

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

September 18, 2002

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Council on Environmental Quality was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on September 18, 2002.

Members Present:

Theresa Elkowitz - Chairperson  
Larry Swanson - Vice-Chair  
Michael Kaufman  
Thomas Cramer  
Nancy Manfredonia  
Adrienne Esposito  
Lance Mallamo  
Legislator Ginny Fields

Members Not Present:

John Finkenberg

Also In Attendance:

Richard Martin - Historic Services  
Joy Squires - CAC of Huntington  
Jim Bagg - Chief Environmental Analyst/Suffolk County Planning  
Penny Kohler - Suffolk County Planning Department  
Clark Gavin - Aide to Presiding Officer Tonna  
Nicole DeAngelo - County Executive's Office/IR  
Judith Gordon - Commissioner/Suffolk County Parks Department  
Nick Gibbons - Environmental Analyst/Suffolk County Parks Dept  
Leslie Mitchel - Deputy Commissioner/SC Department of Public Works  
Dominick Ninivaggi - Department of Public Works/Vector Control  
Ralph Borkowski - Department of Public Works/Landscape Architect  
Kim Shaw - Department of Health Services  
Kevin McAllister - Peconic Baykeeper  
Paul Dill - Hauppauge Youth Organization  
Bob Policastro - Hauppauge Youth Organization  
Larry Feeley - Ward Associates  
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

(\*The meeting was called to order at 9:41 A.M.\*)

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Good morning. I'm going to call the meeting to order. We don't have the minutes of the August, 2002 meeting because they haven't been prepared yet, but I do want to remind everybody that we have a court stenographer, when you speak you have to put your microphone on one at a time, which we are not very good at, but I understand the stenographer was already here till the wee hours of this morning, so let's try to have mercy on the poor woman.

All right, correspondence. I have correspondence regarding the 2003 work plan so I'm going to leave that until later. I also have correspondence from Legislator Caracappa regarding the Dredging Project Steering Committee and the fact that he wants to reinstitute that committee and the CEQ has a representative as an appointee. So I'm just going task -- I'm actually going to direct Jim Bagg to be the representative on the Dredging Steering Committee because he has consistently been the representative. So does anybody have any discussion about that?

MR. KAUFMAN:

One question. We will be allowed to have some input to Jim as members of CEQ?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Oh, absolutely, because traditionally Jim comes back, tells us when he has meetings, what was discussed, and he brings direction just as if I or anybody else on the committee were the representative.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Good enough.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So Jim, you'll keep everybody apprised?

MR. BAGG:

Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN:

Thank you, Jim.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

*Recommended Type II Actions/Ratification of Staff Recommendations for Legislative Resolutions Laid on the Table, August 27th and September 17th.* Jim, do you have things you'd like to call to the Council's attention?

MR. BAGG:

Okay. Yes, I have one Introductory Resolution that I would like to call to the Council's attention, it is Introductory Resolution No. 1953, Authorizing the County Department of Parks, Recreation and Conservation to construct dog runs at Coindre Hall in Huntington within the County Parks. The project is not a Type II Action but is an Unlisted Action and an EAF should be submitted. Council did review

this before, I believe, in April, 1999, and I have given that information to you, Terry.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Yes. Thank you, Jim. In April of '99, the Parks Department came to us with a potential for a pilot program to construct a dog run at Coindre Hall and there was a motion that was considered by the Council to allow that as a pilot program and that motion failed. So Jim, when you send over your staff recommendations, which I assume we're going to approve or amend, you might -- I would appreciate if you would send over to Legislator Cooper this information.

MR. BAGG:  
Right.

LEG. FIELDS:

There was great debate about this last night, we had a Legislative meeting and it probably went on for maybe three hours, four hours. I drove there on Saturday and took my camera, and actually the pictures are in my car. If anybody has been to Coindre Hall, it goes way down and it's very hilly, dogs are unleashed and leashed and people just walk along the side and the dogs defecate and it all goes right down to the harbor. And I had a discussion with our Legislative Counsel about whether the plan of potentially putting dog runs in all of Suffolk County parks should first come to CEQ just to decide if indeed they're appropriate in any park or what park.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, the law actually requires. Because as Jim correctly pointed out, this is an action that's subject to SEQRA, it's not a Type II Action so it's required to come here for environmental review anyway.

LEG. FIELDS:

But I'm asking does it mean that it would be per park or all Suffolk County parks as one unit to come before CEQ to decide perhaps the placement and then --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Right now what would come before CEQ is the Legislature -- proposed Local Law that Legislator Cooper has put forth, because that's what gets referred to us. But if the Legislature wanted to ask CEQ for an opinion on something, that certainly could be done. But what was discussed in April -- it was the April 21st, 1999 meeting, was specifically a dog run at Coindre Hall and the motion was defeated even for a pilot project; it was a close vote, it was 3-4-0, but it was defeated. Yes?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I have one comment to make. I have one problem with the legislation in that it's specifically identifying Coindre Hall as one park and then saying all other parks, so I'm not sure about the legality of it. But also, Coindre Hall is a historic site, it's in the County's Historic Trust if I'm not mistaken, and the Historic Trust manual mandates that it be treated a little bit differently, etcetera. I don't have a problem with dog runs per se in County parks, I do have a

problem with dog runs on historic sites. And to that extent, as the historic trust I think that it falls well outside of any approvability if you will, just from that aspect.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, we don't approve, the Legislature approves. But with respect to -- even as the Historic Trust, I mean, you know, if the Legislature wants to pass a resolution, the Legislature passes a resolution. But I think what Legislator Fields asks and what Jim has suggested is that this is an action that's subject to SEQRA and the Charter requires that it come to CEQ, so.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I'm simply noting that there is a historic aspect to all of this.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I agree with you and that was something that was discussed in '99 as well.

MR. KAUFMAN:

And I think it should be reemphasized today.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I agree. With that, I'll entertain a -- if no one has any questions of Jim, I'll entertain a motion to accept the staff recommendations.

MR. KAUFMAN:

I have to abstain on a couple of them.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

All right. Well, do I have a motion to accept --

LEG. FIELDS:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion by Legislator Fields. Do I have a second by Mr. Cramer.

MR. CRAMER:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. KAUFMAN:

I have to abstain on 1989; other than that, I approve.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay, carried. *Approved (Vote: 7-0-1-1 Abstention: Mr. Kaufman - Not Present: Mr. Finkenberg).*

All right. Next, we have *tabled matters/the proposed development of Green's Creek County Park in West Sayville, Town of Islip*. Is there someone here that would like to address the Council on this?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Hello. You have to identify yourself for the record.

MR. GIBBONS:

Nick, you can pick the microphone up and walk around with it, out of the holder.

MR. GIBBONS:

Nick Gibbons, Suffolk County Parks. I'm going to pass around pictures of the existing conditions at the site. Ralph's got the plan that he developed for us. I have aeriels and tax maps if anybody is interested in the boundaries of the property. The site was an abandoned commercial fish processing plant.

LEG. FIELDS:

Here's a laser that might help when you talk to everybody.

MR. GIBBONS:

Okay. I know that you're all familiar with the location of the Maritime Museum and this is just due east, this is Greens Creek here. This sort of unnamed canal street is barely noticeable as a residential street but it is a public road, Clyde Street runs parallel to the property. And then this road here, Legislator Fields might know the name of it better than an I, but I think that's an extension of Clyde Street.

LEG. FIELDS:

Clyde.

MR. GIBBONS:

This is the Blue Points Property, this is a vacant lot and there are some residential houses in this area here. So what we had in this site was a shellfish processing plant, there were several buildings that were torn down by the County, an oil tank and some contaminated soil was also removed last year. And what we have now is sort of a colonization by alien and pioneer species, predominantly fragmities, and some remnant C and D. The proposal is for -- the bulk heading is brand new, that was put in less than a year after the County acquired it or before the County acquired it and it was a commercial marina. So we're going to maintain the existing bulk head and the proposal is for a board walk along the bulk head with two sitting areas that are here, a small parking area on the north end of the property. And this white and green area that you see throughout that isn't boardwalk is proposed for native planting, typical seaside species and those are identified in the EAF. It's passive park --

MR. BORKOWSKI:

Timber rail.

MR. GIBBONS:

Oh, fencing. Yeah, Timber fencing rail along the -- parallel to Clyde Street to hopefully deter people from driving into the property which is a problem we have right now. Currently we have a snow fence along

Clyde Street and it's cut down weekly and people go in to mainly park down by the water and have a view of the way. It's hard pack enough right now to drive a two wheel drive in there no problem, the idea would be to fluff everything up, cart away that top layer of C&D, put down a subbase, probably sand, and then some top dressing to support cedar and golden rod and beach grass and that kind of thing. Questions?

MS. ESPOSITO:  
I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Go ahead.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
The 3.4 acres of invasive plant species that you'll be removing from the wetlands, are you going to be removing them all manually or were you planning on using any kind of mechanical equipment or any kind of herbicides?

MR. GIBBONS:  
Are you looking on page two?

MS. ESPOSITO:  
Yes.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Yeah, it's not in a wetland per se.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
Well, it says further on in the document that it's fragmities that will be removed and other wetland.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Page five, number eleven in the description of the conditions in terms of plants, species, certainly there are fragmities there and that is the predominant species. The area that it's growing is not wetland but disturbed upland site.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
Okay. How are you going to -- are you going to be using --

MR. GIBBONS:  
Mechanically.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
That's really -- okay, then it doesn't matter to me.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Oh, okay. Yeah, mechanically.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
So there's no herbicides that are going to be planted and used for fragmities.

MR. GIBBONS:  
No, right.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Larry?

MR. SWANSON:  
How do you --

LEG. FIELDS:  
Larry, you have to use the microphone.

MR. SWANSON:  
Since fragmities grows by rhizomes as well as seed, how do you go about removing the rhizomes and over what area? I mean, it's likely spread much further than just where the plant is.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Right, we're planning on using a pay loader to scrape off the two foot and a half to two feet of what's currently on the site which is predominantly C & D and fill material that was brought in presumably to get what was a wetland at one time up to grade so that they could develop it. And our feeling is once we take that away and the evasive -- at least the invasive strain of fragmities seems to do better by rhizome than by seed, we don't really anticipate a problem after the material is removed with the seed colonizing fragmities again.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Nancy?

MS. MANFREDONIA:  
I just have a question. Exactly where are the structures, the Blue Point buildings, the red buildings?

MR. GIBBONS:  
The existing Blue Points Company --

MS. MANFREDONIA:  
Yeah.

MR. GIBBONS:  
-- is right in this corner here along the bay front. And it's on this side is our property, on the far side, if you are familiar with it, is Kingston and that area.

MS. MANFREDONIA:  
And the parking area up there, is that County owned too?

MR. GIBBONS:  
Yes, it is.

MS. MANFREDONIA: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Tom?

MR. CRAMER:  
A couple of things. The -- is it already parkland?

MR. GIBBONS:  
Yes, it is.

MR. CRAMER:  
It's bought as parkland and it's in parkland.

MR. GIBBONS:  
That's right.

MR. CRAMER:  
Okay. With regard to removing the fragmities, you're going to drop that down below the tidal range or into the tidal range?

MR. GIBBONS:  
No, that wasn't the plan, no. The bulk heading and the sheathing on that area -- most of the fragmities runs along, right along the existing bulk head. And we had no fragmities at the time, essentially no fragmities when we took it over, and evidently they maintained it.

MR. CRAMER:  
So you're just going to remove it then, backfill fill it.

MR. GIBBONS:  
That's right.

MR. CRAMER:  
Okay.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
And replant.

MR. GIBBONS:  
That area right along -- I just want to point out, that isn't existing the boardwalk, we would add the boardwalk. So we would be backfilling, construction of the boardwalk and then we'd start planting.

MR. CRAMER:  
How far back does the fragmities come?

MR. GIBBONS:  
Oh, almost to the road in some spots. And the scale on this is --

MR. BORKOWSKI:  
This is like 30.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Thirty feet, so it's approximately 125 feet back from the water.



CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Lance, did you have a question?

MR. MALLAMO:  
Yes. Legislator Fields, could you just tell us the latest status of the Bluepoints Property?

LEG. FIELDS:  
He apparently has come up with a plan and he submitted it to Islip Town and they're preparing to come up with a date for a public hearing. I saw a preliminary copy of the plan the other day and it looked to be as though he were putting parking places in the road. Now, I don't know who owns that road in front of Bluepoints, but it didn't seem that it should be done.

I also wanted to point out that prior to us purchasing the property there were buildings and a lot of pavings, and once the asphalt was removed and the buildings were removed now you have seen these fragmities growing there.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:  
We have had the property probably two-and-a-half years now --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Judy, you have to identify yourself.

COMMISSIONER GORDON:  
I'm sorry. Judith Gordon from the Parks Department.

LEG. FIELDS:  
The new Parks Commissioner, I might add, as of last night.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Congratulations.

APPLAUSE

COMMISSIONER GORDON:  
Oh, thank you, please. We have had the property approximately two-and-a-half years now and I guess over the course of the first six months that we owned it, that's when the buildings were starting to be taken down. And it's unbelievable the amount of invasives that have come into the site just in the short period of time, really incredible. And I don't know whether you have pictures of how it looked when it was developed, but there were quite a few buildings on there and a lot of concrete, there was a lot of stuff taken out of there, awful lot of stuff.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Joy, you had a question?

MS. SQUIRES:  
Are you pursuing grants? We've noticed that there seemed to be many grants available for restoration of the type that you're doing. And perhaps, I don't know if you are looking for grant funding --

MR. GIBBONS:  
We're not in this particular case, no.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
You mean brown fields restoration?

MS. SQUIRES:  
No, no, I mean wetlands restoration. There seem to be not only Federal grants but State grants that you can pursue for restoration.

MR. GIBBONS:  
This would really -- a lot of those grant programs need to demonstrate some sort of habitat benefit --

MS. SQUIRES:  
Okay, I understand.

MR. GIBBONS:  
For wildlife; this won't be that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Any other questions? If not, I'll entertain a motion.

MR. CRAMER:  
Motion for an Unlisted Type I; Type I Neg Dec.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
I have a motion. Do I have a second?

MR. MALLAMO:  
Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Second by Lance. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried.  
*Approved (Vote: 8-0-0-1 Not Present: Mr. Finkenberg). Thank you.*

Next tabled project is *Proposed Improvements and Expansion of Indian Islands Campground in the Town of Riverhead.*

MR. GIBBONS:  
Nick Gibbons, Suffolk County Parks. I would like to start with a confession.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
I don't have a color.

MR. GIBBONS:  
You're already shaking your head.

MR. KAUFMAN:  
As (inaudible), I can take confessions.

MR. GIBBONS:  
I came to find out yesterday afternoon that I prepared the EAF based on the second to last set of plans.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ: Okay.

MR. GIBBONS:

The only difference between the second to last and the final plans are that there's a proposal for a gazebo, you might recall from the last meeting, in the middle of each group camping area for a total of four. They're approximately 400 square feet each for 1,600 square feet. Now, I'm not sure exactly how you want to handle it but if you're willing to consider an amended EAF that we can agree to here today to --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That's fine. I mean, you're talking about four gazebos as opposed to --

MR. GIBBONS:

None.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That's fine. I mean, the gazebos are very small structures.

MR. GIBBONS:

Four hundred square feet each, so we can change those square footage development numbers and --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I don't have a problem with that if we're going to take action on it because it's a small, really small change.

MR. GIBBONS:

Okay then. I have some photos to pass out of the campground. And I wanted to point out, you'll see in the project description there's really three components to the project. One is in the improvements to the existing campground and group camping areas and that is -- I'll just go through these, it's a reconfiguration of the layout of the campground, this is tent camping, car camping type of thing, from 50 to 36 sites, so there is a loss there. But our feeling is if we rearrange things properly, the property can better handle less sites than more and this was just sort of thrown together 30 years ago, the layout of this place. Now, the removal of the living, dead and dying trees is necessary for this realignment and they're replanting where appropriate and where the layout will allow for all with native species; I know that was an issue as well last time around. And I will show you in the pictures what we mean by dying trees or trees that are in a condition where we don't feel they're salvageable and the better route would be to remove them and then replant, and we can talk about that. And then we also propose in this phase to -- or this component of the project to bring electric and water utilities to each of the camp sites. And then finally, the construction of paved -- and paving of eight pull-through camp sites and that means a pick-up truck with a trailer on it, you drive right through, there's no need for backup, you continue on when you leave, and I'll point those out.

The second component is the reconfiguration of the existing group camping areas numbers one, two and three, and they currently have ten campsites each, to consolidating them to two group camping areas, each

with 15 sites; so there's no net loss of camping capacity there, it's going from three of 10 each to two with 15 each. And again, it includes that evaluation of the existing trees and what can or can't be saved and what can or can't be replaced and similarly, the extension of the utilities to serve those areas.

The third and final component is the development of an entirely new group camping area. This would require the clearing of an area which I brought pictures to show you what the current conditions look like. We would then establish 15 campsites within that group area and again expand utilities, electric and water, to serve those.

I don't have a -- something to show you on a board, but I would like to come up to you with the plan so we can look at the layout. I will pass these photos around. The first set of photos I'm going to pass are of the existing group and ten camping areas, it shows the trees and the condition of which they're in currently. It shows the inadequate current utilities, we have an electrical box that you come up to and plug in whatever it is you brought with you and it sort of -- one serves 15 people at any one time.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Nick, this isn't in the Pine Barrens, is it?

MR. GIBBONS:  
This is in Indian Island Park which is not.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Okay.

MR. GIBBONS:  
It's not in the CGA, that's where I thought it was but apparently not, no. Did I -- I'm just looking to see if I included any plan --

MR. BORKOWSKI:  
No, there's no reduction. I'm passing around the reduction now.

MR. GIBBONS:  
I made the mistake of thinking we could pour over the plans around the table.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Do you want us to go over there? I don't have a problem getting up and walking over there; would you rather do that?

MR. GIBBONS:  
If maybe everybody could look at it at once, that might be --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
If everybody promises they're not going to talk while they're over there.

MR. GIBBONS:  
That sounds good, that way we can look at the full set of plans.

And just understand, this is the second to last set. I'll point out the gazebo area, that's the major change. We'll start with the existing conditions. Okay, this is the existing conditions for the -- this is the tent and car camping area and currently there are 50 sites spread out among here. This is the existing conditions for the group camping area, we have four areas currently, one, two, three, and four. This area, I will point out again, is the area proposed for the new group camping area. This is a greater detail of tent and car camping area, it shows the new layout of the sites and the pull-through sites are down on this end here and you'll notice on here as well. This would be paved, these roads would be paved, you drive right through and continue through the site and the realignment, again, of sites. The X'd out circles, Ralph, are?

MR. BORKOWSKI:  
Tree removal.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Tree removal, right, and proposed planting of trees; I'm not sure which is which.

MR. BORKOWSKI:  
The star-shaped is Evergreen, and Pitch Pine and dark circles.

MR. GIBBONS:  
The oak -- this says White Pine but I had asked Ralph about the appropriateness of Pitch Pine, so we're going to do that instead. And again, for the group areas same thing in terms of tree removal and replacement, this is in relation to what we just looked at. So where we had three groups areas here, this would now be two, this would be the new area altogether and this is the existing as well, group area four. And you can see the extension of utilities as well. And I think that's all the relevant details that you would be interested in. Oh, the gazebos, I'm sorry. This is the primary difference between the two plans.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Did those pictures make it around of the existing conditions? Okay. And then the last two photos I want to pass around are the existing conditions for the proposed new group area, that's an area that has no disturbance to speak of.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Does anybody have any questions; Larry?

MR. SWANSON:  
Yes. On the form, page four and page five it asks you questions about sanitary sewage to be generated, solid waste clearing and water usage. I know some of those calculations are probably not easy but nevertheless, it seems to me that we should have some idea of how much sewage and solid waste are going to be generated on a daily basis, how much water is going to be used. And I'm sure that there are means to estimate that for park usage.

The other thing that I'd like to see in here is that, in fact, the County is committed to recycling in the County parks and I don't see indication of that.

MR. GIBBONS:  
In the solid waste category?

MR. SWANSON:  
Correct.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
I think the Health Department does have sanitary flow factors, you could probably assume maximum occupancy and then just use the factor to multiply.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Right. I wouldn't even -- we don't expect any increase, in fact, in some cases maybe a decrease in that we're losing -- we have a net loss of at least the -- in the campground area where we would require self-contained if you have -- if you're bringing in a trailer. Right, it would be useful to have a better quantification or any quantification at all in terms of those numbers in terms of the clearing or demolition debris and that's sort of contingent on whether or not we decide to expand and to what extent. But I could address those.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Right, but certainly you can make a projection, you know how many trees you're removing, you have a plan.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Right.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
You can do some calculation based on that.

MR. GIBBONS:  
That's right. And then if you want, I can quantify also the proposed replacement of those trees and you could compare those numbers, if you'd like.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Any other questions?

MS. MANFREDONIA:  
Yeah. I'm curious, are we sticking with the same amount of tent camping sites that you had before, are there less or more?

MR. GIBBONS:  
Less, and the reason is just what we have currently is too crowded as it is, the 50 sites in that group area. I'm sorry, the camping area, the tent camping area would be reduced to 30, they would be bigger sites and we'd put some planting -- the idea is to plant some buffers between them, put up some split rail fencing to better demark where those sites actually begin and end. Our experience has been when we've

done that there's less complaints and the property can handle the capacity better, whereas what we have now is sort of a free-for-all.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Okay. But I guess what I'm concerned about is do you think 30 will be enough for people who want to just tent instead of bringing an RV and stuff?

MR. GIBBONS:

Right. Based on current use of the park, it's never a problem, the capacity for that.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

For the tent.

MR. GIBBONS:

Right.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

The second question is if you're going to add, it looks like a half of mile of paved roads, is that -- do you feel that that's really necessary or is there some way to do it so it doesn't look so -- I don't know, it just takes away the ambiance of being in a campground with the paved roads.

MR. GIBBONS:

Right.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

And of course, the other problem is people go a lot faster then.

MR. GIBBONS:

Where is that, Nancy, the half of mile?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Somewhere in here it said you're going to add --

MR. GIBBONS:

There's some paving for those --

MS. MANFREDONIA:

-- paved roads.

MR. GIBBONS:

There's some paving for those pull-through sites.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Is that it, so it's not the road itself?

MR. GIBBONS:

That is already paved.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Okay, so it's just to pull in to some sights, is that what it is?

MR. GIBBONS:

Right, there's some slabs on the sites, those pull-through sites, and the road itself that you access those sites with.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Okay. It just has --

MR. GIBBONS:

On page three?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

On page five, I guess, it says zero presently and .5 after completion, roads or parking I guess.

MR. GIBBONS:

Oh, a half acre, I'm sorry.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Oh, yeah, I'm sorry. So that's just -- that's not -- so it's not really roads, it's parking areas or pull-throughs or something?

MR. GIBBONS:

Right.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Gotcha. Okay, thank you.

MR. GIBBONS:

Everything pretty much you see that's a road here is paved already.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Gotcha. Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Adrienne, do you have a question?

MS. ESPOSITO:

Nick, last month we talked a little bit about how many of the live or mature trees would be removed.

MR. GIBBONS:

Right.

MS. ESPOSITO:

And I see in the third component of this you have an estimate of approximately 50 mature trees to be removed for the development of the new camping area.

MR. GIBBONS:

Right.

MS. ESPOSITO:

But it still doesn't say anything about -- it just says as necessary for the other two components.



MR. GIBBONS:  
That's right.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
But you have them all plotted out on the map there, how many you'll be removing, or so it looked. So I was wondering --

MR. GIBBONS:  
Right, that's true. This is sort of a worst case scenario, I think, these plans, the idea being we get the approval for the maximum number and then hopefully we can back down from that. It's going to be up to whoever does the development to decide whether or not the tree is salvageable or not. If you look at the photos, it seems like they all look good to us, they're green and they're --

MS. ESPOSITO:  
That's what I was noticing.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Right, and I had a close-up right at the base of one of the trunks of the tree. It was a split tree but it just showed the compaction right around there and the continuing exposure of the roots and it's been recommended to us that those trees should be removed as a maintenance headache and not really a healthy situation for the tree. And then we could break up the ground around that to do the replanting and sort of making buffer areas within the group area that people wouldn't constantly be driving over.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
So Nick, what you're saying is that some of this has to be a field decision?

MR. GIBBONS:  
That's right.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
All right. Is the Parks Department going to supervise this?

MR. GIBBONS:  
I'll personally be supervising it, but the work won't be done by --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Right, but then maybe to address the concern, which I happen to share, and since you are going to modify the EAF anyway, can you -- and you're expressing to us that this is a worst case, could you say not to exceed --

MR. GIBBONS:  
Sure.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
-- X number of trees that way you have a way to quantify the effect?

MR. GIBBONS:  
Sure, I could do that.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Because last time we discussed some of the trees would be removed would be the ones that had been already negatively impacted, but some you mentioned are fine and just need to be removed because of the design.

MR. GIBBONS:

The layout?

MS. ESPOSITO:

Yes.

MR. GIBBONS:

That's what's expressed here, but I'd like to believe that we can alter this. We don't have -- at least in the group areas we don't have designated sites that are set in stone, we can move those around to manipulate and work around what we can salvage and that's what we would be looking to do.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other questions?

MR. CRAMER:

Jim, did you review the part two on this?

MR. BAGG:

No, I haven't.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, I think that based upon what Larry has asked for and based upon what Adrienne has asked for, I'm going to ask for a motion to table. And I'm also going to ask that you review the part two and when you get the amended EAF, which I'm sure that Nick will get to you in a timely manner, you modify or whatever the part two so it's recommended to CEQ in a form that staff approves it and when we'll take a look at it, okay?

MR. KAUFMAN:

Motion to table.

MR. BAGG:

I'll bring the whole package back.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay, I have a motion to table. Do I have a second?

MR. SWANSON:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a second by Larry Swanson. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried. *Tabled (Vote: 9-0-0-1 Not Present: Mr. Finkenberg).*

MR. GIBBONS:  
I'm sorry. What specifically in Part II, Tom, was --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
No, it's Jim that has to handle the part two.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Oh, okay.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Because the part two is really the responsibility of the lead agency which is the Legislature. So you've done the part II, Jim will review it, if there are any changes he'll make them and recommend them to the Council.

MR. GIBBONS:  
But you didn't have any concerns specifically on that.

MR. CRAMER:  
No.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
So you're adding the gazebos, you're doing the solid waste, the water use, the sanitary flow and the not to exceed trees in the various camp areas.

MR. GIBBONS:  
That's right.

MR. SWANSON:  
And the recycling.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
And the recycling which was the solid waste issue. Okay? Thank you, Sir.

Proposed Construction of a Maintenance Building at Timber Point Country Club, Town of Islip; I assume that's you, Nick?

MR. GIBBONS:  
Yes, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
All right, we'll give you a couple of minutes.

Oh, actually, I skipped on the agenda. The next is the *Proposed Improvement of Hauppauge Youth Organization Sports Complex, Town of Islip*.

MR. GIBBONS:  
Thank you then. I'll be back.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Who is here to speak to us on this?

MR. BORKOWSKI:  
We have Paul Dill from Hauppauge Youth Organization to speak about this project. He's been to DEC, as you know, and asked to report on it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Why don't you just give two seconds of background for those who may not know why it's back.

MR. BORKOWSKI:  
Okay. The Hauppauge Youth Organization is leasing ball fields from the County, they chose to do some clearing of a wetland area to expand their ball fields. They took this upon themselves to do it without any permits and got caught and now they're here. They have now gone to DEC, they were in violation and have now -- is trying to rectify the whole situation.

MR. DILL:  
Okay. Obviously my name is Paul Dill, I represent the Hauppauge Youth Organization and I guess I'm here to answer any of your questions. I supplied you with a survey of the way the ball field was originally and then another plan of how we plan to modify it. They also handed you an order of consent from the DEC.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Which you are in the process of complying with?

MR. DILL:  
Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Do you want to just briefly advise the Council as to what you are proposing to do, because it's been a while since you've been here. If you can just run us through the plan quickly.

MR. DILL:  
Essentially, we are going to put a building in the center of the field, a block building with bathrooms and a concession and reverse the field so that they play out away from the building. That's the whole plan, essentially.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
And do you need a permit from the DEC to do this or are they permitting it through their order on consent process?

MR. DILL:  
Right, once you violate like we did you no longer need a permit you get an order of consent; it's an all-in-one kind of thing.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Ralph, DPW is supervising this now?

MR. BORKOWSKI:  
Apparently we are -- will be reviewing the plans.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Will anybody from the County be performing any inspections?

MR. BORKOWSKI:  
I believe so, yes. I haven't talked to anybody about that but I would have to make the assumption there will be.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Anybody have any questions or comments? Nancy.

MS. MANFREDONIA:  
No.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Larry?

MR. SWANSON:  
First of all, I think it's imperative that the County does provide inspections. But I was wondering, on page four you talk about water usage, it says you're using 16,000 gallons of water per day; is that in fact correct?

MR. DILL:  
I would -- what page was it again?

MR. SWANSON:  
Page four.

MR. DILL:  
Yes, to water the ball fields. I'm not sure that that's a per day thing, that would be a maximum per day in the heat of the summer. I wouldn't say that that's a per day every day; obviously it's not at all during the winter, so.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
You're using Water Authority and on-site well?

MR. DILL:  
No, we currently use the Water Authority. We had talked about at some point putting a well in, there are plans at this point to put that well in.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Okay. So then what we should do is modify the EAF. The EAF says Suffolk County Water Authority and well water, so I assume you're not using well water and a well isn't part of this action.

MR. DILL:  
Correct.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Okay, so we're going to take that off. Who pays the Water Authority bills?

MR. DILL:  
HYL.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Okay, so then you do have some idea of the water you use, right?

MR. DILL:  
We do and we don't. The -- actually the sprinkler system was in such disrepair it hasn't been used for years, we only just started repairing it. I mean, it was there --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
So when you reconfigure the ball fields you're going to install a new -- or you're going to make sure that it's in good repair and you're going to start to irrigate the fields, is that the idea?

MR. DILL:  
Yes, correct.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Okay.

MR. SWANSON:  
Do you use any fertilizers or anything in the ball fields?

MR. DILL:  
We haven't up until -- no, not currently, no.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Do you intend to?

MR. DILL:  
We intend to fertilize the grass, yes.

MR. SWANSON:  
So that should be part of --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
That has to be shown on here, yes.

MR. SWANSON:  
Number of pounds per acre and what the chemicals are. Are you going to use any herbicides?

MR. DILL:  
No.

MR. SWANSON:  
Weed control?

MR. DILL: No.

MR. CRAMER:  
Do you have Health Department permits for the sanitary systems and the rest rooms?

MR. DILL:

Not yet because we had to get through this part of it first, then that's the next part. That all comes with a building permit through DPW.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Have you submitted an application yet to the Health Department?

MR. DILL: No.

MR. CRAMER:

It looks like from your quantities and your designs on page three that it doesn't appear to meet County standards as far as the sanitary system. And then also with a concession, what type of concession stand are you talking about?

MR. DILL:

We sell candy, soda, hot chocolate, coffee.

MR. CRAMER:

Hot dogs, hamburgers?

MR. DILL:

No hamburgers. Once in a while we have a little hot dog machine, we sell hot dogs, pretzels.

MR. SWANSON:

Based on what you just said, it seems also on page three that there is a missing element dealing with solid waste generated.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I'd like to backup a minute. Could you tell me, first of all, the building itself, it's going to be in the middle of the fields and how far is the building going to be from the wetlands line?

MR. DILL:

Okay. If you look on the plan that I gave you, the field closest to the building, so that would be the one in the northwest corner, just to give you an idea, it's 210 feet from home plate to that outfield fence. So I would say the building is approximately 235 feet from the building -- I mean, the building is 235 feet from the wetlands buffer and it's probably -- so that would make it 335 feet or 340 feet from the actual wetland boundary.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

All right. When you say you have to remove another half acre of vegetation and you have several mature trees, what are we talking about?

MR. DILL:

Where did you see that?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Well, it says acreage of vegetation or covered to be removed is a half acre, that's on page two. And somewhere else in here it had --

MR. DILL:

That was done already, that was what we got in trouble for.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

All right, so that's been removed already.

MR. DILL:

Correct. The only thing that still needs to be cleared, again, on the plan that I gave you in the northeast -- no, northwest corner there's a cross-hatched area, that's the only part of the area that still needs to be cleared. And I want to say maybe, maybe there's seven or eight trees there, I'm not even sure there are seven or eight trees there.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Why do you have to clear that land?

MR. DILL:

Because of where the football field sits, you know, from a safety standpoint.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I would feel real happy to know how big the trees are and if there's any other way to save them since you guys have taken down so many big trees and the DEC is requiring you to put up one inch caliper trees which are going to take a heck of a long time to get back. So, I mean, several trees, five trees, ten trees, are they little trees, big trees?

MR. DILL:

They aren't that big of trees. But in essence, the DEC did approve that to take down those trees, that also is within their buffer.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I think we need clarification on how much property you're actually clearing. You said that the .5 acres in the EAF has already been removed, so I'm not sure what you're asking for then. I mean, how much acreage, what is the vegetation --

MR. DILL:

I'm sorry, I just included it in the EAF what we already cleared. We're not really asking for anything.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Adrienne, what he's representing, I think, is that this project includes clearing of a half an acre, some of which he did illegally which is part of the order on consent. But I think what he's saying to us, and I'm not saying it's right, it's not right, is that total for the implementation of this project he needs to clear a half an acre and that little cross piece is included in the half acre; is that what you're saying?

MR. DILL:

Correct.



MR. MALLAMO:

Why can't the football field be moved to the south, it looks like you have plenty of room there, and that could be left in tact.

MR. DILL:

Essentially, because when we -- that's where we practice is that south area there and when we practice we tear up the field. There are lights here if you look. When we practice we practice under the lights, we don't play under the lights but because of the season that football is played in we practice under the lights. So the further north the football field can go the less damage that's done to the playing surface, you know, during practice time.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

I think under the circumstances, in my opinion anyway, you should do everything you possibly can to avoid cutting down any more big trees. And if it means that you have to move your fields, in my opinion, you ought to do it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Also, Jim just handed me minutes of the CEQ's January 16th, 2002, meeting and there was -- there were several very specific things that were required by the CEQ for this EAF. And what I'd like to do is just kind of go down them --

MR. DILL:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

-- so that you can point out to us where they are, and if they're not in there then you can come back to us with an amended EAF that has them. A copy of the lease agreement?

MR. BORKOWSKI:

We submitted that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Fine. The project description stating exactly what the project is, what changes from existing conditions will take place, I think that is shown on the maps; a site map of existing condition should be -- existing site condition should be included indicating, A, the exact boundaries the acreage of the leased property, the DEC Fresh Water Wetlands boundary and a hundred foot adjacent area; the existing facilities; the area and acreage of the previously cleared woodland which was not authorized, a project site map indicating the proposed facilities existing woodland as well as the fresh water wetlands boundary and buffer area. The EAF should clearly acknowledge that unauthorized clearing conducted by the HYO has taken place, it should indicate what additional clearing is necessary in the acreage. The status of the local residents complaint to DEC should be explained, the HYO should acknowledge in the EAF that they are responsible to pay any fines or restoration work required by the DEC with respect to Fresh Water Wetlands if, in fact, such is required; the status of the DEC Fresh Water Wetlands permit, if required, should be explained and a copy of the wetlands application appended to the EAF.

Since the proposed rest rooms need Suffolk County Health Department approval, comments from the Department of Health Services should be appended to the EAF as to whether the proposed facility could meet their standards, I think that's something that Mr. Cramer raised. And while I agree that the Health Department can't give you a permit because one of the things that they require is a SEQRA determination, they routinely process permit applications and provide you with comments, and one of their comments is a little box that they check off saying SEQRA determination. Since the Department of Public Works Building Division must approve the facilities comments from DPW as to whether or not the proposed facilities meet their requirements should be appended to the EAF. Detailed information regarding irrigation and site drainage should be shown on the proposed facilities map and explained in the EAF. The EAF should clearly state that there are no plans for lighting at this time and any future plans for such will be submitted to CEO prior to construction." Lance?

MR. MALLAMO:

I had a question about the lighting because I thought -- and I don't have the lease in front of me -- that there was a restriction on lighting, maybe that came up at the January meeting, and you just indicated there is lighting there.

MR. DILL:

Okay.

MR. MALLAMO:

So does anybody know, is lighting permitted under the lease agreement?

MR. DILL:

The Legislature installed the lighting, so the lighting is permitted.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

The County installed the lighting?

MR. DILL:

Yes.

MR. MALLAMO:

Was it permitted.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That wasn't the question.

MR. MALLAMO:

Do you know when that was installed?

MR. DILL:

Two years ago. I mean, I'm being a little general but I believe there was -- as a matter of fact, I know it was exactly two years ago.

MR. BAGG:

That was submitted -- the lighting -- excuse me. The lighting was done with a Legislative grant, it was not the County who constructed the lighting.

MR. DILL:

The County subbed the job out, we had nothing to do with it, we just showed up one day and the light were there.

MR. BORKOWSKI:

It was done by the County.

MR. DILL:

DPW did it. As a matter of fact, I pulled the original survey from that plan that you had created for the lights; not you necessarily, Mr. Bagg.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ: Yes?

MR. CRAMER:

Getting back to the clearing again, you said it's going to -- the half acre that you show is what's already been cleared on the site?

MR. DILL:

Part of the half acre that we show is what's already been cleared, yes.

MR. CRAMER:

Just looking at it quickly, you show a hundred foot buffer which was there originally and then you look at the size of it, it's probably at least 400 feet long, that's certainly greater than a half acre.

MR. DILL:

Oh, no, no, what we cleared -- that's why I amended the EAF. In the original EAF I wanted to use all of that land. I had -- yes, we did do it, we did break the law, we didn't do it knowingly, we felt we were doing a good thing, it turned out that we weren't, but we did clear a lot more than a half an acre.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I think that was Adrienne's question originally.

MR. CRAMER:

Yeah, that was the question.

MR. DILL:

Yes, we did clear more than a half an acre, that's not what we -- we've amended our own plans. The original plans called for a 90 foot baseball diamond and a 75 foot baseball diamond, the new plans don't anymore, we've downsized it. You know, this is a new plan, this is all we're requiring now to build it back. If you want to know the original, how much we cleared, it is on the survey. Almost everything you ask for is on the survey with the exception of that --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

The Health Department.

MR. DILL:

-- the Health Department and that's only because I didn't know you could get it without, you know --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
You should file an application.

MR. DILL:  
Right, but we don't even have a plan for the building until we get to that. But I'm sorry, going back to that, we did clear and it is written on the survey, the original survey that I gave you that approximately three quarters of an acre point or -- the surveyor wrote it in there, I mean, point eight-tenths of an acre is what I cleared.

MR. CRAMER:  
But that acreage is not in the EAF, all you --

MR. DILL:  
It's on the survey.

MR. CRAMER:  
All you provided in the EAF itself was the area that you're going to leave remain cleared.

MR. DILL:  
Right, which is what the project -- that's what my project called for.

MR. CRAMER:  
But you don't reflect the areas that are being restored or anything else in the EAF.

MR. DILL:  
No, but there is a survey that shows it. I mean, I don't -- I mean, should the EAF show what it is that I'm asking for or should it show --

MR. CRAMER:  
I just want to be clear on that and I want the Council to be clear on it because there was some confusion here as far as what exactly you were showing on there.

MR. DILL:  
I'm merely showing what we need now to do the project.

MR. CRAMER:  
So you are going to leave --

MR. DILL:  
Not what we did when we violated the wetlands boundary, not what we originally cleared --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
We're not trying to give you a hard time.

MR. DILL:  
No, no, I understand that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Please understand.

MR. DILL:

I understand, but I'm confused. I'm not trying to give you a hard time either, it's just that I get confused.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

What I'm going to do is I'm going to ask Ralph to do something.

MR. DILL:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I'm going to -- and I'm not going to ask him to do it now. I'm going to ask Ralph to call Jim and I'm going to ask Jim and Ralph to go over all the things that were required pursuant to that January 16th, 2002, CEQ meeting, so that you could go back and speak with Mr. Dill. And you know, this is -- even though Mr. Dill is doing it, this is a DPW project. So I think if you work with Jim and Mr. Dill to respond to all of those things and also the things that may have been raised today, submit a revised EAF, I would like to get this done, dispose of it and have Mr. Dill stop being subjected to our interrogation. Okay? But I want it done correctly, and I think that's what everybody wants. I don't think that anybody has any animosity toward the project, we just want to get it done right.

MR. BORKOWSKI:

That's not a problem at all. I just wanted to say, Mr. Dill wanted to get on this is agenda quickly, there wasn't really sufficient time to get him on this month's agenda to really do a full review.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That's why we got it mailed separately to us, I know. Tom has one more question.

MR. CRAMER:

One thing that hasn't been shown on the plans is grading and drainage for the facility.

MR. DILL:

We don't plan to -- I don't know what the original drainage is, we're not doing anything to modify the drainage or the topography of the land, we're not changing anything.

MR. CRAMER:

Well, that isn't shown on the plan as far as how the site drains, how it's graded and that's important to know what's happening as far as the wetlands go. You know, are you going to be draining it all off, is there going to be the potential for erosion, are there steep slopes in the area; this is the type of information that really should be shown on the plan.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

And drainage information was requested in January, it was one of the items that I read off. Okay? Anything else before I entertain -- go ahead.

MR. MALLAMO:

I think, too, I would like to see the plan for the building. You know, we just have a foot print here where there's going to be a building, but we'd like to know what it's going to look like, what the facilities are going to be.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Absolutely.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

And I do think the EAF should reflect that it is a vista for the community. I mean, now that we have so little open space, I don't think you can say that it's not a vista for the community. So I think the appearance of the whole site is important.

MR. MALLAMO:

I'm going to ask you to look again at possibly moving that football field. Because frankly, I looked at this site. I know there were many huge trees taken down and to be replaced with one inch trees just doesn't cut it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, the Council certainly -- understanding the order on consent and the DEC's jurisdiction, the Council certainly has the right to request that DPW require more substantial plans, what the order on consent requires is the minimum the DEC will accept. So that's something, you know, we can request. Okay? I'll entertain -- Adrienne?

MS. ESPOSITO:

Also, I was going to say, the EAF should reflect I think that you'll be using fertilizers and where they'll be used in in relationship to the wetlands would also be important.

MR. SWANSON:

Is the County building the building or is it been with private funds?

MR. DILL:

With private. The County is supplying some of the money, not enough to put the building up but some of it.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

But it's not a County building design, you're designing it --

MR. DILL:

Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

-- you're contracting it, you're doing it.

MR. DILL:

Correct.

MR. SWANSON:

So will it have to get approval of the County?

MR. BAGG: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I'll entertain a motion to table if there are no other questions. Nancy, you have another question?

MS. MANFREDONIA:

No, just a motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I have a motion to table, a second by Lance Mallamo. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried.

*Tabled (Vote: 7-0-0-2 Not Present: Legislator Fields & Mr. Finkenberg).*

*Proposed construction of a Maintenance Building at Timber Point Country Club, Town of Islip. Nick, or Judy.*

COMMISSIONER GORDON:

While Nick is getting set up, I just wanted to -- we have Nick Gibbons here who is going to explain any questions in the EAF. We also have the consulting architect, Larry Feeley from Ward Associates who's done the building design.

The current maintenance building that's at Timber Point is woefully inadequate and we need to put in a new building and Nick will explain how we've looked at various sites within the park. We are also in the process of adding new employees. You're probably aware that we've done an extensive improvement project that's just about complete over at Timber point and this new maintenance building will just support that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Okay, thank you.

MR. GIBBONS:

I'm going to try this one sitting down. I gave plans on either side to be passed around. There are two sheets, one is -- shows the elevation and footprint of the proposed building and the other is a location map.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

It's a nice maintenance building.

MR. GIBBONS:

Yes, it is; it's not cheap either.

MR. MALLAMO:

Well, I'll add --

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

So we suspect.

MR. MALLAMO:

I was very surprised, when I saw this in the packet I thought, "Oh,

no," and when I looked at the design I was very, very happy. It's a nice building.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Maybe you should stop now.

MR. GIBBONS:  
We're done?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Go quickly.

MR. GIBBONS:  
The EAF only really addresses the project site, obviously not the entire 227 acres that makes up Timber Point Country Club but the zero point nine acres that is the project site. The photos I passed around show the current conditions of that site where we have the old stable building some of you might be familiar with. It's not possible to salvage any aspect of that building as the stalls that were constructed are load bearing, so there's no use for us for the building nor can we incorporate the existing slab that it's on into the new footprint of the 10,000 square foot building. The existing building is 3,600 square feet.

We did consider two other locations for the maintenance building. One of those was over by the Horan House where we have our existing maintenance facility. We are planning on continuing to use that building, that maintenance building for storage and this would become the principal maintenance area; we've simply outgrown that area. Again, anyone who is familiar with that knows how inadequate that area is, it's directly adjacent to the New York State Title Wetlands and the Horan House limits our ability to develop the entire site over there.

The other proposal, proposed location was between two holes on the golf course. And as you know, there's been quite a bit of time and effort and money spent on improving the golf course and we were not receptive to the idea of placing the maintenance facility between two holes and impacting vistas. And I have that location if anybody is interested.

So we did decide on the existing disturbed site where the stable building is and that's the proposal you have in front of you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Anybody have any questions; Nancy?

MS. MANFREDONIA:  
Okay, I know where the existing stable is. It always appeared to me that that was on State property, but that's County land?

MR. GIBBONS:  
Right, it's close but it's County.

MS. MANFREDONIA: Okay, good.



CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Any other questions? I'll entertain -- oh, you have a question?

MR. MALLAMO:

Yeah, could you just -- while it was a beautiful building, could you just -- maybe the architect could address what the building materials are?

MR. GIBBONS:

Sure. We thought that might be a question. Larry Feeley?

MR. FEELEY:

Larry Feeley from Ward Associates. The building basically would be a concrete block structure but what we would do to enhance the appearance would be to fur out the walls and cover it with cedar shingle, similar to the existing clubhouse. We probably would not make it white for obvious reasons because of the maintenance area. We may trim it in white and possibly go with natural colored shingles to blend into the natural area that it's located in. I haven't discussed that with the County yet, but I would -- that's my druthers if I had -- that would be my recommendation to the County.

MR. MALLAMO:

I think that would be my recommendation, too. And I know that the historic stable that was there before the newer stable was natural shingle, in fact, the clubhouse was natural shingle at one time so that would be appropriate. Now, the window detail, it shows here you have a divided sash above an open sash?

MR. FEELEY:

Yes, that's to, again, complement the existing clubhouse. The existing clubhouse has a myriad of different window mutant styles but predominantly you do have the six over one, let's put it that way. There's also a four over a two over a one also which was the original mutton styling.

MR. MALLAMO:

Well, I was glad to see you picked that up but I just want to be sure that that is the intent, that that's what's going to go in.

MR. FEELEY:

Yes.

MR. MALLAMO:

We're not going to see a substitute. And how about the chimney there, that's brick?

MR. FEELEY:

Yes, that's also to -- again, to allude to the existing clubhouse which has brick chimneys.

MR. MALLAMO:

Yes, I think you did a beautiful job. And the garage doors, are they just panel doors or are they glass?

MR. FEELEY:  
They'll probably just be panel doors, yeah, an insulated panel door.  
Because we are heating building we have to meet current energy code requirements.

MR. MALLAMO:  
And the roof is going to be asphalt shingles?

MR. FEELEY:  
Yes, I would say an architectural-type asphalt shingle to keep the cost down.

MR. MALLAMO:  
The color?

MR. FEELEY:  
Color, the existing clubhouse is black, we'll probably -- we will either go with --

MR. MALLAMO:  
Is it black? I thought the clubhouse was wood shingle.

MR. FEELEY:  
It was originally, it no longer is.

MR. MALLAMO:  
Has that been redone?

MR. MARTIN:  
The clubhouse is still asphalt shingle, right?

MR. FEELEY:  
Asphalt single, right.

MR. MALLAMO:  
I don't think it's black, I think it's a gray; could you just get it so that the color --

MR. FEELEY:  
Yeah, we could do that.

MR. MALLAMO:  
Whatever that is, have it --

MR. MARTIN:  
We have used brown shingles on historic buildings to give the look of a wood shingle.

MR. MALLAMO:  
Yeah. Well, whatever the club is, this building should be, too, so that they at least go together.

MR. FEELEY:  
Yeah, with a natural shingle we would probably not opt for black, we'd probably go more to a darker brown range, you know, to keep it

compatible within itself, I would think, so it wouldn't be such a contrast.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Okay? I'll entertain a motion.

MR. CRAMER:  
Motion.

MR. MALLAMO:  
Second.

MR. CRAMER:  
Unlisted Neg Dec.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
I have a second by Lance. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?  
Carried. *Approved (9-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Fields).*

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Thank you. Okay. Item four which is Suffolk County Department of  
Public Works 2003 Vector Control Plan of Work.

Before we start, I just want to comment that we have two pieces of  
correspondence. One piece of correspondence is dated September 16th,  
2002, from Ronald Klusner, the Supervisor -- he's signed as Supervisor  
of the Department of Environmental Control for the Town of Babylon.  
I'm not going to go into a whole detail about this, but he's opining  
why he thinks that this is a Type II Action.

The other thing that I got was something dated September 17, 2002,  
from Charles Wurster & Ernst Habicht regarding mosquito control in  
Suffolk County, and that looks to me as if it is most appropriately a  
comment on the scope. So Jim, although you'll put it in this file, I  
think you should also provide it to the representatives of CEQ which  
I'll mention in a moment who are working on the scope with DPW and  
also to DPW.

What I've done is I've asked Larry Swanson and Tom Cramer, given the  
aggressive schedule that DPW has relative to the scoping, to work with  
DPW and with the consultants to ensure that the comments are  
adequately incorporated into the final scope that will ultimately be  
recommended by the Council and promulgated, we assume, by the  
Legislature.

Now, relative to the 2003 work plan, I think that all of you -- and if  
you didn't you should have -- should have gotten a letter that I wrote  
to the County Attorney, which if you want I will read into the record.  
"Dear Mr. Cimino, it's my understanding that the Suffolk County  
Department of Public Works will be requesting that the Council on  
Environmental Quality, CEQ, review the proposed 2003 Annual Vector  
Control Plan and make recommendations to the Suffolk County  
Legislature as to the appropriate classification of the action and a

determination of significance pursuant to the State Environmental Quality Review Act and the implementing regulations therefore at 6NYCR or Part 617. As you may be aware, the CEQ has raised a question as to whether an independent review of the 2003 Annual Vector Control Plan would be appropriate given that the Suffolk County Legislature has issued a Positive Declaration on the Long-Term Plan. Specifically, the CEQ is concerned that a separate review of the 2003 Annual Plan may constitute improper segmentation. Accordingly, on behalf of the CEQ, I respectfully request a legal opinion as to the segmentation issue. Thank you for your kind consideration of this request."

And the CEQ members may remember that this was raised in the 2002 plan, it's been raised throughout this year. I haven't gotten a response to this. And I assume, or maybe incorrectly, that there's no one here from the County Attorney's Office who's about to give me an opinion on this, right? Okay. So then I'm going to entertain a motion to table and we're not going to consider this, unless someone has something else to say about it.

MS. ESPOSITO:  
Motion to table.

MR. CRAMER:  
Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Well, I have a motion to table, I have a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried. *Tabled (Vote: 7-0-0-2 Not Present: Legislator Fields & Mr. Finkenberg).*

Okay. Historic Services?

MR. MARTIN:  
Good morning.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Good morning.

MR. MARTIN:  
Just a few things to report on. With the information packet that Jim sent out on the Cornell Cooperative Extension Building?

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Yes.

MR. MARTIN:  
Just so that everyone notes, I did not mention on my presentation that it was reviewed by New York State to be eligible to the National Register, so if everyone is just aware of that. And also, the article that came out in the Riverhead newspaper, since that was published I have gotten a call from Richard Wines who is a member of the Riverhead Landmark Commission and he is in favor of trying to save the building and he was going to bring it up to the full commission and send a letter on to the CEQ.

Also, from last meeting we will be meeting this afternoon out at the airport to review the structures at the airport with Jim Warren from the New York State Office of Historic Preservation. The buildings were not covered in any existing surveys that the State conducted, so we'll be looking at those buildings today.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ: Good.

MR. MARTIN:

And finally, just to the report with our programming, we do have our Deepwells Fall Fair coming up in October and I hope you all make that. That's very popular and it's Saturday and Sunday, October 12th and 13th and from 10 to 5 and it's a great family event so I hope everyone will show up.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:  
Great. Any CAC concerns?

MS. SQUIRES:

Joy Squires. I left you a Smart Growth Summit agenda on your -- in front of you. I know this is, of course, late notice to hand this to you, it is tomorrow, but it has some significant work shops and representatives from most of the towns in Suffolk County including both Robert Gaffney and Tom Suozzi and some good smart growth code information, so that's in front of you. Incidentally, it says 125 but for us and for government, for not-for-profit and for government the fee is \$60. And I do have a brochure on the conference on the environment, the 2002 Conference on the environment that we brought up. It is cosponsored by the New York State Association of Environmental Management Councils of which CEO is a member, and by the New York State Association of Conservation Commissions which I am President of which is, just to clarify -- Nancy asked me this question, so this is why I'm clarifying this. NYSAC is made up of conservation, commissions and conservations boards throughout New York State, that's a municipal entity rather than a County wide entity, and that's October 4, 5, 6.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Anything else? I have a piece of other business but I'd like to take a break for two minutes and then we'll just come back and deal with that. Okay?

*(\*Brief Recess Taken: 10:54 A.M. - 10:58 A.M. \*)*

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I'm going to call the meeting back to order. And those of you who know me, who are most of you, this is very difficult for me and it makes me extraordinarily uncomfortable. But given that I am the Chairman of this Council and given that you know from the time I became Chairman, which is probably ten years ago, it has been very important to me to maintain the integrity of this Council. There is something that's come to my attention that is extremely troubling, and you probably saw my reaction on the last resolution. And there is a member of this Council that is participating very actively in the Vector Control Program who is representing a particular group and I

have seen newspaper articles, I have seen her on TV and I have heard that at the scoping meeting she was the only CEQ member who introduced herself as a representative of the Citizens Campaign for the Environment. So as the Chairman of this Council, it is my concern that, Adrienne, you cannot express an unbiased review of this pursuant to SEQRA. So it was surprising to me that you offered that motion because to me, and I think everyone knows me pretty well, I am extraordinarily sensitized to conflicts of interest and I believe that you have a conflict of interest in your participation in any deliberations on this matter at CEQ. So I'm going to ask you, as the Chairman, to recuse yourself from all future deliberations on this matter.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I would like to respond.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Please do.

MS. ESPOSITO:

I'm not going to do that, Terry, because I believe that what you said is very inaccurate. I have a job just like you have a job and I need to continue doing that job which I will. However, I think that that allows -- that brings me or brings here probably a greater depth of knowledge of that issue than perhaps other members of CEQ, maybe not, maybe it does in some cases. And if you are saying to me I can't be objective or I don't understand SEQRA or I don't understand the process, then you don't know me, and this is the first time that you and I have actually worked together.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Well, what I'm saying to you is that given that you actively participate as an opponent of the Suffolk County Vector Control Program --

MS. ESPOSITO:

Not an opponent, as a reviewer and someone who seeks to make it better than what it is today.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I don't want to get into a whole debate about this, and given that I'm the Chairman I do have certain rights. I am going to tell you that I have a private life too, as does everybody in this room.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Sure.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

And all of us, when we even have the potential for a conflict, we disclose it and we recuse ourselves. And you may have even been here several times where someone has come in, for example, with a Police Department Cell Communications thing for a firm with whom I don't even work and I recuse myself because I represent other carriers.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Okay, that's very different. First off, the reason I made that motion today and the first thing I asked you when I got here was did we get a decision from the County Attorney's Office, you said no, that's where the motion came from. I think that's what you were saying also, I don't think I misinterpreted that.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Adrienne, I don't want to debate this.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Well, I don't want to debate it either but you know what, I want to respond and I have a right to respond.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

You have a right to respond.

MS. ESPOSITO:

Because what you're asking is unprofessional in my opinion.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

I am going to --

MS. ESPOSITO:

What you're asking is also, I believe, illegal. I don't have a conflict of interest. I have a right to review that program, when I was appointed to this CEQ it was a well-known fact that I was appointed to CEQ and I work for Citizens Campaign for the Environment.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

Right, but --

MS. ESPOSITO:

It's never been a secret.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

No, it's not a secret but I think it gives you a bias. And what I'm going to do --

MS. ESPOSITO:

And I disagree with that point.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

That's fine. I'm going to write a letter to the County Legislature and the Executive and the County Attorney regarding this and we'll find out whether it's not -- whether or not it's legal. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

MS. MANFREDONIA:

Motion to adjourn.

MR. CRAMER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON ELKOWITZ:

All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Carried.

*(\*The meeting was adjourned at 11:03 A.M. \*)*

Theresa Elkowitz, Chairperson  
Council on Environmental Quality

{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically