NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Notice is hereby given that the Council of Environmental Quality will convene a regular public meeting at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, January 21st, 2009 in the Arthur Kunz Library, H. Lee Dennison Building, Fourth Floor, Veterans Memorial Highway, Hauppauge, NY 11788. Pursuant to the Citizens Public Participation Act, all citizens are invited to submit testimony, either orally or in writing at the meeting. Written comments can also be submitted prior to the meeting to the attention of:

James Bagg, Chief Environmental Analyst
Council on Environmental Quality
Suffolk County Planning Department
P.O. Box 6100
Hauppauge, NY 11788

Council of Environmental Quality
R. Lawrence Swanson, Chairperson
Call to Order:

Election of Officers

Minutes - check the web at http://www.co.suffolk.ny.us/departments/planning/minutes.aspx#ceq

The November 17th, 2008 and December 10th, 2008 Minutes are available on the website for review

Correspondence:

Finalize the 2009 CEQ Meeting Schedule

Public Portion:

Historic Trust Docket:

Director’s Report: Updates on Housing Program for Historic Trust Sites
Updates on Historic Trust Custodial Agreements

Project Review: Recommended TYPE II Actions:

A. Ratification of Recommendations for Legislative Resolutions Laid on the Table for January 5, 2009.
Project Review:

Recommended Unlisted Actions:

A. Proposed Acquisition for Open Space Preservation Purposes Known as the Drybrook Holdings, LLC Property in the Town of Brookhaven.

B. Review of CR 17 Wheeler Road from CR 100, Suffolk Avenue to Bretton Road (CP 5097) Town of Islip.

Other Business:

CAC Concerns:

***CAC MEMBERS: The above information has been forwarded to your local Legislators, Supervisors and DEC personnel. Please check with them prior to the meeting to see if they have any comments or concerns regarding these projects that they would like brought to the CEQ’s attention.

***MEMBERS – PLEASE NOTIFY THIS OFFICE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE IF YOU WILL BE UNABLE TO ATTEND.

***ALSO FOLLOWING THE MEETING PLEASE LEAVE BEHIND ALL MATERIALS OF PROJECTS THAT YOU DO NOT WANT OR NEED AS WE CAN RECYCLE THESE MATERIALS LATER ON.
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THE CHAIRMAN: I'd like to call the meeting to order. We will go out of order a little bit. We will put the elections of officers at the end.

Anybody have any comments with the minutes that were on the Web?

MR. MACHTAY: I think they were in pretty good shape. I will move to accept the November minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? All in favor? (Show of hands)

MR. KAUFMAN: One abstention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Two abstentions.

MR. MACHTAY: Does that mean they don't pass?

You only have three votes.

MR. BAGG: Three is a quorum, present and voting.

MR. MACHTAY: The December minutes were equally as good as the November meeting, so I would move the December meeting, December minutes as well.

THE CHAIRMAN: Second?

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? All in
favor? (Show of hands) Opposed? Abstentions?

MR. KAUFMAN: One abstention.

THE CHAIRMAN: Finalize the CEQ schedule.

Everyone had an opportunity to basically -- it's the third Wednesday in the month, with the exception of the month of December, when it's the second Wednesday.

MR. BAGG: I might qualify that we might post the location on the Internet and send out a revised copy, but we are waiting for the legislature. We have to double check the use of the conference room across the street. They have to confirm that we can have it on those days; otherwise, we will have it in this room. We will notify you shortly and also it will be posted on the department's CEQ Website.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we need a motion to accept?

MR. MACHTAY: Make a motion to accept the schedule.

MS. GROWNEY: I'll second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further discussions or concerns about the schedule? Let's see, Wednesday, March 18th. All in favor? (Show of hands) Schedule is adopted. Of course we can amend it as need be, when the time arises. Thanks, Jim.
Anybody here -- this is a public meeting.

Anybody here from the public, certainly feel free to speak up, but we usually do it topic by topic, rather than in general form. We will talk about the Historic Trust document.

MR. MARTIN: Very briefly, I'd like to spend most of my time today to explain the report I handed up to you. To update on the housing program, we did have another meeting with the housing committee to review the rents, and we were able to reduce a couple that we thought were relatively high for the location and type of structure. That has been a successful committee. We are going to be meeting, I guess, bimonthly to review all the sites and see how we can better accommodate the tenants and historic sites so we have them all occupied as a goal and keep them occupied.

Historic trust update agreement. The Historic Society, which will be supervising the Farmingville Schoolhouse on Portion Road in Farmingville, has signed a contract. That is a move forward for us. We will be working with them in the near future to occupy that site.

Now I would like to spend the most rest of my time explaining this report and taking any questions you
might have. This is a document that has been in the
works for two years. This binder includes both Phase 1
and Phase 2, which were worked on in 2006 and 2007. The
report was initiated by Commissioner Foley at the time,
Parks Commissioner Foley. He thought it would be
helpful, and I agreed to do a very broad objective
survey of our historic sites and our conditions and
their needs so we can communicate with the budget office
in the county and county exec's office and county
legislature all our needs for historic sites.

Of course, everyone that gets this report, I
think, it will be enlightening to see what buildings we
do own and their conditions. It's been widely
distributed. It's already been handed out to the
legislature. It's been in the hands of the county
eexec's office for a few months. A copy has been given
to them see what they're doing and anticipate our needs.
It's given to the CEQ and the Historic Trust Committee
and the Parks staff, DPW and budget offices in the
county will receive copies.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there going to be a press
release?

MR. MARTIN: It's a good question. I'll ask
the commissioner. He initiated the distribution. At
this point, I'll ask him what he plans to do at this point.

MR. MACHTAY: How is this to be used?

MR. MARTIN: The number one thing --

MR. MACHTAY: (Interposing) By who and how?

MR. MARTIN: By all people involved. To be honest, we want to have everyone involved as to what the needs are. The number one thing is for our budget proposals, this will back it up. This will support it. We get a lot of questions, why do you want it, what do you need it for. With the photographs here and detailed explanations of the buildings and conditions, they will have it right in front of them so they will understand.

Also, what was very important to us and Commissioner Foley at the time was to set up priority. We have so many buildings, which ones are more important, which ones need the attention now that can't wait. That is what we have done here. If you slip a few pages in, there are actually two lists because of the phasing of the project. You will see Phase 1, the priority building is the New Mill. We have had this in our office since 2006, so we have been using this priority already. So the mill at Blydenburg, we campaigned for funds. We have gotten additional funds.
They should initiate that restoration in the spring.

I have to back up a bit. There are two priority lists here. I don't want you to get confused. The first one you will see up top is based on the structure's condition. That was a priority list generated by the consultant who is looking completely objectively, what is the condition of the building.

The next phase, you will see on top, based on the historic significance and condition. That was reordered a bit by our office to bring forward the more significant historic properties. National Register listed buildings and dedicated buildings move to the top. You will see on both lists the New Mill was identified as a top priority. Both were issued on condition and historic significance. On the second --

MR. GULBRANSEN: (Interposing) Before you go on with regard to the structure's condition priority, could you go a couple of more minutes on how the structure's condition turns into a priority. It could be collapsed, it could be ease of repair.

MR. MARTIN: What you just said is pretty much it, imminent collapse.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Were the dollars associated with these structural repairs part of the waiting?
MR. MARTIN: Not necessarily. It was truly on the title. You see here the condition and historic significance. You're right in your thinking that the New Mill had a washout from a storm that we had. It was in danger of collapsing because of that.

We have done emergency stabilization since that storm, but it really needs real work. You can't just have it propped up there. They recognize that. That is the beauty of this. It's not just Parks Department saying we need to do this. We now have an engineer's report saying now that yes, you need to do this. They studied the building and documented T you can see the write-up here. It's not a question mark, it truly needs the attention.

On the second page you will see historic significance, the second one being the Homan Gerard House. That is the house in Yaphank which was the miller's house. That was moved up. You will see under "condition," you will see the Dayton House, which essentially is collapsing. The significance of Homan Gerard House, which is Condition 12. On the conditions, it moved up to Number 2. The historic significance list is the list we will be working off of. They identified the need. We moved it up, it's on the National
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Register, it's a dedicated county building and in the Brookhaven Historic District. We don't want to lose the building.

The Dayton House, in a sense we are already losing. That is highlighting issues. We have the building. The Historic Trust Committee, Mary Ann is concerned about the conditions of the building. That is going to be a tool for us to make some decisions to direct the funds as we go forward in the next couple of years. The money is going to be tight. We need to target the sites that need the attention most.

MS. GROWNEY: I have a couple of questions. One is, when you were talking about the needs of the building in terms of the structures, did you also make recommendations or is just identifying what the needs are?

MR. MARTIN: There are recommendations. If you want, we can flip through the first one. Let's pick.

MR. KAUFMAN: It has everything in here you could possibly want, cost estimates.

MS. GROWNEY: I have a second question, too.

MR. MARTIN: Flip to Tab Number 14, the Homan Gerard House. You will see first there is a format here
that it might be difficult to get all the way through here. It's just a standard format that the information is plugged into. It's very helpful on all accounts because we needed to get some organization to identify these buildings.

You will see up top that's the building name, and underneath the building number. That is the DPW number that is assigned to buildings. Of course, all our projects go through DPW. That communication and identifying the building in the survey, it's helpful that they have it on their desk.

Building is basically drawn up, and you will see the structure, a brief history of the building, whether it's on the Historic Register, or what historic significance status it has with the county code compliance issues, what we plan to do with the building here. Says "to be determined by Parks Department."

This building is vacant and boarded up at this point.

You will see a complete listing of all existing conditions, and then also you will see recommendations after that, including the exterior and interior of the buildings. I did go inside all the buildings. You will see items bolded that need the most attention.
MR. GULBRANSEN: For this one --

MS. GROWNEY: (Interposing) I'm sorry, the second part of my question is, I wanted to know in here -- forgive me, I'm sorry, the second part had to do was anything identified in terms of dealing with energy issues specifically, with any of the buildings?

MR. MARTIN: I know where you're going on that.

MS. GROWNEY: In terms of green energy.

MR. MARTIN: Exactly. They weren't directed to do that in this report.

MS. GROWNEY: I'm done, Tom.

MR. GULBRANSEN: In the example that we're looking at, Homan Gerard House, it shows that was listed as a National Register of Historic Places in 1988. With that listing, are there associated responsibilities or requirements to --

MR. MARTIN: (Interposing) I'd say there are responsibilities. A lot of people don't realize that there are not that many requirements, definitely responsibilities. That is that I think we need to take more seriously over time. We don't want to start losing these National Register properties. I think that is a very poor reflection on our program, if that starts to
happen.

We have been starting to lose National Register outbuildings on our historic sites. If we lost this, this would be one of the first major main buildings that we're losing. The mill is also the same circumstances. I think that is a real concern. I think there is a responsibility to maintain these buildings.

The county has the responsibility.

MR. GULBRANSEN: There are some houses, small houses in Setauket referred to as the rubber factory houses, the Fire department happens to have taken title to them. Some years later, it was pointed out to the fire department that they haven't been taking care of them or that they were neglected.

I was wondering whether those kinds of quote, unquote requirements or statutory limitations are part of these dollars that you listed.

MR. MARTIN: When it's listed on the National Register, there is no watchdog or national agency that comes forward to see if you're maintaining the property. What it does is, the state supervises the program. If they see over time negligence in maintaining the properties, it's not going to look good when you're putting in grant applications on the thing,
and the flip side, they can help you if they know you
need the help.

    It's two-fold, how you're maintaining the
historic structures, and they see the need, where we
need to direct funds, so that could also help with our
grant program.

    MR. KAUFMAN: You're talking about it with
the public ownership and county ownership of these
properties. When you have a private ownership of a
National Register building, you can knock it down, you
can remove that designation at any time. The program is
set up essentially, I'm talking in a general way as
opposed to specific ways, basically you, as a private
homeowner, for example, could remove the designation and
remove the building and take away from that historic
designation. That would remove many of the elements of
the register declaration.

    There are many houses here that are eligible
for inclusion and they get knocked down. You're just
not part of the program if you don't want to be. That
is a private ownership. That shows the outer limits
what can happen.

    When it's in public ownership, there is a
public responsibility. We have a Historic Trust system
set up to try and deal with the buildings and manage
them, and that is that this report all about.

MR. MACHTAY: Except like the Town of
Huntington can even, at the objection of the owner of
the property, can designate a house or a site historic.
And then it has certain requirements in the law, in the
town law, town code, that they must meet if you're going
to change windows or outdoor lighting.

MR. KAUFMAN: That is presupposed upon having
historic districts and having historic municipal
controls in place. You have some in Sag Harbor, out
east and Huntington. In Head-of-the-Harbor, the
controls are relatively weak. It depends literally on
the municipality's willingness to try and create the
districts and enforce the regulations; that is the
problem.

MR. BAGG: You have to point out that the
county does have the designation to the County Historic
Trust. To some extent, that is a safeguard. You can't
take any of the properties off or dispose of them in any
way if they have been duly designated.

In addition, like the Homan Gerard House, the
CEQ has reviewed them in the past and made a
recommendation. Can we get a list of the CEQ's
recommendations so the Historic Trust can understand
that they have taken buildings -- last year they made a
recommendation that five hundred thousand dollars be
used in restoration of the Homan Gerard, and that is not
in here. It should be someplace.

MR. MARTIN: We will have to see how we can
include that information. It's going to be hard to be
adding to this on a regular basis. Some things -- 2006,
some things are dated already. That is a good point.

MR. BAGG: You may not add to this, but you
need to have a list of past CEQ recommendations with
regard to structures. It doesn't have to be part of
this, but there should be an updated running list as to
what the council has done.

MR. MARTIN: For each site?

MS. GROWNEY: Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN: It may give some, what is the
right word for it, credibility to the Historic Trust
system that we have been overseeing this stuff and have
been make recommendations as it comes before us. It may
be done separately in an addendum or something like
that. But it shows we have been concerned, etc. If you
go before the legislature, it's additional ammunition.

MR. MARTIN: We have, of course, have all the
things on record, but you're suggesting putting it
together on a list.

    MR. BAGG: Or the Historic Trust manual,
which is up for revision as well. Are they dedicated or
not dedicated, and what are the past -- we still have a
number of outstanding recommendations designated to the
Historic Trust that haven't moved.

    MS. SPENCER: To summarize the points, I
asked Richard to turn to this page because approximately
a year ago the CEQ did pass a resolution on this
property. It is Number 2 on the list and it is
endangered. I think Jim is right, that we should keep a
record of the things that have come before this body and
have been passed on to the legislature, to summarize
what that register designation actually means. It
points out that a property is worthy, period, so that
any protection for our property comes at a local level.

    As Jim has pointed out, the county then
dedicates properties. That is at the local level. That
is what gives them protection. If something is
dedicated to the Suffolk County Historic Trust, it can
only be removed by countywide referendum. So that
immediately means that it is at the top of Richard's
list in terms of protection and preservation.
MR. MARTIN: I would like to add that in a sense is the requirement part. The National Register gives a sense of responsibility to the county, but the requirement is the county dedication; that puts the requirements on the property.

MR. MACHTAY: Okay, so we take this house that the county designates funds to restore it and it's fully restored. What happened to the book then, do we pull the page out or do you put another page in? You still have this document. Certainly, once it's restored, there is a maintenance question, so something should be added to it. It's easy to add because it's looseleaf.

MR. MARTIN: True, but in organization, it's a lot to do. What we could do, we're looking to continue the survey. We did another phase in 2008 on the Smithers property and Isaac Mills House. In this phase we covered the major sites and larger buildings. Probably in the future we need to do an updated survey to see where the buildings are at five years or so from now.

MR. MACHTAY: Once the buildings are restored and put in proper condition where it's not tumbling down and weather tight and so forth, there should be another
page put in there that says in this year and this month this was done and now going forward to maintain it this has to be done. This is a way to go back to the legislature and say, this has to be done, otherwise the building is going to fall into disrepair again.

MR. GULBRANSEN: In the back of the document, Appendix 23, he lists different cost factors. To the right of that there is a table which says funding for current use, which sometimes includes summation of all four categories. Other times includes A and B or just B.

Is there some kind of judgment going on there with regard to which costs you put in the final versus which costs have not been?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. Where it's all combined, that means they're all needed. If you have a building open to the public, at this point you're putting in the maintenance costs. That concept is in the report here on what would be needed ten years out to maintain the property.

A lot of these buildings have had extensive restoration done to them already, like Deepwells. The point of the report is, like your concept, you've got it to a certain point; that is the maintenance need. We
got it to the point where it's open to the public, but what else needs to be done. There is constant maintenance needed on the structures. That is what the maintenance is about.

I guess it's confusing because we have so many different conditions. Some you're talking about just maintaining the mothballing, which is the boarded up structures which are just sitting there for literally decades. What is needed so it doesn't get any worse. You don't want the building to be declining as it's sitting there. So that concept is in there, too.

MR. KAUFMAN: Page 2 of the cost estimates, I'm looking at two columns down at the bottom. One of them talks about total, all parks. One of them talks about -- I'm not sure what I'm looking at -- thirty-four million and forty-five million figure. Those are what moneys are available right now versus what money is up there?

MR. MARTIN: No, just from their studies there. This is very comprehensive. When they look at a structure, it's not to do partial restoration, it's to do complete restoration with all the documentation that ideally would be required. So, it's a very comprehensive number you're seeing there. That is why
you see it ranging from thirty-four to forty-five, depending on what the Parks Department decides to do.

MR. KAUFMAN: That is in total what we're looking at right now, 2007 fiscal year, as far as dollars we're looking at in this range. I do understand what you mean by ranging; it's A, B, C and D as mixed together.

MR. MARTIN: Based on the properties that are in mint condition, that number, perfect.

MR. GULBRANSEN: That would be the forty-one to fifty-two figure in the bottom of Column D.

MS. SPENCER: Right, I agree.

MR. MARTIN: Right.

MS. GROWNEY: The other one is recommended for total use.

MR. MARTIN: My concept right there is you're right on for Column D that I just explained.

THE CHAIRMAN: How much do you get a year to do this kind of stuff?

MR. MARTIN: It varies. The past year we suffered from the current economy and we actually lost our funding for what we call our 7510 account, which is our general account. We had a million six hundred thousand in that account that was removed. We, last
year, were successful in getting individual projects like the mill funding and boathouse at Hall. I think this report and targeting of those structures helped with that. But otherwise, we are not recently not getting the funding that we had in the past.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many of these structures are what you designated as mothballed?

MR. MARTIN: Good question. Off the top of my head, I'd really have to go through the list. I don't have it in my head.

MS. GROWNEY: Could it be fifty percent?

MR. MARTIN: No, not that high. This is about forty-nine structures, which includes multiple stables at Old Field, of two hundred fifty structures. Two quarters of the buildings were not surveyed, which could be outbuildings or mothballed. I'd have to go through the list. One of the ones that had been mothballed is the --

THE CHAIRMAN: (Interposing) Black Duck Lodge in Flanders. Refresh my memory. At one point Black Duck Lodge was going to be a B and B. That failed.

MR. MARTIN: The interior needed to be worked out. That was under a state grant, that concept, which
we got partial funding for.

THE CHAIRMAN: So you just give up and board it up?

MR. MARTIN: It's not that we give up. I think our responsibility is to maintain these buildings on site, and we do try and continue with the restoration. I guess the issue here is if we don't have a local community organization to partner with us, it kind of does stay at that stage. That is what pushes these properties along, when we have that community support.

Of course, we only open these sites and have programs because of the community groups. We do not have any park staff that would run the park site to open it to the public until I get a group approaching us to get a contract. That is why the contracts are so important. I went to get complete funding, usually, or the buildings would not be open to the public.

That the issue there on why that has lingered so long. If I had a group, we probably would have moved forward on that.

MS. SQUIRES: To continue with what Jim brought up, I think that is important and it should be moveable loosely so that it can be clipped to the back
of the document. We have been talking about collective
memory. Margo Myles and I have been talking about it.
The things that are in our heads that are not
necessarily in other people's heads. For instance, both
Jim and Larry remembered a year ago, but look at the
things that have been discussed maybe five, ten years
ago, and not only money recommendations, but just
environmental recommendations, so it would be great.

It doesn't have to be beautiful, I don't
think, it just has to list a date and the structure, and
what was recommended.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is your guess how the
legislature is going to use this? It seems to me there
is a couple of discreet things. One, we have a lot of
properties that are not being adequately attended to.
And two, we have other things we want to fund.

Are we going to try and push the legislature
to take care of what we want to buy or just sit back and
idly get more stuff that we can't take care of?

MR. MARTIN: I think we do need to address
those concerns. Jim, you want to speak to it a bit, or
Mary? We have been discussing this in committee on how
we can approach that problem.

MS. SPENCER: When you say "we," we are the
Historic Trust. I believe what we have been doing is trying to help Richard in caring for these properties. We have been trying to help Richard in securing funds to restore these properties. The mention that went through the CEQ about the Homan Gerard House is a good example what we can do. The manual gives the Trust the four proposed properties for acquisition. In my tenure, that has never been something that we have done. I have not seen the CEQ do that, I have not seen the Trust committee do that.

It seems to me that our focus has been on trying to preserve that which we have. If we look at this page of that, the second page of priorities on the priority list in the beginning of the book, when Richard said there are two pages that list New Mill first and Homan Gerard House second, I totally agree that we have to take our memory and write it down. The motions that have come through the CEQ and that have been brought by the CEQ should be part of the record.

I think it is interesting there are no changes to the page, even though it was written two years ago. The mill is still in grave jeopardy, the Homan Gerard House is sitting there boarded up and not a penny has been spent. If you go down this list, there aren't any
updates to make to the list because Richard doesn't have
the staff and he doesn't have the funds. Keeping this,
you don't have to make any changes?

MR. MARTIN: Not yet.

MS. SPENCER: I think that when changes, when
and if changes do come, that it's very important that we
note them in this document. Jim?

MR. BAGG: I might also point out that the
mill has been recommended for restoration for over
thirty years. That the picture on the Historic Trust
manual is a picture of the miller's house at that
particular time. The recommendation was to restore the
mill as well as the miller's house, so that has been a
long standing project.

I have a question, Richard. There is a motel
tax?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. BAGG: Some of that money is supposed to
be used for maintaining and restoring buildings.

MR. MARTIN: It is. Every year we get about
three hundred thousand in that account. These projects,
you see the numbers here. I need to use that for all
the sites. Most of these sites need about five hundred
thousand or more for Phase 1 to get started.
That is part of the problem, to recognize the true cost of these. Usually we have to wait a few years to get the funding, enough funding to start the job. Public Works is very reluctant to have to rebid the projects two or three times when essentially it is one project. They ask us, please, can you get a certain amount of funding so we can get a substantial amount of work done.

The motel money does not provide for that kind of project. Also, it can be used for maintenance or restoration for smaller projects as part of the total.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where is the mill house?

MR. MARTIN: That is included in Phase 3, which you don't have in front of you.

THE CHAIRMAN: How many houses in Phase 3?

MR. MARTIN: There is Smithers property. I think there are twenty in total.

THE CHAIRMAN: There are twenty others?

MR. MARTIN: There's about a hundred sixty-five that you don't have. This is forty-nine out of two hundred fifteen in front of you. This is a multi-volume study that you will be receiving over time. We did hit the priority buildings. Parks decided which buildings they were to cover. We did hit the priority
sites with Phase 1 and 2.

THE CHAIRMAN: With regard to -- I keep thinking of this because I pass it so often, when the Mill Pond House was purchased, it was purchased with a very specific idea that it was going to be used in conjunction with the house next door, which is owned by the Town of Smithtown.

After the purchase, it was determined that it can't be used because we don't have the money to restore it to the point that we can use it safely and meet the Disabilities Act and so forth.

It seems to me that there is something missing in our planning process that these things aren't thoroughly investigated and thought out prior to making a commitment. We're digging ourselves deeper and deeper in a hole. How can we introduce more careful thought into the acquisition process?

MR. MARTIN: I think the CEQ and the Historic Trust can make recommendations to the procedures and to the review that is taken right up front of the process, the purchasing process and to actually require -- I would recommend that Public Works also get involved to visit these sites and give a cost estimate as to what it would take for the public uses that you mentioned at
that site. That is not done at this point.

THE CHAIRMAN: Could the Historic Trust sort
of create a process, Mary Ann?

MS. SPENCER: I don't think you need the
sub-committee. I think the CEQ requires, you know, the
acquisitions come before us, so we could ask or require
that earlier in that acquisition process, that these
things be taken into account. By the time they come to
us, that information is there.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sometimes, not all the time,
the acquisitions come to us. If you guys don't act
today, then everything is going to go poof and it's your
fault.

MS. SPENCER: But it doesn't need to be that
way. I feel that it is our responsibility, the CEQ with
these acquisitions are going to come before us, that
they ask that that information be gathered so by the
time it gets here, we are informed.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Again, that is a new
property being proposed for acquisition would come to us
and it would look like this already? (Referring to page
in manual.)

MS. SPENCER: That would be ideal.

MR. BAGG: As part of the environmental
review of SEQRA and EAF, there are questions that deal with historic sensitivity and dedicated property. As part of EAF, you can request that information be included for review before you proceed with finalizing SEQRA.

MR. GULBRANSEN: I would add, that information should differentiate between the goal of preserve, which is different from restore. We jumped all the way to mint condition before. Mint condition is certainly what we have to act on.

MR. KAUFMAN: There is another consideration, that is cost factors with making these estimates. To the extent that we have been just been presented with a report, maybe ten or twenty thousand dollars to do each one of these surveys, if you will. The county has been notoriously reluctant in the past to spend money for these kinds of surveys prior to purchase.

What happens if the survey comes in and it suddenly looks like we're buying something that is expensive. That gets into -- it creates problems, shall we say. It's putting the cart before the horse. I'm saying it's a practical thing as opposed to what should happen.

What Tom and Mary Ann were talking about is
correct. It's a practical condition, how far we can go
in asking for something in the EAF?

MR. MARTIN: Isaac Mills is a good example.
The community thought it would be used as a public use
building. As soon as we bought it, Public Works was no
way. You can only use it for this and this. We can
only use it for residential use. I don't know what it
would take to get it up to code in terms of public
assembly. The county should know that when they're
purchasing a property, if they're purchasing it for
community use.

MR. KAUFMAN: The same thing happened with
Sagtikos. We essentially had an idea of what we were
looking at. The county was interested in purchasing the
property for fifteen years. We had an idea of what was
out there. I think when the county actually purchased
it and did the actual survey, I think it was surprising
the amount of money that it was estimated to restore it.

Had they known that up front, I don't know if
the purchase would have gone through.

MR. MACHTAY: When you have these community
groups that want a particular building or location
purchased and preserved and what have you, do you let
them know that they have some kind of responsibility for
raising funds and maintaining the building and so on and so forth?

MR. MARTIN: Where we have a direct interest in the very beginning, yes, we definitely do. In the sense of Isaac Mills, there were different ideas. There was nothing concrete of which group might be interested. The goal was for community use.

I did meet with the Arts Council next door and they do have an interest in using that structure, but they don't have the funds to do that kind of work to bring it up to code.

MR. MACHTAY: But if they raise those kinds of funds, you wouldn't stop them, would you?

MR. MARTIN: I never stop anyone from raising funds.

THE CHAIRMAN: They can't raise the funds to keep their own building up.

MR. KAUFMAN: A lot of these groups form in a concrete sense after the purchase of the property.

MR. MACHTAY: I understand that because I was involved in a group like that for many years. We raised all sorts of money when the need arose, before we were a 501(c)(3). After that, we got all kinds of donations from big corporations because they...
saw it as a tax deduction.

So, I say that if there should be a civic group is out there looking for this, their feet should be put to the fire right at the beginning.

MR. MARTIN: I say yes to that. Sagtikos is a good example. They went to the legislature and said they would raise money for it, and they did raise money through grants. You don't always have that situation where you have that interest out there, but not a group formed yet.

THE CHAIRMAN: I don't want to spend all day on this. Do you have other important issues that you wanted to bring out to the board?

MR. MARTIN: Today I just wanted to go over the report. This is something extraordinary, that I wanted to report on it.

MR. KAUFMAN: One question about the report format itself. I've seen a number of engineering reports in my day. I have done a lot of real estate over the years. I assume there is a fair amount of backup information that is filed out there for each of the columns that you have included in here. I notice that it is a standard form. It gives --

MR. MARTIN: (Interposing) I don't have all
the notes from the consultant, if that is what you're asking.

MR. KAUFMAN: Did the consultant just plug in stuff into the format here?

MR. MARTIN: No, this was created by the consultant. We met with them to agree on a format. They came up with this format. We opened up four files in the office for them. They came and researched the sites and we gave them a tour of every site and brought them into the building.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'm looking at Black Duck Lodge and it has a number of columns in here about windows, for example, materials, this, that and the other thing. Is it possible for you -- I'm not asking for it; obviously, when they come up with the cost estimates, they have to have a reason for it. I assume that the documentation is out there someplace.

MR. MARTIN: That would be with the consultant.

MR. KAUFMAN: That is about a third of what I normally expect in a private report.

MR. MARTIN: This is just a survey to identify needs and costs and estimates and things. To start a job, we would have to hire an architect who
would use this for basic information.

MR. KAUFMAN: This is a third of what I would expect from a private architect's report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is that a standard architecture firm?

MR. MARTIN: They are familiar with this. It was picked off a list. The Department of Public Works has of consultants.

THE CHAIRMAN: The reason I ask this, this is very often, if you go out to hire an architect to review your house and they're not familiar with historic structures, their recommendation is tear it down. I was wondering if you used someone that it was truly involved in old structures.

MR. MARTIN: I don't know their resume. The firm was picked by the Department of Public Works.

THE CHAIRMAN: You're comfortable with the numbers?

MR. MARTIN: I know they go toward the high point and we discussed that with them. They defended their numbers. In some cases, we did reduce them, explaining the point that a lot of our sites do not get restored to complete museum standards. They fought back in the sense of defending their reputation, in real
costs and real numbers, that is what things would cost.

Getting into the projects, we're finding the
million dollar point is the starting point for most of
the projects. Up to four million dollars in estimated
costs for the Coindre Hall boathouse. The architects
are working in the real world. When they come to the
county for municipal work, the costs often increase with
all the requirements in the bidding process.

MS. SPENCER: Just as the commissioner has
distributed this to all of us, it's an educational
process. It's for us to understand so we can help
others understand what is involved. The county has
taken on over two hundred historic properties and they
have said -- they are charged with maintaining and care
for those properties. This is the beginning. This
helps understand what this means, what that will cost
and what condition these properties are in.

I would like to continue that educational
process under SEQRA, educating all of us and everyone
that is involved in the county on an acquisition. You
know, we should know from the beginning, from the very
beginning when the county buys a property, an historic
property, what is involved in maintaining a property,
restoring that property. These are real costs and they
should be listed at time of acquisition. They should not come to us many years later.

MR. GULBRANSEN: When a new opportunity is presented, do you envision that it could be presented relative to the prioritization that you have already begun here? Would you able to indicate, fifteen out of fifty? We have a list.

MS. SPENCER: You can do that.

MR. GULBRANSEN: We have a resource limitation. A new one by definition would displace something else further down on the relative list.

MS. SPENCER: The Isaac Mills would be a good example of this. When Isaac Mills came in, which is a recent acquisition and it's already been discussed this morning, it's already on the National Register, that already moved up in the list of two hundred fifteen properties. It's going to be somewhere in the middle. It's going to be in the top half because it's already listed. It's in decent shape. It will still be in the top half because it's been recognized as worthy of preservation.

MS. GROWNEY: One question I have has to do with part of it is the collective memory, but developing a form where collective memory can be listed somehow.
Is there a form that you guys use that identifies what kinds of things, when you walk through a property and you say we want to consider this as something to purchase, is there some sort of criteria that you go through? Can there be a form with a criteria, what kinds of things are you looking for at this point in time?

MR. KAUFMAN: One of eighteen?

MS. GROWNEY: What are you talking about?

MR. MARTIN: We don't have any form like that. The initial review comes from Real Estate at the commission's request.

MS. GROWNEY: To find some way to address some of these issues and what comes first and what might be required. It might be simply hiring somebody to spend just a few hours doing a preliminary look see and making a submission, rather than doing this whole big blown up anything.

MR. MARTIN: I agree. I think the basics, if you're saying you don't want to use it for public assembly, what are the code requirements, and just that basic review was not done.

MS. GROWNEY: What Mary Ann was saying that something been done beforehand so that it can go to the
next level or dismissed.

MR. KAUFMAN: Loretta, when the county purchases property nowadays, when does the assessment occur, before, when the county is thinking about it, or when the county has decided to purchase?

MS. FISHER: Loretta Fischer. It's part of the acquisition process. Once we get a willing seller, we do the appraisals. We do the environmental assessment of Phase 1 at that time before it comes to CEQ, generally.

MR. KAUFMAN: There is assessment done prior to eventually getting to the legislature?

MS. FISHER: Jim actually reviews them as part of the process.

MS. FISHER: It's the environmental side of it, not the historic, necessarily.

MR. KAUFMAN: What I'm trying to find out, this is actually leading up to something Mary Ann is talking about right now. If the county is able to do these kinds of assessments on other types of land purchases prior to it going through the complete system, it's possible what Mary Ann is talking about could be applied. I'm talking about in a general way.

I don't know how much it costs to do a
structure survey for these things, whether the county is willing to do something like that. In a general way, is it possible to do.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: The county starts with the planning resolution. We will have fairly high costs in just determining what the cost of maintaining the structure would be. I don't think you want to spend the money until you have the sense that the legislature is going to move forward with it.

In this climate, the legislature is not going forward with anything. There is nothing new going through unless it's of such historic importance, and even then it's a tough sell. This is a tough climate. We can talk about the types of questions to be answered when the property is submitted. I can say with confidence those questions are going to be asked already.

The only thing we have been buying are vacant lands, and if they have buildings, part of it is the price is factored in the destruction and removal of the building. I haven't seen anything in a long time and it really has no chance of going through.

MR. KAUFMAN: You're talking about political realities.
MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I want you to understand.

MR. KAUFMAN: You're talking about this as part of the legislative process.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: To square with you, I don't see the Vanderbilt in here. The boathouse in Vanderbilt needed like three hundred thousand dollars just to keep it from falling down. It wasn't to restore, it was to hold it so we don't lose it. It was vetoed by the county executive. We overrode the veto. We were not able to pass the bond. We don't have the money to maintain it. We have the projects shown in the budget without the necessary funding. That is how bad it is right now. It's going to be a very difficult year. These are the practical realities. It's a great rhetorical conversation.

Just the practical reality, I'm speaking with the legislator's perspective as one who is committed to preserving historic structures. We almost need a plan to not lose structures, not even adding new ones, maybe not doing some of the restoration, but taking some of the money to stabilize and maintain to get through the storm.

MS. SPENCER: That is what he's doing.

THE CHAIRMAN: Just preserving what we have.
MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

MR. KAUFMAN: There is a building near me which is the subject of possible acquisition.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Forget it.

MR. KAUFMAN: Excluding the reality, as Mary Ann pointed out, if we had an idea of what we were looking at in terms of maintenance costs, going into the future, what we would be looking at? It's not something we ordinarily see that much up front. It would be helpful from an EAF standpoint.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: I wouldn't spend the money on it; it just wouldn't go through.

MR. MARTIN: The Vanderbilt was not covered in our survey because we just covered Parks Department. Those buildings are obviously historic for the county.

MR. BAGG: They're in Suffolk County parks, but it's handled by the trustees.

MR. MARTIN: As far as I know, it's not directed the supervisor maintain the property.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: From my perspective, I look at it in the same group; it's the same budget. I have to add this number, the fifty million dollars here to the Vanderbilt numbers.

MR. MARTIN: You're right. I just wanted to
explain why it's not in here.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Big Duck is not in here.

MR. MARTIN: We picked buildings that had some need. That is probably the best maintained building that we have. The county still retains ownership. If it gets a little crack in it, it gets repaired in a second.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Like an egg crack.

THE CHAIRMAN: Recommended Type II actions.

Jim, any recommendations for legislative resolutions?

MR. BAGG: They're in your folders. I would like to call your attention to Introductory Resolution 1001 is before you today for determination, and also Resolution Number 1021, authorizing the granting of a permanent easement to the Suffolk County Water Authority for the production, distribution and transmission of drinking water that had a site plan submitted along with it.

There is a whereas clause that says the Suffolk County Water Authority has developed a plan to use approximately two acres of the subject parcel. You cannot approve SEQRA after the fact, so I have notified the legislative council as well as Legislator Romaine, who introduced the bill, that you have to do an
Environmental Assessment Form on the proposed site plan and submit that to the CEQ under SEQRA, which has to be completed before you can complete the easement.

MR. MACHTAY: Does this fall under the alienation of parkland?

MR. BAGG: No, the original Suffolk County Drinking Water Plan. I have no idea, it's roughly two acres, as to where it's going to go. That is the vegetation or characteristics of the property that has to be reviewed before you give the County Water Authority an easement of lease on a piece of property to develop a facility with a site plan. You can't do SEQRA after the fact, you have to do it before.

MR. GULBRANSEN: I have a question. Item 1017, adoption of local law establishing the Toxic Free Toddlers and Babies Act. Is that a matter that we could learn more about?

MR. BAGG: I can get actually get copies of that to if you want to see what it is. To me, that is administrative. If they want to say that they feel certain items shouldn't be put in baby food or other things.

MR. GULBRANSEN: I think that is a baby food/toy thing, not a child protection from exposures.
MR. BAGG:  I don't think so.
THE CHAIRMAN:  Motion to accept staff recommendation?
MR. KAUFMAN:  Motion.
MR. MACHTAY:  Second.
THE CHAIRMAN:  Any further discussion? All in favor. (Show of hands) Opposed? Abstention?
Motion carries.
Recommend unlisted action, proposed acquisition of open space, preservation of Drybrook Holdings. Loretta?
MS. FISCHER:  Before you today is an eleven point nine acre parcel in an area that was approved for planning steps in 2006. That area included sixty-seven acres in total. That is approximately twelve acres of that sixty-seven acre area.
It's primarily a buffer between two residential areas in the North Shirley area, south of the LIE, and North Street, with vacant land, at the present time, to the east. That vacant land to the east was on our master list for acquisition, a large lot industrially zoned, which this property is also, and has been a target for acquisition by the Town of Brookhaven as well as the county. As well as these properties are
to the west, and they are more or less a buffer between the residential area and the North Street road at this point in time.

This was presented and by Legislator Romaine for planning steps in 2006, and it is only a part of the total area of sixty-seven acres that was proposed. It is wooded, mostly pitch pine, oak. Actually, it's outside of the Pine Barrens core area to the north.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Loretta, this obviously has been through planning steps. We have an accepted offer.

MS. FISHER: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: Is there something going on, that it's not coming from the County Executive's Office?

MS. FISHER: The County Executive was not in total support of this acquisition. I cannot tell you definitively his reasoning why at this point, but he deferred the acquisition over to Legislator Romaine because of his opposition.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: It's unusual.

MS. FISHER: Yes. I know that from the Planning Department perspective, this wasn't a high priority area for acquisition. We wanted to see whether
we were going to move forward on the larger fees first, and then put that into perspective as far as acquisitions for this year.

We don't have anything. The county does not own any significant holdings in that area. We do have some small lots in green that we picked up through tax lien, but we don't have anything significant in that area specifically. We were hoping to see what came out of the larger acquisition first before we wanted to move forward on these buffer areas. That is our position on it. But it is -- what it has, pitch pine, pine oak. It's not a high priority area, but it is what it is.

THE CHAIRMAN: North River drain basin.

MS. FISHER: No.

MR. KAUFMAN: What is its score?

MS. FISHER: Well, we did score it originally as a sixty-seven acre acquisition, in that scoring.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: That included the Town of Brookhaven piece?

MS. FISHER: No. Town of Brookhaven? The smaller piece?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: There is a piece right next to it that is Town of Brookhaven.

MS. FISHER: Brookhaven is in blue. The
acquisition is in purple. Altogether, it's about
twenty-five points, ten points of which was size. As a
composite of the sixty-seven acres.

MR. KAUFMAN: One more question on this.

Where exactly is it located in terms of exits on the
LIE?

MS. FISCHER: Actually west of Exit 69, which
is Wading River Road, which is Wading River Road is to
the east of here. Exit 69 comes off the LIE. This
road, North Street, goes westward and curves around
south and that is the portion that you see here. So
it's west of Exit 69. It's like Manorville-North
Shirley, in that area.

It's a desolate area. We are concerned about
dumping in that area. This area is well known for a
dumping area all along this roadway, unfortunately. It
isn't traveled very much, has limited usage, at least at
this point in time. And there tends to be problems with
dumping along here for the last couple of decades.

THE CHAIRMAN: I never heard you as
unenthusiastic about a piece of property.

MS. FISCHER: I'm just saying that it's not a
high priority. We were more concerned, more interested
in looking at this after we looked at the larger piece.
We were trying to focus on the larger piece first and
not pick up these smaller pieces until that larger piece
was solidified, one way or the other. If the larger
piece is not sold to the county, it would be developed
industrially. It's industrially zoned. That could
change with a change of zone.

At this point in time, the Town of Brookhaven
has done updates to the Master Plan. It's still zoned
industrial. This property is zoned industrial as well
as this whole sliver. We're concerned about what the
whole area is going to look like. We were hoping to
hold off on this until the other piece was more
solidified in our minds, as far as moving forward.

MR. KAUFMAN: Are they the same owners?

MS. FISHER: No.

MS. GROWNLEY: I have to address the dumping
thing. What kind of dumping? Is it household stuff?

MS. FISHER: Yes, primarily stuff people dump
from their trucks, also landscape waste. If you drive
along it, it's very unkempt. The Town of Brookhaven
always is there picking up, but years can go by,
refrigerators are left on the side of the road.

It isn't a highly traveled road. We are
concerned about maintenance at this point, unless we
have a bigger presence here. So, those were our concerns.

MS. SQUIRES: Is it shared with Brookhaven?

MS. FISHER: No, they are not partnering with us.

MR. BAGG: There was an environmental assessment for toxic and hazardous substance. I believe there is a structure on the center of the site which is dilapidated. It was built in the late '50s, '60s sometime. The roof is collapsed. It has asphalt shingles on it.

The suggestion to Real Estate is number one, all structures and debris be removed from the site. If there was a fuel oil tank, they couldn't find one associated with it. It has to be removed and enclosed. If there was a septic system associated with the structure, that also has to be closed pursuant to New York State Department of Health standards and DEC, so that the property is free of all structures and debris.

MS. FISHER: They're cognizant of that. It was related that those structures would be dealt with before acquisition.

MR. KAUFMAN: I've been looking at the proposal and I'm somewhat conflicted about it. I take
Loretta's concerns seriously. It doesn't score that high, it's isolated. Our job here generally is to look at the parcel in isolation, what is the impact of this particular purchase.

We start veering into policy, which can sometimes be an interesting area to look into, and our objections can be registered to it. At the same time, we're not policy making on this particular parcel. It does not, for example, offend the sensibilities such that I would do just a no on it or abstain or something. We have had some parcels that came here that were just incredibly wrong to purchase, from a policy sense. I don't know that one gets here.

To the extent also Loretta is talking about sixty-seven acres is still accessible. If the sixty-seven acres are purchased, that makes this particular purchase look a little bit better, if you will. We get more land in the area and it becomes a nexus for preservation, so far as we can do something like that with respect to the dumping that is occurring.

By the way, that goes beyond -- I think that brings it outside of policy considerations and being totally wrong, if you will. That is probably the wrong
word to use. What it boils down to, we have to vote on this one way or the other.

The question is whether this is environmentally okay, not politically okay, and whether we think this is going to have an impact on the environment. What swings me on this particular one is the fact that the sixty-seven acres nearby is still in consideration. Whether we get it or not is another question. We are not looking at segmentation in that sense; it's two different owners. That doesn't particularly concern me.

That is what I think the question boils down to is what is the impact of this particular parcel. Looked at in isolation maybe, maybe not. Looked at in broader terms with a little bit of reluctance, it's probably a neg dec.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do you want to make a motion.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'd like to hear what anybody else has to say first.

MR. BAGG: I'd like to back that up. That is before the CEQ, if the county chooses to proceed with acquisition of the parcel for passive purposes, what is the impact, not whether you think the parcel should be purchased or fits into the puzzle. What are the
overriding environmental impacts if we purchase the
property. As far as I know, there is none.

MR. KAUFMAN: One way we have dealt with this
in the past, something has been neg dec and we clearly
see it's a neg dec, we have been able, in the past, to
register our objections either by letter or side letter,
which is something you attach to the CEQ resolution or
testimony or whatever.

I don't think this particular parcel reaches
that level of creating problems.

THE CHAIRMAN: You know, speaking of
environmental issues of this property, is the county
prepared to try to keep it clean or is it going to
become just a place for people to dump?

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: That is more generic than
property specific.

MS. GROWNEY: I like the fact that it's
almost twelve acres. I like the size of it in terms of
this community, which looks like it's a very dense
community. I don't know if there are any passive
recreational areas nearby. It looks like there are
other areas that were developed.

MR. KAUFMAN: These are paper streets.

MS. GROWNEY: But there are houses then. It
looks like it's a fairly dense built community to me. I think if the county is interested in keeping open space for dense communities, that sways me.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: I'd like to make a motion, unlisted.

I'm sorry, I missed most of the discussion. In the resolution before the legislature,Resolved Number 5, fifth resolve, telling us that this property will not be used to transfer development rights pursuant to the county code. Is there some reason why it's not being used for that?

MS. FISHER: Yes, it's zoned industrial and we only take residential credits off property. If it's zoned property, it does not hold. There are no credits pulled off of them.

THE CHAIRMAN: Michael, make your motion.

MR. KAUFMAN: Unlisted negative declaration.

MS. GROWNEY: Second.


MS. FISHER: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Review of County Road 17,
Wheeler Road from County Road 100. Anybody here to speak on the project? When you come up, would you please identify yourself for the stenographer.

MR. NORMANDIN: Stephen Normandin, from the RBA Group, consultant for the Department of Public Works.

THE CHAIRMAN: What is the RBA Group?

MR. NORMANDIN: Engineering consulting firm. This project is being advanced by the Department of Public Works from Suffolk County. Road 100, which is Suffolk Avenue in the south, up to Bretton Road, which is just south of Sunrise Path or New York Route 111 in Central Islip.

County identified the project as a critical north-south arterial that connects Long Island Expressway with Southern State Parkway and traverses downtown CI as well as the court complex. It also recognizes the fact that Wheeler Road in this section is primarily residential in nature.

So that being said, the county embarked upon an expanded project proposal, which identified several alternatives for improving the roadway in 2004 and is now in the preliminary design phase for improvements going forward.
The county has identified this roadway has a high accident rate, higher than the statewide average, as well as high pedestrian volumes along the roadway. In the middle of this project area is the Central Islip Senior High School as well as the Alfano Early Childhood Development Center.

With regard to the accidents, this roadway is single lane in each direction, north and south, with shoulder lanes that vary in condition and width from none to up to two to three to four to five feet in width. Primarily the accidents on the roadway are rear-end collisions which results from a vehicle being stopped in the through lane trying to make a left turn, as well as overtaking collisions, which is that same vehicle trying to make a left and a car veering around to pass him within this minimal varying shoulder.

What the county is proposing, for the most part, is a safety improvement project both for vehicles as well as the heavy pedestrian volumes up and down the corridor. What the county is proposing is to introduce a two way center turn lane, or designated left turn lane where appropriate, and continuing the two north to southbound lanes. All of this would be done within the existing right of way.
Like I mentioned, impacts to the residences along the roadway would be minimized to the greatest extent. No right of way acquisitions would be made. Realistically, the widening is from none to two to three feet max, really just to redesign, make the roadway uniform throughout as it meanders in and out now, with intermittent curbs and sidewalks. The project will provide a center turn lane, either ten or eleven feet in width, through lanes in each direction, north and south, twelve feet in width, new curbs, new grass utility strip and continuous ADA compliant sidewalks.

The purpose is to reduce the amount of vehicular accidents that occur on the roadway as well as provide pedestrian accommodations. We have done volume counts on the pedestrians in and around the schools, and it is significant. So the importance of providing sidewalks on both sides, since there are two residential neighborhoods on either side which filter into the corridor, we felt providing sidewalks on both sides is critical.

It should be noted in October 2007, before this council was an early implementation project which would be constructed this spring, which I identified right in front of the two schools, which is going
forward by the county using the same design elements. This project really connects into those and stretches it on either end. That would complete the entire Wheeler Road corridor as one continuous complete section, new drainage, curbs, sidewalks, utility relocations as necessary, primarily safety improvements.

It does help as far as traffic capacity. It takes the blockage out of the through lanes, brings it to the center turn lane and allows the cars to progress a little bit better on the corridor. That is about it. It's a federally funded project as opposed to the implementation project. The cost is approximately three million dollars.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you tell me what the success rate is of two lane left turn lanes; how many head-on collisions do we have?

MR. NORMANDIN: It's difficult to say. If you really broke it down, since there are so many side streets, it's minimal, not even a third of project length. It's really designated for exclusive left turn lanes where you wouldn't have that. There would be side streets very close together offset from each other. You will have a left turn lane in one direction, and a left turn lane in the other.
I don't have statistics for you, but the amount of accidents that we have now is primarily rear end, right angle, left turn and overtaking on this roadway. So providing a left turn will improve that. I don't have the stats. There are, of course, added benefits, but there are some negatives with the center turn lane as well.

MR. KAUFMAN: Couple of quick questions. The intersection of I-11 at the northern terminus, that is not the best intersection I have seen with the stop sign up there.

MR. NORMANDIN: We're one to two hundred feet in advance of that.

MR. KAUFMAN: There is Kinkos or Fed Ex over there. If you widen it, the traffic flow control is very dicey.

MR. NORMANDIN: That is a state right of way, anyway.

MR. KAUFMAN: While this is not a classic road expansion, the expansion of Portion Road went from two to four. You had meetings with the civics and school district as well as the legislature.

Are you representing today that they are all in favor of this? I'm basically looking to community
opposition.

MR. NORMANDIN: The other alternatives were two and four and five lane sections. This was the most narrow of sections.

MR. KAUFMAN: There is some agreement from them.

MR. NORMANDIN: Yes.

MS. GROWNEY: There were other sections that were developed on this.

MR. NORMANDIN: That will be.

MS. GROWNEY: There are several schools.

MR. NORMANDIN: Yes.

MS. GROWNEY: Is there much bike usage?

MR. NORMANDIN: There is usage. You can only do so much. There is this much right of way. Pedestrian use volume is more than triple bike activity. Bike activity, as far as observed, there are no physical counts, they vary, they're not significant.

MS. GROWNEY: Would you say that the bike usage is not significant because there is no way for them to safely use a road, or would you say it's just an observation in that area, they don't use bikes much?

MR. NORMANDIN: Bikes are used in this area. There are existing shoulders which provide some area for
them. We looked into that. We have only this much room
and maxed out with pedestrian sidewalks, both sides of
the roadway, the vehicular accidents was critical to us.
You can only do so much.

What we did do is identify bike routes in the
area, both on the east and west sides. Route 111 is a
proposed bike route under the New York State DOT's
non-motorized study, and Hawthorne Avenue, the Town of
Islip proposed that as a bike route. Suffolk Avenue is
already designated as a bike route as well as the
Expressway service road.

MS. GROWNEY: There are options for bikers?

MR. NORMANDIN: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: I have a couple of questions.

It came to SEQRA. Is adding turning lanes considered
adding travel lanes?

MR. BAGG: I don't think it's a travel lane. It's not considered a travel lane because it's not a
through lane.

MR. MACHTAY: For purposes of SEQRA, you know
what I'm getting at.

MR. BAGG: I understand. Basically the road
is being widened from what it is now, so the pavement is
going to be expanded in certain areas to make the road
uniform.

MR. MACHTAY: For purposes of SEQRA also, I can't quite make out all the signatures. Who prepared the EAF Part 2?

MR. NORMANDIN: That would be the RBA Group.

MR. MACHTAY: The project's sponsor, on behalf of the project sponsor?

MR. NORMANDIN: Exactly.

MR. MACHTAY: Do you think in the future the DPW should be told that they don't prepare the EAF Part 2, but rather the project reviewer reviewing the project, the CEQ?

MR. BAGG: I understand. We have the sponsoring agencies. In this case the DPW reviews it. If you wanted to make changes, you can make changes. At least it's done up front.

MR. MACHTAY: Technically it should be the reviewing agency that prepares EAF Part 1 and Part 2. I applaud DPW and yourself for meeting with the community, the legislator and so on and so forth. At the end of the EAF Part 1, you have conformance to existing comprehensive or project master plans. You go down the plans and say "not applicable."

Have you considered the town comprehensive
plan in preparing all this?

MR. NORMANDIN: This is a county facility, county way.

MR. MACHTAY: I'm asking because the Town of Huntington does have such a plan, and they just adopted such a plan. I'm asking if the Town of Islip has one and if you considered this in planning this.

MS. GROWNEY: They don't have one.

MR. MACHTAY: That answers my question.

MS. HAHN: I wanted know about plantings, are any of the medians going to be planted?

MR. NORMANDIN: They're such a short length. They're not expected to be. There is some areas with a striped hatched median. The county will not be providing raised medians in such a short length. Sometimes it becomes a maintenance and sometimes a safety issue.

MS. HAHN: What about trees?

MR. NORMANDIN: It doesn't fit.

MS. HAHN: No beautification at all?

MR. NORMANDIN: That is a good point. Up at the north and southern ends by Motor Parkway, as well as by Suffolk Avenue, there are commercial shopping centers in that space. Instead of the grass utility strip,
would be similar to Suffolk Avenue, the embossed
cement, red brick and some decorative lighting is
being considered in the commercial areas.

MS. GROWNEY: The lighting is dark sky
friendly lighting?

MR. NORMANDIN: Yes.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Was there any consideration
of the stormwater runoff planned? Is the volume the
same as it was or better than it was?

MR. NORMANDIN: It's primarily the same as it
is now. The roadway, as I mentioned, it's a minimal
widening. It's really just redefining the roadway;
however, where there is now, there are some low areas.
Whereas curbs don't exist, now that we're putting some
curbs in we have to catch -- it's the same volume
overall, but now we have to catch it because it now get
depressed in the grass areas where there are no curbs.
So we are going for, correct, adding leaching basins,
improving upon the situation.

MS. HAHN: Any filtering?

MR. NORMANDIN: There will be leaching
basins.

MR. KAUFMAN: You're not going to have a
vortex in there or anything like that?
MR. NORMANDIN: Would only be for a positive system.

MR. BAGG: That would only be necessary if it's discharged to surface waters. Leaching basins leach into the ground and goes in. Many times in past projects they put in leaching basins. If is there a downgrade towards a stream, they catch as much runoff as they can. If there is a severe storm, they put in a vortex at the end to catch any pollutants before it goes in.

THE CHAIRMAN: One of the concerns that I have is looks like the project stops right at what I consider the most dangerous part of the whole strip, at the southern end where you have the at grade railroad. About a hundred feet beyond that you have a major road. I don't know if it's Suffolk Avenue. I think it is. It seems to me that that is crying out for improvement more so than what you're actually proposing.

MR. NORMANDIN: Not in the project scope. That was a major -- I think the county does have plans for County Road 100, has studies. I can refer to Jeff, who is here from the department. That would be another project, another corridor, another set of money for that.
When you're talking about railroad and grade separation, that is another whole issue with the Long Island Railroad. It's not in the confines of the town; you're correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion unlisted, neg dec.

MR. MACHTAY: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion? All in favor? (Show of hands) Opposed? Motion carries.

Thank you. Any other business?

MR. MACHTAY: I would like to make a motion both nominating and electing Larry Swanson for chairman and Michael Kaufman for vice chairman.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor? (Show of hands) Opposed? Abstention?

MR. KAUFMAN: You and I should abstain.


MR. KAUFMAN: I didn't get a chance to give my election speech.


Now CAC concerns, Joy.

MS. SQUIRES: I just received this. I don't
have copies for everyone. This came into the Planning Department. It's Long Island Bikeways and Trailways. It's done by New York State DOT, Region 10, Suffolk State Office Building. It's very interesting. It has a lot of good reference material, and it has a really lovely map, which rips easily when you try and open it up. At any rate, it's a nice map.

MR. MACHTAY: The Town of Huntington, in the first Town Board meeting of the year adopted a new comprehensive plan. I was on that committee to prepare that. It's on the Internet on the Website. They do have a chapter on bicycle paths. They do have a map designating certain areas they think would be suitable for bicycle paths, including state county and town roads. A lot of that was prepared by the State DOT.

To be consistent, I will be asking the question when projects come in, especially in the Town of Huntington, as to whether or not they have considered the Town Comprehensive Plan. Maybe we can get some push. Jim, I know you put your feet to the fire, so to speak. You will find it on the Internet.

MR. BAGG: I think that is very good.

MR. MACHTAY: How do we get that?

MS. SQUIRES: I was in Margo 's office last
night and a pile of them came in. I don't know how.

THE CHAIRMAN: I read Route 347 is going to
go through significant growth in the next few years.
Exactly what that means, I don't know. Hopefully, it's
going to be a vast improvement over what we currently
have.

MR. MACHTAY: Let me say one other thing.
New York State Town Law 272(a), Sub 11(b), it's
something that I dealt with when I was with the town,
says when any governmental agency other than the town is
doing something in a town that has a comprehensive plan,
they must consider, not absolutely do, but consider that
comprehensive plan.

So I would hope that DPW, in putting together
their projects, will consider whatever towns. That is
why was asking the questions before about Islip, have
they considered the town's comprehensive plan. I think
that this is something that we should all keep in mind
when they're doing something.

MR. GULBRANSEN: To that effect, could I ask
that Jim get a link from the Huntington study which
shows the bikeways that they have in mind? Could you
provide that link to the other towns in the county so we
can invite them, if the CEQ wants, to evaluate that, to
consider it? Why don't we let each other know what we think about this, and we would like to think more about it. If you could show us your views, that would be helpful.

MR. BAGG: We have most of the Master Plans in the office.

MR. GULBRANSEN: With respect to bikeways.

MR. BAGG: If they have chapters with respect to bikeways, I expect it would be there. Can I have the site again?

MR. MACHTAY: New York State Town Law 272(a), Sub 11(b).

MS. SQUIRES: One of the reasons we're excited with this, we had a comprehensive plan in '93 that the Town Board never adopted, and this was adopted in January.

MR. BAGG: I think a letter should be written to DPW to alert them to these facts, all of the information and say when a road project comes in before CEQ, they're going to request information regarding these things.

MR. MACHTAY: They don't have to comply with the comprehensive plan, but they at least have to consider it.
THE CHAIRMAN: Would the CAC pass that onto the DPW?

MR. BAGG: We'll do it.

MR. MACHTAY: Contact the Planning Department, who is in charge of the comprehensive plan, is this in conformance or not.

MR. KAUFMAN: On the EAF conformance to existing project or comprehensive plan. I happen to know in this particular area with Islip that we were talking about, they don't have a specific Master Plan addressing anything that we were talking about. There is a general Master Plan; I believe it's not been updated.

MR. MACHTAY: I believe whether it's road specific or not, it's community specific, and it may have something that addresses the community. That somehow would have a bearing on the historic or community or residential.

MR. KAUFMAN: In the example that we were dealing with, Nancy Fretonia, a former member of CEQ for the fifteen or twenty years --

MS. SQUIRES: (Interposing) She's chair of the Islip Conservation Board now.

MR. KAUFMAN: Also with the civics, she would
have brought that up that this was a specific concern
for this project.

MS. SPENCER: Is master plan and
comprehensive plan interchangeable terms?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

MR. SCHNEIDERMAN: It's a great map. I
noticed one lighthouse they missed. Certain places I
was looking for mountain biking and places that I go are
not listed for mountain biking. In general, it has an
awful lot on it. It has improved trails, bike routes,
campgrounds. It's a fairly easy to read map too. I
would like to get a copy of it. It's a useful
resource.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is there any other business?

No other business. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

MR. MACHTAY: Motion.

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor, motion
carries.

(Time noted: 11:20 a.m.)
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