont Lake watershed.

This is fairly obvious. You know, cesspools are -- you know, they're aging. You have this kind of thing happen, and fortunately this was only a car and not someone in the car, someone falling through. So, you know, you sewer, you close the cesspools properly and you eliminate this potential -- this hazard.

There is some static economic activity. If you sewer out an area that would be more likely to bring in business and businesses that aren't allowed under current zoning or density requirements, lack of affordable and excessive housing stock due to density restrictions and also low numbers of rental units, so sewerage would likely enhance that. There's also underutilized commercial and industrial properties that by sewerage you may be able to draw in larger, more water use intensive industries.

And I'd like to turn it back over to Rob to talk about what our plan was and what the recommendations were from our study.

MR. RAAB:

Okay, when we were tasked to take a look at the expansion area, which is approximately 2,000 acres and incorporates the communities of Deer Park, Wyandanch, North and West Babylon,

Health Committee - July 24, 2014

Wheatley Heights and a portion of West Islip, our original concept was to actually look at the whole area and consider what would be strategic sewerage opportunities for that area. The Southwest Sewer District is fortunate in the fact that they do have an active treatment plant which would accommodate sewerage that would be generated in the area that we were studying. So for that reason, anything that was devised or any plan that could be put together could be done relatively quickly and, therefore, would reflect benefit very quickly.

One of the things that we were tasked with because of the large area was to try to break the project up into small, fundable areas, and to do that we decided to break the area up into what we call subareas, and what we identified were 29 subareas. These were actually devised based upon looking at each area, and primarily the land contours, the roadway systems, the land use in this area, as well as environmental factors. Considering all these physical and natural features, we were able to break the project up into these 29 areas. Once the areas were broken up into these different subareas, we were able to look at each one and to rate each one as far as which ones were the worst conditions. Now the conditions that each subarea were based on various parameters. One was the depth to groundwater and what the critical groundwater depth was ten feet and less. The second characteristic was parcel density. One of the issues in this area was that you have all cesspools and the lot sizes are pretty much -- you see three, four, five homes on an acre, or even in some cases even more. So the combination of the high groundwater and the dense population made the accumulation of sewage in the ground quite high. Also, what we factored into our equation as we prepared this environmental matrix was the closeness of these areas to the various waterways, as well as we did factor in the economic revitalization needs as well within this community.

Based upon this analysis, we came up with six priority areas that we have proposed for initiating the first phase of a sewerage project.

MR. BUTLER:

Thank you. You can see from this slide here, there's a model that was done that showed groundwater travel time to surface water bodies, and you can see the red there is zero to two years, the yellow is two to five years, the green is five to ten years. So the areas that we've selected have a significant amount of red. They will contribute nutrient and other pollutant loads into these surface water bodies relatively quickly, and so the six areas that we've selected will almost immediately see improvements or reductions of nutrients to the groundwater and surface water bodies.

Now our plan with respect to these six areas is to evaluate the use of low pressure sewers to keep costs down, force mains, pump station systems in conjunction with gravity sewers, because gravity sewers are the least expensive to maintain and operate. And what I'd like to stress is that there's really not much of a learning curve because we've laid out a conceptual plan for a sewer system for the entire study area as well as in detail for the six areas that were prioritized. And that's really illustrated here, as you can see, in this area in North Babylon where we've laid sewers out, the parcels are shown, the man holes, the depth of the sewer, the excavation, the dewatering, that's all been already estimated. So there's really not much of a learning curve here for us.

I just want to focus a little bit on the benefits, the immediate benefits. For the 6,000 parcels that comprise those six areas that were selected, you -- that would generate about 450 pounds of nitrogen per day going into groundwater, ultimately into surface water bodies. That would be stopped immediately by sewerage because the sewers would go right to Bergen Point, would be treated and discharged to the ocean outfall where those pollutants and nitrogen are easily assimilated in the ocean. So those are -- it's gone from the system, it's completely eliminated. It's not like building a new plant and discharging the groundwater in an upland area somewhere. So you have the plant available, the outfall is there and it's basically 450 pounds a day gone right out of the Great South Bay and the groundwater.

Health Committee - July 24, 2014

As I illustrated before on some of the photos, there are ancillary benefits as well. As I talked about economic revitalization of downtown business areas, by sewerage you would have a more diverse retail and commercial opportunities for business. There's an opportunity for mixed-use development, and of course job growth opportunities, not only through the construction of the sewer but, you know, increased commercial and business activity, and of course an increased tax base.

For commercial and industrial redevelopment, the County could realize large corporate industrial employers, bring them back to the area, job growth opportunities that go with that and as well as an increased tax base. And there's also an opportunity for transit oriented development in certain areas. It's also an additional funding mechanism, it's an opportunity to provide affordable and excessive housing -- accessible housing and, once again, job growth opportunities.

And if you have time, we can talk about some of the, you know, case study if you like of an area that was not included in the six, and that is there's a commercial industrial redevelopment area along Brook Avenue in Deer Park, and this is known as area one ten three, and that if some time if you build the six areas, you may be able to expand this area to connect this commercial industrial redevelopment. And as you can see here, in the green you have groundwater 13 to 17 feet and red is three to seven feet, and these are -- this is a fairly heavily, a densely developed commercial district that's really presently not on sewers and that drains to Sampawan's Creek. So here's an opportunity where you could increase the use of these properties as well as divert pollutants and nutrients away from Sampawan's Creek and ultimately Great South Bay. So let me turn this over to Rob.

MR. RAAB:

No, you finish.

MR. BUTLER:

Okay. So why D & B? We've been working with the County for decades, we know, we understand the procedures and requirements. A significant number of our employees are County residents. We also have a good working relationship with Suffolk County villages and towns and public interest groups which would assist us during design and construction of the program. We have experience in water and wastewater facility planning and design, we have trenchless technology capabilities which inevitably will be used for some portions of this project, and we have the region's most experienced staff with pump station design. So that's really where we leave it with you.

And one other thing is we would like to stress that it would be a great thing to design these six areas as far as possible and then once phasing -- once funding becomes available, construct them in phases so that you have a design ready on the shelf and funding comes in and you can build it. So that's where I'm going to leave you and I appreciate your time, and if you have any questions we'd be happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

That was really a very good presentation from the standpoint of just the pictures and being able to illustrate it, and you make a very clear, compelling argument, and you did it in a nice, concise fashion that we heard every word you said, and that's very rare to be able to do that in a committee. Sometimes a presentation like that could go for a lot longer, but I think you have all of our attention, so I appreciate it. And it's very important. You know, it's a priority. And I had the privilege of having you come to my office and present and I really felt it was worth the committee's consideration to hear what you had to say. Legislator Calarco has a question.

LEG. CALARCO:

Thank you, gentlemen, for coming; Ladies and Gentlemen, excuse me. I just had a couple of quick questions. First, the presentation appears to center around the Carls River portion of the Southwest Sewer District. I know the County Executive has talked about actually three really big projects that he's come out in favor of. So were you just commissioned to come in and look at this one specific area?

MR. BUTLER:

Yes. Actually, our focus was on the Southwest Sewer District expansion area. There were two other studies, one was in the Oakdale/Sayville area and the other one was the Mastic/Shirley area. This one here, they're all similar scope. The one difference here is that there's an existing treatment plan, and I think that's the major difference.

LEG. CALARCO:

I could be wrong, but I thought Oakdale was going to try to tie into the Southwest District; wasn't that the plan? They already reached into the East Islip area.

MR. BUTLER:

I think that -- since we've done the study, that has come up, all right? The study was done back in 2013 when we were just focusing pretty much on the area that was in the border that I think we showed, which is Deer Park and so forth. However, the treatment plant at Bay Park -- I mean, excuse me, at Cedar Creek -- I'm naming all the wrong ones. Bergen Point.

LEG. CALARCO:

Bergen Point.

MR. BUTLER:

(Laughter) busy today. At Bergen Point, will have some additional capacity once that is expanded.

LEG. CALARCO:

So we have to do an expansion of Bergen Point for it to accommodate -- not to accommodate this project, though.

MR. BUTLER:

Well, this -- from what we're gathering is that there should be enough capacity within the existing facility to handle the flow generated for this first six areas.

LEG. CALARCO:

First six areas meaning this -- the Wyandanch, Deer Park --

MR. BUTLER:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

-- proposal.

MR. BUTLER:

In those first six subareas. However, there will be some additional capacity, especially they're doing the I and I studies right now, too, which should reduce the amount of flow and so forth. So that's actually being looked at by the DPW at this time.

LEG. CALARCO:

That there's another company that was commissioned to do the Oakdale/Sayville study?

MR. BUTLER:

Yes, that was another firm, yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. The other question actually is more specific to this particular project itself. And I saw that you mentioned the number of parcels that you're looking at connecting of potentially 6,000 parcels and you're going to be able to address 450 pounds of nitrogen per day. So when you're talking about those 6,000 parcels, are we talking primarily like single family homes or are we looking at some mixed-use properties or --

MR. RAAB:

I believe about 90% of the areas is single family homes. There is some multi-family homes, there is some commercial and industrial, but for the most part you're talking about residential properties.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. And are they -- I guess they must vary in size depending on the particular area you're talking about in terms of the acreage of those properties and the flow coming out of each of those houses or what have you?

MR. BUTLER:

I would tend to think that, and especially in that area, the density is actually extremely dense for Suffolk County. You're looking at three to five, if not more residents on -- and some of them are two-family and so forth, on an acre.

LEG. CALARCO:

Per acre, okay.

MR. BUTLER:

And they're very -- they actually border, many of them border the Carls River, so.

LEG. CALARCO:

Sure. No, I understand. I happen to represent the Patchogue-Medford area. Down in the Village, in Patchogue Village we have a sewer system, although it actually doesn't connect any of the single family homes in the Village at this point in time. But we have a similar type of development where we're pretty -- we're pretty packed in, especially on the south end of the Village, believe it or not.

Do you have a cost estimate that comes with this? I don't think I saw any actual dollar figures on here. What are we looking at? I mean, obviously it's all -- you know, it's all going to be a lot of money and I'm sure it's more than we have, you know, sitting in the bank right now which is zero, so, but it's nice to know what we're actually looking at, what we're going to have to do in terms of trying to get to this stage. I think it's more important to have that conversation. I think it's laudable that we're actually doing this and taking the bold step to figure it out, because we could just keep saying it's too much money to do it and we're looking to actually get it done, but we do still need to know what those are.

MR. BUTLER:

Well, I mean, if you look at the original study we did, we were tasked with getting sewers for the whole study area, but in reality that's probably not necessary, because as you get further away from that center area, you're getting bigger lots, the depth-to-groundwater is deeper, so putting sewers in the outlying area would probably not happen, at least not in the immediate future.

In the areas that we identified, those six areas where it's the most dense, the highest groundwater, the most density, we were looking in the range originally about \$500 million to put sewers in. However, that was based on designing an all gravity system. Now when you're using a gravity system, everything has to flow and, therefore, the pipes have to be deeper, so you reach out to the farthest distance, everything flows by gravity at certain points. We estimated that once we get into the design phase, you know, the more detail design, we'd be able to use pump stations, we'd be able to use pressure sewers and possibly reduce that cost to half. And this would be as we're getting in to get more information, more field data and so forth, you can really refine your costs and reduce the impacts to the area.

LEG. CALARCO:

When you talk about possible transitioning to the low pressure system, which is actually what we utilize in Patchogue Village for the most part, except for the core business district that, you know, goes back to the original creation of the plant back in I think the 1920's. The bulk of our system that's been done since then has all been done as the low pressure system, and that can

Health Committee - July 24, 2014

actually -- while it reduced the cost of putting it in for municipalities in terms of what you have to put into the street and those kind of things, it actually adds cost on the other end for the homeowner, the property owner, because now they have to buy a pump, they have to do a little bit more work to make their system function. When you work up your numbers, are you going to look at trying to offset that cost? Because otherwise my fear -- and I actually -- I can see it in that we have places within the Village of Patchogue that are more than ready to connect if the home owner, the property owner is willing to, you know, put up that kind of an investment. It's just a very large investment for a single homeowner to put up. Even if they had to replace their system, it would be cheaper to just abandon the system and build a new one than to connect at this point in time.

MR. BUTLER:

Yeah, I think that's going to be part of the design effort, to actually look at that type -- those type of issues and questions. One of the issues with the pressure system is, like you mentioned, they become more of a burden for the homeowner. In some areas throughout the country, what they do often is they set up almost like a district as part of the sewer district, a section that would actually maintain the sewers for the residents, work out some kind of an arrangement to make it more cost effective, you know, have a staff and maintain it. Because if you just leave it up to each home owner, there's chances that you could have some more problems.

LEG. CALARCO:

Well, it's not even the ongoing cost that's the concern I have. Part of the concern I have is that if we decide to transition to a low pressure system and we're now going to put in an investment of this kind of dollars to put pipes in the ground and then tell the homeowners, Oh, by the way, you've got to fork over the ten to \$15,000 it costs to actually make that connection, and that's the dollar figure that we're looking at for any properties in the village --

MR. BUTLER:

That's correct, right.

LEG. CALARCO:

-- that I know to be the real cost factor. Those property owners are just -- they're not going to do it. You know, it's just like telling them we want them to upgrade to these better, higher nitrogen-reducing septic systems in other areas. The cost is just so prohibitive that the homeowners, even if it is in their long-term best interest, just probably aren't going to ever make that investment. So we need to make sure that we provide that into our cost estimate so that we can encourage and provide for those people to be able to make that connection.

MR. BUTLER:

I agree.

LEG. CALARCO:

Because I support this. I mean, I think that in the perfect world we should be able to try to sewer everything from our County line out to the Mastic peninsula and everything in between on the South Shore because our bay is dying.

MR. BUTLER:

Right.

LEG. CALARCO:

I'm done. Thank you very much.

MR. BUTLER:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

Is there -- do you have any studies that show the economic value of doing like the downtown first or a commercial area first and the benefit it gives to that area so you could expand? Because, you know, honestly, we don't have the money to do almost anything. But I'd like to know if there's any study that shows the benefit of doing it downtown first.

MR. BUTLER:

I would think just logically, you know, it's been shown, especially in areas where the smaller lots are, those are going to be where you have the most concentration of sewage entering the ground. So you have a situation, whether it be on the north shore where you have recharge areas, on the South Shore where you have the high groundwater, just environmentally it makes sense to do that.

As far as the economic benefit, you're a hundred percent correct. I mean, you're bringing people in, you're bringing workforce housing, you have economic development, you get more taxes; more taxes, you have more opportunities for sewers. So it's just a logical progression.

As far as specific studies that say focus on -- I'm not aware of any and, you know, we didn't have any for this study.

LEG. TROTTA:

So it's your opinion that we should be doing the downtown commercial area first?

MR. BUTLER:

Well, my opinion is that it makes sense that those are typically the focus areas just because of the density that's there. You know, in the downtown areas you tend to have the smaller lots.

LEG. TROTTA:

If you were the decision maker and you had to do a small area, you know, you only had like a hundred million dollars to do it, would you do a residential area or would you do a downtown area?

MR. BUTLER:

I would do a residential area in a downtown location.

*(*Laughter*)*

P.O. GREGORY:

There you go.

LEG. CALARCO:

He would sewer Patchogue *(laughter)*.

LEG. TROTTA:

I'm getting to Kings Park. Would you do -- that's not the -- let's use Kings Park as an example. It's pretty similar. I mean, the ground water is higher, but there are small lots and there's a downtown area. If you could choose which one, just do the downtown or do a neighborhood of 200 houses at the same cost, which one would you recommend that we do?

MR. BUTLER:

Well, it would be hard for me to recommend because I would want to see what's the environmental impact. Okay? For example, in the study that we did, in this area, this is primarily residential, so you don't have as much of a commercial element. However, the effluent from the cesspools is entering the Carlls River, so it has a direct impact on the Carlls River system, Belmont, and also the Great South Bay. So, I mean, that's part of the equation. You know, when you're sewerage, there's other factors, too. You have to consider what the environmental impacts are.

LEG. TROTТА:

Let's say the environmental impacts are the same for both.

MR. BUTLER:

I'm not really that familiar with Kings Park, to be honest with you.

LEG. TROTТА:

Never mind.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Any other questions from my colleagues? Again, thank you, gentlemen, and lady for coming in.

LEG. CALARCO:

The Presiding Officer has a question.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Mr. Presiding Officer.

P.O. GREGORY:

I just wanted to thank you for your work. I know we've met in the past and you've done an excellent job with informing the community, which obviously you know better than I -- or just as well as I, I should say -- that there were some very big concerns about that and I think you addressed their concerns very well.

MR. BUTLER:

Thank you.

P.O. GREGORY:

We look forward to working with you. I spoke to Legislator Browning, maybe we'll have a visit to your office in the next coming weeks to learn more about your efforts and what you're looking to do. Thank you for coming here today.

MR. BUTLER:

Thank you very much.

MR. RAAB:

Thank you.

MS. CHRISTIAN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Thank you.

That's the only presentation that I have on the agenda today. With that -- I mean, for the committee. With that, we'll move on to the agenda.

Tabled Resolutions

Okay, we have ***IR 1042-14 - Establishing guidelines for the use of Methoprene in Suffolk County (Schneiderman)***. I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Second by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *The motion is tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).*

IR 1236-14 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law to require the use of biodegradable products by chain restaurants (Hahn). I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *Motion is tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).*

IR 1334-14 - Directing the Department of Health Services to test groundwater for 1,4 Dioxane (Hahn). Tom, could you -- oh, great, thank you. Walter is here. Please come up. Thank you.

I know Legislator Hahn is looking for us to move this and I think we were looking to try to get a more comprehensive list. Could you give the committee just an update on kind of where we stand and if this legislation is even relevant?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

Thank you, Dr. Spencer, Members of the Committee. My name is Walter Dawydiak, I'm the Director of Environmental Quality. We did promise a comprehensive monitoring report and a framework and a strategy for moving forward. We made a tremendous amount of progress on that front. It found out -- we found out that after we scratched the surface, it went much deeper than we expected. There were a number of reports that we had to go through and review not just data from the Health Department and the Water Authority and other suppliers, but from the Massachusetts Septic Test Center, the U.S. EPA and the United States Geologic Survey. So we have developed a list, we've identified about a dozen parameters that we would like to add to our regimen over time. Dioxane is at the top of that list, however we have not vetted the list or the criteria with either the Water Authority, DEC, EPA, USGS or Stony Brook, and we really want to have an opportunity to sit down with our partners to go over the criteria, the list, determine which subsets of wells are their priorities, whether they should be all groundwater samples or vulnerable drinking water supplies, and also to determine who will do these parameters and how. Because in many cases, these are research screening level investigations that aren't necessarily appropriate for doing in all samples at all times. So we're looking at working with Stony Brook and the U.S.G.S. to do some of these parameters.

So we have scheduled a meeting, it was scheduled for September 9th. We invited Legislator Hahn, you, Dr. Spencer, any other interested parties to come and sit down, review our report and our recommendation to come up with a strategy to address these parameters. We would respectfully ask that this resolution be tabled until that time. I'm happy to answer any questions that you have.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Thank you. That's perfect. That's exactly what we need. I guess my question would be after the September 9th meeting, if we were to just give a very conservative timeline as to when we would have a final recommendation as to what we're going to make as our testing policy, what would you say, just for planning purposes?

MR. DAWYDIAK:

We're hoping that by the end of September we have a final report that's been agreed upon by the Federal and State agencies, water suppliers and stakeholders.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Okay. I think that's fair enough. Okay. Well, we appreciate you being here and thank you for

Health Committee - July 24, 2014

that update. Any questions? So with that, I'll ask for a motion to table.

LEG. CALARCO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***The motion is tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

IR 1394-14 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law to warn consumers of the dangers of liquid nicotine (Anker). It has to be tabled for public hearing?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

All right, it has to be tabled for public hearing. I'll make a motion to table for public hearing. Second by Legislator Trotta. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Motion is tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

Introductory Resolution

IR 1631-14 - To further extend deadline for Tick and Vector-Borne Diseases Task Force (Schneiderman). I make a motion to approve.

LEG. BROWNING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SPENCER:

Seconded by Legislator Browning. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Motion is approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).***

Is there any other business before this committee today? I have none. And seeing none, this committee is adjourned. Thank you.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 3:18 PM*).