

SUFFOLK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

c/o Suffolk County Planning Department
100 Veterans Memorial Highway, PO Box 6100, Hauppauge, NY 11788-0099
T: (631) 853-5192 F: (631) 853-4044
Thomas A. Isles, Director of Planning

NOTICE OF MEETING

DATE: August 4, 2010
TIME: 12:00 P.M.
LOCATION: Legislative Auditorium in Hauppauge

The tentative **AGENDA**

1. Adoption of minutes May 2010.
2. Public Portion
3. Chairman's report
4. Director's report
5. Guest Speakers- Bob Shinnick, Director of Transportation Operations – Suffolk County Transit Plan
6. Section A14-14 thru A14-23 & A14-25 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code

None

7. Section A14-24 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code
 - Hamlet Preserve 0200 97670 0100 001003 (Brookhaven)
 - Constantine Ioannou 0100 02300 0011 014007 (Southold)

8. Discussion:
 - a) Comprehensive Plan
 - b) Amityville Inter-Municipal Agreement
 - c) Amendments-Rules of Proceedings
 1. Community Sewage Treatment Works
 - d) Amendment - Suffolk County Planning Commission Guidebook
 1. Native Vegetation Clearing

9. Other Business
 - Public Safety Model Code
 - 2009 Suffolk County Planning Commission Annual Report

NOTE: The **next meeting** of the SUFFOLK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION will be held on WEDNESDAY, **September 1, 2010, in the Legislative Auditorium in Hauppauge.**

SUFFOLK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

c/o Suffolk County Planning Department
100 Veterans Memorial Highway, PO Box 6100, Hauppauge, NY 11788-0099
T: (631) 853-5192 F: (631) 853-4044
Thomas A. Isles, Director of Planning

AGENDA

August 4, 2010

1. Adoption of minutes May 2010.
2. Public Portion
3. Chairman's report
4. Director's report
5. Guest Speakers- Bob Shinnick, Director of Transportation Operations – Suffolk County Transit Plan
6. Section A14-14 thru A14-23 & A14-25 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code

None

7. Section A14-24 of the Suffolk County Administrative Code

- Hamlet Preserve 0200 97670 0100 001003 (Brookhaven)
- Constantine Ioannou 0100 02300 0011 014007 (Southold)

8. Discussion:

- a) Comprehensive Plan
- b) Amityville Inter-Municipal Agreement
- c) Amendments-Rules of Proceedings
 - Community Sewage Treatment Works
- d) Amendment - Suffolk County Planning Commission Guidebook
 - Native Vegetation Clearing

9. Other Business

- Public Safety Model Code
- 2009 Suffolk County Planning Commission Annual Report

NOTE: The **next meeting** of the SUFFOLK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION will be held on WEDNESDAY, **September 1, 2010, in the Legislative Auditorium in Hauppauge.**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

-----X

SUFFOLK COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

County Legislature Building

Hauppauge, New York

August 4, 2010

12:00 p.m.

-----X

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- DAVID CALONE, Chairman
- ADRIENNE ESPOSITO, Secretary
- MATTHEW CHARTRAND, Town of Islip
- VINCENT TALDONE, Town of Riverhead
- CHARLA BOLTON, At-Large
- THOMAS McADAM, Town of Southold
- SARAH LANSDALE, At-Large
- MICHAEL KELLY, Town of Brookhaven
- JOHN FINN, also present

- THOMAS A. ISLES, Planning Director
- THOMAS YOUNG, ESQ., County Attorney for Planning Department
- DANIEL J. GULIZIO, Deputy Planning Director
- ANDY FRELENG, Chief Planner
- JOHN CORRAL, Planner

1
2
3
4

8/4/10 Planning Commission

THE CHAIRMAN: You will be happy to know that my microphone has a push button. Good afternoon. Welcome to the August, 2010 meeting of the Suffolk
Page 1

5 County Planning Commission. We have a quorum present,
6 and I ask Commissioner Bolton to lead us in the pledge.

7 (Recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance)

8 THE CHAIRMAN: First item on our agenda is
9 the adoption of the May, 2010 minutes. You will notice
10 that our editor-in-chief, Commissioner Holmes, is not
11 with us. She actually wanted us to know -- first of
12 all, she regrets not attending. This is the first
13 meeting she has missed in five years. She will read the
14 minutes. Linda, we miss you.

15 But she is up in Boston speaking about her
16 book at a conference today. Her hit streak is over.
17 She did send me her edits to the May minutes, which I
18 have added to mine and gave to the reporter. Anyone
19 else have any comments or questions on the May, 2010
20 minutes?

21 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: No, but can we get
22 signed copies of her book? She is holding out.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: All right. The edits that I
24 had and Commissioner Holmes had to the minutes were all,
25 as usual, typographical; a little bit cleaning up a

3

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 couple of things, but nothing of substance. Anyone else
3 have any additions or edits for the minutes? Seeing
4 none, I'll entertain a motion to adopt the minutes of
5 May, 2010.

6 COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND: Motion.

7 COMMISSIONER LANSDALE: Second.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: In all in favor? It's
9 unanimous. It's nine to zero.

10 The next item on the agenda is the public
11 portion. I don't have any cards. Is anyone from the
12 public present that wishes to speak? Seeing none, we
13 will close the public portion and move to the Chair
14 report. Couple of things. In a few minutes we will
15 hear from Bob Shinnick, who is here from the county on
16 the Suffolk County transit Plan. Before that, a brief
17 update on some of the Commission activities. Of course
18 our primary goal is our Comprehensive Plan. We will
19 talk about that a little bit later on in the agenda.

20 Our task forces. Public Safety, thanks to Tom
21 McAdam as well as Andy and Ted we have a first draft of
22 the public safety product to review later today, and we
23 will get to that on the agenda. Anything else you want
24 to add on that now?

25 COMMISSIONER McADAM: No, I'll wait.

4

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 THE CHAIRMAN: On Energy and Environment, I
3 think as everyone knows we are moving on three and
4 possibly four items. Solar effort; we have sent the
5 draft building permit to the Department of State. We
6 have comments back from the Department of State. That
7 is being gone through now by some of the people on the
8 task force. So we are hoping that will get resolved
9 very soon, and same with Wind, which is really
10 piggybacking on Solar. Adrienne has been leading the
11 charge on native vegetation and habitat stuff. That is
12 on later on the agenda today. We will be discussing it
13 today. Great decisions will wait for the fall.

14 A new thing we started tackling is the green
 Page 3

15 commercial building code. As you recall, Islip used the
16 model that the County Planning Commission had come up
17 with under Sarah's leadership, and Southampton also
18 developed a similar slightly different standard, and we
19 talked about trying to bring the towns together to
20 discuss a standard energy efficiency code. If we don't
21 do that soon, everyone will end up in their own place.

22 Along those lines, Constantine and I were
23 asked to make a presentation at the Long Island Clean
24 Energy Leadership Task Force. We did that a few weeks
25 ago; it was well received. A lot of the towns and

5

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 villages from Nassau and Suffolk participated in that.
3 I think Constantine is interested in heading up an
4 effort in that regard. I think we will try and partner
5 with the Sustainability Institute of Molloy. LIA energy
6 committee said they want to be involved. We will see
7 where that goes. That is just starting. Sarah,
8 anything else to add on the energy and environment
9 approach?

10 COMMISSIONER LANSDALE: Not at this time.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: I think you wanted to try to
12 get a full task force meeting in the next couple of
13 weeks. Housing; Constantine is not here. He's working
14 on the -- we are going to do a piece of the housing
15 presentation at the Federation training at the end of
16 September, and there will be some follow-up work on
17 that.

18 The last task force is Economic Development
19 and Smart Growth. Charla has been working on the

20 historic preservation incentives. Is there anything new
21 on that?

22 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: No.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: Transit oriented development.
24 Vince, do you have anything new to add on that at this
25 point?

6

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: No, that will be in
3 September.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: We are expecting there will be
5 some research being done. That will all come out in
6 September. Sewer Summit 2 looks like it's going to be a
7 reality. Adrienne is our point person on that.
8 Adrienne, if you want to say a few words on what the
9 latest is on that.

10 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Please mark your
11 calendars for October 14th, which is a Thursday. That
12 is the scheduled date for Sewer Summit 2, or Summit
13 2.0, as Dave has named it. There will be two portions;
14 one will be a portion with elected officials and
15 government representatives, as well as commission
16 members who would like to attend. It will be more of a
17 closed door brainstorming open discussion portion. It
18 will be followed immediately after that with a public
19 panel and discussion as well.

20 So, we will be talking more about the agenda
21 and the specifics and will be held here, I believe, in
22 the media room at the H. Lee Dennison building. So we
23 had a very productive, lively rigorous discussion on
24 Monday and we will be meeting every two weeks,

25 delightfully so, up to the summit. If people have

7

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 questions, feel free to let me know.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any questions
4 about that? As you all know, that is something, an idea
5 of doing Sewer Summit 2, that is something that came up
6 at this table. We pushed it forward. The county
7 executive is excited about that. We are working on that
8 feverishly. Thank you, Adrienne.

9 COMMISSIONER FINN: I have a question. You
10 said every two weeks is a meeting. Who attends, who can
11 attend and what is the purpose?

12 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: It's a working group
13 meeting comprised of now three or four representatives
14 of the county executive's office. Chairman Calone was
15 at the last meeting, myself, and the objective is to
16 come up with what is the right agenda, what is the goal
17 and objectives of this summit and how do we meet them?
18 How do we achieve them? It is the planning process to
19 put the summit on, to be able to maximize the
20 effectiveness of it.

21 We were discussing such things as reviewing
22 various potential funding mechanisms to create a funding
23 base for sewer upgrades, a fix-it first, where we have
24 to fix existing infrastructure that is now antiquated
25 and debilitated, getting an assessment of where

8

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 different sewer studies are at, and putting it all in

3 one place because there are a number of different
4 studies going on in different places conducted by the
5 county. It's a small group, about eight or ten of us.
6 It's to focus the agenda and achieve a goal.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Any follow-up on that?

8 COMMISSIONER FINN: No, just that, as we
9 know, in the environmental and development community,
10 sewers are a lifeline for this island to sustain itself.
11 It's something that we are pretty passionate about and
12 something that I would personally like to get involved
13 in if there is an opportunity to weigh in on as the end
14 user, so it's not so we don't get too far down the line
15 coming up with a game plan. I would be more than happy
16 to volunteer my time to get involved if there is an
17 opportunity.

18 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: The goal of the
19 committee is not to come up with a game plan, the goal
20 of the committee is to craft a conference that will be
21 effective in coming up with a game plan.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: This will be an event
23 sponsored by the county executive and the planning
24 commission. As I mentioned, that is something that we
25 actually came up with and suggested to the county

9

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 executive that we should do this and bring together the
3 elected officials and have a conversation about, how do
4 we better a job getting money out of D.C. How do we do
5 a better job getting money out of Albany and create
6 local sources of funding so we are not dependent on the
7 whims of Albany and D.C. And Constantine, the vice

8 chairman, is actually having some of his staff work on
9 looking at some alternatives of things going on around
10 the country so we can learn what is going on, and maybe
11 we can get some insights on what might be possible.

12 If we have elected officials in the room who
13 have a political will to get it done, that will go a
14 long way. Adrienne is the point person. Constantine
15 will do some of the presentation. Certainly we can
16 probably use help as we move forward. We will keep
17 everyone in the loop, particularly you John, given your
18 interest. Thank you.

19 One of the projects we are working on is the
20 Suffolk County Unified Permit Portal. The idea behind
21 that is to unite planning through technology, better
22 communication through villages and towns, increase
23 clarity and predictability for applicants. Last month,
24 the planning commission hosted, along with county
25 executive's office and county economic development

10

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 office, the first brainstorming session on that. We had
3 twenty people from seven towns, Director Isles, Deputy
4 Director Gulizio, Commissioners Roberts, Kelly and Finn
5 were there. The county executive was there and a few
6 others. The good news is the county executive is very
7 much championing this. I was at a Long Island
8 Mid-Suffolk Business Association meeting last week,
9 where he focused on this and he acknowledged the
10 Commission's role. He indicated this is a key priority
11 for him. The good news is Brookhaven seems to be
12 stepping up and is geared to work with us on this

13 project.

14 In your packets there is an article, the one
15 with a turtle wearing a hard hat called Arrested
16 Development. It was the cover story in the Long Island
17 Business News a few weeks ago. So, it was kind of an
18 acknowledgment publicly that that is something that is
19 important. We are trying to figure out how to make this
20 work. There is a strategic steering committee. There
21 will be technical challenges. This will not happen
22 overnight. At the same time, we're moving down the road
23 on it and see what we can get done. I will keep
24 everyone in the loop. Commissioner Roberts is the main
25 point person. I'm involved as well. As this moves

11

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 forward we will get other people involved. Any
3 questions?

4 If not, according to press reports, the
5 Heartland project is moving forward a bit. The question
6 that was raised, should we do another site visit. It's
7 been two years since we were there last.

8 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Has it changed?

9 THE CHAIRMAN: It hasn't changed, but we
10 have. We have at least four new members since that
11 time. There is a possibility that we have two more on
12 the way on the Commission. I appreciate your feedback
13 on that. It doesn't have to be here, it could be off
14 line whether some folks want to do another site visit.
15 We did it two years ago thinking it was coming up
16 imminently. Of course, the way development works, it's
17 been two years. That is a possibility.

18 Few other things. The annual report, we
19 finally have the draft completed. Again, I was the one
20 slowing that up. We have that for your consideration
21 today. We will do some editing after today. I think
22 it's at a stage where we can adopt it, if you wish, as
23 the commission and get that out probably in the next few
24 weeks.

25 Lastly, Commissioner Yves Michel, the County

12

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 Economic Development Commissioner, has on his schedule
3 to present to us next month some things his department
4 is working on. We will see how long our agenda is in
5 September. He's ready, able and willing to present to
6 us.

7 That concludes the Chair report. Any
8 questions at this time? One other thing I want to give
9 Sarah an opportunity to mention is the event that her
10 organization is sponsoring, a very important event in a
11 week or so.

12 COMMISSIONER LANSDALE: Thank you, Chairman
13 Calone. It's actually, just to clarify, it's the
14 senator's event. We are one of three organizations,
15 including Vision Long Island and Hofstra University,
16 putting together this event. It's exciting. It's on
17 Monday, August 9th at Briarcliff College. Senator
18 Schumer is putting together this event, where the heads
19 of the Interagency Partnership for Sustainable
20 Communities are visiting Long Island. It's the third
21 such site visit that they have done in the field in the
22 country, the first suburban region. They are visiting

23 heads of HUD, DOT and EPA. There is lots of interest at
24 the federal level about coordinating these agencies.
25 It's an opportunity for the municipalities to share

13

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 their thoughts about the difficulties of accessing these
3 funds to spur revitalization. It should be a great
4 meeting and it's open for everyone.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: There are letters in your
6 packet that have some more precise information. Thanks
7 to Senator Schumer for putting it together, but we know
8 how much work you guys did in putting this together. If
9 no other questions, we will move to the Directors
10 report.

11 MR. ISLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Several
12 items to update. In addition, let me begin by noting to
13 you that Jim Bagg, who is the chief environmental
14 analyst, is going to be retiring in about three weeks.
15 We have another staff member who also indicated that he
16 will be retiring. With that, in terms of professional
17 staff level in the department, we will be down
18 twenty-eight percent from about two years ago. That is
19 the reality of the times financially. We believe we
20 will have one new person as a junior planner as a
21 replacement.

22 That will impact our workload. We will adjust
23 to that as best we can. We are reassigning work to deal
24 with that. That is a factor that might affect some of
25 the work that comes before the Commission.

14

2 The next item, we were asked by the county
3 executive to coordinate an oil spill study in the event
4 the Gulf spill were to end up in New York, and we
5 completed that, working with other agencies, including
6 fire rescue and emergency services, environmental
7 agency. And that is completed, in the hands of the
8 county exec and legislators. Fortunately, the facility
9 is now capped. Nonetheless, a review of the response
10 plan was still important.

11 Thirdly, we are working on an application for
12 a HUD sustainability planning grant that is under way at
13 the present time. It's a lot of buzz on this in the
14 planning circles. It is the first federal planning
15 money of this nature in probably thirty years. It is
16 being coordinated through a consortium of entities out
17 of the New York metropolitan area. That is the way the
18 program is designed. We are looking at an execution
19 grant in terms of a specific study in Suffolk County
20 that would be a part of this. That would be perhaps
21 looking at the issue of a regional transfer of
22 development rights approach to the number of TDR
23 programs that currently exist at the state level in the
24 Pine Barrens Program county level with the Wastewater
25 Credit Program as well as various town programs that

15

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 exist. We think this is an opportunity to look at
3 planned growth centers in the county and where TDR can
4 better facilitate growth where appropriate.

5 Next, the Commission heard a presentation at
6 the last session from Michael White, Executive Director

7 of the Long Island Regional Planning Council about the
8 Sustainability Plan. Documents related to the plan were
9 circulated. Various workshops are continuing to be
10 conducted, including one today at two o'clock. This is
11 the fourth and last of those sessions that are being
12 held.

13 This is a highly important planning effort for
14 Long Island, certainly for Suffolk County. I think the
15 County Planning Commission is an important entity to
16 weigh in and participate in the plan. Staff will be
17 doing a more detailed review of the plan later on in
18 August once we clear the decks of some other work that
19 we have. If the Commission would like to take that up
20 in terms of comments or feedback to the Regional
21 Planning Council, I think that is something the
22 Commission should seriously consider.

23 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: I just want to find out
24 where is that equity meeting being held.

25 MR. ISLES: It goes from two to five today,

16

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 on 110.

3 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: It's near Republic?

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Right.

5 MR. ISLES: The next item the Chairman
6 mentioned, the Planning Federation event scheduled for
7 September 29th. Andy Freleng is leading up the effort
8 to put together the program descriptions, the panelists
9 and presenters. That will be in the mail by the end of
10 next week so that it will be circulated. Here again, we
11 are looking at a good program coming up. Featured

12 speaker, keynote speaker will be Larry Levy from the
13 Hofstra University National Center for Suburban Studies.
14 We have a number of good sessions, including a session
15 through the planning commission on the task forces and
16 so forth.

17 We also have two SEQRA sessions. This time
18 one on pending changes to EAF forms that DEC and Albany
19 are looking at. We have an intro to SEQRA course for
20 those people just getting into the field.

21 Just to make you aware of in terms of
22 departmental activities, in addition to the normal
23 ongoing work we are doing on the plan, we do a
24 substantial amount of work on the county's official
25 statement. That is for bond offerings that the county

17

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 does. We are gearing up on that and updating
3 demographic statistics. That will be part of the
4 statement and part of the consideration of bond sales.
5 We have a deadline on that in two weeks. Staff effort
6 is being put towards that.

7 Another point is the Fire Island-Montauk
8 reconstruction plan is moving along. This is the plan
9 that has been in the works for -- reformulation plan.
10 That is the term for that. It began literally thirty
11 years ago. The Army Corps has been moving that
12 forward. They're now beginning to do outreach to
13 elected officials, and I think they're on schedule to do
14 a release of a plan next summer. It is percolating
15 again.

16 It's an extremely detailed plan. It involves

17 a number of important public policy issues in terms of
18 coastal protection, resource protection and so forth.
19 Here again, this is one that I believe is a significant
20 county planning issue. It is completely within the
21 jurisdiction of Suffolk County geographically; however,
22 it also touches on a number of jurisdictions. At some
23 point I believe a presentation to the Commission would
24 be warranted.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: What do you think would be the
18

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 timing on that?

3 MR. ISLES: I think I can safely say within a
4 year, hopefully by the end of the year there would be a
5 presentation. Another project, just to keep you posted,
6 I believe I have mentioned that we are updating the
7 county's retail inventory study. We have been out there
8 already. We have about half the county completed. We
9 do this periodically every five years or so. 2005 was
10 the last study that was done. Indicated the best retail
11 occupancy rates in a long time in Suffolk County. The
12 lowest had been 1996 following a recession in the early
13 '90's. Not too surprisingly with the current recession
14 that we are facing, general retail vacancy rates have
15 increased.

16 Couple of examples. In Islanda, retail
17 vacancy rates from eight to thirteen percent. Lake
18 Ronkonkoma, it's gone from three percent to twenty
19 percent. Southold, fifteen percent to thirteen percent;
20 that is actually an improvement. Most areas that have
21 been studied have gone up in vacancies. A few have gone

22 down. We will complete the inventory and then do an
23 analysis in terms of what is happening in retail.

24 The last study indicated more office and
25 personal uses in downtown than shopping centers in prior

19

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 studies. As we get the data, I will share that with
3 you.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: I would say on that, I think
5 we have talked about this before around the table, the
6 Suffolk County Planning Department does a great amount
7 of work, puts out great data. I think we need to try to
8 get that out into the public. We talked about putting
9 out a press release here and there when appropriate.
10 When the study is done, you guys did great work. The
11 taxpayers are paying for it. We should get it out
12 there. Get them thinking about it in whatever field
13 they're in.

14 MR. ISLES: We agree with that, certainly. I
15 would like to mention a couple of things. On the
16 county's Farmland Protection Program, which is a
17 substantial part of the department operations, we have
18 two full time planners strictly working on farms. One
19 is to make you aware of the amendment to the county code
20 that regulates that program known as Chapter 8, the
21 amendment to the code that is still pending in the
22 legislature. We expect to reconvene at a public hearing
23 in the legislature on August 15th. We are down to
24 issues in terms of lot coverage of farm structures and
25 mechanism for various approvals. We think we are at the

20

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 end of the line. We don't have a hundred percent
3 consensus on the actual language, but we think we have
4 satisfied ninety-nine percent of the concerns with the
5 language. So we think that we have something that is
6 sound and beneficial to the program in the future.
7 Related to that is we have had increasing
8 problems with enforcement on the county farms in terms
9 that the county owns development rights to what is
10 almost ten thousand acres of land. We had a number of
11 issues with violations dealing with activities that are
12 not agricultural activities. For example, mining
13 activities of topsoil or sand materials and so forth.
14 Two operations of farmstands that are supposed to be
15 selling farm products that are grown on the premises and
16 broadened out way beyond that. Inconsistent with the
17 county code. What this points to is the amendments to
18 Chapter 8 will address a lot of the problems we are
19 currently facing. Bakeries, in the county definition in
20 Chapter 8, and as well as the fact Chapter 8 does not
21 include any enforcement language or penalty language
22 that if the public feels that the program is not
23 protecting farms and is somehow being abused, then the
24 confidence in the program may be damaged.
25 The last point on farms, we also administer

21

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 the New York State Agricultural Districts Program, which
3 is another tool for preserving farmland. We have about
4 twenty-one acres of land coming into the program this

5 year. A public hearing on that will be held August 17th
6 as well. There is an awful lot of staff work that has
7 to go into that.

8 Lastly, I think I have mentioned to you the
9 Robinson Duck Farm Feasibility Habitat Restoration
10 Study. This is an eighteen month study headed up by
11 DeWitt Davies in the department. That is complete. We
12 will be finalizing that in August. If the Commission
13 would like to see a copy, certainly we can do that.
14 It's a case of a former duck farm with a very radically
15 altered coastal environment, and opportunity now as a
16 county parcel to do some restoration and improvement of
17 that location. This is an example of really what we
18 call a rural brown field. The ninety plus duck farms we
19 had in Suffolk County, not many of which are still
20 there; we just scratched the surface.

21 That completes the staff report today.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Director Isles.
23 Any questions of Director Isles or the department?
24 Seeing none, we will move onto our guest speaker, Bob
25 Shinnick, Director of Transportation Operations for the

22

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 county. He will speak for ten minutes or so on the
3 Suffolk County Transit Plan. Thank you, Bob, for being
4 here.

5 MR. SHINNICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
6 Commission, for inviting me today. I have also have
7 with me Chris Chatterton, who is one of our staff
8 members. I'm here to speak about the transit plan, and
9 I will do that. I know I'm here to speak briefly and I

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

will at least try to do that.

I want to speak a little bit about the county bus system. To put that in perspective, Suffolk County Transit is a county owned, planned and managed bus system operated by private bus carriers under contract with the county. What that means is we actually set policies, we set the fares, we set the routes, we do the planning, we manage the contract agreements, but the bus companies themselves operate the buses, hire the drivers and train them. We maintain the buses themselves. They also own the garages in locations where the buses are stored.

The system itself consists of two major types of service. The S-E-T bus line is just what it sounds like, the network of bus routes, as well as the Suffolk County Accessible Transportation Service, which is an ADA

23

8/4/10 Planning Commission

required reservation door-to-door service for persons with disabilities. The focus of the talk today is going to be bus lines but it's important that we know about the SCAT service, because whatever the bus lines do in terms of where they go, when they operate, the requirements of the ADA have us also operating as paratransit service for the people that can't use the bus lines, and they are a major cost element in the program.

We currently manage a fifty-three million dollar transit program. That is the bus lines, thirty-six plus million dollars, and the paratransit itself has grown to over seventeen million dollars a

15 year. It is quite expensive. It is one of the reasons
16 why, when moneys get scarce, allocations occur and
17 mandated services come up front in terms of what needs
18 to be funded. I'm not editorializing here, I'm talking
19 about where money goes and the discretionary service,
20 which is the bus lines itself, gets what it can, but it
21 hadn't grown for years.

22 If you look at the report, you will notice
23 there are comments about the service not having expanded
24 appreciably over the last several years. The funding
25 and ADA mandate is one of the reasons that has not

24

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 happened. To give you a snapshot, the bus lines known
3 as Suffolk County Transit, it's a substantial bus
4 system. It operates fifty bus routes between the Route
5 110 corridor on the west and Orient and Montauk point on
6 the East End. It's a six day service. It basically
7 carries people to and from work. Seventy-five percent
8 of the riders are commuting to work or college. That
9 breaks down to sixty-seven percent of the riders going
10 to work and about eight percent plus actually going to
11 college.

12 We have a regular ridership in terms of
13 utilization. We carry twenty-six thousand people a
14 day. The majority of the folks, eighty percent, are on
15 the buses because they have to be; they have no other
16 alternative. On the flip side, twenty percent go on to
17 use the bus and they could have used another mode of
18 transportation. Usually that would be considered a car
19 in terms of suburban services. That is not unusual.

20 That is relatively typical. It's not a bad split, but
21 you would certainly like to have more people opting to
22 use the buses, and the way to do that is make the
23 service attractive to see and use.

24 The planned summary report that was handed out
25 is the result of three years' worth of rather detailed

25

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 work. There is a lot of technical analysis, several
3 interim reports on specified areas, fare and funding and
4 route diagnostics and so on and so on. The analysis
5 that you have, and I hope you have had a chance to look
6 at it -- it's short intentionally because I don't think
7 people want to read, quite frankly, too much of this
8 stuff; it can be deadly. I realize I'm talking to a
9 group of planners. Maybe that point would be missed; I
10 don't know.

11 The county executive, I should note, did
12 commission this study. He was concerned that
13 transportation, as expensive as it is and as necessary
14 as it is, might not be -- the funds going to it might
15 not be allocated correctly. What he was trying to do is
16 evaluate the system in terms of efficiency and
17 effectiveness and determine that if new funds for
18 expansion were contemplated, that it would be allocated
19 properly and that it be analyzed to see if it went well.
20 So we did that and we looked at the bus system and we
21 looked at how it operates. We had every trip monitored
22 in terms of where people got on and off every bus stop.
23 We got a good solid feeling and database to see what
24 parts of the bus lines were being utilized, and at that

25 level the uses are obvious.

26

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 You want to look at under-utilized areas to
3 see whether you want to continue on with that service,
4 and you look at services that are doing very well to see
5 if you can copy that and do some more of the more
6 productive service. We had focus groups. We had driver
7 meetings. We sat and talked to bus drivers. We had
8 public meetings. Some of the folks here I think were
9 part of the original focus group activities to see what
10 people thought Suffolk County Transit should be, what
11 should a bus service do in a suburban area, who should
12 it be carrying and how should be presented.

13 Fundamentally, if you have been around this
14 business, you can contemplate who will come back.
15 Especially looking at our transit system, they wanted
16 more frequent buses, they wanted buses operating in the
17 weekdays, to be operated later and earlier. In those
18 three suggestions, they were primarily for convenience
19 so people can use the buses to and from work and
20 commuting. Service coordination and modernize
21 equipment. Overwhelmingly people asked for what we
22 don't do, and that was to have Sunday service. That
23 came across the board at every single level of analysis.
24 We did passenger surveys. We asked people what did you
25 think of the system. The same thing came back to us.

27

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 The plan itself, what you have is a summary.
3 I can answer questions now, I can answer questions

4 later. We can share the detail of the interim reports
5 with you folks. Interim reports, we may be able to put
6 them on the Website for draw-down. It's very extensive
7 information. The summary really kind of goes to general
8 categories for improvement. Some bus lines are
9 referenced there. Things like upgrading service from
10 hourly, to half hourly. To running service later in the
11 evenings at the same frequency as well as running
12 service later in the evenings but something at less
13 frequency.

14 Andy, do you have something that you can show,
15 an illustration, Figure 1. Figure 1, those are the
16 strongest bus lines that we have. All of them that we
17 are recommending, if they're not already there, run to
18 ten o'clock at night on weekdays, between five and six
19 a.m. in the morning. We have buses that start at five
20 fifteen out in Greenport as well as on Route 110. We
21 have a bus line that operates now every fifteen minutes
22 in the a.m. and p.m. peak periods, and thirty minutes
23 every day, which is a solid level of service. That bus
24 line carries about twenty-eight hundred people a day,
25 almost all of them going to and from work. It's a very

28

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 important service.

3 Anyone who knows about the 110 corridor and
4 the kind of development that is there, you can see where
5 we are being successful. You can also see we haven't
6 made a dent in the congestion going on, but the service
7 it provides has been well received. On Figure 2, on
8 the next slide, those are fewer routes. Those are

9 important routes in the county. There is a line out of
10 Riverhead that goes along the North Shore and the
11 Hauppauge area. It's route S62. It's a lifeline
12 service in the sense it's functional, it's important
13 that it be there. It's not a strong route in terms of
14 ridership. One of the reasons that -- the communities
15 that it travels to is a very rural ridership is a little
16 older. We don't have very strong downtowns or centers
17 to go to on the East End of the service. Riverhead is a
18 strong draw but not enough to put a lot of riders on the
19 bus. On the West End it does very well.

20 Slide 3, the plan -- I didn't mention it's
21 modular. It's a listing of services that can be added
22 depending. At the county's convenience, they're staged
23 over up to a ten year period in terms of implementation
24 what the staging really means, one is the convenience of
25 if the county wants to, and more importantly if the

29

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 funding is available. It doesn't have to be a ten year
3 plan, it can be a five year plan. The services that are
4 identified early on for implementation can be moved
5 around, and depending on priorities, almost like a menu,
6 things can be put into the system. That context is
7 modular and flexible.

8 The plan itself, in terms of overall concept
9 of staging, talks about fixing the existing bus lines
10 first. There are problems identified. There are
11 opportunities for improvement. To give you one example
12 bus line S57 operates between Sayville and the Smithaven
13 Mall and also serves MacArthur Airport and Ronkonkoma

14 rail. It goes right into the airport. It does modestly
15 in terms of operation. The plan recommends that be
16 continued north over to Stony Brook University as well
17 as to Port Jefferson. In doing that, we have a
18 connection between the North and South Shore.
19 Ronkonkoma will be a big driver. We have other north
20 and south services in the system that are functioning
21 very well.

22 Another recommendation is to take bus route
23 3D, which comes out of Brentwood, travels through CI up
24 to the Smithaven Mall to Stony Brook. That is one of
25 the bus lines that we have standees on a regular basis.

30

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 To extend that route down to Babylon, provides another
3 South Shore to Stony Brook University connection. We
4 feel that will be very productive.

5 There are new bus lines entirely that are
6 included in the plan, Patchogue to Southampton. There
7 is no South Shore connector. Another connector from
8 Southampton Village further out to Montauk to complete
9 the logical system connectors out there. Several other
10 bus lines are identified in the plan for recommendation,
11 either new or improved. I don't know if you want me to
12 go through them all. It's probably not necessary. That
13 is the flavor. We will fix what we have first, make it
14 better, make it more frequent. Then from there, extend
15 the bus lines and bring in new bus lines as we go
16 forward.

17 This plan will be -- the next step is for the
18 federal government FTA to review it for their approval.

19 From there it will be sent to the New York Metropolitan
20 Transportation Council for incorporation into the
21 Regional Transportation Plan. Depending on the will of
22 this organization and probably the county executive, we
23 may be seeking local county government endorsement as
24 well. Lastly, the plan does talk about coordination and
25 locations where centers can be developed where the buses

31

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 will come in and allow transfers to occur, downtown
3 areas such as Bay Shore, Riverhead, even Hauppauge, rail
4 stations, as well.

5 They're steering us in the direction of what
6 is called the pulse system for coordination. What that
7 means buses arrive and wait specifically for other buses
8 to arrive at a location. They all come in and they all
9 go out. That may not be all that possible at all
10 locations where this could happen. But what we are
11 looking to do is improve service coordination so people
12 have a better opportunity to transfer from bus to bus
13 and continue on their trip.

14 I kind of got off message, but if there is
15 something I can address, I would be happy to.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Thanks for the presentation.
17 I have a question. I'm interested in how the bus line
18 kind of system is constructed. I'm thinking of the
19 airline system, where you have two different models.
20 One kind is the point-to-point model, and the other the
21 kind of hub and spoke model. It strikes me a lot of
22 this is more point-to-point. A bus starts out east and
23 goes all the way well to the west.

24 I was wondering, because of my own ignorance,
25 does the hub and spoke model not work in the suburbs

32

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 where you have a lot of transfers but more frequent
3 service between those, kind of like the Southwest
4 Airlines model?

5 MR. SHINNICK: Hub and spoke kind of looks to
6 a more powerful downtown, something that is transit
7 oriented development, something people go to as a
8 destination, where you can concentrate the bus routes.
9 What we have is a modified grid system. We are kind of
10 all over the place because there is really not a focus
11 in most cases. The mall does, the downtowns and
12 certainly Stony Brook University. We are at every
13 hospital, every college. The problem in Suffolk County
14 everybody is going everywhere, so we are kind of forced
15 to have people transfer or take a very long ride
16 someplace.

17 We are trying to extend the bus lines in some
18 cases so we can have more single trip opportunities for
19 people to get to where they are going. You can't have a
20 hub and spoke in microcosm. Riverhead says that might
21 work. Other areas in the county it's more difficult.
22 We're not really built for transit.

23 THE CHAIRMAN: That is one of our challenges
24 as a region. Thank you. Other thoughts or questions?

25 COMMISSIONER McADAM: Hi, Bob. Thank you

33

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 very much for your presentation. Have you identified
3 the cost for Sunday service throughout the county?

4 MR. SHINNOCK: What we did was take what was
5 in the plan. For those of you that might not be aware,
6 there is a legislative resolution that was passed that
7 was looking to raise fares for the bus system with the
8 hope of raising enough money to support the Sunday
9 service. The answer, I don't have the answer to that
10 question yet. The answer to your question is it's
11 probably a little over three million dollars annually to
12 run those twenty-four bus lines that were shown on the
13 figure for an eight hour day.

14 Eight hours is not that long. It can be ten
15 to six or nine to five. It's not going to make
16 everybody happy because naturally people, if they are
17 working seven or eight hours, they may need a longer
18 day. That is a point of departure. When we run the
19 Sunday service, we have to run the SCAT paratransit
20 service as well, as I mentioned earlier. That adds a
21 little cost to it. It's an important dimension to our
22 ridership that they be able to move around, people with
23 disabilities as well. A little over three million is
24 the up front cost without considering the fares that are
25 collected.

34

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 MR. ISLES: Thank you, Bob, for the
3 presentation. You did a great job in the report. The
4 Chair mentioned Heartland earlier as a project that was
5 coming before the Commission soon. Does this report
6 consider that, as part of planning for that, or what

7 impact do you think that will be beneficial in terms of
8 ridership, hub and spoke design?

9 MR. SHINNOCK: There is one line in the
10 report about Heartland, only because we treat a lot of
11 these for Suffolk County mega projects the same way.
12 You know something is coming and you don't know when,
13 and exactly what the configuration is going to be. I
14 can't editorialize. Calverton similarly, and Parr
15 Meadow for years, and these things, we are waiting.
16 Over the years they were going to be different things.
17 We're aware that they're there.

18 As approvals get closer, if it's going to be
19 built out anywhere like the original projections, it's
20 going to take substantial bus service to go in and out,
21 in just talking about Suffolk County Transit because
22 there will be a lot of people in there, the
23 concentration of individuals, if they chose to use
24 transit, the footprint of the development to go
25 somewhere. If they are going to be in cars, that is one

35

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 thing. We will probably be able to peel off some
3 significant ridership. We have to wait and see. We
4 have some bus lines in the area. When you see these
5 developments being proposed, you begin looking at the
6 network and see how you can bend and push and what can
7 be built. There are preliminary things. I wouldn't
8 want to jump the gun until we knew that was going to be
9 happening.

10 MS. LANSDALE: Thank you so much for your
11 presentation. It was well done. I wanted to ask a

12 couple of things. One is, what can we do as a
13 commission to incentivize transit ridership? Another
14 question, just for my own edification, when is your
15 agency involved in the land use planning process when
16 there is a mega project like Heartland proposed? When
17 are you brought into that?

18 MR. SHINNICK: Answering that one first, when
19 my department starts seeing environmental impact
20 statements and proposals, we get brought in. When we
21 see paperwork for development that is within our
22 department's review, we will also come in. Usually, it
23 has to do with a bus stop or placement of a bus shelter
24 in a shopping center. On the mega stuff, we are there
25 with the highway engineers and stuff like that. We are

36

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 part of their response.

3 In terms of what the Commission could do,
4 listening to you all talk about your reports and knowing
5 some of you personally, you're at a lot of locations
6 where transit oriented development is brought up. I
7 think it would behoove everyone in government, speaking
8 from a transit perspective, which is my little corner of
9 the world, is just be aware of the need for
10 accommodation for transit. A lot of developments occur
11 along roadways and sidewalks and curb cuts are in for
12 the people with disabilities. There is no provision for
13 people to walk from roadside into the facility. There
14 is no pedestrian access necessarily there. I have seen
15 some of it happening recently, but little things like
16 that, downtown areas, they need to have formal set aside

17 operations for the buses.

18 I'm not talking about giving us a major amount
19 of space, but to accommodate the buses. I can tell you
20 almost every downtown in Suffolk County at some point,
21 and I have been here over thirty some odd years with the
22 bus system, I have heard from them they don't want the
23 bus stop downtown, they don't want those people, it's
24 congestion. Sometimes it comes down to a couple of
25 parking spaces in front of a retail facility being

37

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 eliminated because of a stop. Somewhere along the line,
3 a complaint comes in about those people. If it's
4 raining and there is no shelter, they run into a store
5 for cover.

6 There needs to be a change in attitude towards
7 transit to understand how important it is. I think if
8 people bring it up and put it in their analytical
9 thinking and introduce it in write-ups where it's
10 appropriate to bring the story forward, I think that is
11 the best thing that you can do. It's something that is
12 pervasive in Suffolk. I have talked to mall managers
13 who come from other parts of the country and came in
14 with very positive attitudes about what they have done.
15 It doesn't take very long, when we are talking to them,
16 all of a sudden we have a problem. It's amazing.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: The Planning Department and
18 county executive are working on a comprehensive plan for
19 the county. I'm sure a transit piece will be critical
20 to that. When that document comes out, we will
21 emphasize the need for transit oriented design, those

22 kinds of things.

23 MR. SHINNOCK: Can I can add one more
24 comment? We are in the process of getting ready to
25 receive eighty-one new transit coaches for the system.

38

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 We only have a hundred sixty-two actually in operation.
3 Half our fleet within the next three months will be
4 brand new, very modern, good looking coaches.

5 Secondly, we are in the process of doing an
6 RFP to buy an automated vehicle locator which has GPS
7 technology involved. We will be able to go forward
8 develop real time data not just for us but for the
9 public consumption as well.

10 THE CHAIRMAN: Commissioner Finn and then
11 Commissioner Taldone and then we will wrap up.

12 COMMISSIONER FINN: I want to say thank you
13 for coming in today. From my personal standpoint,
14 because primarily our business is commercial and retail,
15 we always look at it as an asset to have to have a bus
16 stop within walking distance from any of our properties,
17 both in Nassau and Suffolk County.

18 The question that I was curious about, you see
19 the revenue as obviously with most suburban bus networks
20 pales in comparison to the expenses. How does this bus
21 route stack up, whether in Nassau County or other
22 suburban areas, with revenue versus expenses, and then
23 the budget at the state level, which was just passed
24 yesterday, are there any anticipated changes in funding
25 for this, and if there is, how would that be distributed

39

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 amongst the rate fare, if there is?

3 MR. SHINNOCK: State budget has not been good
4 for transit in the last two to three years. We have
5 lost two and a half million dollars in state operating
6 assistance from Albany. That was on the basis of
7 twenty-two million five hundred thousand. We are down
8 to twenty million and change right now. That happened
9 to Westchester, everybody. Years ago it was very
10 undependable; it would go up and down. As the economy
11 got hot, the money escalated. It's not that
12 encouraging.

13 I asked people recently and no one seems to
14 see any likelihood of any bounce back in the short
15 term. In terms of Suffolk County Transit itself,
16 because we use private carriers and it doesn't have to
17 be private carriers but in our case we have been able to
18 keep our cost substantially below what it would cost to
19 operate the system if it was municipally operated. MTA
20 has a high cost relative to what we pay. Westchester
21 deals with a private carrier does their service; they're
22 not so inexpensive. It doesn't always make the
23 difference that a private operator will be less
24 expensive than anybody else.

25 We collect about nineteen to twenty percent of

40

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 the cost at the fare box. In Nassau County it's between
3 thirty and forty percent. When you begin comparing
4 systems we have to look at the environment. We do not
5 have a subway. Nassau has a higher density of

6 development, older population. Longer established bus
7 system as well. We have lower density. We have to go a
8 little bit further pick up our people.

9 There are trade-offs. Twenty percent, we
10 would like it to be much higher. It's roughly what can
11 be expected nationwide in a suburban system, but
12 certainly would want it higher.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Speaking of trade-offs, have
14 you looked at or did the study look at the impact in
15 ridership if you made it free.

16 MR. SHINNICK: There is a limit on how many
17 people you will draw by the fact that it's free. There
18 would be a cap. I have yet to meet a county
19 administration that would be friendly to that thought,
20 though. It would take quite a pitch.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: There are people around the
22 country that are looking at that, simply because of the
23 positive benefits of getting people off the street.
24 Particularly in these economic times, it's highly
25 unlikely. I was just wondering if that analysis has

41

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 been done.

3 MR. SHINNICK: I can give you a version of
4 that, though. The paratransit service is very expensive
5 on a per unit basis. We're not throwing away our money,
6 it's well spent, but you can only carry so many people.
7 When the nature of the service is totally on demand, you
8 are almost at a one person ride, maybe two or three at a
9 time. It's very inefficient in terms of numbers of
10 people that can use the service because it's an ADA

11 mandate, it's a civil rights law that drives the growth
12 of that system. Our system has to ramp up to the
13 anticipated demand of the users, so we have to keep
14 building the system, as long as people want to ride it.

15 Where I am going with this is there is one
16 recommendation that is intriguing, that people with
17 disabilities who would otherwise use the SCAT service,
18 free service on the bus system with the hope that some
19 people, not making people that can't use the service do
20 nothing unnatural, but allowing those people the
21 opportunity, entice them on the buses. A lot of transit
22 systems are doing similar things, giving people mobility
23 training and bringing people from the para over to the
24 bus line. The difference is about thirty-five dollars a
25 ride. It's a lot of money,

42

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Thank you, Director
3 Shinnick, for making the presentation today. I have a
4 couple of quick points. Quickly, I wanted to talk about
5 the Sunday service, which again, we always talk about
6 Sunday service, and some folks think that includes
7 holidays but currently that does not. The proposal to
8 increase service to add Sundays, even with the limited
9 hours, would not provide service on holidays on the East
10 End where the business is agricultural or tourism
11 depends heavily on the labor force that moves on the
12 S92, which is the second heaviest line in the county.
13 Those businesses depend so heavily on those workers and
14 they can't get them on the peak days, particularly
15 during the summer and holiday season.

16 The Legislature's hearing and the bill
17 authorizing the County to raise fares up to fifty
18 percent gives you broad leverage in terms of where you
19 can go with that fare. I assume that would generate
20 substantial funds if you went to the full fifty percent,
21 although folks in the field may be out for you with
22 ropes and torches. My point basically is we need
23 extensive Sunday service so people can work. There is
24 no way that you can go to Tanger, with two hundred fifty
25 stores, and apply for a job and say I can work weekdays

43

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 and most Sundays, but no holidays, and expect to get the
3 job. That workforce is a big target for the bus service
4 because that is typically low income wage earners. The
5 guest houses, restaurants, the farms, they all need
6 those workers.

7 We need that money applied to a full service
8 like what Nassau has, I don't know how to get there for
9 years I've been working with you and others in the
10 Legislature trying to get trying expand our system. It
11 hadn't happened. Do you think this approval for fare
12 increase could provide the seven day a week, three
13 hundred sixty-five day a year service? Is that under
14 consideration?

15 MR. SHINNICK: It could be. It's a policy
16 decision. Sunday service, I know exactly what you're
17 talking about. It's a big leap for the county to even
18 want to do that right now, but I think it's a warranted
19 thing to do. The holidays, I assume you're talking
20 about the major holidays, of which there are six, and

21 not some of the lesser ones because we do operate on
22 those days. It's strictly a policy decision that is
23 coming at a higher level than me. When we recommend for
24 this exercise, as a rule of that legislation, we will
25 spell out what the cost will look like at different

44

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 levels of effort as well as the anticipated revenues at
3 a few different fare ranges. It will be a policy call
4 if somebody wants to do, as you say, seven days a week,
5 no exceptions.

6 You have to understand there will be some days
7 where the ridership will be absolutely minimal because
8 there are holidays that have not joined the retail
9 activities like other holidays have.

10 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I understand that and
11 agree fully on the main lines you would tailor the
12 service to meet the need. I don't know what the need
13 would be. Of course it would be greater on Memorial Day
14 and Labor Day than Thanksgiving. And the SCAT service
15 would decrease because people are not going to medical
16 offices and things like that. The point for my
17 question, we promote the transit oriented development
18 Heartland type of projects. We know if people move in
19 there that expect to use public transit, they're not
20 going to stay home on Sundays and holidays, they will
21 need a car. Once they have the car, they tend to stay
22 in the car. My concern is if we don't provide service
23 every day of the week, people who can drive are forced
24 to drive. We are losing those people as riders. The
25 MTA charges the same payroll tax and the myriad other

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 charges and fees to Suffolk residents as are paid by
3 Nassau residents. Nassau bus gets many millions a year
4 in service and support from the MTA; we get nothing.

5 I don't know what to do about it. I talked to
6 everyone I possibly can. It's totally unfair to the
7 business community and taxpayers that we are paying all
8 this money to the MTA. None of it comes back to our bus
9 system. I don't know how to address that. We are being
10 revenue starved and it's totally unfair to our county.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Vince, good
12 point. I don't know if you can comment on that.

13 MR. SHINNICK: Only to say "amen." The
14 County administration has spoken loudly in the right
15 direction to the right people.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Nassau is going in the other
17 direction by force of the MTA.

18 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: But we're still paying
19 taxes.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we're paying taxes and
21 getting nothing for it.

22 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: One last comment
23 regarding what we can do. I know our staff is looking
24 at putting in requirements that items put into a
25 municipality gets back to you, whether shelter or

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 accommodations needed to be made at a site. That is an
3 important thing for your staff to look at, where is

4 there a bus route proposed, not only the service, how
5 people get from the bus into the building or whatever
6 the facility is. That is happening here. We are
7 referring it back to you. I know that the highway folks
8 are starting to share in the last couple of years the
9 site plans with you rather than build it first and then
10 call you out and say where can you put the bus stop. I
11 think things are moving in the right direction, and
12 again, I thank you for coming here today.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. To the extent that
14 you are not getting the site plans or not getting them
15 until too late in the game, I would like to know about
16 that. I trust, as Vince said, things improved in that
17 regard. If there are any glitches, please let us know.
18 Secondly, with regard to the memo, I assume you will
19 write to the twelfth floor in terms of how to use
20 resources. My concern is timing. This commission may
21 wish to weigh in with the county executive and his staff
22 regarding options that are on the table.

23 I meant to ask you about the anticipated
24 timing of that decision.

25 MR. SHINNICK: From my office, I can tell you

47

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 we will probably have this wrapped up in about a month
3 from now. I'm talking about the resolution. We are on
4 the same page. In approximately a month we will have it
5 out the door from our office. When a decision is made,
6 wherever, this is something the legislature is very much
7 interested in as well and the county administration is
8 looking at the bottom line. I know they support this

9 plan and I know they support Sunday service.

10 I can say that without any problem, it's
11 always been the money and where does that come from.

12 THE CHAIRMAN: It's a common refrain in many
13 fields. Thank you. I appreciate your time. We will
14 move onto the next item, the regulatory items. We have
15 the Hamlet Preserve up first.

16 MR. CORRAL: The first subdivision before you
17 is the Hamlet Preserve. This one, the applicant seeks
18 town planning board approval for a hundred forty-six
19 lots on two hundred five acres. The property is located
20 on the east side of William Floyd Parkway, which is
21 County Road 46, approximately two miles south of Montauk
22 Highway in the Hamlet of Shirley. The jurisdiction is
23 William Floyd Parkway, which it's adjacent to -- the
24 surrounding area, you can see to the northeast of the
25 property is a school complex. There is an elementary

48

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 school, middle school and high school with multiple
3 athletic fields directly adjacent to the property.
4 Approximately a half mile north is a large shopping
5 center. There is a pharmacy, grocery store, home goods
6 store, gym, some fast food restaurant. Immediately
7 surrounding the property is medium density single family
8 homes.

9 This property was a golf course with two
10 eighteen hole golf courses one full sized golf course
11 and another par three and driving range. It's closed;
12 it's no longer in use. On site there are three man-made
13 lined ponds and connecting the pond, those two ponds, is

14 a man-made stream that is also lined. These are
15 proposed to remain with the subdivision. Also, in some
16 of the information sent to us, there is some indication
17 of what what wetlands vegetation are around the ponds.

18 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: If there are two
19 man-made ponds, is the third one natural?

20 MR. CORRAL: All three are man-made.
21 Property is zoned A-1, forty thousand square foot
22 minimum lot size. You can see in red there is some
23 pockets of commercial zoning. To the north is the
24 shopping center, then to the south here, along
25 Neighborhood Road there is some commercial zoning,

49

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 including Mastic Beaches' kind of downtown residential
3 district, a little bit to the east of the property
4 running north on Mastic Road. 1996 Brookhaven
5 Comprehensive Plan proposed planned development district
6 for this property.

7 The history of this, in 2007 the Suffolk
8 County Planning Commission received a hundred eighty-two
9 lot clustered subdivision that was conditionally
10 approved. In 2008, the Suffolk County Planning
11 Commission received SEQRA information
12 for a PDD, was four hundred fifty restricted unit retail
13 space and sewage treatment plant. We sent back a letter
14 not objecting to the town being lead agency. Then we
15 prepared a draft scope for this. But no other
16 information has been received and we haven't acted in
17 any additional way.

18 The difference between this subdivision and

19 the subdivision we received in 2007, the major
20 difference is in this current subdivision there are
21 hundred foot setbacks from the surface water, the
22 man-made ponds, which reduce the residential lots from a
23 hundred eighty-two to a hundred forty-six. In 2007 it
24 appeared that it would be a gated community. This
25 proposal is for the roads to be dedicated. Lastly, on

50

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 the south side, there is now a proposed emergency access
3 gate, which was one of the conditions we had in the 2007
4 subdivision.

5 The current plan is a hundred forty-six
6 residential units that are clustered, with fifteen
7 thousand square foot lots with open space areas is about
8 sixty-one percent of the property, if you include the
9 surface area of the front. That said, if the
10 application will be offered as dedication to the town,
11 the open space is about sixty-one percent of the
12 property if you include the surface area of the ponds.
13 Also, I think I mentioned before that the roads will be
14 offered for dedication to the town as well as the three
15 recharge basins proposed.

16 I just thought I would show a few pictures and
17 the recommendations. This was yesterday at the site.
18 It's now gated and closed. This shows a little bit to
19 the right is the driving range showing the condition of
20 the property. This is looking east and slightly to the
21 south, and this is looking east and lightly to the
22 north. This was the entrance exit gate for the golf
23 course and is proposed for the subdivision. This would

24 be the location of emergency access gate on the south
25 side of the property. The sidewalks running north along

51

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 William Floyd Parkway, and this is the school community
3 behind the subdivision with the track and football
4 field. This is looking the other way towards the school
5 to the northeast.

6 Our recommendation for the subdivision is
7 approval with conditions. The conditions are -- the
8 three conditions were also -- they're modified to some
9 degree. I'll explain that they were conditions from the
10 original 2007 subdivision. The first being that the
11 conservation easement of fifty feet along William Floyd
12 Parkway. Just looking at the site plan, there are two
13 lots there that would be affected by that and also one
14 of the cul-de-sacs. We felt that was important to
15 preserve the natural vegetation for the aesthetics of
16 William Floyd Parkway and also to serve as a buffer for
17 the new residents and William Floyd Parkway.

18 MR. ISLES: The exception would be the access
19 road.

20 MR. CORRAL: Okay. With the exception
21 being.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: We will put that -- okay, we
23 will get to that when we get into the conditions itself.

24 MR. CORRAL: The second condition, this was
25 also conditioned in the 2007 subdivision. One side of

52

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 the proposed roadways have sidewalks; that the sidewalks

3 connect to the existing sidewalk on William Floyd
4 Parkway, and also the sidewalk to the school property on
5 the northeast side of the property.

6 Then the third condition, in 2007, the Suffolk
7 County Planning Commission didn't have affordable
8 housing guidelines explicitly developed. We said twenty
9 percent should be set aside as affordable housing. Now
10 with the guidelines we have it as a condition of
11 as-of-right development of ten percent, in accordance
12 with the guidelines. We have the comments below.

13 The open space, the applicant has now said
14 this was a condition in the previous, but the applicant
15 has provided information that they will offer for
16 dedication. In this comment we said that the town
17 should consider if they want all the open space to be
18 dedicated or possibly the larger tract on the east side
19 of the property. We said possibly covenanting the open
20 space that is not dedicated to the town, that they
21 should be shown on the final subdivision map.

22 The second comment is that they're not New
23 York State freshwater wetlands mapped on the property,
24 but that wetlands, from the information provided, there
25 are vegetative wetlands found, so that the wetlands

53

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 should be mapped by a qualified expert and shown on the
3 subdivision.

4 The third is just for the town to ensure this
5 subdivision is in compliance if it applies to the 2009
6 New York State Workforce Housing Act.

7 The fourth is with this new development that
Page 44

8 it's in conformance with the county's energy efficiency
9 and public safety guidelines.

10 The fifth is, which was also mentioned in the
11 previous subdivision review, that with this large
12 development, this was an opportunity for different types
13 of housing and also tighter cluster to preserve a larger
14 tract of open space. We are reiterating that point back
15 to the town.

16 That is the staff report. Anybody has any
17 questions?

18 THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I appreciate the
19 work on that. I want to point out one thing about the
20 affordable housing. It was our policy that everything
21 was twenty percent back in 2007. We revised -- that
22 had been the Commission policy, I think it was Felix
23 Grucci who proposed that when he was a member of the
24 Commission. Our new guidelines recommend ten percent as
25 of right, twenty percent if it's change of zone.

54

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 This is a Brookhaven project. Michael, any
3 comment on the area or anything you want to share about
4 the background?

5 COMMISSIONER KELLY: Just to follow up on the
6 commissioner's comment on the access being excluded from
7 the conservation easement. I think if you're going to
8 do the access, we should also maybe give relief to those
9 two lots that would be affected along with the
10 cul-de-sac that would be affected. Maybe those
11 components could be outside the scope of conservation
12 easement. Otherwise, those lots will have to be

13 reoriented in some way, shape or form along with the
14 cul-de-sac.

15 As far as the sidewalks, the original
16 application, I don't know if it was the '07 or
17 previously, did it contemplate a gated community, and if
18 it did, were the roads narrower than they are right
19 now? If they're a wider roadway due to the proposed
20 dedication, that could provide enough space for public
21 access instead of the sidewalks would increase
22 considerably the cost. If there is accessibility via
23 wider streets, it might be a little bit easier to walk
24 in the street than to add the cost of the sidewalks.

25 MR. CORRAL: The previous subdivision, I

55

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 think it appeared to be that it would be a gated
3 community. I would have to check on the width of the
4 streets from the previous. I know that the current
5 subdivision said fifty foot right-of-way with
6 approximately thirty-two foot wide paved streets. I can
7 check that.

8 COMMISSIONER KELLY: I'm sure that is the
9 town code.

10 MR. GULIZIO: It's a fifty foot right-of-way
11 with thirty-four foot of pavement standard and eight
12 foot on either side for things like sidewalks, curbs,
13 drainage and utility lines. It's normally anticipated
14 the sidewalk be installed outside the actual travel way
15 adjacent to the thirty-four foot within the eight foot
16 portion.

17 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Couple of quick

18 questions regarding first, I should say that the design
19 itself is almost anti-pedestrian. Everyone wants to go
20 the shortest distance out to the road. There are two
21 buses that run by here. Adding that additional buffer,
22 you're walking through a wooded dark area on your way
23 along the road before you can get to any of the houses.
24 I think a place for pedestrians and cyclists segregated
25 from the automobiles is essential, even in a community

56

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 like that.

3 Of course I do recognize the cost of the
4 concrete being substantial. Given the design, it's
5 unlikely there would be a lot of folks who use it other
6 than recreation. I think there needs to be a designated
7 walkway. Maybe we don't use the word "sidewalk" and
8 just have dedicated right-of-way segregated from the
9 automotive traffic so they can basically paint a stripe
10 on the asphalt. Change the color of the asphalt, do
11 something less expensive, at least provide a place for
12 people to walk or cycle where automobiles wouldn't
13 travel.

14 This is not a design that is intended to
15 foster pedestrian movement in the first place. My
16 second comment related to the buses. We should be
17 asking for a dedication for a bus turn out if determined
18 appropriate by Suffolk County Transit operations. There
19 are two buses here that would pull off William Floyd
20 Parkway onto the shoulder. A nicer pull out, perhaps a
21 shelter, or even without a shelter, nicer pull out would
22 take the bus out of the traffic area and make it easier

23 for people to board. I would not suggest a bus shelter
24 because I don't think this is going to be a high volume
25 site, but a dedicated area or an offer of dedication,

57

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 whichever the county thinks is appropriate. I think
3 that is my final comment.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: I want to make sure we get
5 that last one precise. You're saying if requested by
6 DPW or requested by the county.

7 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: As a condition we
8 should require an offer of dedication or dedication of
9 sufficient area for a bus turn out, if deemed
10 appropriate by Suffolk County. Actually, it's the
11 Department of Public Works Transit Operations Division.
12 If they think that's necessary, it's a condition. If
13 they say it's not necessary, there is enough shoulder,
14 there is nothing for the developer to do.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections to that
16 condition?

17 MR. ISLES: Clarification, is it the intent
18 to have land dedicated, and that is it, or do you want
19 the land dedicated plus the build out?

20 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Dedicated and built
21 out if deemed necessary or desirable.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: How would that work with an
23 easement; that would have to be carved out of an
24 easement too?

25 COMMISSIONER KELLY: Yes.

58

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objection to adding that condition? Seeing none, we will add that condition. The last one, I want to see if there are any other comments on the first suggestion Commissioner Kelly and Commissioner Taldone talked about. Do we have any other questions?

COMMISSIONER McADAM: Actually, I have two. The property, the school is located on the northeast side. I think if there isn't a fence there now, I'm pretty familiar with that area, there should be a fence somewhere between the property and the school, and a very high fence because they use it as a way out so they will be using it to go through the community now.

The second thing is, I don't know if we can answer it here, and I know it has come up before. This area is in dire need of a sewer district because of the problem on the Forge River. My understanding is we are adding at least a hundred forty-six individual septic systems plus stormwater drain off to an area that already needs a sewer district. Now I'm not sure what the requirement is. Why they don't have a community cesspool or Chromaglass or some other means to handle the sewage? But I myself feel very uncomfortable knowing what the area is now by adding more to it. I'm

59

1
2
3
4
5

8/4/10 Planning Commission
kind of in a quandary with it.
MR. CORRAL: The community is currently fenced, or the subject parcel is currently fenced in and the site plan shows the fence is proposed to remain.

6 With your second point, it would have to be approved by
7 the Suffolk County Department of Health. It's in
8 Groundwater Management Zone 6, which requires forty
9 thousand square foot minimum lot size, which these lots
10 do have.

11 MR. ISLES: It requires that lot size in
12 order to have conventional septic systems as opposed to
13 a sewer treatment plant. So they're in Zone 6, so they
14 meet that.

15 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Three points. One is
16 to support Mike. They're in conformance with Article 6.
17 Article 6 has not proved to be protective enough of our
18 natural resources. Second thing is with the stormwater
19 runoff this an ideal proposal for more of the green
20 technologies for dealing with stormwater. Perhaps if
21 the Chairman is comfortable, we could add that we hope
22 that the developer would reconsider the antiquated
23 archaic recharge basins and look for more modern use of
24 the land, including but not limited to permeable
25 pavement, bioswales, rain gardens with native vegetation

60

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 to assist with filtration of stormwater runoff.

3 The third one is a question for John. Was
4 there anything in the file concerning soil testing?
5 Given there is a golf course, we know there is intense
6 use of pesticide application. The Commission looked at
7 this before where we found plumes and soil contamination
8 on areas that were previously a hothouse in Bayport, if
9 you recall. Any soil testing done?

10 MR. CORRAL: I do know that there are borings

11 for the consistency of the soil in the information, not
12 environmental testing that was provided in the
13 applications.

14 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: I want to go on
15 record saying to allow, I don't know which jurisdiction
16 it is, for a subdivision to go up on what was a golf
17 course, there should be soil testing. People are going
18 to grow plants, have gardens, kids are going to play on
19 the grounds. We need to know what is there.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: Any thoughts? Commissioner
21 Kelly.

22 COMMISSIONER KELLY: If a developer is buying
23 a parcel of ground, especially of this size, they are
24 doing a Phase 2 Environment Testing, which I don't think
25 is within our purview. The developer would go through

61

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 environmental testing on their own. Any bank that would
3 finance anything of this magnitude would require a Phase
4 2 Environmental. What was the other point?

5 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: I had three.

6 COMMISSIONER KELLY: Stormwater. In terms of
7 stormwater, a lot of those issues become town issues in
8 terms of the recharge basin. A developer, I don't
9 think, would go ahead and put in the recharge basin. It
10 is somewhat costly.

11 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: I think that is the
12 point of us being a regional planning board, to start
13 installing a different perspective and methodology
14 amongst the applicants. It's not a condition, it's a
15 comment. We want them to start thinking about it.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: Is that a comment to the town
17 or developer?

18 MR. FRELENG: The applicant is the town. The
19 comments go to the town for the town to consider.

20 MR. ISLES: Encourage the town to consider.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Let me just say I'm now
22 acutely aware of the need for precision of these
23 things. The comment that you are proposing Adrienne, is
24 encourage the town to consider the use, reconsider the
25 use of recharge basins and instead use more modern

62

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 techniques such as rain gardens, bioswales, et cetera.

3 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: It's called green --

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Think about it.

5 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Stormwater runoff, we
6 want them to use green methodologies for stormwater
7 runoff filtration.

8 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: May I suggest we
9 include a couple of examples of that such as rain
10 gardens?

11 MR. ISLES: Stormwater collection and
12 disposal.

13 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Stormwater
14 management.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: Encourage the town to consider
16 the use of green methodologies for stormwater management
17 such as rain gardens, permeable pavement, bioswales, et
18 etcera.

19 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: As an alternative to
20 conventional recharge basins.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Any thoughts on that?

22 COMMISSIONER KELLY: I want to go back to the
23 other point.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: No, I want to finish this
25 one. As an alternative to conventional --

63

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 MR. ISLES: Drainage design.

3 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Can we say recharge
4 basins?

5 MR. ISLES: Well, it's recharge basins,
6 leaching pools, catch basins.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: As an alternative to
8 conventional drainage design, such as recharge basins.
9 As an alternative to conventional designs like recharge
10 basins. I think we got that. Any objection? We will
11 add that without objection.

12 COMMISSIONER LANSDALE: I have a question.
13 On Page 4 of the staff report about the second condition
14 about the sidewalk, which I fully support in whatever
15 way is deemed most appropriate. Connecting it to the
16 school property on the northeast corner and how we
17 reconcile that with the comments made previously about a
18 fence, which confused me about a sidewalk leading up to
19 a fence.

20 There is a national movement to create safe
21 routes to schools. Just looking at the proposed
22 subdivision, I would suggest we can reconcile that by
23 having an opening in the fence where that meets the
24 sidewalk.

25 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I'm not actually

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 certain about this. As I see it, leaving the school,
3 one would head to the street north, head over to William
4 Floyd Parkway directly rather than meander through the
5 community. I think the sidewalks are primarily for the
6 residents to move about. It doesn't have to actually go
7 anywhere. I don't know that students would chose this.
8 It's not really the most direct route.

9 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Children always use
10 the direct route?

11 THE CHAIRMAN: The point is well taken.
12 There are people that live in that community who will
13 attend that school. The other issue, the sidewalks, you
14 are keeping the sidewalk with the roads. I don't see
15 there is an opportunity that you would cut through
16 someone's property, that you would put an opening in a
17 fence where the road splits. I don't think we should
18 put anything other than a comment. My personal opinion.
19 It's a good issue to raise. The school can make a
20 decision about who they want having access there. The
21 school may say we don't want a hole in the fence where
22 kids can walk out.

23 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: Then we should look at
24 Condition Number 2 carefully.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: We can strike that last part

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 after "William Floyd Parkway," and put a comment we
3 acknowledge that this might be an opportunity to provide
4 access to the school and that is something the town

5 should consider; something like that?

6 Any objection to deleting that aspect of
7 William Floyd Parkway? Delete it. The last word will
8 be "parkway," and we will add a comment that
9 acknowledges that that might be an opportunity to
10 connect the development with the school, and that the
11 town developer and school should discuss that.

12 Any objection to that? Seeing none, any other
13 comments or questions? Anything else anyone wants to
14 raise? If not, let's go to the first part of Condition
15 2. Vince, you proposed some alternative language kind
16 of piggybacking on something Michael raised, which was
17 some sort of right-of-way.

18 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I would leave sidewalk
19 for pedestrian right-of-way abutting the -- within the
20 street, utilizing alternative color or striping to
21 designate pedestrian and cyclists.

22 THE CHAIRMAN: For pedestrian designated
23 right-of-way in the street.

24 COMMISSIONER KELLY: It will be much better.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: The only question is if you

66

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 want to use the word "pedestrian," if there is a better
3 word.

4 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: If you say "pedestrian
5 ADA compliant," then it would have to be a certain size.
6 It would have to be thirty-six inches at least. I don't
7 know if I want to do that. Yours is better, it's simple.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: A proposed sidewalk or
9 designated pedestrian right-of-way within the street

10 shall be included on at least one side of the roadway.
11 The sidewalk should also connect to William -- sidewalk
12 or right-of-way shall connect to William Floyd Parkway.

13 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Right-of-way. We know
14 there is a sidewalk.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: So we have, I think, the only
16 other issue that we have to discuss is the first
17 condition. The conservation easement shall be created
18 along William Floyd Parkway, with the exception of the
19 access road. That is the way it reads right now.
20 Michael mentioned the notion of somehow tailoring that
21 to not run afoul of the existing property. I don't know
22 that we had any conversation on that or whether there is
23 a consensus on that.

24 COMMISSIONER KELLY: I think John in his
25 report indicated there were two houses and the

67

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 cul-de-sac that would fall within the fifty foot
3 easement.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: One thing that strikes me if
5 there is five feet encroaching on it, that is de
6 minimus. I don't know if you have information about how
7 close that stuff comes to the --

8 MR. CORRAL: I did measure it. I don't
9 recall exactly but I know it's not encroaching by a
10 large degree. I don't remember the footage. I know it
11 was close to fifty feet, but slightly less than that.

12 MR. ISLES: Is that the same as the
13 cul-de-sac; is that also a few feet?

14 MR. CORRAL: Right.

15 MR. FRELENG: The regional consideration for
16 the planning commission is the visual of the
17 right-of-way from William Floyd Parkway. I'm wondering
18 why you want to make exceptions on a preliminary map
19 where you pull back the cul-de-sac, make some
20 adjustments to the lot lines, and why you want to do
21 that, override the regional consideration of the view
22 shed of the right-of-way. I think you might be over
23 thinking this.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: It is a good point. It's a
25 preliminary map. They can play with the map ever so

68

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 slightly and accomplish the regional standard which is
3 in our guidelines. Other thoughts, comments?

4 COMMISSIONER KELLY: Along those lines, I
5 agree with Andy if there is sufficient room to move it.
6 But with the ponds and wetlands or whatever it is
7 further interior to the site, it may not be feasible.
8 While it is a preliminary map, these developers do have
9 a reputation of building quality housing in certain
10 areas. I think they have been through this quite a few
11 times. If they can do it, I'm sure they would. If they
12 can't and this is the site they have to live with, it
13 doesn't seem like it's a burden.

14 MR. FRELENG: I realize this might be
15 sensitive to the findings that the local municipality
16 might make to override the Commission. Keep in mind the
17 municipalities have the ability to override the
18 Commission when they have local considerations that
19 override the regional consideration of the Commission.

20 You're making reasonable comments and you yourself are
21 making findings that the municipality may want to make
22 similarly to override the Commission.

23 COMMISSIONER KELLY: Provided the town board
24 can garner a super majority.

25 MR. FRELENG: But that doesn't take away from

69

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 the rationale of the Commission's regional
3 consideration.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: Other thoughts, comments?
5 John.

6 COMMISSIONER FINN: I have a question about
7 the affordability and aspect with this applicant how
8 many units has the town required to set aside as
9 affordable. Not what the Commission said, what the town
10 has said.

11 MR. CORRAL: In the application there was no
12 information that any units were to be set aside as
13 affordable. There was no information either way.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: The only other thing I want to
15 add is we have in the comments directing the applicant
16 to the energy efficiency and public safety guidelines.
17 That is Number 4. It does emphasize the regional
18 significance of energy efficiency and public safety. I
19 know the staff has done a good job of trying to make as
20 many comments as are reasonable. However, I want to
21 raise this issue just because we typically have made
22 this a condition. Even though it's a weak condition,
23 it's making sure they simply highlight it to the
24 applicant. It doesn't require adoption. Any thoughts

25 or comments on that?

70

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 COMMISSIONER FINN: I wanted to finish the
3 point about the affordability. As Long Islanders, we
4 are very concerned about the affordability of housing
5 and boiling it down to the basic economic principles of
6 supply and demand. If you do the math on this site,
7 there are a hundred twenty-six acres that are going to
8 be preserved in open space, which is a great thing.
9 Based upon the amount of units that the developer can
10 build on, I think this is far less than the allotment.
11 Setting aside as a condition, ten percent
12 affordability. Is that factored into the matrix?

13 MR. CORRAL: I just I would like to qualify
14 the map for the subdivision that we received was a
15 hundred forty-eight lots due to the surface wetlands or
16 surface water located on the map. So the open space,
17 which is I think sixty-one percent of the property, is
18 the result of the cluster of the subdivision, but it is
19 sixty-one percent of the property being designated as
20 open space.

21 COMMISSIONER FINN: I'm not opposed to
22 sticking with the Commission guidelines, I just wanted
23 to point that out.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: What I was saying when I
25 interrupted Commissioner Finn was Comment Number 4,

71

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 simply pointing the applicant to consult our guidelines.

3 We are trying to continually raise the profile of public
4 safety and efficiency. Any objection? Seeing none, we
5 will move that up.

6 The only thing is to make a final decision on
7 the first condition, that the easement be ten feet with
8 the exception of the access road. As Andy pointed out,
9 that is what the guidelines say. If the town wishes to
10 do otherwise, they would have to override or they can
11 abide by the condition by, it sounds like redrawing the
12 map relatively minimally.

13 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I would like to
14 suggest that I consider it a de minimus encroachment so
15 I think we should exempt it, but specify except for the
16 encroachment of Lots 7 and 8 on the map dated, lay it
17 out so we acknowledge it's a minor encroachment. Or
18 leave it alone or make a comment that they consider
19 slight reconfiguration feasible. But I wouldn't make
20 that a condition that has to be overridden.

21 THE CHAIRMAN: Make a comment such that it
22 would call attention to the regional policy of fifty
23 feet. But noting that there might be a few parcels and
24 the cul-de-sac that infringe on that and encourage them
25 to meet the standard.

72

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Specify the parcels,
3 but it could be a few more in the final map.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: The final map might look a bit
5 different. Any thoughts on that?

6 COMMISSIONER FINN: Andy pointed about
7 maintaining. If we can eliminate when you're driving

8 down a roadway to see the housing, where it's well
9 protected there, it's landscaping or buffer. Are they
10 asked to do anything different than what is existing as
11 far as the conditions that are there right now?

12 MR. CORRAL: There wasn't information in the
13 application that we received that it would be treated
14 different from the -- that there was a specification for
15 that visibility consideration.

16 THE CHAIRMAN: I guess the point is, you can
17 have a fifty foot easement but you can have a blinking
18 red light. John, are you saying we don't want you to
19 encroach on it, but if you do encroach on it in a de
20 minimus way, maybe landscaping would solve the view shed
21 issue without having the fifty foot easement.

22 COMMISSIONER FINN: Again, if it's three or
23 five or seven feet and it's well blanketed to maintain.
24 If it's not, we may look at that fifty feet as more
25 important, or even further suggest that there be some

73

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 sort of added landscaping to prevent that.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: That might be a solution. If
4 this seems to be an issue, it could be a notation of the
5 regional policy of fifty feet and noting that if there
6 is any infringement upon that by any parcel, that you
7 recommend that there be a buffer, landscape buffer or
8 something like that. Any thought on that, comments? It
9 would be noting the county policy which would be fifty
10 feet on William Floyd Parkway, with the exception of the
11 access road, but indicating that if that is infringed
12 upon -- what is the right word? Encroached -- that

13 appropriate landscaping buffering be instituted at those
14 locations. Does that make sense?

15 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I think we are still
16 requiring that cul-de-sac and those two lots be moved;
17 otherwise you need a super majority vote.

18 THE CHAIRMAN: I thought your proposal was to
19 make it a comment.

20 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Yes. You could have
21 left it as a condition exempting the cul-de-sac road and
22 two lots that encroach. If you make it a comment, then
23 you don't have to specify that, I don't believe.

24 THE CHAIRMAN: The proposal is to mark it a
25 comment.

74

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I'm sorry, I hate to
3 do this. We do want to keep a fifty foot width as a
4 condition. We don't want to lose that. Andy, am I
5 correct there? You prefer this as a condition weakening
6 it a bit to allow the encroachment of the roadway, the
7 cul-de-sac of the two lots that they show.

8 MR. FRELENG: Staff would prefer it as a
9 condition, but it's the Commission's prerogative to
10 change it however you would like.

11 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: We would prefer to
12 keep it as a condition. As Mike pointed out, they have
13 been working at this a long time.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: The proposal is a condition;
15 that's fine. Preservation of at least fifty feet in
16 width along William Floyd Parkway, with the exception of
17 the access road and with the exception --

18 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Any encroachment be
19 sufficiently buffered with landscaping. (Inaudible)
20 THE CHAIRMAN: Andy, the condition as just
21 read, any objection to the condition in that way?
22 Seeing none, we now have a proposal with Condition
23 Number 1 amended, Condition Number 2 amended, Condition
24 Number 3 as written in your report. Condition Number 4,
25 if requested by the county they should offer dedication

75

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 for bus turn out. That is my wording I used. It's not
3 precise. And Condition Number 5, that the former
4 comment number four, which is the planning
5 commission standard, there are five conditions. Old
6 Comments 1 through 3 are as written. Old Comment 5 is
7 now Comment 4 and we added two new comments, one
8 encouraging the town to consider the green stormwater
9 management. Comment Number 6 is the school access
10 comment. Okay.

11 Entertain a motion to accept the staff report
12 as amended.

13 COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Make the motion.

14 COMMISSIONER KELLY: Second.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor of accepting the
16 staff's report as amended? That's nine to zero. The
17 next item is Southold. That is John's as well.

18 MR. CORRAL: The second subdivision before
19 you is for planning board approval for a three lot
20 subdivision on a six point seven acre lot in the Hamlet
21 of East Marion in the Town of Southold on the north side
22 of Main Road, which is State Road 25. It's located --

23 there are two parcels actually related to this
24 subdivision, the larger six point seven acre parcel on
25 the north side of Main Road and the smaller one

76

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 point-o-eight parcel on the south side.

3 The subdivision itself is for the north
4 parcel. The south parcel is being set aside as open
5 space. Jurisdiction is adjacent to State Road 25 and
6 also the Long Island Sound to the north and Orient
7 Harbor to the south. Just east of the parcel is the
8 causeway connecting East Marion to Orient, and directly
9 adjacent to the east or west are residential homes.

10 Northern six point seven acre parcel is
11 currently improved with one residential house and two
12 accessory structures. And it's predominantly cleared
13 with woods on the property boundaries. On the north
14 side there is a bluff with beach down to the Sound.

15 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Where are the
16 accessory structures; could you point them out?

17 MR. CORRAL: I believe it's a garage and barn
18 structure. There are two brown structures. Zoning for
19 the parcel is Residential 80, which has a minimum lot
20 size of eighty thousand square feet. There is a another
21 view of the property. With the south parcel having
22 mapped New York State tidal wetlands and the northern
23 portion having a bluff on the northern side.

24 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Can you point out the
25 wetlands?

77

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
Page 64

2 MR. CORRAL: This map doesn't show the
3 wetland mapped in, but they were mapped and they're in
4 this area. If you look real close, there is a stream
5 there. They were mapped in as tidal wetlands.

6 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Do you know how many
7 acres?

8 MR. CORRAL: Total parcel is one
9 point-o-eight acres. The tidal wetland, looking at the
10 map, is more than half.

11 MR. FRELENG: The map in the staff report
12 shows what we are talking about.

13 MR. CORRAL: The history of this one, like
14 the previous subdivision, had a history with the
15 Planning Commission. In 1978, the Suffolk County
16 Planning Commission approved a much larger eighteen acre
17 subdivision, creating seven lots. This lot is one of
18 the lots, or one of these two lots that were created in
19 that 1978 subdivision. One of the conditions was that
20 all the lots, the stormwater runoff would remain on
21 site.

22 In 2004, this subdivision with a similar
23 layout was referred to us and we disapproved it through
24 the creation of landlocked lots. The current
25 subdivision is similar, but has some differences also.

78

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 The southern parcel has been designated as open space.
3 The bluff line has been mapped and labeled, which is one
4 of the conditions or reasons for disapproval in the 2004
5 subdivision.

6 There is also now building envelopes and some
Page 65

7 of the sanitary structures have been moved. The current
8 subdivision still has the twenty-five foot right-of-way
9 with the sixteen foot wide paved common driveway. This
10 resulted in landlocked lots, which is against Planning
11 Commission guidelines to have a right-of-way instead of
12 the individual property access to the right-of-way.

13 Our recommendations is in the past, we
14 disapproved all landlocked lot subdivisions. With this
15 new planning commission kind of emphasizing kind of
16 regionally significant guidelines, the policy of the
17 commission has changed somewhat. What we are
18 recommending is basically address the reasons for the
19 previous disapproval with conditions. Instead of
20 twenty-five foot right-of-way, two fifteen foot wide
21 flag lots could be created.

22 I will go to the conditions. That was the
23 first conditional approval, that Lots 1 and 2 be
24 redesigned so there is a fifteen foot flag lot down to
25 the main road, in the event there is a dispute with

79

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 respect to the common driveway. The common driveway
3 could still be used, but they could still have legal
4 access if a problem arose in the future.

5 The second condition is that the coastal
6 erosion be flagged in the field by a qualified expert.
7 This was a condition in the 2004 subdivision that hadn't
8 been shown on the map. The other part, flagging the
9 bluff as setbacks and non-disturbance areas. All
10 stormwater runoff be maintained on site, both of the
11 environmentally sensitive areas and the importance of

12 State Road 25.

13 We have three comments, the first being
14 because of the location of this property, that the town
15 or county doesn't -- I think the subdivider should
16 acknowledge to the Town of Southold Planning Board that
17 the creation of this subdivision in no way commits
18 either the town or County of Suffolk to any program to
19 protect this property from shoreline erosion, and that
20 any approval granted by the town in no way signifies
21 that the development and use of the property is
22 considered without hazard and possible loss.

23 Because of the nature of hurricanes and nor
24 east'ers and location, we thought it was an important
25 comment to make. The second is again the comment about

80

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 energy efficiency and public safety guidelines, that
3 they should consult our guidelines. Two new residential
4 structures are being proposed and good opportunity for
5 that to be considered.

6 The third is some of the Planning Commission's
7 guidelines related to setbacks from the bluff were
8 addressed by the subdivision. One that wasn't was
9 clearing of vegetation, so we have the Planning
10 Commission's guidelines of clearing vegetation within
11 fifty feet of the bluff line. That is the staff
12 report.

13 THE CHAIRMAN: This is a Southold matter.
14 Commissioner McAdam, any thoughts you wish to share with
15 us about it?

16 COMMISSIONER McADAM: I'm familiar with the
Page 67

17 area. The area is elevated. It goes down towards the
18 main road. I agree with staff that the major problem
19 there is that that road gets flooded and Orient is
20 basically cut off until either the tide goes down or
21 they figure out some way of pumping out the water.

22 I guess the question is how they would retain
23 the stormwater runoff on site. That was the first
24 question. The other one, which I thought it was kind of
25 interesting, I think it should be stronger, but I am not

81

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 quite sure how it would be, the first comment that the
3 subdivider should be sending a letter to the town saying
4 if there is any damage to the beach, that they won't be
5 going to the state or county or actually federal
6 government in some cases.

7 My question is whether there could be stronger
8 legal wording on this that would be incorporated into a
9 deed or covenant in some way, in the event there was a
10 problem in the future. I live in the town, so I'm
11 concerned they don't come back to the town and want the
12 town to dredge and put sand on the beach at the cost of
13 the town. The question is whether there could be
14 stronger language. I believe it's the first time that
15 I've seen this type of language since I've been here,
16 and I think it's a good idea.

17 MR. FRELENG: The Commission certainly, in
18 addition a requirement to Suffolk County. You can
19 condition that to Suffolk County, you could also
20 condition that the town make that requirement to
21 themselves, but they may override it. I don't see if

22 you condition that, the applicant should make a
23 statement that precludes the county to being responsible
24 for any drainage, how the town could override that.

25 COMMISSIONER McADAM: I'm not concerned about

82

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 the town overriding it, more that the subdivider may try
3 to override it. That is why I was thinking of something
4 a little bit stronger. I kind of doubt, and I don't
5 want to speak for the town, that the town would have a
6 problem with that.

7 MR. FRELENG: That the town shall covenant or
8 require covenants and restrictions to the extent we are
9 talking about. If they want to override that part, make
10 a condition that the town shall require covenants and
11 restrictions related to --

12 THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor? Any other
13 discussion about that proposal? Seeing none, adding
14 that as a condition. We will add that as a condition.
15 Anything else you wanted to add, Tom? Since you're from
16 the neighborhood.

17 COMMISSIONER McADAM: Actually, it's the same
18 question. I guess I just got into the first one, the
19 stormwater runoff now. Is there a way of maybe firming
20 that up a little bit more like we did with the other?
21 As you can see from the map, it's an environmentally
22 sensitive area. If there is some unique stormwater
23 runoff system that we are aware of, there might be
24 something to consider. I'm not an expert in any of
25 this.

83

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 MR. FRELENG: There is a range of ways to
3 treat stormwater. They would have to grade the property
4 in such a way to capture it. Drywells underground or
5 something to catch that. The town is obligated to meet
6 all the stormwater regulations. I think the strongest
7 thing that the Commission does is condition that the
8 stormwater remain on site and refer them to our
9 guidelines, which has a more detailed description of the
10 state requirements for stormwater capture. I don't
11 think you want to get into specifying how they are going
12 to do it. This lot is much smaller. I don't
13 know if you want to go into smaller treatment. You
14 might want to suggest that. I don't know if you can
15 specify the type of treatment on this site other than
16 this be kept on site and let the engineers work it out.

17 COMMISSIONER McADAM: This is a state road.
18 How would the state get involved in preventing the
19 stormwater? Would they have to get approval from the
20 state on protecting the state road?

21 MR. FRELENG: No, because we already have a
22 curb cut onto the state road. I don't think they would
23 be going to the state for an access permit. The state
24 is obligated to meet the access requirements and
25 stormwater requirements to keep the stormwater off the

84

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 road.

3 THE CHAIRMAN: That is Condition 3 has to be
4 maintain on -- it's a bottleneck. You choke off

5 thousands of people living to the right-hand side.
6 Anything else?

7 COMMISSIONER McADAM: No.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: We have a condition on the
9 lots, Condition 1. Commission policy for a long time in
10 this case, it only involves redrawing the map. Two is a
11 condition this commission put on several years ago.
12 Obviously want to be consistent with our previous
13 rulings to the extent we haven't changed our policy.
14 Three we discussed the stormwater remaining on site.

15 We added new Condition 4, which is really
16 pulling Comment Number 1 up at Commissioner McAdam's
17 suggestion, the town shall require covenants and
18 restrictions that relate to the fact that the town and
19 county are not going to be responsible for any possible
20 loss. I would recommend, as I said in the past one,
21 that we move Comment Number 2 up to a condition. Is
22 there any objection to that? Seeing none, we will make
23 that Condition 5.

24 There is a one comment. Only question, do you
25 want to say anything about, this would have to be a

85

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 comment. We would not want to dictate this saying
3 anything about stormwater runoff. Any of the green new
4 methods, I don't feel strongly about that, because this
5 is small.

6 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: A rain garden, it's
7 about fifty dollars.

8 THE CHAIRMAN: If you want to add a comment
9 that would be germane; if not --

080410PLANNING.TXT
COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: I don't feel

10
11 compelled to, in this particular case the stormwater
12 from the actual structure would come from the building.
13 To me, it would be probably more critical. We don't
14 have jurisdiction over this. Talk about their
15 application of fertilizers and pesticides which will run
16 right into the wetlands and coastal water. They can use
17 a rain barrel. Certainly they can afford it. Certainly
18 we can suggest using permeable pavement for patio
19 structures, rain gardens as a suggestion.

20 THE CHAIRMAN: I have concern about -- you
21 will remember that under our regional significance
22 definition this would not be. It is denied. It's
23 coming back because it was denied by the Commission. I
24 think it's best to leave it the way it is, unless it's
25 strenuously objected by anyone. Any comments or

86

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 questions? If not, we have on the table the staff
3 report as amended.

4 Motion by Commissioner McAdam. Second by
5 Commissioner Chartrand. The motion is for approval of
6 the staff recommendations with the five conditions as
7 discussed and one comment. All in favor, please raise
8 your hand. That is nine-zero. Thank you.

9 That ends our administrative section. We have
10 a few things to go through. I think we will be out by
11 three o'clock. Comprehensive Plan, anything in
12 particular?

13 MR. ISLES: Nothing in particular, except it
14 mentions we have Volume 1. We do have a subset, a

15 demographic section on race and segregation we could
16 present to you either in September or October. Seth
17 Foreman has written that. It does have some interesting
18 findings.

19 THE CHAIRMAN: Why don't we consider it for
20 September, unless the agenda gets long
21 administratively. If that is okay with the Commission.
22 Anything else? Amityville Inter-Municipal Agreement.
23 Amityville made a proposal to tweak the Inter-Municipal
24 Agreement. You have seen the staff report. It's a
25 minor tweak to the IMA. My understanding from staff,

87

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 they are not opposed and you are not opposed to us
3 entering into the agreement as amended.

4 MR. FRELENG: That's correct.

5 THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? If not, we
6 need to formally vote on the IMA with Amityville.

7 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Make a motion.

8 COMMISSIONER McADAM: Second.

9 THE CHAIRMAN: Nine to zero vote. If we get
10 IMA's back with substantial changes, that is a different
11 story, but this was minor and I think it's appropriate
12 to enter into it as we did.

13 The next is the rule of proceedings. About
14 three months ago there was a little bit of confusion.
15 We need some clarification about when our regional
16 significance definition would require that a project be
17 brought to this table by the staff based solely on the
18 sewage connections. Adrienne worked with Director Isles
19 as well Mr. Freleng on this. I think we have a proposal

20 that is much clearer. You have a staff report on it.
21 Andy, do you want to say anything about it?

22 MR. FRELENG: I don't need to unless there
23 are any questions.

24 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: You just refer, in
25 Item 2, construction of new residential units that meet

88

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 or exceed the following threshold. Fifty units, if not
3 connected to a Suffolk County sewer district. What are
4 you actually referring to?

5 MR. ISLES: Designated sewage treatment plant
6 district that exist in the county. Difference is, if
7 someone is creating a new plan, that is not a district.

8 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: It is not something
9 owned by Suffolk County, it's a district. For example,
10 like the Huntington Sewer District where there is a
11 certain area that is already sewerred; is that what you
12 are saying?

13 MR. ISLES: Yes.

14 THE CHAIRMAN: We can clarify that.

15 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: To me it wasn't all
16 that clear and it should be.

17 THE CHAIRMAN: Is a Suffolk County sewer
18 district something owned by Suffolk County or finalized
19 within Suffolk County.

20 MR. FRELENG: How about an established
21 municipal sewer district in Suffolk County?

22 THE CHAIRMAN: Established municipal sewer
23 district in Suffolk County. In fact, you don't
24 necessarily need Suffolk County. We will make that

25 amendment without objection. Any thoughts or comments?

89

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 Thank you Charla, good point. If not, I'll entertain a
3 motion to approve this amendment to our rules and
4 proceedings for the definition of regionally significant
5 project. Motion by Secretary Esposito and second by
6 Commissioner Bolton. All in favor, please raise your
7 hand. Nine to zero.

8 We are going to table the native vegetation
9 clearing discussion.

10 COMMISSIONER ESPOSITO: Again. Remember, I
11 have to leave by 2:30?

12 THE CHAIRMAN: The Public Safety Model Code,
13 Tom will take about five minutes after we vote on the
14 annual report. On the annual report, we have an
15 obligation under county law each year to provide annual
16 report to the county executive and legislature. We did
17 this last year and we used the same format this year.
18 The only thing missing, from what will ultimately go
19 out. I will write a little preface each year. It's a
20 cover letter of sorts.

21 You will see that the first section is a
22 planning section overview. The things we worked on
23 during 2009 - comprehensive plan, the task forces. It's
24 an annual report on what the Commission was up to. A
25 couple of bullet points on the things we worked on.

90

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 Section 3 is the statistics relating to the
3 referrals we got from the municipalities. Those are

4 always very interesting, just so see where we are going.
5 That is on that one page.

6 Number 4 or Section 4 is the kind of trends
7 within the county -- materials put together each year by
8 the County Planning Department. It's a fact based
9 overview of things going on with the county and various
10 different categories with the housing or development,
11 employment, office space, et cetera. It's really a
12 great bit of information.

13 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: Mr. Chairman, I have
14 one comment. I didn't realize we were going to be
15 authorizing this today. I didn't get a chance to look
16 over the whole thing, I noticed one thing under
17 population in the final paragraph. It says Suffolk
18 County has a relatively stable household base. Then it
19 goes on to talk about percentage of household married
20 couples with children characterizing them evidently as
21 the evidence for stable household base.

22 That may be a technicality, but it certainly
23 isn't representative today of the way people live and
24 who has a stable household. It seems a little bit
25 exclusionary in terms of, as I said, the demographic

91

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 trends occurring throughout Long Island as well as the
3 nation.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: That is a fair point, the word
5 "stable."

6 COMMISSIONER BOLTON: There must be another
7 way of, I'm not a demographer, but I don't even know if
8 there are other comparative statistics to offer that

9 could refer to changing household compositions. I don't
10 know. I leave it to whoever wrote it.

11 MR. ISLES: Peter Lambert was the author of
12 that. I can be talk to him and get some background. It
13 may be related to demographic terms, but I will find
14 out.

15 THE CHAIRMAN: One thing we can do, I'm
16 hoping, unless there are substantial questions that we
17 can authorize it today. There is a whole bunch of
18 tweaking that can be done, cleaning up the document.
19 It's all things that are sort of factual based. It's
20 something we are required by law to do.

21 What I do in the preface is bring out some
22 interesting facts. We do have an opportunity to provide
23 comment back to the department on this. The only reason
24 I would like to authorize it today, technically under
25 county law, we're supposed to get it out in the first

92

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 quarter of the year and it's quite late, which is
3 partially my fault. If we can get it out before our
4 next meeting, I would like to do that. If it's amenable
5 to the rest of the group, authorize the publication of
6 the annual report and make any edits for the next week
7 or so, things like that.

8 I think it's certainly reasonable to include
9 those. Let we conclude, the last section of the record
10 is simply our guidelines and there are policy goals
11 established by the Commission. Next year, we talked
12 about looking at the guideline every two years. For
13 this year, 2009, these were the guidelines that we had

14 in place. Any comments or questions?

15 COMMISSIONER FINN: Just getting back to the
16 population aspect, I think the report has a lot of great
17 information, but they do reference a term that is very
18 commonly used here on Long Island, which is brain drain.
19 It makes reference as it almost kind of minimizes it.
20 They reference age groups from fifteen to twenty-four
21 that they're actually increasing. That may be the case,
22 but it's always been focused on twenty-four to
23 thirty-five.

24 I think we should maybe look at, from the
25 editing process or get some more factual information.

93

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 It's such a hot button of where the future of Long
3 Island is going.

4 THE CHAIRMAN: We have had some presentations
5 in the past. Peter Lambert has made a presentation.

6 MR. ISLES: This is based on factual
7 information. It's not made up. Major fact is in terms
8 of the demographic, the cohort, the twenty-four to
9 thirty-five year old age group. What happened in Long
10 Island in the 1970's, we had a hundred forty thousand
11 fewer people born than in the prior decade. That was
12 the baby bust after the baby boom period.

13 There are two factors that affect the
14 population characteristics today. There is the age
15 cohort, the decline in birth. Indeed we are seeing an
16 increase in the younger adult population due to the echo
17 baby boom in the '80's. We have extensive information
18 on migration. We talk about the population in the

19 county increases. A lot of that is due to the
20 immigration of population that we have had, especially
21 foreign population growth.

22 What we can do is Dr. Foreman as well as Peter
23 Lambert have done extensive research on that. We can
24 have that presented to you as well.

25 THE CHAIRMAN: We are in the middle of the

94

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 comprehensive plan process. We are getting the fresh
3 data over the next six months to a year. Why don't we
4 say this? Folks have additional items that they want to
5 point out, why don't we say by the end of next week any
6 comments should be in. If there are no other questions,
7 I would like to authorize the staff to complete the
8 annual report, issue the annual report, I will sign off
9 on that as a last step so everyone is comfortable with
10 the comments.

11 All in favor of adopting the annual report or
12 instructing staff to complete and issue the annual
13 report, please raise your hand. Nine to zero.

14 The last item, if you turn to the public
15 safety portion, Tom has done a great job with the staff.
16 He will have a few minute overview of what they have
17 come up with. So we need to get people's feedback on
18 this.

19 COMMISSIONER McADAM: First of all, I would
20 like to thank Andy and Ted for reformatting and editing
21 the many versions we had of this over the past few
22 months. Basically, the ordinance covers not only the
23 hard surfaces used in public safety planning, such as

24 barriers and sidewalks and structures like that. What
25 we added this particular time was more of the

95

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission
2 technology, wireless, video, audio, and how that can be
3 used in providing public safety at various buildings,
4 industrial buildings and so on. Most of them do use it
5 but it's never -- I haven't really seen that formulated
6 anywhere on the local level.

7 The other thing that we included in here was
8 how people think when it comes to public safety. Some
9 people believe they're always safe and they really don't
10 have to worry about public safety on their own, that
11 somebody else will do that. In many other ways, people
12 have to be aware of where they're located at any
13 particular time, whether in a parking garage, whether
14 walking in a tunnel at night with limited access. We
15 tried to get to the psychological aspect of what people
16 should be thinking about, whether it's technology or
17 hard surfaces are instituted.

18 What I would ask everyone to do is if they
19 can, over the next few weeks or so, if you could, go
20 through the model ordinance that you have in front of
21 you and if you have any kind of editing or anything that
22 you want to add to it, if you could direct that by
23 e-mail to Dave, myself, Andy and Ted, because what we
24 would like to do by October is have the ordinance
25 adopted, but even before that, after we do our editing,

96

1 8/4/10 Planning Commission

2 what we want to do is send this to the elected and
3 appointed officials that are on the public safety
4 committee and get their input so we would like to give
5 them a month to look it over. If anybody has any
6 questions, I would be happy to answer.

7 THE CHAIRMAN: Any questions? If not, as Tom
8 indicated, he would appreciate the first step is making
9 sure we are happy with it. I think it's pretty good. I
10 had some thoughts on it, I know Charla did. As we get
11 more comfortable with it, we will send out it out to the
12 elected officials for their feedback.

13 Anyone else has -- I believe we lost our
14 quorum and therefore we are adjourned. Thank you all.

15 (Time noted: 3:00 p.m.)

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF NEW YORK)
)
COUNTY OF SUFFOLK)

ss:

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I, JUDI GALLOP, a Stenotype Reporter and Notary Public for the State of New York, do hereby certify:

THAT this is a true and accurate transcription of the Suffolk County Council on Environmental Quality meeting held on August 4, 2010.

I further certify that I am not related, either by blood or marriage, to any of the parties in this action; and

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand.

JUDI GALLOP

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25