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Arthur Kunz Library
H. Lee Dennison Bldg. - 4th Floor
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Call to Order:
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Correspondence:

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 September 17th, 2009 and October 13th, 2009.

B. Vector Control – 2010 Annual Work Plan
Project Review:
Recommended Unlisted Actions:

A. Proposed Smith Point County Park Master Plan Update. Town of Brookhaven.
B. Proposed Multi-use Recreational Facility at Cherry Avenue County Park. Town of Islip.
C. Proposed CR13, 5th Avenue & CR13A, Clinton Avenue Roadway and Intersection Improvements, Town of Islip, CP 5538.
D. Proposed Acquisition for Open Space Preservation Purposes Known as the Peconic River County Park Addition – Naftal Associates, L.P. Property in the Town of Brookhaven.

Project Review:
Recommended TYPE I Actions:

A. Proposed IR 1861-2009 Authorizing the Granting of Permanent Easements to the Suffolk County Water Authority for Production, Distribution and Transmission of Drinking Water Supply and Ancillary Facilities On Certain Parcels Acquired by the County of Suffolk Under the Old Drinking Water Protection Program. Towns of Brookhaven, East Hampton, Islip, Riverhead and Southampton.

Suffolk County Parks:

Updates on County Parks

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.***
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
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A regular meeting of the Council on
Environmental Equality was held in the
auditorium of Williams H. Rogers Suffolk
County Legislature Building, 725 Veterans
Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on
November 18, 2009 at 10:30 A.M.

Appearances:
Michael Kaufman, Vice Chairman, CEQ
Gloria G. Russo, CEQ
Thomas Gulbransen, CEQ
Daniel Pichney, CEQ
Eva Grownwy, CEQ
Richard Machtay, CEQ
Mary Ann Spencer, CEQ
Christine Desalvo, CEQ Staff
James Bagg, Chief Environmental Analyst
Joy Squires, CAC Representative
Richard Martin, Historic Society
Lauretta Fisher, Department of Public Works
Nick Gibbons, SC Parks Department
Dominick Mavinaggi, Department of Public Works
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[The meeting was called to order at 10:36 A.M.]

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Hello,
everybody. My name is Mike Kaufman.
I am Vice Chairman of the QEC. Our
Chairperson, Larry Swanson, is not
with us today, so I will been
starting the meeting. I'm calling
it to order.

Let's see. We all have a
revised agenda in our packets, and
I'll guess we'll start off, to make
Jim happy, properly and in order,
we'll deal with the minutes. Has
anyone checked the minutes from last
month?

MR. MACHTAY: There were no
minutes.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. The month
before?

MR. MACHTAY: Before that, there
were no minutes put up yet, either.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. I guess --
have you been monitoring the website
with any frequency? I just looked
at it yesterday. September, October
minutes were not put up yet, so we
can't vote on them, so we'll skip
that item on the agenda. Jim, is
there any correspondence out there
that we should be made aware of?

MR. BAGG: No, not at this point
in time.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's easy. The
public portion will delay for a
little while, if that's okay with
you. Let's go to Project Reviews
and Recommended Type 2 actions. We
have the Legislative packet for
resos laid on the table yesterday.

Just as a personal aside, Reso
1959, Naming the new 4th precinct
building after Cyril J. Donnelly;
Mr. Donnelly was the former police
chief of the Town of Smithtown prior
to the amalgamation of the town
police forces into the County force
in 1960. He's a historic figure
from around the 1930's up through
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the 1970's in the Town of Smithtown,
and I think it's a very, very
appropriate thing to do, and I hope
the bill goes through.

I see 1972 is in there,
Approving the vector control plan of
DPW, which was presented to us a
month or so ago. SEQRA's complete
on that one. Do any members have
any comments on any resos?

[No response]

Not hearing any, I will call for
a motion to accept, staff
recommendations?

MR. MACHTAY: [Raises hand]

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion by Richard
Machtay. Do I have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: [Raises hand]

MR. KAUFMAN: A second by Eva.

All in favor? Vote is unanimous.
Okay. Oh, my favorite subject.
The next one is Proposed establishment of a
dog run at Robinson Duck Farm County
Park, Yaphank, of all towns, Town of
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Brookhaven. Is there anyone here to present on that?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN: By the way, sir, could you identify yourself for the record?

MR. GIBBONS: Good morning.

Nick Gibbons, Suffolk County Parks Department. The proposal is for a -- the establishment of a five-acre dog run at Robinson Duck Farm, if you're familiar of where that is; I'll orient you a little bit.

As part of the attachments to the correspondence is an aerial photograph. I think that's probably the easiest way to describe it. The dog run -- proposed dog run's area is indicated on the aerial. It's on the south side of Montauk Highway. Just to the north of Montauk, you can see Sunrise Highway. They almost meet in that spot. It's east of the Wertheim Refuge, which
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surrounds the property on both the
west and the south, although to the
south, it's bi-sectored by the LIRR.

Then to the east, far east, by the
carmans River, the habitat of this
area is an old field, former
agricultural land, that has since
grown over. The County Parks
Department maintains it in an old
field state by mowing once every one
to two years. The community type is
a mix of both invasive species and
native grasses. A native grass
restoration project was completed
about six or seven years ago to the
south of this site.

The area that's proposed for the
dog run is predominantly mugwart, an
invasive Asian species. There's a
proposed parking area of
approximately 15 to 20 vehicles.
It's located in the central part of
the property along to the north
there, and we proposed to maintain
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an existing roughly 20 to 30 foot buffer along Montauk highway.

MR. KAUFMAN: Do any of members have any questions? Eva.

MS. GROWNEY: In the past, what has been the most recent activities on the property aside from the mowing? Is there anything else that's gone on there?

MR. GIBBONS: There's several structures to the east. You'll see those on the aerial. There's three county residences and a couple additional commercial buildings, routine maintenance. We're actually forward with demolition of one of the commercial structures. It's just simply unsafe at this point but aside from the mowing, that's the extent of management activities that Parks has undertaken.

MS. GROWNEY: There's no other activities from the local residents happening on the property?
MR. GIBBONS: We do have an issue there with unauthorized access for bow-hunting purposes, but it's not a sanctioned use by the County Parks Department through public access to the site.

MS. GROWNEY: Might that somehow be a conflict? Will something have to be done about the bow activity?

MR. GIBBONS: It wouldn't be the field area, anyway. There's some wooded area that surrounds the structures. It provides additional protection to the property and enforcement, so, no, I don't see any conflict there.

MR. KAUFMAN: Nick, one quick comment: You said it's mugwart up there, which is an invasive species?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. And that covers the entire area of the dog run itself?

MR. GIBBONS: The mugwart is
probably about 70 percent of this
site.

MR. KAUFMAN: So, essentially,
you're using the dogs to control the
mugwart for all intensive purposes?
Can you train dogs to eat this
stuff?

MR. GIBBONS: [Inaudible
response]

MR. KAUFMAN: Ignoring the rest
of it, I have one comment on it.
I'm not sure this is a Type 2 action
under the designation that you gave.
The snow fencing and the previous
parking area probably are minor
temporary usages, but we're
establishing a five-acre dog run.
Those uses are never temporary.
Once they're in there, they are
there forever, and that's really the
use that's being placed here.

I think this is an unplisted
action more likely, or possibly a
Type 2. It's going to get a negdec
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most likely if it's unlisted. There may be another section under Type 2 but I don't have the regulations if front of me. It's over 4,000 square feet; that much, I know. Does anyone have the SEQRA regs in front of them?

MR. GIBBONS: I'll just point out, for your consideration, are two points. Number one, we've done these in a couple of sites at this point. You guys have seen one or two in the past. The difference here is, number one, this makes use of entirely of an existing cleared area, which the others didn't.

The other is the fencing in this case is truly temporary in the sense that it's -- if not replaced every three to four years, say, it deteriorates over time and it will have to be replaced, whereas we've expended capital funding for chain link fences for more permanent
facilities in other places.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah, but that's really focusing upon the improvement as opposed to the primary use, which is what I'm focusing on and what SEQRA would focus on. Again, I'll defer to anyone who remembers the Type 2 regulations. I really think this is an unlisted, though, and, again, that's not going to make a difference. We have enough documentation to make a call on it today.

MR. GIBBONS: Before you -- I'm sorry -- before you -- I just want to discuss the other attachment, which were photos taken within the past week of the site, so that gives you an idea of the habitat involved. This is -- this mote area is all within the existing proposed dog run area. There were some flags held -- hung up to delineate that, but they don't show up in the photo. But
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this is just south of Montauk highway.

MR. KAUFMAN: Dan, you had raised your hand. Do you have a question?

MR. PICHNEY: Since today was supposed to be invasive plant day, for the remainder of the site, are there any efforts to control mugwart?

MR. GIBBONS: We did undertake a grassland or warm season grassland, native grassland restoration at this site about six or eight years ago. It unfortunately was not maintained. There was good initial response. It was seeded through a grant through the USDA that the Parks Department received. We did this on a number of sites at the time. This site has also been burned in the past to maintain grass on habitat, but unfortunately, the mugwart -- we're looking for an effective means that
doesn't involve herbicide at this point. I'm not sure there are any.

The entire --

MR. PICHNEY: I don't -- yeah.

MR. GIBBONS: The entire site, I should mention, is the subject of a feasibility study for restoration. It's being headed up by the Planning Department. However, the primary focus in terms of restoration is the Carmans River wetland quarter, and a secondary goal is native grass and restoration within the field area as well as.

MR. PICHNEY: Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Jim, you have a comment?

MR. BAGG: Yeah, I have a question. Nick, does this project go before the Legislature, or is this strictly determined by the Commissioner at this point in time?

MR. GIBBONS: In this case, this is a project that won't go beyond
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	he department in the sense that it
does not require a capital
appropriation. Some of our others,
which I brought you in the past, did
require -- through our capital
program, we have a project of
establishment of dog runs in county
parks. However, because of the
inexpensive nature of the material
being proposed at this site, it
doesn't require capital
appropriation.

MR. KAUFMAN: Given the fact
that it's a dog run, and again, the
usages are not necessarily
temporary, I think the review is
proper and that's what we're doing
here right now. I think it's an
unlisted action, and if there's no
other comments, I'd entertain a
motion.

MS. SPENCER: [Raised hand].

MR. KAUFMAN: I have a motion by
Mary Ann.
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MS. SPENCER: No, I have a comment.

MR. KAUFMAN: Oh, you have a comment.

MS. SPENCER: I have a comment. Nick, is there a possibility of moving the dog run to the west so that it's in the west corner? It would not be completely cleared but it would be further away from the residences. Also, that's a busy road. I mean, access on and off that road into the parking lot, no matter where you put it, may be problematic.

MR. GIBBONS: Are you talking about the residences on the north side of Montauk highway?

MS. SPENCER: No, I'm talking about the residences on the east side -- the --

MR. GIBBONS: Oh, the Bush Farm there?

MS. SPENCER: -- to the Bush
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Farm and the County property.

MR. GIBBONS: The reason why it's centrally located, there's a couple reasons how we wound up here. At one point in time, we were proposing it to the extreme south of the field, but for a number of reasons, not the least of which, ecologically, it, makes more sense. It's less of a fragmenting feature of the old field grassland if it's up by Montauk Highway where the most impact from traffic noise, what have you -- the reason it's centrally located, equidistant roughly between the Wertheim boundary and the Bush Farm, which is to the east there, is to maintain, to the best of our ability, a buffer between us and the Wertheim Refuge.

That request came from Wertheim itself, from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. So in this way, we're ensuring -- and I should also
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explain that we will not mow that
area as frequently. We'll continue
the mow it to keep it in a grassland
state, but we'll leave everything
else un-mowed that's outside of the
dog run area to continue to keep
that buffer established between us
and the private holdings to the east
there and also to maintain an
ecological vegetative buffer between
us and the Wertheim Refuge to the
west.

As for the access off of Montauk
Highway, you've been there, so
you'll know the existing access is
an extremely dangerous situation,
and at one point, we contemplated
using that existing access for the
general public. It's just simply
not appropriate. We've been working
with DPW to take a look at what's
most important off of Montauk
Highway, but the proposed access is
certainly an improvement to the
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existing conditions, and it
significantly increases site lines,
both east and west on Montauk.

And finally, the reason we are
-- this is a balance of a lot of
different conditions, but in this
case, we are roughly opposite the
last residence to the north on
Montauk. We're looking not to
impact the residences to the north
by establishing an entrance right in
front of any one of those, so
actually this could be revised a
little bit if -- where it says
Montauk Highway there, the proposed
entrance is actually south of the
word Montauk, roughly. It's a
little bit to the east of where it's
shown on this but still within the
eexisting dog run area, as proposed.

MS. SPENCER: Nick, what was the
Wertheim National Refuge, what was
that rational for a buffer?

MR. GIBBONS: The reason this is
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snow fence and not chain link and
more formal than some of our other
sites are -- there's several
reasons. We don't have existing
utilities on the site. Some of our
other dog runs, our formal dog runs,
have water run to them. We don't
have any such infrastructure
proposed here.

But more importantly, the fact
that we don't have chain link, this
is -- the concept here is a natural
borders dog run. This is
legislation that was subsequent to
the previous resolution that
directed parks to establish five dog
runs. There was a follow-up
resolution to that said we would
take a harder look at establishing
natural border dog runs. I'm still
not clear on what that is. However,
at least for now, we feel as if a
snow fence is roughly -- is a
natural border, for lack of a better
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term, in that it's somewhat
temporary in nature. The site could
be moved around, subject, again, to
the CEQ's review.

I understand Mike's point in
terms of once it's established, it's
kind of hard to -- and that's true
of any of our recreational
opportunities that we establish in
Parks. But the idea is to get the
public used to the idea that that is
the designated area and,
theoretically, we could take the
snow fence down and the vegetation
that's grown up around the perimeter
of this established dog run area
would serve as enough of a natural
border for the public's use.

What I don't understand clearly
is how that benefits the public's
use of the site, how that changes
what the natural border park offers
that the conventional border park
does not.
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MR. KAUFMAN: A better view for the dog's, Nick. You remember that argument.

MR. GIBBONS: Wertheim's concern is that the dogs don't know where the end of the dog run is, and that they will eventually venture out onto their property.

MS. SPENCER: Which would argue that there would also be some kind of a barrier, right?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MS. SPENCER: And going back the Mike's point about the view for the dogs, which we've had --

MR. KAUFMAN: Believe it or not, that's a really serious subject.

MS. SPENCER: Yes, well, this is a totally cleared area. If you were to move this to the west towards the Wertheim, leave the parking where it is. Move your square to the west so that you include that forested area. There's a little variety for the
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dogs, it's not just a cleared field.

MR. GIBBONS: We could take that under consideration. I'm not sure it changes the SEQRA designation necessarily, but we'll definitely take it under advisement. Your primary concern, just to be clear, is a buffer between us and the farm; is that correct?

MS. SPENCER: Yes, that's my primary concern. And given that the Wertheim is a permanent -- that's not going to become housing?

MR. GIBBONS: No.

MS. SPENCER: So moving it closer to Wertheim does buffer the properties on the east a little better.

MR. GIBBONS: It gives us -- yes.

MS. SPENCER: And gives the dogs some trees to run in.

MR. GIBBONS: It gets closer into being truly opposite the
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MS. SPENCER: But you're providing a buffer and the highway.

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MS. SPENCER: And you could leave the parking where it is. I mean, your access wouldn't change.
So the parking, instead of being in the middle of the dog run, would be on the edge of the dog run.

MR. GIBBONS: Right. I didn't want to get into this much detail, but as long as it's come up, the reason I have the parking centrally located is, the thought is from an operational standpoint and based on our experience at these other locations, we would -- if you could approximate a line through the middle of this dog run area and thereby dividing it in half so we have an A side and a B side, four to six months out of the year, only one side would be open providing the
CEQ 11/18/09

other area an opportunity to
reestablish some vegetation, as has
been our experience at West Hills
and Blydenburgh. In a very short
amount of time, the dogs entirely
denuded the site of any vegetation.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's why I made
that comment about the mugwart
possibly being controlled by the
dogs.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, that's true,
but everything will be controlled.
They are not very selective in terms
of where they step.

So the only issue in terms of
planning this thing is then that the
parking should be really centrally
located in that if we had it to the
extreme west of this site then the
public would have to park in one
area, avoid using that half that's
fallow, for lack of a better term,
temporarily while they get to the
other side, if that makes sense. I
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was going to show that on there, but
I thought it would be just too
confusing -- I didn't know that --
but as long as you asked, I want to
explain it. That's operationally
where we think -- how we're going to
run this site.

MR. KAUFMAN: Tom, you had a
question?

MR. GULBRANSEN: Good morning.

MR. GIBBONS: Good morning.

MR. GULBRANSEN: In the fore
program that the DEC has underway
with municipalities is now being
upgraded and driven in part by the
pathogen issues that a lot of the
abatements are facing. I'm not
familiar with the dog run
operations. How do you think this
is going to effect the pathogens
that are heading out into the
waterways? Do they have
pooper-scooper receptacles and is it
no net gain; do we know?
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MR. GIBBONS: This site has no impact on water quality given its proximity to the nearest body of water. We do offer amenities such as those at our formal dog run sites. That will not be the case here. This will be a carry in/out facility.

Our experience has been if you provide receptacles at an area like this where there's no staff to speak of, they become a dumping ground for everything that people want to get out of their garages but are hard to get rid of, and that just becomes an operational headache for us.

We did recently establish a dog run down at Roe Avenue in East Patchogue similar to this; again, snow fencing, a natural borders concept. It's truly a natural border in the sense that it fronts Great South Bay. In that case, there's really no place to go other
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than up to the shoreline there.
That's on a former dredge spoil
site. Again, it's in East
Patchogue. That's a site where we
don't offer, for the same reason,
receptacles.

We have that in a lot of our
passive parks where there is no
facilities to speak of, and every
time we add a receptacle to one of
these seats, we're dividing the
existing staffs time by yet another
factor and it's not as if we're
adding additional staff to the
department to run this; we're not.
So that being said, there could be
some unanticipated results here and
then we'll have to adjust
accordingly.

MR. GULBRAIS: That was what I
wanted to close with. The pathogen
loads that were looked at by EPA and
DEC are calling for productions on
the level of 95 percent reduction,
and a lot of it seems to be driven
by pet loads unless a better source
can be determined in the future.
So, just so you know, if a
municipality in the area comes
knocking on the door, we might
actually go back and help them
mitigate against something if they
find that's going to help decrease
their load, maybe.

MR. GIBBONS: More often than
not, that's road runoff. That's how
pet waste contributes to those
issues, and in this case where you
have 70-acre basically intact
property with no pervious surfaces
-- or impervious, rather, there is
plenty of filtration on the site.

MR. KAUFMAN: Eva, you had a
question?

MS. GROWNEY: Yes, just for a
little more clarification because
that was along the lines of one of
the questions I had. The other --
so does that mean they'll be
providing some sort of plastic bags
for people to -- there's no
provisions whatsoever.

MR. GIBBONS: No, our experience
is that unless you provide those a
receptacle, all those serve to do is
to wind up in the -- elsewhere in
the park; that is, they're used and
then they're tossed onsite,
unfortunately.

MS. GROWNEY: All right. The
other part of my question is to get
to -- to address the buffer issue a
little bit. What if is this square,
the red part of the square, was
pushed down the southern aspect of
the green parking square so that
you're providing a little more road
buffer? Maybe that would help
address somewhat the issues that
might come up with the housing being
across the street.

MR. GIBBONS: Oh, less frontage
along Montauk; deeper rather than wider?

MS. GROWNEY: More frontage --

MR. GIBBONS: Less frontage on Montauk, I meant --

MS. GROWNEY: Pushing the square -- keeping it perpendicular -- keeping the red square perpendicular to the green square, pushing the red square to the south so that the parking is outside of the red square instead of inside the red square.

MR. GIBBONS: Oh, I see. Yes, that certainly could be done. We could take a look at that, sure.

MS. GROWNEY: Okay. Thanks.

MR. KAUFMAN: Any other questions? Dan.

MR. PICHNEY: I just have another ancillary question again, not germane to that specifically. In terms of policy, is there any reason why the department is maintaining that that field is a
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field, an ecological region, rather
than letting it revert back to
forestland?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, there is.

This is one of the rare habitats, as
much of this property is largely
invasive species and impacted by
those species, it still offers
structurally grassland habitat
that's utilized, if not to a lesser
extent than a native grassland would
be, in my -- and this is a program
that's run out of our unit where we
have six or eight sites such as this
that we continue to maintain, as I
said, maybe once -- one to three
years, say, in this state just
because this is the, really, rarest
of community types and it speaks to
the agricultural past of the County,
and it's sites such as this that
we've lost to natural succession.

So we recognize that this is an
artifact of past use, but that does
not necessarily mean it's any less important. So this is on a rotation, and I have several sites we treat in a similar way.

MR. KAUFMAN: Dan, we do this with -- I think United Artists is on that list also, of trying to preserve certain types of ecological niches that have disappeared.

MR. GIBBONS: That's right.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah, United Artists property.

MR. GIBBONS: That's in Eastport, County Road 51 by the Stargazer.

MR. KAUFMAN: And there are additional sites. Field habitat like this is relatively rare. We don't have that much in the system. We usually buy -- well, the County usually buys pine barrens lands or water quality lands, things like that. It's unusual to have this kind of a situation.
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MS. SPENCER: Another question.

So you say that in this particular instance, there will no bags, no garbage can, no maintenance, it could be an issue for groundwater runoff. Are these dog runs -- will this be a permanent dog run, A, and, B, is the thinking within the County that these -- that there could be, like, friends groups established who would be responsible for keeping them policed and clean, and that if a friends group were to take that responsibility and then they were negligent, the dog run would disappear?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes. That's the case over at Roe Avenue in East Patchogue where that's truly deemed the pilot program, and it's -- but I can't explain to you what the difference is between that site and this except to say that if this proves to be problematic in ways we
don't anticipate, then Parks will reevaluate and there's nothing to stop us from removing us from the site, which speaks to the argument I was making in the submittal is that what makes this temporary as opposed to Blydenburgh, which is, I don't know, $60,000 or $80,000 worth of improvements, that's a lot less temporary. It would be a major impact to the department to have to remove said improvements as opposed to here where we're just rolling up the snow fence and walking away.

The problems I would anticipate here, besides, you know, really not following the rules, and, yes, there are friends groups and there are -- there is a code of conduct that these groups profess and explain to new members, but that's not to say everybody that uses this will be part of these groups. I doubt that is the case.
But the other thing that could go on here is this parking lot. If this is open all the time, which we anticipate it will be, at least initially, and the hours will be dawn to dusk as they typically are in other passive sites, this could be an area where we wake up in the morning to find there's a boat left in the parking lot or some other appliance or other debris. If that becomes an issue, then Parks will have to reevaluate that because, again, every time we install a receptacle, every time we throw a gate up with a lock on it, somebody has got to be there to open and close that gate.

We experience those growing pains in a lot of different places where we try to establish passive uses and don't have the staff to maintain or supervise those sites.

MR. KAUFMAN: I'll make a final
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comment then I will ask for a motion
on this. I don't know if anybody
saw this in Newsday, but there were
two people sitting on a bench with
Coindre Hall framed in the
background and also with two dogs
over there, and I don't know if --
has a dog run been established over
there?

MR. GIBBONS: You saw a photo
with dogs at Coindre Hall?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yeah, one dog was
kissing the other dog. That's the
caption. I was shocked.

(LAUGHTER)

MR. GIBBONS: That is shocking.
Coindre Hall is not an authorized
dog run site.

MR. KAUFMAN: You don't have to
go any further. Don't worry about
it. I just that it was apropos.

MR. GIBBONS: The dog run is
something that's come to this
council in the past, the approved
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dog run area. It has not been constructed.

MR. KAUFMAN: Please, someone, make a motion.

MS. GROWNEY: I make a motion that we pass this application in its form.

MR. MACHTAY: You have to classify it and then make a recommendation.

MS. GROWNEY: As an unlisted action.

MR. KAUFMAN: Do I hear a second?

MR. PICHNEY: Second.

MR. KAUFMAN: I have a second from Mr. Pichney. Calling the vote. All in favor? Abstentions? Okay. Motion passes.

The next action is a proposed acquisition for open space preservation purposed known as the North Fork Knolls, LLC, formerly Hubbard Duck Farm, Town of
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Riverhead. Lauretta, could you identify yourself for the record?

MS. FISHER: Yes, good morning.

Lauretta Fisher, Principal Environmental Analyst with the Department of Planning.

Before you today, we have one acquisition, the Hubbard Duck Farm, former Hubbard Duck Farm. It's a 77.5-acre parcel that's actually sandwiched in between two other major county parklands properties: The Indian Island County Park to the east and the Indian Island County Golf Course to the southwest. The Long Island Rail Road is the northern boundary of the property.

It is situated along Saw Mill Creek, a tributary that flows into Peconic River in its -- near Riverhead near its beginnings, and it has freshwater wetlands associated with it along the creek.

There is mostly wooded with, now, a
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grassland where a former farm field existed just south of the railroad tracks.

MR. KAUFMAN: You're not going to put a dog run in there, are you?

MS. FISHER: I hope not. It is a -- it was used as a duck farm.

There were significant structures, a number of structures on the property. It's taken over a year for the property to be cleared and approved. A Phase I was completed and all the requirements that were identified in the Phase I have been addressed and either removed or completed.

The only remaining structure on the property is a small concrete slab in the northwest corner of the property. It's a flat slab that exists, and it was determined that instead of -- actually it exists within a wooded area now, and it was felt that removing it would create
more of a disturbance and loss of vegetation than actually, you know, having it there. So it was determined that at this point it would be left there and that is the only structure on the property at this time. So the property has been cleared, and we are looking to acquire this as a 50/50 match with the Town of Riverhead and add to our significant holdings in this area, so this is a large piece for us and a significant piece that we feel in this watershed.

MR. KAUFMAN: Lauretta, I have two quick questions and then I'll open it the other members. I have a memory that we were dealing with a property nearby just recently, an acquisition, and we were looking on the shoreline or something.

MS. FISHER: Yes. If you look at the map before you, there's small properties outlined in purple and
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then small properties outlined in

green to the south of that. It
doesn't show, but it's in Peconic
River. That was the Riverside
acquisition. The Town of Riverhead
bought the purple and the County
bought the green parcels that are
situated, actually, along the
Peconic River shoreline to the south
of there, so that was a recent
acquisition, I believe, last year or
a year and a half ago.

MR. KAUFMAN: The other question
I have is you were talking about
remediation of the property. Was
there ever a manure problem in the
area, or has that been cleaned up or
sealed or whatever?

MS. FISHER: With regard to the
duck waste?

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

MS. FISHER: It wasn't
identified as a problem on this
site.
MR. BAGG: If I might respond to
that. Basically, you can see that
orange area on the map. That was
where the sewage disposal facility
for the duck farm was and also the
sewer disposal for the field, so
they're not on this particular site.

MR. KAUFMAN: Any questions by
members? Tom.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Good morning,
Lauretta.

MS. FISHER: Good morning.

MR. GULBRANSEN: The resolution
calls for cooperation with the Town
regarding the management of the
acquisition or the management of the
property. Is there any detail about
what the management and ongoing cost
might be?

MS. FISHER: At this point, it
will be left in its natural state as
a passive recreational area. The
details of any kind of use at this
point has not been prepared yet, but
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it will be a passive recreational
use, very minimal use with trails
possibly, but we're not foreseeing
anything beyond that.

If the Town, with the County's
approval, County Park Department's
approval -- any management agreement
would be reviewed and approved by
our Parks Department, and that, if
at that point, if there is any
formal -- formality to its use, it
would come back here for a review.

MR. KAUFMAN: Any other
questions by members? If not, I'll
entertain a motion.

MR. MACHTAY: Motion --

MR. BAGG: If I might point out,
we revised the suggested
classification since this lies
adjacent to two existing park
facilities. The threshold of 100
acres with Type 1 action drops to
25. Therefore, this becomes a Type
1 action.
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MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Well, I heard Mr. Machtay make a motion a second ago that it was a Type 1 negdec. Do I have a second on that one?

MR. GULBRANSEN: Second.

MR. KAUFMAN: Second by Tom. Calling the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Any abstentions? Motion passes.

Going on to the next item on the agenda, Historic Trust Docket. I guess that's up to you -- where's Rich? There he is. I guess we're looking at updates on housing programs and custodial agreements and anything else we need to know about.

MR. MARTIN: Good morning. The Suffolk County Parks' housing program, the committee that reviews the rents of these houses, has finished with all the current available buildings and that review
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was put into a resolution going
forward to the Suffolk County
Legislature for approval. We did
adjust some of the rents, and once
that is approved by the Legislature,
there will be a countywide Suffolk
County employee memo by the Parks
Department announcing what vacancies
and houses are available.

We do have four vacancies at
this time, two at West Hills County
Park, one at Timber Point and the
apartment within the main house at
Coindre Hall. So we're hoping, of
course, early next year to get
interest in those properties and to
fill those vacancies.

We will have a Suffolk County
park policeman moving into the Isaac
Mills House in Saint James come
January 1st. We're still doing some
restoration work on that building
before he can move in. We're
putting a new roof on it right now,
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So things are moving forward. The community, like I said before, has been very helpful in adjusting the rents so we can occupy them.

MR. KAUFMAN: Anything else?

MR. MARTIN: With our contracts, we are in the final stages of negotiations with the Town of Huntington. We're looking within the next two weeks to have a contract signed, which would provide them space on the first floor of the Coindre Hall Boathouse for their kayak program and also a large classroom on the second floor of the main house for our recreational programs and educational programs, and after that contract's been signed, the agreement is that the Town would provide the County with $600,000 towards the restoration of the Coindre Hall Boathouse, which we're looking to start early next year.
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MR. KAUFMAN: Quick question:

What is the condition of the Boathouse right now? Obviously, it needs work with $600,000 coming in, but is it safe to use right now?

MR. MARTIN: Half of the building has been deemed safe where they store the large sculls from the rowing club. The other half of the building has been closed up by the County architect. So after this project, that’s the space we’re looking to open up for the Town to use. So there’s a lot of structural problems especially with the tower in the center of that building that have to be taken care of before the public can access that half of the building.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. Thank you. Any comments by members? Tom.

MR. GULBRANSEN: A while ago, we talked about getting sufficient candidates to occupy these
residences. At that time, there was
mention about perhaps reaching out
to a broader community. I remember
the firefighter/EMS community as
another candidate group. Did that
get considered or is there
sufficient population from just
County employees to get what you
need?

MR. MARTIN: I'll say that and
other ideas haven't been considered
yet. We are waiting -- has taken
time to get the committee to review
all the housing to adjust the rents.
I'm hoping that would allow us to
rent them, and so that resolution,
like I said, is just going to the
Legislature now and then a new
countywide memo will go around with
those adjusted rents, and we're
hoping that will allow us to fill
them. If it doesn't, then, yes,
those kinds of suggestions -- this
program now does allow us to go
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outside of the department and the
County employ to find tenants.

MR. KAUFMAN: Joy, you had a
question?

MS. SQUIRES: It's really just a
comment. In order for this
construction to go on, someplace has
to be found to take the sculls while
work is being done, and sculls are
very large, and they need to be near
the water. It's an interesting
problem that you don't necessarily
think about when you do a
restoration.

MR. MACHTAY: That's true, and
Suffolk County Parks Department is
meeting with the Town of Huntington
and Sagamore rowing and the high
school groups that also use the
boathouse to try to find within the
town, on a waterway, a suitable spot
where they can store the sculls and
continue their program. We figure
this will be at least a year where
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they have to be offsite, possibly
two. But we're working -- we just
had a meeting with the Town. We're
really working with the Sagamore
rowing department to find alternate
spots. They might have to split up,
actually, and put the storage on a
few locations. We're very engaged
with the group to find them
alternate spots.

MR. KAUFMAN: Just as an aside,
Rich, the Stony Brook crew stores
its boat at Long Beach in
Nissequogue out in the open. They
have tarps over them, and they have
racks out there but they are out in
the open. They have one small
building where they keep some of the
oars and some of the ancillary
equipment, but it is possible to
store them outside.

MR. MACHTAY: Right, and it's
just security issues, and we are
working with the Town to see where
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the safest spots would be for that
possibility also.

MR. KAUFMAN: Any other
questions by members?
[No response]
Okay. We'll move on then. Is
there anybody here to update us on
County Parks?
[No response]

Nobody is here. We'll go on to
other business. Oh -- Nick Gibbons
to present us with updates on County
Parks.

MR. GIBBONS: I'm just waiting
for -- there were two specific
sites, and one of the two, I'm just
waiting for something to come
through, and I'll have that
momentarily. Larry had asked me
specifically two questions, and then
I'll kind of open it up if there's
any additional inquiries from the
council.
One had to do with our
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concessionaire, Rusty Lever, Deep Hollow Ranch at Theodore Roosevelt County Park, Montauk. As many of you know, he's been a concessionary with us for many years. The final term of his existing contract expires December 31 of 2012 at which point the proposal and our people have to go out to public bid. He has no longer any additional option years on his contract.

In a lot of different ways, his contract is unique compared to others, and in once instance, if this is the case, is the fact that each year by the end of October, he can decide whether or not he wants to continue the contract. That's different from a lot of other agreements we have. Each year brings another -- an additional layer of reporting that's required and additional County requirements that are opposed on all of our
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concessionaires including Deep
Hollow Ranch, so it's always at his
option that he can walk from the
contract on any given year. That
being said, the longest this can
continue is two more years before
its has to go out to RFP, and that
was a question Larry had specific to
Theodore Roosevelt.

The other site that Larry had
asked about was -- I believe he
referred to Black Duck Lodge
specifically, but collectively, we
call the entire park Hubbard County
Park. It includes both the Smithers
property, which you guys have been
more familiar with over the past
year, and Black Duck Lodge as well.
They are all included within the
collective assemblage of properties
that collectively are Hubbard County
Park. We recently received a grant
through Assemblyman Englebright's
office, and I wanted to break down
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for you how that grant was broken up
in terms of the budget that's been
allocated for each of the aspects of
this project.

The restoration of the existing,
what we call the clubhouse building,
the main building within the
Smithers assemblage of buildings,
$375,000 is earmarked for the
renovation and restoration for that
building. That probably is not
going to cover everything that's
required of the building, but it
will certainly stabilize -- won't go
to more than stabilizing the
building and restoring a significant
portion, primarily the exterior of
the building, and then I'll defer to
Rich after I get through this list
to provide additional updates on
that, if you're interested. Another
$5,000 will go towards the
development of a sign plan for the
entire site and actual fabrication
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of those signs, the materials as well. Whether or not we could fabricate them inhouse or not, we certainly have the ability to do so, but an overall sign plan that interprets the complexity of these properties is certainly in order.

An additional $40,000 will be going towards trail improvements at the site. Those of you that are familiar with the site, it has extensive wetlands, some far more sensitive than others, and being able to get responsible access for the general public to these sites can often require boardwalks, platforms, what have you, and construction wetlands such as that has are expensive propositions, so this $40,000 is earmarked towards satisfying that goal.

And finally $130,000 is set aside for the development of a master plan that will take a more
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comprehensive look at the entire
property and come up with a --
develop a phase set of goals that
the Parks Department will then at
some point in time -- it's envision
is to establish a capital project of
implementation of that master plan,
similar to what we have done at
other sites. That master plan will
certainly come back to the council
for review and will go on to the
full Legislature for approval.

So that -- those grant monies
are currently with New York State,
and Parks is working closely with
New York State to begin that
project.

MR. KAUFMAN: Are those funds
actually allocated; in other words,
they are turned over, so they're not
--

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, they are
already committed, and we have no
reason to believe that they are
jeopardized by any of the current events in Albany or here in the County.

MR. KAUFMAN: The second question -- I'll get to you in a second, Eva. The second question I have is this is a unique site, as we all know, and it has a number of very, very sensitive environmental features. Any master plan that you develop and that eventually comes to us or is developed in cooperation with us has to take that into account, I think you know; I'm just sort of putting it on the record and reemphasizing it.

This park has to be protected. This is one of the jewels of the system. It's one of, if you will, one of the 10 most important sites on the entire inventory that the County has, so just obviously, be very, very careful. I know that's your intent. You and I have
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discussed this over the past year,
so we have to be very, very careful.

MR. GIBBONS: This is certainly
not a traditional master plan in the
sense of a Smith Point master plan,
which I brought to you guys a month
or two ago --

MR. KAUFMAN: This is not a
heavy usage plan.

MR. GIBBONS: No, and there's
already protections in place that
ensure that Hubbard is going to look
the same way it does now many years
into the future. It's within the
core preservation of the area of the
central pine barrens. It's
regulated by a number of different
DEC regulatory programs, Freshwater
Wetlands Act as well. Those two
programs alone encompass a large
portion of the property and impact
what activities can occur.

And finally, the way in which
the County acquired these properties
also binds us to, if not outright
dedicated to the nature preserve, to
treat them as if they were.

MR. KAUFMAN: Eva, you had a
question.

MS. GROWNEY: I have, I guess,
some question and some comments.
Obviously, Nick, you know I'm
compelled to say something about the
study that was done by the American
Institute of Architects. The
national grant that I had received
to work through the Peconic chapter
for two years on the park and our
study, which we concur with you,
should be kept -- the park should be
kept in its natural state as much as
possible with minimum impact.

The comment has to do with
availing. I hope you guys will
avail yourselves of the study we did
do. There is a publication. I'm
not sure what stage it's at. I know
it's electronically published. I'm
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not sure it's been printed, which we
certainly, we'd like to make sure
you have. The office may already
have a copy electronically.

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, I believe so.

MS. GROWNLEY: Okay. Great. The
other thing is I'm also compelled to
say, because of the study, I very
strongly stress and hope that you
guys will pursue the implementation
of energy systems that are not going
to effect the environment because,
as you know now, the heating system
is antiquated beyond belief and I
hope you guys will work with
potential (Ceretherm) or other
aspects, wind and/or solar, and in a
way that's sensitive to the property
because I know, historically,
there's a lot of things that need to
be kept, maintained the way it is,
so I hope they will look creatively
at that.

And I'm certainly -- I will
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avail myself if you want in any
capacity I can. But I think that
that's a really important factor to
maintaining the sensitivity of the
environment as it is now.

MR. GIBBONS: The department has
no objections to exploring those
provided they're in accordance with
the historical and environmental
regulations already afore to this
site. Absolutely. And the council
-- both the council and the Historic
Trust Review Committee will also
have ample opportunity to review the
document and provide input prior to
it's completion, certainly.

MS. GROWNEY: Thank you for
that.

MR. KAUFMAN: Any other
questions? If not, thank you very
much, Nick.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. I guess now
we'll move on to the highlight of
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the meeting, the presentation on the Wertheim Wetlands Project by Dominick Ninivaggi, Superintendent of the Division Of Vector Control of Suffolk County DPW. Just identify yourselves for the record.

(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record where panel members agreed that presentations would be held off the record.)

MR. MACHTAY: If you can just add that the PowerPoint presentation is being given by Mr. Ninivaggi on the Wertheim Estate, and we can just attach the pictures to the back of the minutes, that would be fine.

[Continuation of meeting held off the record]

MR. KAUFMAN: Now, I'm going to exercise dictatorial powers as vice chairman. Unless there's anything else anybody wants to talk about, we're adjourned.

[Meeting adjourned at 1:03 P.M.]
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