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THE CHAIRMAN: I would like to call the meeting to order. We have the minutes posted for the December 9, 2009 meeting. I am surprised there enough computer capacity to handle it. Anybody have any comments on the Minutes of the December 9.

MR. MACHTAY: I did not read the December minutes.

MS. SPENCER: I didn't either. I haven't read all of them -- September, October, November.

MR. MACHTAY: September, October, and November -- I sent Jim all three.

MS. RUSSO: You can't access December.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you get that, Christine?

MS. DE SALVO: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: I would be willing to move September, October, and November Minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a motion to move the September, October, and
November Minutes of CEQ.

Do we have a second?

MS. RUSSO: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Correspondence, Jim?

MR. BAGG: Nothing. We did send
out a coordination letter with respect
to seeking lead agency for the Legacy
Village Project. The County Executive
is going to move forward with a positive
declaration. The cutoff to it was
yesterday, and we have not received
anything to date in terms of challenging
the County to be lead agency. So at
this point, we are lead agency unless
something comes in, in the next couple
of days.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just for my
clarification, review what has happened
since December -- the December CEQ
meeting?
MR. BAGG: Since the December CEQ memo and the Council's recommendation for an EIS or a DEIS, the County Executive's office has decided to move forward with a DGIS because they don't know the total details of the project at this point in time.

The Planning Department sent out a SEQRA coordination letter in January -- early January. The cutoff period was December -- late December -- it was yesterday. We have not received any comments back challenging the County as lead agency, so the County Executive, it's my understanding, is going to submit a CN, a Certificate of Necessity, resolution next Tuesday for a positive declaration requiring preparation of the DGIS and the scoping.

They're also going to go to a consultant for preparation of this, and the Department of Public Works will be responsible for soliciting a consultant to go out to BID.

MR. CHAIRMAN: For the DGIS?
MR. BAGG: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will we do the scoping?

MR. BAGG: We will hold a scoping meeting in conjunction with the Planning Department, and then the final scoping will be done -- in addition, the consultant will aide in the scope. Then the final scoping will be done, adopted, and the DGIS will be prepared. Then it comes back to CEQ for approval of completeness compared to the scoping thing, and then it will proceed with a normal course for the public hearing and comments for that DGIS.

MR. CHAIRMAN: When do you anticipate the consultant will be selected so we can move forward with the scope?

MR. BAGG: Well, I believe in the next few days the Department of Public Works is going to solicit a list for consultant services, and send out a scope of services and probably within two to three weeks they will have a
consultants on board.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Michael?

MR. KAUFMAN: What is happening with the coordination request through the Town of Brookhaven about the lead agency?

MR. BAGG: Nothing.

MR. KAUFMAN: So we received no answer?

MR. BAGG: No answers from anybody.

MR. KAUFMAN: So have we passed the 30 day countdown?

MR. BAGG: Yes, that was yesterday.

MR. KAUFMAN: So now essentially we are lead agency if we want to --

MR. BAGG: Yes, however, I am going to wait a couple of days to see if there is something that was postmarked in the mail last minute. Other than that, at this point in time, we received nothing.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Director's Report on Historic Trust.
MR. MARTIN: Good morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

MR. MARTIN: As for our housing program, we have moved the tenant into the Isaac Mills House in St. James. That was in the beginning of the month, so that building is occupied. The new roof is completed on that, so we're starting to turn that building around.

We still need to meet with the our committee for additional review on some of the properties and also send out canvas letter to County employees to try to occupy the building but we did reduce the rents so hopefully that will happen soon.

We are working over at the Wellington Duck Pond. There is two houses there that are in the housing program. There is actually a Federal Stimulus Program for labor. That's going to the Suffolk County Labor Department so we will have a full crew there painting the interior of one of the houses -- speeding it up and we're
going to get it ready for rental, and we
have put a new roof on the second house
at that site, so those two should be
rented out this year.

With our Historic Trust Custodial
Agreement, we have signed a contract
with the Town of Huntington for the use
of our boathouse, and also our classroom
space in the main building. We have met
with them, and they will be using that
for a number of years and they will do
Kayak programs and other educational and
arts related programs in the main house.

We are initiating a contract with
the Long Island Lighthouse Society for
the restoration of the Cedar Point
Lighthouse. We have just a basic
agreement with them for that site, and
now we're doing a full contract because
they're very interested to start
fundraising for the full restoration of
that building. That is a new
initiative.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good.

Michael?
MR. KAUFMAN: On the Isaac Mills House, as I would say, the Mills Pond House, I don't need the name of the occupant, but what type of person is this? Is it a County employee?

MR. MARTIN: It is a County employee. It is a park police person who has actually been in the program for a number of years. He has moved from the cottage we had at Yaphank to this house. So he knows the parks very well.

MR. KAUFMAN: But he came off the list basically?

MR. MARTIN: Well, the number one choice for the program is the park police or county police for security at the site. So they get in since they are the first ones on the list.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's great. I am really glad that somebody finally moved in there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is why we don't see any ice hockey being played on the pond.

MR. MARTIN: Well, the pond is not
frozen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It was frozen.

MR. MARTIN: We do have signs up that it is County property, and they can't skate there but we don't have full patrol.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions?

Yes?

MS. SPENCER: In the September minutes, you said something about wanting to meet -- have the CEQ meet on the historic site.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. SPENCER: I have not yet discussed this with Richard, but I would like the CEQ to meet at the Isaac Mills House either in April or May.

MR. MARTIN: We have to see because they have turned the heat off. We put two zones of heat in the house at this point. One zone for the apartment and one zone for the public space.

MS. SPENCER: It may be in May, but I would like the CEQ to meet at the Isaac Mills House. I would very much
like -- I think that's an exciting site, and I would like to meet there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So let's make a plan to do that. I do agree that we wait until May because we held a meeting at one of the sites -- the site across the street -- I forget the name but it was in the Winter and we had to sit there with our overcoats and gloves on. It was quite an experience.

MS. SPENCER: May it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Recommended Type Two Actions, Ratifications of Recommendations from the Legislature's Unit.

Jim?

MR. BAGG: Yes, I would like to point out a couple of resolutions in the packet that deal with the Council. One is 1037 of 2010. It's a Charter Law to expand the functions of the Council on environmental quality to include a vibrant Suffolk County bike route. That was submitted by Legislator Schneiderman.
Another resolution in the packet is
Number 252 of 2010 also submitted by
Legislator Schneiderman which is a
Charter Law to provide flexibility in
the membership of the Council on
Environmental Quality. Mr. Schneiderman
wanted the ability to point a
representative on his behalf to come to
the CEQ if he could not attend. I don't
know what the status of these two
resolutions are in the legislature. I
guess Mr. Kaufman has indicated that
possibly the resolution of allowing the
legislator to appoint a representative
in their place is not looked at
favorably. I know they had a change in
the EPA Committee and Vivian Fisher is
now back on the CEQ. Mr. Schneiderman,
I believe, is Head of the Parks
Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Michael?

MR. KAUFMAN: One of the concerns
was having someone at CEQ who is not
appointed by the Legislature or is not a
legislator themselves. Because we have
an impact upon the planning of the
County and a lot of operations of the
County, some people feel that at this
point in time essentially having an
unelected member without executive
authority might cause legal problems,
separation of powers, issues, things
like that. Some suggestions have been
made that if the Chairman of the EPA
can't make it, we have a vice
chairperson or another legislator make
it, but not have someone from the
legislative office show up. That's just
one of the concerns that, obviously, has
to be worked out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

MR. MACHTAY: I have one question
maybe Loretta can answer.

There are three disputed
resolutions on here with an 0400
section. There is the Huntington
properties that are being sold.

MS. FISCHER: Are they redemptions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What are the
numbers?
MR. MACHTAY: Is that WB?

"Authorizing a sale pursuant to Local Law (blank) reality property."

MS. FISCHER: Right, those are redemptions.

MR. MACHTAY: So those are the ones people are redeeming --

MS. FISCHER: Yes.

MR. MACHTAY: (Continuing) -- for lack of taxes and so on and so forth?

MS. FISCHER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion to accept staff rights.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Second?

MS. GROWNEY: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Recommended Unlisted Actions:
Proposed Acquisition of Open Space
Preservations of Lake Panamoka County
Park.

Lauretta, Happy New Year.

**MS. LAURETTA FISCHER:** Happy New Year and good morning, everyone.

This acquisition consists of five parcels with a total of approximately three acres in size adjacent and including a portion of Lake Panamoka itself. A portion of the property does move into the lake. These properties are significantly impacted by wetland -- freshwater wetland habitat and we're looking to acquire them for past recreational purposes under the new Drinking Water Protection Program.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Any questions?

**MR. GULBRANSEN:** Are they subject to development? Can they be developed?

**MS. FISCHER:** According to our review, we did not consider them developable under existing zoning but if you pursue this, this might possibly be developed.
MR. KAUFMAN: Tom, for way of ratification and the way this system works is even if the property is not necessarily capable of being developed since there is variances out there and you never know sometimes what towns will do, the County sometimes will take that into account. Also, these properties do have some value. If you look at the way it's setup -- the way the properties are setup in terms of being adjacent to other properties, they do have some value obviously. It goes through the ETRB Review Board and they determine the prices. So, obviously, they would be lower but hopefully they will be lower than the fully developed parcel might be, but the County does acquire these types of parcels.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments on this?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response by the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: I make the motion as
Unlisted Negative Declaration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Second?
MR. MACHTAY: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other comments?
(WHEREUPON, there was no response by the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?
(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)
MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?
(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
MR. CHAIRMAN: Abstention?
MR. GULBRANSEN: I abstain.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Proposed Acquisition For Open Space purposes property known as Reeves Bay.

MS. FISCHER: This is one parcel that is approximately eight acres in size along with frontage along the bay. There is some tidal wetland along the fringe, but it's mostly upland and could be developed. This is in an area that approximately a dozen parcels that the County is looking to acquire to protect this maritime habitat tidal wetlands influenced area.
MR. CHAIRMAN: Is this the one that has possibly NOAA funding?

MS. FISCHER: There is -- I don't think this is the one. There is another -- I am not sure if it is this one, Larry. I think it's another one -- another in the vicinity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion?

MR. MACTHAY: Negative Declaration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion from Richard Machtay.

Second?

MS. RUSSO: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Is that it, Lauretta?

MS. LAURETTA FISCHER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Sewer District
Number 3, Southwest Bergen Point
Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion,
Town of Babylon.

MR. WRIGHT: Ben Wright, Department
of Public Works.

A couple of general comments before
the consultant expands on what is in the
environmental assessment form.

This project to expand Bergen Point
Wastewater Treatment Plant is just for
the plant to be expanded by 10,000,000
gallons a day. We haven't identified
where the sewers would come from and
where the service area expansion would
be. The project does have support. It
is in the capital program budget with
$65,000,000 this year and, obviously,
that lends the support of both the
County Executive and the Legislature
putting it in the program.

Attachment Number 4, does include a
couple of items that indicate that
support. The area that could be served
would be a subject of a couple of RFP's
that we will be sending out to look at
areas that are within the boundary or
adjacent to the boundaries of the
southwest sewer district, and that's
something over the next couple of years
that will be developed and identified
where that sewer would come from.

The process that we have to go
through concurrently and after a CEQ's
determination requires a report to be
sent to the Legislature for a public
hearing. We need a number of other
resolutions and an application from the
State Controllers Office which
determines whether or not the sewer
districts residents can bail the burden
of the cost associated with the
expansion $65,000,000.

The project is giving us assistance
to a joint-venture of Camp, Dresser,
McKee, Dvirka, and Bartilucci. The
representatives from Dvirka and
Bartilucci are Joe Marturano and Steve
Cabrera. Steve is just going to expand
on the project just to clarify some
items that may need clarification.
MR. CHAIRMAN: Ben, before you start, I was curious as to why you selected 10,000,000 gallons per day? If you're going to expand, why not --

MR. WRIGHT: Well, it started out that back in 2002 Public Works did a report looking at North Babylon, West Islip, Wyandanch, Deer Park, and Bayshore and to serve those areas was approximately 5,000,000 gallons a day. So when we first went out with the RFP to look at expanding things by 5,000,000 gallons a day, the geometry of the tanks and some of the loadings were incorporated into the plan and looked like we might need seven or eight so we rounded things up to 10,000,000. It was a little bit arbitrary, but the thought in our mind was still the areas most likely to be served would be those to the north of basically Southern State Parkway which is the northern boundary of Bergen Point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So in another 10 years, you're not going to be back
asking to add another 10,000,000 gallons per day?

MR. WRIGHT: I can't say we're not, but the site is going to have some restrictions. There is some insertion technology that can be utilized to keep the same footprint and giving more capacity. So that's a possibility, but we are getting a little bit limited on the site itself.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Mr. Wright?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. GULBRANSEN: The plant capacity has a plan to increase but how does that increase relate to the effluent level of discharge?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, DEC has to approve a permit modification. They have received the reports which is in the process of going through and getting their final approval on that, but they will also have to approve plan specifications. The effluent part of it -- the infrastructure that's there is sized for double the service area which
is more than enough capacity.

MR. GULBRANSEN: So physically you
could do it, but the question now is
will DEC think that the water body is
similar to that extra load?

MR. WRIGHT: Yes.

MR. GULBRANSEN: We don't know
that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Plus the oceans. In
that same vain, there has always been
debate about the salinity of groundwater
salinity of the Great South Bay
increasing because of withdrawing water
and then pumping it back into the ocean.

MR. WRIGHT: That's going to be the
impact statement when the service areas
are identified. Part of the RFP that we
will be sending out will incorporate
environmental phase. That is an issue
that has to addressed at that point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Anymore questions?

MR. MACHTAY: Maybe I missed it,
but is there a need for this expansion
now? In other words, the volume that's
going into the plant is greater than
what the plant can handle; right?

MR. WRIGHT: No, it isn't. We're
planning for the future.

MR. MACHTAY: Well, I guess my real
question is, is this a self-fulfilling
prophecy? You're going to make it
bigger so that the more development to
fill up the plant. It's like when they
build a highway, right? After they
build it, traffic comes; right?

MR. WRIGHT: Well, if you look at
the areas to the north of the service
area going from the Nassau/Suffolk line
out, most of that area is developed
already. It's not a matter of
stimulating more development.
Obviously, there could more growth and
growth inducement, but it's as much to
improving environment is to provide that
revitalization as necessary.

I did want to mention that part of
the support came from the County
Executive and the County Legislature
developing a sewer task force, and also
a RFP Committee. The task force had a
number of meetings and hearings
throughout the County to identify
critical areas. The RFP Committee took
the recommendations from that task force
and developed an RFP that will be
advertised next week, and that's to
allow a better definition of the
benefits of sewers and the improvements
to the environment, as well as, the
growth associated with it.

MR. MACHTAY: Well, there are homes
out there that are on cesspool that
would be connected to the --

MR. WRIGHT: Yes. In fact, there
is a new committee that was just formed
in the North Babylon/Deer Park area.
It's called Concerned Citizens for
Sewers. They want sewers because
they're dealing with their cesspool
problems for so many years that it's
unfathomable to them that they can't
hook up to a sewer. We get calls
everyday saying, "Are you going to sewer
in Bayport? Are you going to sewer out
east further?" There is more

information in the media now and those
people are starting to call with the
interest.

MS. GROWNEY: The expansion then is
limited to the location on the site that
you're trying to handle has nothing to
do with the hooking up of other --

MR. WRIGHT: That's right. It is
just a plain expansion itself.

MR. KAUFMAN: Rich, one of the
concerns in the Town of Smithtown has
been that the town is very heavily
developed at this point in time, and we
have restrictions upon further
development because of waste water
issues. They're talking about expansion
of some of the sewer plants that we have
in the Town of Smithtown right now. that
might not necessarily increase
footprints, but might allow for smart
growth and better development in the
area. So the policy question in that
sense is do we take some of the existing
buildings off of their cesspools and put
them onto sewer systems? Visibly a lot of the effluent would be going out to the Long Island Sound. There is right now a substantial fight going into the Sound in Kings Park -- the Nissequogue River. So the balance is to be made and they try to do the plan, obviously, using a planning director. You probably know that those issues exist.

MR. MACHTAY: Well, you talk about the need in North Babylon but does this extend to Melville in the industrial area?

MR. WRIGHT: There is quite a few connections along the Route 110 area already. I think we might have as many as 50 connections.

MR. MACHTAY: But they're private lines?

MR. WRIGHT: No, the County owns the lines going up Route 110 and some of the other areas. Any time more than one owner of a lot is involved with a sewer system, it's usually the County that has that responsibility.
MR. KAUFMAN: In this document also
there was stuff in there that talked
about the Route 110 Corridor. I know
there had been discussions about
expanding sewer capacity in there
because right now there are limitations
on what can occur in terms of
development.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Legislator Vivian Fisher, welcome back.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: Thank you. It is good to be back.

Ben, are these infrastructure improvements necessary if we're going to look at applications for the possibility of federal money coming to Suffolk County to help develop or sewer systems?

MR. WRIGHT: We have listed this project with the environmental facilities which does distribute both low interest loans and any stimulus funding. So it's on that list, but because the plant is doing so well in ranking is not as high as some facilities that have problems. So we're
low on the list. It's a good thing and
a bad thing, I guess, if you look at it
that way.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gloria?

MS. RUSSO: Ben, Section 1, in
attachment three Expert Fire Engineering
Report, the introduction mentions the
actual flow, what it's designed for, and
it mentions the biological oxygen demand
and total maximum you're allowed and it
says here that they were exceeding for
about eight months or so --

MR. WRIGHT: In 2006, I believe, is
what it refers to.

MS. RUSSO: Yes, but it also says
that according to New York State
regulations NYPRR 29, "This designed for
loading exceeded for more than 8 ask
month and 2006 for plan future must be
submitted through New York DEC original
water manager." So is that the primary
motivating force for doing this?

MR. WRIGHT: No, this project was
initiated prior to that. As part of
this project, in 2007, we submitted a
growth plan with DEC. When you exceed
that number -- it hasn't exceeded in the
last two years, but for some reason we
did back in 2006, but there is three
different ways of satisfying the permit.
There is a moratorium and a water
conservation expansion. We happen to be
in the expansion process. Plus probably
at that time you're sending an RFP out,
so we did satisfy one of those three
criteria with the DEC. It wasn't
initiated because of that, but it helped
us that we were in the process with DEC.

MR. GULBRANSEN: There was mention
earlier in this discussion about how the
capacity expansion might allow for
further development hookups for
additional areas. Could you explain
whether the expansion would also -- how
you would decide how much the expansion
could be dedicated to picking up places
where we know where the septic systems
are causing the groundwater loading into
the bay as a documented problem? We
recently read and recognized that the
Great South Bay has nitrogen loading issues but isn't it true that this plant could remove some nitrogen from the system and these existing homes has contracted with allowing for development?

MR WRIGHT: If you went further to the east, the areas that are really a subject of the RFP are really filling in the areas in Babylon and Islip from the Nassau County line going east. So when you go passed the Heckscher spur, there are some other areas that are going to be looked at individually, and it's possible that they could make a connection at some time in the future, but that's really a process we have to go through with the RFP to determine that. Most of what's on the south shore that's in the sewer district is already connected. That's not going to assist anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions? Michael?

MR. KAUFMAN: In looking through
some of the evaluation material, I was
struck by one thing. It looks as if the
plant has adequate capacity right now,
but I know in the past around 2006 and
other times there have been problems
with under capacity, if you will. In
other words, trucks lining up and not
being able to deliver their loads and
things like that. Also, I am noting in
here that there seems to be -- what's
the right word for this -- there is not
much redundancy in the system. If part
of the system goes offline and say one
or two of the tanks just stop working or
some of the pumps stop working, there's
not that much redundancy in there and
the system will basically clog up. So
those are two observations and the
questions I have for you are, under this
plant, will there be more redundancy
built into the system so that if
something does go offline, the primary
system can still be operable?

MR WRIGHT: The answer to that is
we do have redundancy now. For example,
we usually use the aeration tanks. We usually use seven of them, but there will be more redundancy with the expansion. The other part of your question with the trucks --

MR. KAUFMAN: Before we get to that, is that part of a purpose of this?

MR WRIGHT: No, it's part of -- you have to have redundancy as part of the recommended standards for regular treatment.

MR. KAUFMAN: It's basic engineering purposes.

MR. WRIGHT: Out of three aeration blowers, we're using one. We have standby and one that's ready to be used. But on the truck issue, that's really scavenger and septic and we have a limitation of 500,000 gallons per day. Some days are heavier than others. We haven't had that experience for some time now and part of it is due to the private industry having the facility where you can take leech aid in but those trucks don't come to Bergen Point.
They get pretreated and discharged to
the sewer system, but they're basically
sanitary waste by the time they're
discharged.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ben, go ahead with
your presentation.

MR. CABRERA: My name Steve
Cabrera. I am with the CDM/DB
Joint-Venture.

This upgrade is, I guess, the most
recent in a series of plan upgrades that
have occurred over the recent years that
have been subject to environmental
review. In this particular case, we
selected the coordinator review route
where we submitted a lead agency
coordination letter on October 5, to
potentially involved agencies and
solicited comments on any objections to
the County assuming lead agency status
or any objections to any of the
environmental concerns on the project
itself. It's now a comment period of
close to two months and we didn't
receive any comments from any of the
involved agencies on either of the lead
agency status or any particular
environmental concerns.

In a nutshell, the primary activity
at the plant that would involve
excavation or major disturbance all
occur, as Ben said, within the property
of the existing plant. There is no need
to expand the boundaries of the plant at
all and on this aerial photograph -- I
don't know how the yellow highlighted
shows up for those of you on the
opposite side of the table, but these
show the major areas where major
excavation will occur, and that will be
the area of the four foot tunnels of
primary tanks and the four proposed
aeration tanks and the proposed final
clarified here on the west. Now, as you
can see, all of these structures will be
adjacent to existing similar structures
in areas of the plant that are already
disturbed or graded or filled land or
dredge spoils.

After receiving no comments on the
environmental -- Part 1, of the
environmental assessment form, we
completed Part 2, and we then submitted
to you folks for your determination of
significance. We're not in or adjacent
to any sensitive significant habitats or
wetlands or wild scenic rivers or any
other significant environmental
resources. If there is any impact to
construction, it would be limited to the
construction period, but there is no
anticipated significant impacts that we
can see at this point.

That's pretty much it unless you
have any other questions. There are, in
addition to these major areas, where
there would be excavation where there
are variable speed drive pumps, et
cetera, that are associated with these
tanks that really don't take up very
much space but we just wanted to convey
here the major areas of the plant.

The project will require a permit
from New York State DEC for stormwater
discharge from construction activity
because the total area that would be
excavated will exceed one acre and that
triggers the need to obtain a permit
from DEC. There is a potential for a
wetlands permit that might be required
because we are within 300 feet of
wetland over here on the west but
generally speaking, the DEC's
jurisdiction for their wetland
regulation is restricted to any area of
a ten foot contour elevation, and we're
well above that. It is possible they
don't have jurisdiction but,
nevertheless, we would be conferring
with them to see if there is a permit
necessary. If there is a permit
necessary, it would be a permit for
construction within the adjacent area.
At this point, this would be considered
a general compatible project that would
simply require a permit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thomas?

MR. GULBRANSEN: Just a basic
question on the engineering.

You talked about the capacity
expansion and BOD expansion that might occur in the effluent when it gets approved, but can you generally describe how the plant expansion will result in a net removal of nitrogen through jetification or isn't it true we're doing more than just holding it in and pumping it out? This process is allowing the plant to remove nitrogen from the waste plant.

MR. CABRERA: Actually, the purpose of this project is not for denitrification.

MR. GULBRANSEN: It doesn't change nitrogen removal at all?

MR. CABRERA: As far as the actual quality, this project is not designed to improve F1 quality, but to guarantee that it achieves the permanent F1 requirements and limitations that are dictated by the permit to handle that additional flow. So what I am saying is the BOD limitations and the suspended solemn limitations, we expect would be identical to what they have now just
that it has the ability to handle more
flow and achieve those limitations based
on the increasing capacity, but it's not
for denitrification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think there
is any nitrogen as we end the -- there
is a kind of notion that --

MR. CABRERA: Not yet.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Right, but we know
that's coming now.

MR. WRIGHT: Just let me add that
there is a limitation on some nitrogen
seasonally. It is about 15 milligrams
per liter and we have it well underway.

MR. MARTURANO: Which we need that.

THE REPORTER: State your name?

MR. MARTURANO: Joe Marturano.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's the method of
disinfection?

MR. MARTURANO: Right now it's
chlorination. So they would have to
chlorinate. The County is in the
process of designing a UV disinfection
system which will eliminate chlorine
residual in the discharge while
achieving the disinfection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eva?

MS. GROWNEY: So that's going to be part of this project?

MR. MARTURANO: It's not part of this project. It's a separate project that had --

MR. BAGG: The CEQ reviewed it already.

MR. MARTURANO: (Continuing) -- come before the CEQ.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any further discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: I'll make a motion of Unlisted Negative Declaration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Second?

MS. RUSSO: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Discussions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Board voted.)
MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Abstentions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Thank you.

MS. FISCHER: If I could just make a correction to my statement before on Reeves Bay. It is going -- this is the one that is going to possibly get the funding from NOAA. It's going to be a 50/50 with the Town of Southampton and NOAA will reimburse the Town of Southampton's portion of the acquisition cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just out of curiosity, what program of NOAA's -- I didn't realize they have property by activities that --

MS. FISCHER: Let me just --

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you don't know --

MS. FISCHER: Here, I've got it.

NOAA Coastal and Land Conservation
Program.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

Tom?

MR. GULBRANSEN: When we make a recommendation approving it, do we ever do it subject to things like the DEC findings of effluent impact?

MR. KAUFMAN: We do, do that but they generally don't like to do that.

MR. BAGG: Then it becomes a condition rather than a declaration which adds complications. We usually put in there that one of the reasons why this will be is that the County will obtain all the necessary DEC permits.

If they don't, then the project does not proceed.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Still we need to do that because we know the process will not allow without that.

MR. KAUFMAN: If you want, on some of these motions if it's an important enough project, it's not a problem to point those issues out and put it in as part of your recommendation. It puts
the Legislature on notice that there is
an issue with other agencies. Again, a
lot of it is automatic and sometimes can
use these to explain it.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: Before we go to
the next item, I just wanted to ask Rich
Martin something. I saw in my aide’s
notes that the Isaac Mills House that
there is a tenant there but which plan
was it under because I remember that
there were several configurations with
the Hope House but what are we looking
at now?

MR. MARTIN: They took actually the
smaller space of what was the bedroom --
the loft bedroom on the second floor on
the west end of the house and they --

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: That was the B plan?

MR. MARTIN: I am not sure, but it
was the secondary plan and a kitchen
downstairs.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: And the rest of the
house?

MR. MARTIN: The rest of the house
is reserved for public use.
MS. FISHER: Thank you, Richard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proposed improvements at County Road 48, Middle Road and Cox Neck Road.

MR. BAGG: Any letters in support of that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes. That reminds me, is there any letters supporting this project?

MR. MACKEY: No, it's actually -- Jim, I believe its the next project that those letters are for.

MR. BAGG: Sorry.

MR. CHAIRMAN: My mistake.

MR. MACKEY: I am Russ Mackey. I am with the Suffolk County Department of Public Works and I am Senior Civil Engineer.

The Department has contacted Greg Greene from Cashin Associates. He will be further describing the project to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In my packet there were no drawings or maps or anything. I don't know if I was the only one who
didn't get any, but it will certainly
help out if there were some available.

MR. MACKEY: I do apologize. I do
have them.

MR. GREENE: Well, for those of you
that can't --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Good to see you, Mr.
Greene. Please, give your name.

MR. GREENE: Greg Greene from
Cashin Associates.

We're working with Suffolk County
Department of Public Works on the
preliminary design, and the
environmental assessment for this
project. This project is basically an
improvement of two intersections in
Mattituck on County Road 48. The first
intersection is at Cox Neck Road on the
west side and then its also the
intersection of where Middle Road and
Sound Avenue split. The proposal calls
for two tandem modern roundabouts to
replace those two intersections. The
primary reason for this improvement is
safety. The Town of Southold civic
groups have expressed a lot of concern about safety. Also, this design will help improve general traffic flow through this double intersection area.

In terms of the environmental assessment, we, of course, looked at all the issues that are typically addressed under SEQRA. Again, the main reason for the project is to improve circulation and safety both for pedestrians and vehicles.

One thing I would like to point out is that the work to create these intersections will be done entirely within an area that's already disturbed. It is an area that's within the existing roadway boundaries. In fact, the amount of paved surface under the proposed project actually decreases compared to what they're now. Right now it is 4 acres down to about 3.7 acres. It also pulls and increases a buffer with the adjacent areas on each side because the paved area is pulled in to a larger extent along much of the working area.
The drains here are generally flat.
Like I said before, it's already in a
disturbed area. There are no wetlands
or surface waters in close proximity.
The nearest surface waters are
associated with the Mattituck inlet.
That's about a quarter-of-a-mile to the
north which you can see on the project
location map that we passed out. The
closest surface water bodies up in
Mattituck inlet and the closest wetlands
is to the south about 800 feet and
they're associated with the northern
part of Lake Laurel. That's also shown
on the project -- that location.
So proximity for wetlands surface
waters really is not an issue. We
checked with the DEC and New York State
National Heritage Program and there is
no recorded presence of endangered
plants or animals in this area. The
area does not contain any wetlands or
woodlands or any other habitat. The
vegetation here now is typical and
roadside kind of grassland vegetation.
In terms of historical culture or resources, the SHIPO (phonetic) office states their preservation office has no record of any historical cultural resources in this work area. As for stormwater, I already mentioned that the amount of pavement will actually decrease under the project, so there will be less stormwater generated under the proposed project. Also as for the stormwater, to the extent possible, will be retained within proximity through a recharge to the groundwater. The project site is adjacent to what is considered a critical environmental area. The special groundwater protection carrier is designated as the central Suffolk area. It is a large groundwater protection area that extends all the way from Port Jeff Station on the west, and its western end terminates right along the south portion of this project area. So it is adjacent to that environmental area, however, to mitigate that, as I mentioned, the amount of
pavement will be less and the paved
surface is actually being pulled further
away from that critical environmental
area providing even a greater buffer
then there is now.

So the only impacts we see
associated with this improvement are
cost in construction related impacts.
There will be some construction noise
and air emissions and some construction
equipment. They're temporary and short
term and to a large extent, can be
mitigated during the construction
process. In the long term, we see
beneficial impacts of the project. One
is to improve traffic flow, improve
safety, and an actual increase in buffer
areas to the adjacent areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Greg, describe how
the traffic will flow if it goes from
the vicinity of where it says
"preliminary" up to the northwest?

MR. GREENE: The northwest -- this
one? (Indicating.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.
MR. GREENE: You come up here --
you come around -- you come around this
first circle and then you come around
and then you continue that
way. (Indicating.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: So this very shallow
angle --

MR. GREENE: This one?

(Indicating.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. GREENE: This will be removed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, that road
goes?

MR. MACKEY: Yes. The New York
State DOT Roundabout Group has looked at
this. We have taken their
recommendations, and some of their
recommendations are shown in this plan
as it is.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it only going to
disappear for the traffic going to the
northwest or will that whole road go?

MR. MACKEY: This whole road will
go. This whole thing will be removed
and planted back grassed and seeded.
(Indicating.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. GROWNEY: I have several question.

Are there any existing couverture (phonetic) in handling more north at the moment?

MR. MACKEY: No, it's just a series of -- I believe from the circles that we have, it's a series of leeching basins right now and I think of swell in the middle of the existing one.

MS. GROWNEY: And what will you be doing?

MR. MACKEY: Leeching basins.

MS. GROWNEY: Is there a bike route being introduced?

MR. MACKEY: No, there will be no bike route introduced, but as with any roundabout what happens is the bikes use the sidewalks.

MS. GROWNEY: And are there existing sidewalks?

MR. MACKEY: No, but we will be incorporating them.
MR. GREENE: Ma'am, I will just
point out the pedestrian bicycle access
along the shoulder of the road here.
(Indicating.)
MS. GROWNEY: So they will be
continuing -- there will be continuity
of that?
MR. MACKEY: Yes.
MR. CHAIRMAN: Vivian?
HON. VILORIA-FISHER: Is it a
modified roundabout? The way you
describe it, it doesn't seem like a true
roundabout. Can you just follow the
flow again going east to west?
MR. MACKEY: With the roundabout,
it is called a modern roundabout. The
way it is, is most people think of it as
a traffic circle and those are not. The
difference is the entry angle into the
actual, for a lack of a better term,
circle. With the roundabouts, you don't
drive perpendicular. Traffic circles
you do come in perpendicular thus the
angle is kind of flowing in and there
are easier gaps to get into as far as
weaving.

**HON. VILORIA-FISHER** : Can you just --

**MR. KAUFMAN**: Show the traffic flow.

**MS. MACKEY**: If you're coming this way and you're coming around this one, you come here and then you come around this one and you continue. (Indicating.)

**HON. VILORIA-FISHER**: How many exits out are there? As you're going northwest from Sound Avenue, you have that exit -- it is the first exit to Middle Road going east.

**MS. MACKEY**: Right, this County Road 48 going east. You come up around here and the driveway which we will incorporate here and access to these businesses here. (Indicating.) Then you can also go up here on Cox Neck road. Then if you want, you can keep going around and keep going west.

**HON. VILORIA-FISHER**: There are business there. Are there any provisions for pedestrian having the ability to cross or is --
MR. MACKEY: Yes, as you see right here, there are roundabouts through these splitter islands. There is always -- you know, you see here crosswalks that are --

HON. VILORIA-FISHER : There are crosswalks?

MR. MACKEY: Yes, there are crosswalks.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER : What about the easterly one?

MR. MACKEY: Yes, there are crosswalks here, here, and here.

(Indicating.)

MR. GULBRANSEN: Currently there is a traffic light maybe there are even --

MR. MACKEY: Two, I believe.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Do they both go away?

MR. MACKEY: Yes, they both go away. The traffic light -- the intersection originally never had a traffic signal. A high accident rate put that there as a safety measure.

From what I know, it is a temporary
measure and this is more of a permanent solution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it New York State Law that the person on the circle has the right-of-way?

MR. MACKEY: Yes. As you come into the roundabout, you have to yield to the person. In fact, the signage is for yielding as you approach. Yield would be painted onto the ground and yield signs and what they call yield teeth. It is the symbology.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not clear to me that everybody appreciates that.

MR. MACKEY: There have been some problems. Like I said, New York State DOT, I believe, on their website has part of their site dedicated to "How to drive through roundabouts?" It is more of an education type thing. Hopefully this is kind of similarly in close proximity to another roundabout in the area which would be at County Road 58 in. So hopefully the people that drive through here are also --
MR. CHAIRMAN: You will have it appropriately marked?

MR. MACKEY: Yes, there is a standard in the federal manual of traffic control devices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eva?

MS. GROWNEY: Going in the other direction, if you were just kind of enough to --

MR. MACKEY: Which way do you want to go?

MS. GROWNEY: Just what you're doing and --

MR. MACKEY: You come around and go that way or you can come around and go this way and then you come around and go that way. (Indicating.)

MS. GROWNEY: And you can you go gown?

MR. MACKEY: Yes. Instead of coming down this way, you come down over here and go down. This couldn't be incorporated because the way the angle -- the reflection angle from that roundabout would not work.
MS. GROWNEY: Is that for both sides or just the one side.

MR. MACKEY: I believe it would be on just the -- wherever there is a crosswalk. It looks like both sides.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gloria?

MS. RUSSO: Russ, you mentioned this briefly and I wanted to ask you if the new roundabout in Riverhead by the hospital is totally finished?

MR. MACKEY: No.

MS. RUSSO: I didn't think so. I have been through there several weeks ago and it didn't look like it was done.

MR. MACKEY: Construction --

MS. RUSSO: Like this modern style you're talking with the tangential approach?

MR. MACKEY: All of them are, yes. All the ones are being built with the tangential ( Phonetic) style. The difference with that one that you're talking about will be a two-lane.

MS. RUSSO: Has that one performed so far in the way you were hoping at the
least?

MR. MACKLEY: The way construction
goes, unfortunately, they hoped to have
it up before the paving season ended
but, of course, the cold beat us to it.
So right now it's still in construction.
They haven't finished that area just
yet.

MS. RUSSO: Have other
municipalities used this modern
roundabout; is that what you're basing
your --

MR. MACKLEY: I believe Suffolk
County has another one coming down the
line out in West Hampton. Yes, I know
Nassau County has a bunch of them.
Suffolk County has put one in Patchogue.
Nassau County has one in Great Neck. I
believe there is one in West Hampton
Beach which was called -- basically it
was a modification of it. It is almost
like a peanut roundabout, I believe,
they call it. Brookhaven has also put a
couple of them in.

MS. RUSSO: Have they performed
well?

MR. MACKEY: Yes. What it is, is they're actually safer. When you look at points of contact or points of intersection, roundabout actually reduces it and it reduces speed. What New York State is saying is "No one blows a roundabout. People blow lights."

MS. RUSSO: What is the speed limit on that road -- the main road?

MR. MACKEY: The main road? I believe it's different as you go out further north on the highway, but it mixes around from two lanes in each direction down to one. So as you come through, of course, there is going to be advanced signage warning what's coming ahead.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What's the diameter of these?

MR. MACKEY: It varies, I believe, from each one depending on how much room. We stride for -- again, it's within New York State regulations.
MR. CHAIRMAN: So it will handle trucks -- fire trucks?

MR. MACKAY: Yes, I believe the designed vehicle for it is listed as DB50 which is a tractor trailer, but the biggest one is WB67. I am not sure which one -- I think it was the WD50 that we went with but there is a -- as you can see, there is a truck apron around here which cars don't use but if trucks need to, they can -- it's like a mounted curb that they can go up and the traffic can go around. That's the designed purpose of it.

MR. GULBRANSEN: As for someone who drives out to that ferry as has done so for 25 years, when you're heading east on Country Road 48 and that two lane road through the farm and you're really kind of looking forward to getting going and that traffic light is where you start to proceed more quickly. So my recommendation is the signage should announce two roundabouts coming because I couldn't imagine going through the
first roundabout and saying, "Great, go," and then heading outward and finding yourself looking at another roundabout and they want you to go 15 miles an hour -- you know, there are two roundabouts ahead is a nice way to say it.

MR. MACKY: I believe and again I updated it, but when you come out of here the angle is that can't gun it to 55 immediately and it's within a close visual. It is all -- you can see the next one. So it's not like you're coming around a curb and oops there it is. Visually, you will be able to see them both.

MR. GULBRANSEN: It's very deadly road so anything you can go put there would be great.

MS. SPENCER: I would just like to add something to Tom because the traffic going west is usually stacked up with a lot of cars and they're waiting to break out. That's going east. Going west, you have to slow down. So anything --
if that works, that's important.

MR. MACKEY: Yes, well the key to
it is that using a visual traffic common
by having the curb like this where if
you're looking down the road and you're
looking straight, you see a curb in
front of you; not a straight road. The
automatic perception is to slow down
because you don't -- as you're coming
around, that's why kind of a lot of them
you come in and deflect into it which
also causes a natural traffic common of
slowing down the speed.

MS. SPENCER: One further point.
There are a lot of large trucks that
are --

MR. MACKEY: Yes. It is designed
for them that's why the truck -- there
is actually a video if you look at the
New York State website of a tractor
trailer with a modular home on the back
that navigates one of these.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?
MS. RUSSO: I will make a motion as
an Unlisted Negative Declaration.
MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: I will second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Board.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Abstentions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Proposed Construction of Parking Facilities on County Road 80.

MR. MACKEY: This is, I believe, a copy of something you have in your packet. We submitted this, this morning. I apologize because the project manager on this project was called out to construction, so I will be presenting for him. I hope I can answer
your questions as best I can.

We entered this morning to Jim and
I think they made photocopies of two
letters. One was from the Town of
Brookhaven and one from the Montauk
Merchants Association and both are in
support of this project.

What this project is, is we're
building off street parking along
Montauk Highway in Mastic. As you know,
right now, currently there will be eight
separate locations which will create 53
marked parking stalls. The amount of
land effected is approximately .59 acres
with construction and .18 acres with new
land. The new land is mostly grass
areas currently being used for parking
purposes. Again, we have a current
project in the area of County Road 80
out in Mastic. The property owners
after construction had started have come
to us and sighted the need for off
street parking. We also included in
here the agreement with the County that
all property owners will have to sign.
This will be not just for individual property owners, but the agreement is for that all properties within the area could use it. So it's not like you're parking on this land, therefore, you must use my store. It will be inter-property use for this parking.

MR. CHAIRMAN: While you raise that, I was interested in knowing whether after you build these parking lots that it appear to be essentially a store-by-store basis, is the County responsible for maintaining it thereafter?

MR. MACKEY: To my knowledge, no. From what I have been told, no. We will build it but the individuals will maintain it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So even though you're getting this agreement that it has to be available for anybody, the County is relieved of the responsibility of maintaining it?

MR. MACKEY: That is my knowledge, yes.
MR. KAUFMAN: Paragraph 4, the contract says, "Upon completion of the improvements, the owner voluntarily assumes full responsibility for the maintenance and repair of the parking areas at no cost and further agrees to keep parking areas open for use of the general public." Then afterward it doesn't determine occasions and things like that -- that someone who has the right-of-way has the -- but that is the language stated with the County that it will not have responsibility after that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who enforces this?

MR. KAUFMAN: The contractor. The County -- whoever signs this contract -- whatever private property owner signs this contract is responsible for those particular properties. I am assuming it would be very stupid for the property owner not to maintain space that will benefit them.

MR. GULBRANSEN: I just have a basic question as far as environmental in nature. My question is, generally is
this County building the roads and
improvements on private property or if
this is being done within the
right-of-way, does the County own it as
a county road? I don't understand the
relationship between the county road and
the right-of-way easement and -- well,
it looks like it is going to be --

MR. MACKEY: What happen was that
this project -- the project that's
adjacent to this which is County Road 80
in Mastic which goes from William Floyd
east is a federal aided project.

MR. BAGG: We previously approved
it.

MS. MACKEY: Yes, you previously
approved it. We've had multiple
meetings. We had two public information
meetings. We had many public
information meetings. There was a total
of four. None of the business owners
came forth and said what we're doing
would effect them. These letters came
from Brookhaven and from the Merchants
Society to the County Executive. The
County Executive supports this project because they're saying if the project went through, it severely negatively impacted the economically liability of some of the stores in the area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But wasn't the idea though that you were taking curbside parking away for the improvements and to alleviate that situation you were providing a service, if you will, to the store owners?

MR. MACKEY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That was my understanding so I sort of thought it was tit-for-tat.

MR. MACKEY: Again, within using federal monies, we would not be allowed to do something like this in that project.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eva?

MS. GROWNEY: Except the only difference is the roadway would have been maintained -- you know, with curbside parking so that is the difference that I see aside from the
fact that --

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't understand.

MS. GROWNEY: Well, if they were
improving the road and putting parking
back in on curbside parking --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Couldn't --

MS. GROWNEY: I am just saying if
they did, then they would be maintaining
that. But now since they're not putting
in the curbside parking and they're
making kind of unusual arrangements to
develop private property owners so the
actual maintenance of that is going to
fall to the whoever actually does it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Gloria?

MS. RUSSO: I am reading the actual
legal agreement for this. Items 4 and 5
say, "These property owners to the
properties will be paved" so have they
read this and agreed with that already
or is this kind of to be sorted until
hammered out?

MR. MACKY: No, these property
owners were all members of -- to my
knowledge members of the Montauk Highway
Merchants Association and are all in
support of it because they feel it will
help all their businesses and allow
people to park.

MS. RUSSO: They are on board with
this?

MR. MACKEY: To my knowledge, yes,
they are.

MS. RUSSO: The way it is written?
MR. MACKEY: Yes, to my knowledge.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mary Ann?

MS. SPENCER: Richard has just
pointed out that Mastic Liquors at 1619
Montauk Highway in Mastic is a Town of
Brookhaven landmark. I would like that
noted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How do you know
that, Richard?

(WHEREUPON, there was laughter.)

MR. MARTIN: Because I go there all
the time. Because it was, in a certain
way, a unique landmark within the Town
of Brookhaven with the media coverage
both in the local papers and Newsday and
it is an individual landmark, not a
district but an individual landmark that
the owner supported so they went forward
with it as a roadside architecture, in a
sense. I think it was originally built
as a gas station.

MR. MACKEY: No, it's not a Suffolk
County land. What are the
classifications of an individual
landmark?

MR. MARTIN: You have to check the
exact wording in a sense?

MS. SPENCER: Town of Brookhaven
has an historic ordinance that provides
both for district and for individual
landmarks. This has been individually
land marked and, therefore, falls under
that ordinance in the Town of
Brookhaven's district.

MR. MACKEY: I am going to assume
and, again, I'll double check but since
the Town of Brookhaven is also on board
with this project that they -- you know,
I am not going to speak for them, but I
am going to assume that they looked at
it and they agree with it, as well.
MS. SPENCER: There is a process that they --

MR. MACKEY: I will double check.

MS. MARTIN: I would just double check the landscaping issue with putting a parking lot next to this facility, they might want to mitigate with a plan or something because it is a historic landmark.

MS. SPENCER: It does have to go through --

MS. SQUIRES: Why is it a landmark?

MS. GROWNEY: The place of the parking area may be angled around from where it is now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just like the big duck. (Phonetic.)

MR. MARTIN: Some kind of early roadside development in Suffolk County for commercial use.

MR. MACKEY: I will check with the right people of Brookhaven.

MS. GROWNEY: Yes, because there are a lot of stipulations about it.

MR. MACKEY: We will follow
whatever necessary rules.

MS. VIVIAN FISHER: There is no picture on here.

MS. GROWNEY: The last page.

MR. MARTIN: It doesn't give you a side view. I mean you have seen buildings like this before. They're disappearing the front of it to show the overhang which originally had the gas pumps and you would pull in and that was cut out -- the front of the picture there. (indicating.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. MARTIN: And that's showing the building -- well, the type.

MS. SPENCER: That's a nice word.

MR. MARTIN: I was intrigued that the Town of Brookhaven was that progressive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So any motion that we make probably ought to reflect the need to look at this issue.

Having worked on the Fords River out there, I know one of the researchers grace hopes was as the highway was
reconstructed, that there would be
provisions made for sewers along Montauk
Highway so to avoid digging up the
highway in some future date --maybe five
to ten years; was that every achieved?

MR. MACKEY: To my knowledge,
again, I think construction is ongoing
for that project and from what I have
heard, I don't want to answer because
it's not my -- I am not the project
manager on that, but I don't believe so.

MR. GREENE: But it wasn't included
in that project. I know there was talks
about including and putting in dry sewer
pipes, but it was never included. This
way they would never have to reopen the
roads again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Legislator Gloria
Fisher?

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: Thank you for
bringing that up because I know there is
a sewer study going on in that area
right now. So what kind of intersection
is there between the conclusions of that
sewer and that project?
MR. MACKEY: Well, for this project or are you talking about the one that is currently in construction?

"HON. VILORIA-FISHER.: The one that is currently under construction.

MR. MACKEY: To be honest with you, it's not my project. I don't know, but I am going to assume that when you mix -- I am making a big assumption here, but when you mix federal funding for a road with a study coming down and with the way the federal government is pulling back the funds, that I'm assuming that something like that really couldn't wait because of the way that road was in such bad condition.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER : I will just mention it the legislature.

MR. GREENE : I believe they needed to create a sewer district before they move forward with installing those pipes.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER : I'm sorry I couldn't hear the beginning.

MR. GREENE : I believe they had to
create a sewer district in the area
prior to installing those pipes. I
think that would have taken time, and
they don't want to wait any longer for
the roadway construction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any further
discussions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response
from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: If not, do we have a
motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion Unlisted
Negative Declaration with the
recommendation that certain Town of
Brookhaven land properties that may have
been land marked be further investigated
and if any restrictions exist, that they
be taken account of by the County.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?

MS. GROWNEY: I'll second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We have a second
from Eva.

Any further discussion?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response
from the Council.)
MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response from the Council.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Now we're going to get an update on County Parks. Happy New Year.

MR. GIBBONS: At the past couple of meetings we kind of postponed this update. In that time, I haven't been asked to update on anything. Did you guys have any specific -- last we talked was about Montauk. There was some interest in a grant we received from New York State at Hubbard County Park.

There is no real update on that except to say that the State of New York continues to ask us for information and we continue to provide that information. That's roughly a $500,000 grant sponsored by Assemblymen Englebright.

It is going towards the master plan, some improvements, and restoration of the main club house at Smithers
Property.

MR. KAUFMAN: Isn't that money
dedicated or can it be pulled back?

MR. GIBBONS: No, we have an
agreement with New York State. Again,
it needed to be finalized but those are
-- my understanding is that there are
essentially formalities.

MR. KAUFMAN: The reason I am
bringing that up is there has begun
degrading already with environmental
funds.

MR. GIBBONS: Right, we understand
that.

MR. MACHTAY: I think it was the
September meeting that I had asked you
if you had a brochure list or something
that tells us these are the parks and
here's what's available at each park and
I guess with the holidays and --

MR. GIBBONS: You're still waiting
for that?

MR. MACHTAY: Because as you sit
here today and say, "What do we want to
know?" If I had that list, I might be
able to say to you, "Well, what about
Douglaston Park?" (Phonetic)

MR. GIBBONS: That's why you don't
have it.

MR. MACHTAY: I was very impressed
by the golf course.

MR. GIBBONS: The golf course?

MR. MACHTAY: It was beautiful.

MR. GIBBONS: Oh, at Timber Point?

MR. MACHTAY: Yes.

MR. GIBBONS: Obviously, I had no
part in that meeting. I stayed as far
away as possible.

MR. GULBRANSEN: It was a heavy
weather day.

(WHEREUPON, there was laughter.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We called for you at
four o'clock.

MR. MACHTAY: The scenery was just
beautiful.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But the roof leaks.

(WHEREUPON, there was laughter.)

MR. GIBBONS: Not in our offices.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Eva?

MS. GROWNEY: The Hubbard County
Park grant monies that are coming, is there a description that's been listed as to what its covering specifically that can be made available?

MR. GIBBONS: Well, we haven't yet developed a scope for the master plan, specifically, nor have we decided exactly how the monies are earmarked for each of the four categories. I will explain what those are again and how those will be used individually, but of the -- I could be a little off with these numbers, but roughly $300,000 to the building. $100,000 and change for the master plan. $25,000 to $50,000 to trail improvements and $10,000 give or take for signage -- somewhere around there. So the real hard ones to put your hands around is the master plan, so we're going develop that inhouse. It's not a traditional master plan in the sense of a capital improvement programs, active recreation, and those types of things that we're more familiar with. So that will come out of us as opposed
to -- we normally consult with DPW on
something like that because they are our
consultants for such projects. In this
case, we're looking for something
different than those.

MS. GROWNEY: Well, I am very
excited about that, needless to say.

MR. GIBBONS: We are too. We
thought like everything else that it
would have at least started by now, but
it hasn't.

MS. GROWNEY: But it's on the way?

MR. GIBBONS: It's on the way.

MS. GROWNEY: And I hope that in
some of the areas, it will be helping
you in such a capacity.

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, I think that
will be folded into any master plan.

MS. GROWNEY: That is great news,
so I can bring that to EIA, so I thank
you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just to go back to
the beginning. In addition to what Rich
mentioned that he had requested -- the
idea of doing this was that we have a
responsibility of overseeing a lot of these facilities, but we know very little about them. I didn't want this to become a erroneous task for you, but what I had hoped was that each month that you might, within reason, that you might pick a part -- maybe it's one that you're particularly having trouble with or maybe it's one that you're interested at the time, but to go graduate and work our way through the list of the major parts as to their status, their use, how well they're being kept up, how well you're able to keep the personnel and so forth that are necessary to maintain public safety and cleanliness. Also, how well the buildings are maintained and that kind of thing just so that we would have an understanding of the conditions of our parks and many of us have not had the opportunity to visit all of these parks, and so it would be refreshing for us to learn a little because we never, as a group, go out to see them.
HON. VILORIA-FISHER : As you know, I was Chair of Parks for a couple of years. I am not sure this has to do with environmental. I won't be seeing you as often, Nick. I do want to point out the issue with the marinas that are going to be privatized and, again, take a very good look at the conditions of our marinas because they need a lot of work. I think we're going to be looking at the bulkheads that have to be done and that's critical of our historical buildings. Parks Department put out a great plan and a prioritization of historic buildings, and I thought it would help bolster by keeping the money from the -- our increase in hotel/motel patterns and target it towards our historic structures. Unfortunately, the budget in Parks for historic structures was cut and that line was put into the hotel/motel tax. So rather than supplement what was in our budget, it was displaced -- what was in our budget and that was a very big disappointment
to me because I know that Parks has done
a really good job in identifying some of
these, but I guess you'll just have to
do what you can with whatever the budget
is and hope that the hotel/motel tax
comes in. Those are just two things
that happened in 2009 that I think are
very critical to Parks and. Of course,
the whole dog park discussion, I think,
is also something that -- we have a
pilot at the Duck Farm and we're hoping
that Greg will see that we don't have
too many problems with so then we won't
have to do the other dog park. I am
just putting a lot of things out there
for you that might be something you
might want to talk about.

MR. GIBBONS: Some I might.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: Well if you
don't, I will. We'll share that, okay,
Nick? The hot one's I will be happy to
tackle.

MR. GIBBONS: Okay, well then you
can have the dog parks.

MR. MACHTAY: I would be interested
in the parks having some hiking opportunities and plant life is of interest -- you know, things like that?

MR. GIBBONS: I can come prepared with a primer on each of our parks.

MR. MACTAY: I am not a boater, so the marina's don't really concern me, but they may concern other people at this table. On the other hand, I am inclined to be a botanist, and I like to go hiking and so on and so forth. I pick up my son in Stony Brook to hike, but what's available?

MR. BAGG: Nick, does Parks have a listing of County Parks on the internet or what's available?

MR. GIBBONS: It's by no means comprehensive but, yes, we touch upon all the major places where we would have facilities that we would direct the general public to. Everybody has their own pocket area that they're interested in and most likely we have a park on there. I would probably not get into that level of detail here. If someone
specifically had a question about an area and what we're doing in the area, I could comment on it.

MR. MACHTAY: If we had a list, you could provide it to the CEQ?

MR. GIBBONS: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You shouldn't plan on doing this longer than 15 minutes or so at any meeting because meetings are long enough.

Eva?

MS. GROWNEY: The other thing about the list that I could see would be helpful especially if there is something that is needed that the community -- that we can then take back to our community about what's available. That is something that we might be able to do.

MR. GIBBON: Right. I am not really in the lobby business, so it's hard to say. Really, in any park, we have a list of items that need attention. So it is a matter of juggling those priorities.
MS. GROWNEY: Maybe if we have awareness of where they are, then the talk will go back to their respective localities.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, I will explain the different -- each park has it's own unique set of issues and they're all a little different, so I can certainly explain that.

MS. GROWNEY: Yes, a little notation. It does not have to be a big description, but that would be great.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mary Ann?

MS. SPENCER: As long as we're using Nick to educate us, there are all these parks on the website -- well, there are things that we identify as parks. We also, at every meeting, buy property and this becomes County property or County parks and I would like to see minutes sometimes on the different categories, the difference on how we treat or don't treat or ignore some of those purchases, for example.

MR. GIBBONS: Well, there is one
issue about explanation on the variety
of acquisition programs we have. I
understand what those are, and I work
with them almost on a daily basis. I
would defer to Planning. They have done
a presentation maybe even here at one
point maybe when the membership was a
little different than it is now as to
what those programs were, and what their
guiding principals are and how they rate
properties are different depending on
what program they require them to be on.

MS. SPENCER: That's not what I am
interested in. I am interested in what
happens after it's been acquired and are
there categories that you don't have
anything to do with?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MS. GROWNEY: A lot.

MS. SQUIRES: Larry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. SQUIRES: Maybe a little later
on in the year Nick and I could do a
short presentation because we're having
extraordinary success in Huntington.
The Legislature approved and we did an acquisition adjacent to the Walt Whitman High School called the Perming Out Wetlands (Phonetic) and the County paid more money than the town did because we are required to do certain things. We have a consultant who is doing trail guides and working with the high school. It's a committee that includes the school district, the town, Nick, Suffolk County Park Trustees, and we think it's going to be a model program when it is finished. It's becoming quit exciting and maybe we can share that in terms of what you're asking, Mary Ann. What happens when the County spends money to buy something with the town? What is the town's rights and responsibilities?

MS. SPENCER: When they buy something for parkland? That's what I am asking. Whether it is with someone or not, what happens?

MR. GIBBONS: That is --

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ms. Gloria Fisher?

HON. VILORIA-FISHER : It can be very
thorny (Phonetic) because when I was
first elected, I was working on the
revisions of -- do you remember the
Nature Preserve Handbook?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER : When we looked
at the Nature Preserve Handbook and
tried to define the usage of those
parklands that are all nature preserves
and what is passive and what is active,
I could see why Nick didn't take the
opportunity to defining all these
things.

MR. GIBBONS: They're very tricky.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: They're very,
very tricky, but there are some that are
out there that are active parklands that
we share with the County.

MS. SPENCER: I think in the
overview, what I would like is if we can
identify Hubbard. We know it is a
County Park. I would like to some sense
through these acquisitions that are made
from different funds and how many acres
are out there? Like is it a third of an
acre here, an acre there, and a quarter of an acre here that are just out there that no one manages at all because they were just bought in open space preservation on the parks preservation?
I would like some sense of that.

MS. FISHER: Like the holding of --

MR. KAUFMAN: Mary Ann, the person likely to pass that inventory and actually deals with a lot of those issues is Lauletta Fisher. She's about 40 feet away from us right now. She would be the proper person to talk to.

Right now, when the County acquires land --

MS. SPENCER: I am talking to the right person in the sense that I want to know what he spends his time doing?

(WHEREUPON, there was laughter.)

MS. SPENCER: What I want to know is, do you just look at parks like Hubbard and I want to know if --

MR. GIBBONS: No, we don't really spend an enormous amount of time on those little places you're referring to
that are scattered throughout the County. We have probably, I don't know, somewhere between 2,000 to 3,000 acres of properties that are --

MS. SPENCER: That's what I wanted to know.

MR. GIBBONS: (Continuing) -- isolated lots that are only accessible through someone's backyard or otherwise privately landlocked and we have those everywhere. I won't apologize in the sense that I think that denying and neglecting is exactly what these properties need and that they are simply preserved. They are now County property. Nothing can happen to them in the future. They're simply purchased outright for the sake of owning them and having control over their destiny which is simply acknowledging that they exist, know where they occur, and then to do nothing after that is exactly what they need. They're primarily wetlands place of parcels. River quarter areas -- those areas that have been targeted
ecologically significant in sensitive
areas. They're parklands, but they are
not parks. They are not places within
--

MR. KAUFMAN: Different departments
administer them.

MR. GIBBONS: They're all within
the Parks Department purview.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Vivian?

HON. VILORIA-FISHER : And you know
what? Within those categories, there
are some parcels that say, for example,
the Ford's River area in where we have
been trying to congregate properties
around there and sometimes I question
why we're spending the money and
Planning says it is because we need the
access. We need to be able to have the
system -- a wetland system that we can
manage. So that's not really used as
parkland per se for the public to
recreate. Then we have other areas and
even though we're talking about Hubbard,
Parks itself may not be spending a lot
of time there but you kind of have a
stewardship agreement with somebody. We saw it in the legislation that I have. It starts unlimited -- you know, it's working at it three, four, five, and the dog house and everything and have meetings about it. I mean like Audubon, we have some agreements with them. So there are a lot of different programs that really could create oversight of our Parks even the tenants you served on that committee with me.

MS. SPENCER: Right, and I think that is crucial in any economic agreement especially now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Michael?

MR. KAUFMAN: Mary Ann, to look at it in another way, the County owns 30,000 to 32,000 acres of land that are administered by the Parks Department or at least classically administered by them. There are a number of other departments that intersect with the Parks Department. The jurisdiction may be in Parks but, for example, one of the acquisitions that we did today with Lake
Panamoka County Park addition --
Planning is handling the acquisitions.
It is part of the various master lists
that had been identified through the
years as being necessary. There are
other areas for drinking water, et
cetera, where the interest to buy them
comes from, say, the Legislature or the
Department of Public Works or whatever
to purchase those particular properties.
They sort of come together at the final
day in Nick's Department where they are
generally placed for administrative
purposes, but Nick may not necessarily
see -- for example, Panamoka is more of
a planning thing compared to -- again, I
look to the master list that had been
distributed a couple of years ago. They
had pictures of various lots, et cetera,
and it will go through ETRB (Phonetic)
so it will come through Legislature, et
cetera. There will be planning in
place, so Planning actually often will
be the proper repository to finding out
how we're getting them and what we're
supposed to be doing with them. Afterwards, it will go to Nick's Department to administer and there will be several tiers in there. Some of them are active parkland, for example, Hubbard and Colinger Hall (Phonetic) and things like that. Then there's, as Nick was saying, if you will, they will deny and neglect. For example, Panamoka, I don't think we're going to have any agreements out there to have neighbors administer those properties, et cetera. They're just going to sit there as open space and open land. Park's is not going to actively do anything with it. It will be preserved as open space, so it will prevent beautification and other problems from developing with Panamoka. It's almost like it's on a second tier, if you will.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Many of those little slivers and so forth become nightmares for the Parks Department to deal with because they're not maintained. They're used for dumping grounds and so forth.
I think that's one of the reasons why we question these purchases of these little individual one-third of an acre unless it fits in a big scope.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's why Planning has those masters lists. Yes, very obviously, and in the past the County would purchase various isolated parcels. The Department of Planning has tried to rationalize the procedures by, again, creating the master list and creating a master criteria for purchasing. Now when purchasing, they must have a reason behind that reason. Obviously, it can examined by us which we can look into it. Again, I use the Lake Panamoka example where there is land being preserved in the area. It makes sense to do this particular purchase. We have to look at it sometimes where several compartments have to come together. That's what I am basically saying to understand the full thrust of what's going on.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Joy?
MS. SQUIRES: I think what you need in this instance is somebody from each town and from Parks to share the acquisitions. I am kind of in an unique position because I am Chair of the town's open space committee. So Nick and I could, right now, go through everything in the Town of Huntington. That's all County parks only because I have to do, but the Town has a responsibility. It's not just the responsibility of the County. The town should be able to say to what use they have put this land.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nick, when I initially started out and this is not be an onerous task. Thank you for coming.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you for the opportunity.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Could I add a little more. I am a little bit less focus on parcel management. It's important, but I think I would like to understand what the Council can do for and to support your mission particularly
on the process stuff that would help.

For example, are our parks being
utilized efficiently or is some kind of
education and outreach appropriate? You
said you were not lobbying, and I am not
asking you which you were lobbying on
your behalf, but if there is an
education campaign or public service
announcement that the town is doing or
that Nassau is doing and you could jump
on board and get a lot of mileage with a
little bit of co-investment, we as
Council could help you to do that, we
would like to hear about that too. I
would like to help you if we can
understand this, and if there is some
kind of initiative or an effort that you
would like to be a part of that we could
help legislate to seeing more clearly.

It wouldn't be in a review capacity, and
we'd be more in a promoting status or
help you identify places where your
mission could be solved or served by
combining them. As Joy pointed out, and
other people have suspected there are
other initiatives that are a lot like
what Parks want to benefit from, but you
don't need to do it by yourself. Maybe
we can help advance that for you or help
you. I just don't know what they are.

MR. GIBBONS: Right. I am not sure
necessarily how the CEQ's mission
includes that concept.

MR. GULBRANSEN: Maybe it does not.
I don't know.

MR. GIBBONS: But I would say that
we might -- I can provide an orientation
to place on a monthly basis for sure and
perhaps in that orientation -- that
conversation that results at each of
those meetings some of these issues may
surface where the Council has a
particular interest, and then we can
discuss those at the time and then
separate from, Mary Ann, what you were
asking, to me, that is a separate
conversation. We talk about the formal
parts that everybody has either heard of
or has visited and for the benefit of
everybody here I can get everybody on
somewhat of a level of playing field and
understanding those parks and then we
can move onto and "here's everything
else" and everything else has become
almost as significant. It certainly
creates -- it's more labor intensive
than our active places.

MS. SPENCER: That's why I asked.

MR. GIBBONS: Yes, and then the
separate categories fill for Joy's
benefit is this idea that we're
continuing to stretch our acquisition
dollars and leverage more acquisitions
by partnering with the towns. But I
will be perfectly honest with you, it is
from an administration standpoint and
management standpoint extremely
difficult to include just a single
additional partner. We have both the
towns and we have partnerships with
almost all the ten towns at this point.
Some are better than others, and I
understand the concept and it works on
paper. We are getting more for
collective taxpayer dollar -- County
dollar which is great, but at the end of
that process, it kind of becomes Parks
responsibility. It has proven to be
somewhat onerous to get partnerships
with the town in the place. Joy would
say that is certainly the case with
Huntington -- you know, formally we can
work informally just fine. It's when we
try to make things official that it gets
really sticky.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the legislature
understand your view on this?

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: Yes. It's come
before us. We're waiting for
resolutions from the towns to move
forward with partnerships. Is that what
you're talking about, Nick?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER : You have to
formalize it, pass the resolution, and
then take the responsibility for
management?

MR. GIBBONS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Once all these
things get put into place, does the town
assume their proper responsibilities
under the agreement in general?

MR. GIBBONS: No, I can't say that
is true, but it runs the entire gamut
from being too aggressive, and then
displacing county resident's rights to
those properties which is a primary
priority for my department, and seeing
to it that we all have equal access to
these place to being entirely absent
from the process where the County may
have owned a majority interest in a
property, but we're looking to the town
for management which is how we came to
do an acquisition in their town in the
first place and yet the town is an
absentee owner. So it's all those
things and everything in between.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, I think, we
ought to move on anyway, Nick. Thank
you very much and I look forward to
hearing more from you.

MR. GIBBONS: Thank you for the
time, and I will have something more
formal for you next month.
MR. CHAIRMAN: And not too long.

Moving on --

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: Nick said something about our mission as CEQ and what Tom suggested that we would be a part of that mission as the Council on environmental quality, but if we have a park, such as -- I am thinking in my district the sandpit which we did not acquire, but it came to us by tax default. It's an abused piece of property that continues to be abused and until we arrive at a stewardship agreement of that property, it's going to continue to be abused. In light of that kind of set of circumstances, would that be part of our mission to ask the County to look at the environmental health of properties that we own and what can or might be done to mitigate the abuse of that property?

MR. BAGG: I mean the Council has the right to look at environmental questions and make recommendations to the Legislature beyond just project...
The Legislature can also request that the CEQ look into specific issues and respond back to them, as well. I mean, the instance of the sand-mine, I mean, clearly, the CEQ has reviewed two plans with respect to that and Bob happens to be -- as well as some of the towns as they come up and we go to partnership with the towns and then when it comes to management and the town's coming up with the money to manage the property, they don't have the money, so they're not full-filling their end of the bargain and the respect to the sandpits and, I guess, that's the Boys and Girls Club, they have had problems with getting enough money to build the facility and that's been changed as to what they're actually doing. That's been, what, ten years now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I mean one of the things --

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: But you answered my question that it can be part
our mission.

MR. KAUFMAN: It's in the charter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We can be proactive, but I would say relatively in recent history in my tenure here, every time we have, we've gotten our wrist slapped by the Legislature. They don't like it. I guess the one place where we have been a little bit successful in the last few years is to get the Legislature to at least look at when they're purchasing buildings to considered what are we really getting ourselves into? There have been other instances where we have gone forward to try and promote things, and we really have been shot down. As you know, that's the Legislature's prerogative and so forth. So there is mixed missions in some respect.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: Well, you know, that's happened with any advisory group, and it's a matter of positioning and I mean that's -- there have been heads that have knocked with Parks Trustees when the Parks Trustees have had a
different and we have had to bow to the
decision made by the trustee. So that's
just naturally an order of power play.

MR. KAUFMAN: Just one quick
comment. It is in the charter. To
answer your question, that is one of the
missions of the CEQ. If you look at the
enabling legislation, it does give you a
broad mandate to look into these issues.
On the other hand, as Larry just pointed
out, there have been consequences that
have gone too far and it's not been
handled well. So we say that's the best
way it could have been handled -- the
issue.

MR. GULBRANSEN: "It's gone too
far" is a statement too. I think maybe
it should be pointed out that it is the
opinion that there are levels of power
is difference of opinion and they just
might consider it too far. I think it
is a fact-finding basis and should be on
a co-mingling basis.

MS. SPENCER: One final point. I
don't want you to lose sight of some of
our success. It was the CEQ that -- it
was from the CEQ that the momentum came
on looking at the rentals for properties
particularly the historic properties and
that came from this Body and it has
benefited both the properties and the
County.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER: It's just a
matter of getting someone from the
Legislature who will carry it.

MS. SPENCER: But that came from
us.

HON. VILORIA-FISHER : But it was from
here.

MR. MACHTAY: One last thing on the
agenda. Are there candidates for
chairman or vice chairman?

MR. BAGG: Election of office?

MR. MACHTAY: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We need nominations.

MR. MACHTAY: I nominate Larry
Swanson as Chairman and Michael
Kaufman as Vice Chairman.

MS. SPENCER: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any other
nominations?

MR. GULBRANSEN: I didn't get a
second on that.

MS. SPENCER: I seconded it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the Council voted.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Can I have a motion to adjourn?

MR. KAUFMAN: I make a motion.

MS. RUSSO: Second.

(WHEREUPON, this hearing of the
Council of Environmental Quality was
adjourned.)

(Time Noted: 12:30 p.m.)
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