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WHEREUPON, this proceeding convened at 12:00 p.m.

Off-the-record discussions ensued, after which the following transpired:

(TIME NOTED: 12:12 p.m.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right. Good afternoon and welcome to the February meeting of the Suffolk County Planning Commission.
I'll note that we have a quorum present, and I would ask Dr. Constantine Kontokosta to --

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Oh, my goodness.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- lead us in the pledge.

(Pledge of Allegiance)

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Well done, Doctor.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: He's improved as he's moved up the ladder.

The first item on our agenda is the adoption of the minutes for December 2011. I know both the editor in chief and I went through those.

Are there any comments, Commissioner Holmes?

COMMISSION HOLMES: You found a lot more errors than I did. I only found 13, and they were mostly minimal. So, you know, you can add yours and -- you know, I don't know what you think.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah, they were all pretty de minimus, and I think I -- we've given them to
Judy. So --

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Yeah.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: So any other comments or questions on the minutes, or edits?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion to
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COMMISSIONER HOLMES: So moved.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- amended.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Moved by Commissioner Holmes, seconded by Commissioner Weir.

All in favor, please raise your hand.

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And that's 11 to zero.

Thank you, all.

Next item is the public
portion. I don't believe there are any cards, so we'll move onto the next item which is the election of the officers 2011.

Suffolk County Planning Commission last meeting nominated for chair, myself, and for vice chair, Constantine Kontokosta, and for secretary, Adrienne Esposito.

So those nominations were made last month, and I'll let our esteemed attorney make a comment about the nomination for chair.

MR. YOUNG: All right. The chairman has been nominated, or his name has been put before the legislature, but it has not been officially acted upon yet. So as a holdover, he cannot be named chairman, per se, he would have to be acting. But in your resolution, if you just make it or put it to it, that upon his being -- by the legislation, being sworn in, the title will revert back to chairman.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Mr. Young.

Any thoughts or comments on that?
COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Well, in view how long we had Bobby Martin as acting chairman, that's de minimus of what we're doing with you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Right.

And I think Mr. Martin might have been acting chairman for years, actually --

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: It was many months.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: I'm told the legislature will take up the vote in a few weeks, but one never knows. So -- anyway, it is what it is.

At this time, the floor is open, however, for other nominations. First I'll entertain any other nominations for chair of the Planning Commission.

Are there any nominations from the floor for chair?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
none, there is one nomination, and we'll close the nominations for chair, and ask the secretary to vote one vote for David Calone for chair.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Acting.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes, you can say for acting chair. That's fine.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: I cast one vote for acting chair David Calone for chair of the Planning Commission.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And I think that's all we need to do, right?

MR. YOUNG: (Head gesture)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Next is the position of vice chairman. We have one nomination, Constantine Kontokosta.

Are there any other nominations from the floor for vice chair?

(Whereupon, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none, we'll close the -- the nominations and would ask the secretary to vote one vote for Constantine Kontokosta for vice chair.
SECRETARY ESPOSITO: The secretary votes one vote for Dr. Constantine Kontokosta for vice chair.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And lastly for the position of secretary to the commission, are there any nominations from the floor for secretary?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none, we have the nomination of Adrienne Esposito that's been nominated by the Nominating Committee. We'll close the nominations, and I would ask the Suffolk County Planning Commission secretary to cast one vote for herself.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Well, I would love to cast one vote for Adrienne Esposito for secretary of the commission.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right.

Well done. You've earned your keep right there.
All right. Well, thank you.

Thank you, all, for, you know, your confidence in us.

Let me say a few things.

As I've traditionally done sort of at the start of the commission year, I wanted to do a little bit of a summary of last year as well as talk a little bit about this coming year.

Obviously, I look forward to working with Constantine and Adrienne and all of you. This will be an exciting but also challenging year for us.

As you all know, Director Isles has announced his retirement, and that will be coming -- taking place sometime next month. We'll actually have a lot more to say about that, you know, as we move forward. But it's certainly -- you know, there'll be new challenges with regard to that, and obviously we wish Director Isles very well in the future. And as I said, we'll talk more about that later and next month.

I also want to give a
particular shout out, as I mentioned earlier, Constantine has received his doctorate, which is an incredibly -- as you all know, an incredible accomplishment. So congratulations to him on that.

(Applause)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Also this month, Michael Kelly was inaugurated as the president of the Long Island Building Institute, and I want to congratulate him on --

(Applause)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- on that achievement.

And so he'll be president for this -- this year, for 2- -- the year 2011, and so I think he -- the building community is obviously well represented by Michael, and we're obviously very lucky to have him with us as well.

So 2010 was a busy year for the commission. Among the highlights:

We continued our tour of the County with our meetings in Brookhaven, Shelter Island, and Babylon Town Halls;
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We took our bus tours of the EPCAL property and Shelter Island; We did background research for and got the town supervisors and other stakeholders to buy into the idea of the Suffolk Unified Permitting Portal that's now moving forward strongly under the leadership of County Executive Levy and his team;

We finished the Universal Design Incentive Code and saw it adopted by Babylon, and now it's under strong consideration by Smithtown and others, and Vince Taldone continues to work on that;

We assisted the County Executive in putting together Sewer Summit 2 and beginning to explore alternatives for sewer financing;

We hosted the East End Wind Symposium with the East End Supervisors & Mayors Association to educate policy makers on rules relating to -- or issues I should say, relating to rules and regulations governing wind energy.

We also drafted the wind permit
Earlier in the year we co-hosted two kick-off events with the County Executive's office on the Comprehensive Plan, and significant progress was made, as you all know, on the Volume I of that plan; We developed the fast-track solar permitting plan and application, and got LIPA to put funding for it in their new budget that they just adopted; We also completed the green methodologies for storm water runoff guidance document that's now going out to the municipalities;

Also in 2010, the vice chairman and I were asked to present on the Commission's efforts to the Long Island Association on two different occasions, to the Long Island Clean Energy Leadership Task Force on two different occasions, as well as the East End Supervisors and Mayors.
In the last few weeks, I had a chance to sit down with virtually all of you and talk about the Commission and our priorities for 2011.

To summarize those conversations, what I heard was a desire to keep our emphasis on major County-wide issues such as the development of the Comprehensive Plan as well as related issues like housing and infrastructure financing.

Based on the input from all the Commissioners here, I'd like to give you a short list of the projects we'd like to tackle this year:

First, we want to finish Volume I of the Comprehensive Plan and make significant progress in Volume II. To make sure that the Suffolk County Planning Commission is engaged and providing regular feedback to the staff, we're going to reconstitute our Comprehensive Plan Committee, and I know that Tom McAdam, Linda Holmes, and Diana Weir are going to serve on...
that committee. If others are interested in serving on that as well, please let me know. That will be, perhaps, the most important thing we do this year.

We also wanted to update our Planning Commission Guidelines as it’s been two years since the last update. As you know, that is a process we just -- just started, and Commissioners Holmes, Kelly, Finn, and Weir are going to work with me on that.

We’d like to complete the unified solar permit application and plan. It’s basically done from our perspective, and LIPA has endorsed it. We’re just waiting on the
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Nassau County Planning Commission to hopefully endorse it, hopefully later this month, and then LIPA will send out a letter to the municipalities by the end of February listing the incentives that they’ll be giving to adopt this plan or abide by this plan.

We’re also looking at creating a standard for professional
certification for interior commercial alterations, and hopefully working with a town or two to pilot that, and Commissioner Finn's going to be working on that project.

On the Public Safety Design Code, we've completed the draft and now we're getting it out to the electeds for -- and staff for feedback, and hopefully this year we will get that to completion.

Tom McAdam's done a lot of work on that, and he'll continue to lead that effort.

We are going to continue to help the East End towns come up with an East End Wind Code and to implement the wind permit application that our task force created. The next meeting I'm at is actually in hope- -- we think is going to be the end of next week in East Hampton, and Secretary Esposito as well as Commissioners Chartrand and Weir are helping work on that.

We're going to continue to help with the development of SUPP, the Unified Permitting Portal.
The County Executive has asked Commissioner Yves Michel from Economic Development and myself to head the Steering Committee for that. Also serving on the Steering Committee are Commissioners Kelly, and Roberts, and Finn.

We'd like to take a look at agriculture. Agriculture is not just our heritage in Suffolk County; it's a part of our way of life. So we want to look at how we can be supportive of regional food policies that are sustainable and supportive of this critical land use industry. And Commissioner Lansdale's going to help us work on that.

We're just putting together our new inter-municipal working group on commercial energy standards. We're hoping to make head way in that in working towards a standard for the County, and the Vice Chairman as well as Commissioner Finn are going to work on that. And LIPA has expressed a strong interest in being supportive of that, as has the County Executive.
We're hoping sometime in the first half of this year to hold a symposium on Green Methodologies for dealing with storm water, building off of the guidance document that we passed about two months ago. Secretary Esposito's going to be focusing on that.

When it comes to TODs and best practices, Commissioner Taldone has been in touch with Vision Long Island and the APA, and they're trying to develop a tool kit that we might wish to consider down the road in terms of a resource for municipalities regarding best practices on transit oriented design.

We also, I think, from my conversations with all of you, I heard that we need to do a better job of coordinating housing policies across Suffolk County and across Long Island. Hopefully in partnership with the Long Island Regional Planning Council, we can work to identify best practices on a local and regional level, identify town housing goals, and work on the...
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County and regional policies to support those goals.

On this Commission we have some of the leading thinkers and doers when it comes to housing on Long Island: Vice Chairman Kontokosta; Commissioner Horton who serves on the County Executive's Workforce Housing Task Force; Commissioner Kelly, of course, as the new head of the Builders Institute; and Commissioner Weir who is one of the leaders of the Long Island Housing Partnership. So we would be remiss if we didn't have all this brainpower on housing around this table and not do something about it. So hopefully that will be something we can move on this year.

Lastly, there are a handful of important, related issues that we kind of bandied around the table here a little bit that relate to balancing growth with environmental
protection. Those are issues like open space preservation, clearing standards, infrastructure financing, TDR reform, et cetera. I've taken to calling the folks who I hope will be part of those conversations, the Protect and Grow Committee, and I hope that Vice Chairman Kontokosta as well as Secretary Esposito and Commissioners Kelly, Finn, Lansdale, Horton, and others will be part of those conversations going forward.

We obviously have a lot going on, and I want to thank all of you for making this Planning Commission a place where major ideas and issues relating to Long Island's future are being debated and addressed. I also want to thank our staff for their hard work and assistance to the Commission all year long. They have been strong partners in everything we've been doing.

Long Island is a geographical anomaly. We're literally a geographical dead end. Our supply of land and water is limited, and we...
can't grow out, we can only grow in. But when we grow in, we need to be careful about how we do it so that Long Island doesn't get inundated with traffic and pollution and overburdened natural resources and infrastructure.

But there also needs to be a balance because there's a cost to going slow. When development gets too hard and too expensive, it stops happening, and then we stagnate, because development begets economic activity and economic activity creates jobs, and at the end of the day, there are no employees without employers.

So I think we as a Planning Suffolk County Planning Commission need to work to make the development process more efficient, and we're doing that. And yet we need to not be a rubber stamp either. The Commission is the only place where regional values and concerns are formally brought into the planning process.

And we also can't be afraid to do things just because our progress
will be measured across the years rather than in the next news cycle. That's what a planning commission is all about, thinking ahead and figuring out what comes next. I look forward to working with all of you in 2011 and to figuring out together what comes next. So thank you for, again, your support of myself, as well as Constantine and Adrienne, and we look forward to working with all of you.

If there are any questions, I'll entertain them now. And if Suffolk County Planning Commission not, we'll defer to Director Isles and, again, congratulate Director Isles on his service, and tell him that we look forward to working with for another month or so, but --

DIRECTOR ISLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to all the members of the Planning Commission for the opportunity to work with you this past year.

In terms of Departmental matters to bring you up to date on, I'd like to first begin by announcing a staff change that does
effect the Commission.

John Corral has worked with the Commission for three years and has been assisting Andy and Ted in terms of the regulatory review process.

This would be the last time -- last meeting with the Commission as a -- in that role.

He is switching within the Suffolk County Planning Commission Department, fortunately, to the farmland component of the Department, and we certainly will welcome his participation in that. And that will work directly with the Farmland Committee as well as with the Agriculture, Employment, and Protection Board.

Replacing John will be Andrew Amakawa who is in the back. If you'd just raise your hand, Andrew.

MR. AMAKAWA: (Complying)

DIRECTOR ISLES: And Andrew's been to the Commission for prior meetings. Andrew's been with us for two years, so Andrew has been doing farmland for two years and he's going to rotate into the regulatory
So the month of February will be our transition, and March they'll each take their respective positions in their new units.

Suffolk County Planning Commission

Just a couple other updates. As I've indicated, the County is part of a consortium of 17 entities that are applying and have successfully received a grant through HUD for the Sustainable Communities Program. That is to the tune of about $323,000 that will be used as part of a regional TDR study, slash, land use plan for Suffolk County.

We're now in the process of finalizing a memorandum of understanding with the consortium, and that is in full gear at this point with the idea that we can then proceed to consultant retention probably midyear and then commence the project. The project itself is probably about an 18 month project. And there'll be more on that, obviously, as the project begins to take off.

Next, another project we have
that's at a stage of significance, and that is the Sagtikos Corridor Land Use Transportation Plan. This is a grant we received from NYMTC, the regional transportation planning entity. We are at a point of signing an approved contract in the Department of Law. This has been achieved, and so we're now going to circulate that as a consultant and get that project underway as well. That's obviously a growth area of the County, and this will be important in terms of any future transportation planning in that area.

Next is to update you on the Yaphank development, Legacy Village. This was proposed by the County Executive on surplus County land, or what is potentially surplus. This is --

We've just completed, with our consultant, a draft generic environmental impact statement.
That was submitted to CEQ in January, and is under review by the Council at the present time. They will then determine at a future meeting, whether it's February or March or whatever meeting, if the document is complete.

If it's not complete, obviously, we'll go back to the consultant to supplement it. The document, by the way, is 2,500 pages so far. And we'll keep you posted.

Next is, on a couple of agricultural items --

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Can I ask you something?

DIRECTOR ISLES: You may.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Has that gone out for public review yet?

DIRECTOR ISLES: No. Once CEQ has to --

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Okay.

DIRECTOR ISLES: -- do the job of reviewing and saying, Does this match the scope that was approved by the legislature? Once they do, then it starts the public review process. It does require a public hearing as well, so there will be a public hearing.
hearing associated with that.

A couple of agricultural items
to update you on.

The Department did make a
presentation to the agricultural
forum that was held in January in
Riverhead, an annual event among the
agricultural community, and
basically talking about the -- the
new Chapter 8, which is the County's
implementing law for the County's
purchase of development rights
program for which we have about
10,000 acres of land under that
program, and also about other
updates to the County's Farmland
Program.

We also completed in the month
State. And it is interesting to see that we're adding properties to the Ag Districts Program, we're not taking them away. So we seem to be holding our own at about 34,000 acres total of agricultural land.

And the last thing for agriculture is something else I've updated you on periodically, is the Aquacultural Program. We're now in cycle three of that, and this is the cycle that's open to the general public to apply for the ability to

lease underwater lands for shellfish cultivation in Peconic and Gardners Bay.

It's a very restricted program in terms of the rules and requirements, but it is the first comprehensive program to also provide access with the idea of perpetuating and growing the shellfish industry in the Peconic Bay system, and also encouraging filter feeders in terms of water quality improvements.

Next, I'd just like to let you know, in terms of the Open Space
Program, the Farmland Protection Program, we are in the final year of the Quarter-Percent Program in terms of the bonding ability. So the voters of Suffolk County in November of 2007 approved an extension of the Open Space Program, the Quarter-Percent Program, which goes now to 2030, and the Suffolk County Planning Commission legislation provided that in the first four years, a certain percentage of those funds could be bonded in order to accelerate purchases.

So this is the last year of the bonding, 2011. We're anticipating bonding another $46 million which will bring us to the limit. And then from that point on, going forward in January of 2012, the money available will be what we call "pay as you go money," the residual money for the open space, whatever's left from paying the bonds.

And then there are two capital programs known as the "Legacy Program and Multifaceted," and that's a legislative executive
decision in terms of whether to access that money. So the program, here again, is still going forward this year, but just -- it will be coming to a certain milestone at the
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end of this year.

And the last informational item to bring to your attention is a little bit of a detail item, but New York State DEC is proposing an amendment of the environmental assessment form. They are soliciting comments until February 18th. The Department is reviewing that form. It is -- requires a lot more detail. It seems to be very project-focused. So for a lot of SEQRA things that weren't specifically projects. We're not sure how good of a fit it's going to be but, here again, it is important to the agencies and the applicants that are involved in the SEQRA process, so I just bring it to your attention.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Director Isles.

Any comments or questions?
COMMISSIONER HOLMES:

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE:

Commissioner Holmes.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES:

Mr. Chairman, I’d like to read into the record a comment our Shelter Island Town Supervisor made on -- this month in commenting on the County and the Town partnering to purchase the development rights on 57 acres at Sylvester Manor for agricultural farm development. And Supervisor Dougherty commented, and I quote, There’s been no greater friend of Shelter Island open space efforts than Tom Isles. He will be sorely missed.

Here, here.

This is for your scrapbook, Tom (handing).

DIRECTOR ISLES: Thank you, Linda.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And
only one who feels that way, but thank you, Linda, for noticing that and reporting on it.

Any other comments or questions for Director Isles?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: If not, we'll move onto the next item on our agenda, which is our guest speakers.

Walt Dawydiak is here from the Department of Health Services.

Good day, sir.

If you would do us the favor of spelling your name for the record, and we look forward to a brief overview of the plan.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Good day, Mr. Chairman.

My name is Dawydiak, D-a-w-y-d-i-a-k.


Thank you, members of the Suffolk County Planning Commission, for having me here today.

Is there a way to make this button stick, by any chance?

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: I think you could talk to the
I'm going to give you a brief overview, roughly 10 to 15 minutes on the Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan. I've got about 20 slides, I'm going to go fairly quickly. Feel free to interrupt, stop me, ask questions, at any time as we go along.

This process initially began really in 1987 when we undertook our first Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan. That was a great study and it laid a 20-year blueprint for how to provide a safe drinking water supply plan, but it was dated. A lot of new challenges and issues have arisen since then.

We also felt that we needed to revisit the Water Supply Plan in terms of the pollution control and management to groundwater. Not just the drinking water, but also for the ecology and surface water. So this study has a distinctively different flavor than the prior one.
The cost of this was $800,000, roughly half of which was underwritten by Suffolk County Water Authority and half of which by the Health Department.

Procedurally right now we have drafted the plan. It is available on the Web. We had a Steering Committee meeting in December of 2010. The comment period right now is open through March 1st, and we're welcoming comments, and at that point we'll move ahead with our plan amendment aspect.
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ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Walt, when did you say it was open until? I'm sorry.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Right now the request was through March 1st. If folks asked for an extension, we'd entertain that, but we're hoping we can get all comments by March 1st. There is no statutory period. This was not legislatively commissioned. This is an internal study. We've kept it open and transparent involving stakeholders, but this will not be approved by the legislature or have any formal
A lot of what we did in this study was really of interest to water quality engineers. We really upgraded the model in terms of the finite element grid.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)
can backtrack it and particle trace it to a potential source. So it's got all sorts of utility.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)
So that sounds like a good success story, but the problems are there are pockets of very degraded water quality, particularly in the north shore of Huntington, Smithtown, Western Brookhaven where a lot of preexisting dense development was not sewered. So there are localized stretches on wells.

The other major issue is that the surface water standard is .5. It's 20 times lower than the drinking water standard. And we as a society are still coming to grips with estuary programs and processes for how to manage groundwater so that we don't impact surface water. And that's still all relatively new, but it's a major emerging concern again.

In terms of volatile organic chemicals, it was good news and bad news. The level of wells that were...
effected by volatile organic -- so what we refer to as organic toxics, went down from 149 to 134, but certain contaminants like perchloroethylene went up significantly.

So it's a mixed bag. We didn't lose a lot of ground, but we didn't fix the problems either.

Issues such as methyl t-butyl ether and pharmaceuticals and personal like care products continue to be emerging concerns and are ubiquitous in our aquifer as well.

Next slide.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAVIDIAK: This slide just shows the upper Glacial Aquifer over a 20 year period. You see that there's a difference in data between the full data set in the same wells. In a nutshell, we kind of went from roughly 3 to roughly 4 parts per million. Again, better than what drinking water requires, but not really good enough to protect our surface waters.

This slide shows a similar graphic for the Magothy.
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groundwater quality is about .3. So before people were here, we were well below 1; 20 years ago, we were at about 1; now we're up at about 3. And what that really is, is a function of the Upper Glacial contamination bleeding down into the Magothy Aquifer.

Go ahead.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: Many of you have probably seen this slide before. This gives you the spectrum of nitrogen impact to the function of land uses.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Can you read those, Walt.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Not from here.
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I can tell you the middle ones. Four and six, the two in the middle, the fourth and fifth ones from the left, those are actually unsewered residential development at Suffolk County Sanitary Code densities. Four parts per million equates for one acre lots, 6 parts per million is half acre lots. And those were the two thresholds that
we used in the County for allowable densities in the absence of sewers. The number way to the left is agriculture. Row crops are up at around 12; the number way to the right is open space, which is about .5; and there’s some numbers in the middle. Golf courses are down a little bit lower, down around 3 or 4. So that just gives you the range of potential impacts for potential land uses.

Next slide.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)
020211PLANNING.TXT

17     some pretty significant water  
18     quality degradation there as well as  
19     in Western Brookhaven.  
20         That pink area in the middle of  
21     the Island, Zone 3 and Zone 5 in  
22     Southampton Town on the south fork,  
23     that's where our Health Department's  
24     most stringent requirements are;  
25     one acre per lot or 4 parts per
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2         million.  
3         A lot of open space was there  
4         in the 1970s during the 208 study  
5         and when the Sanitary Code went into  
6         effect, so we made a lot of progress  
7         in protecting those areas with  
8         relatively high quality water.  
9         Obviously, the Pine Barrens and Open  
10        Space Programs have been a  
11        tremendous success as well.  
12        The southwest sewer district  
13        was tremendously effective in  
14        improving nitrogen concentration.  
15        There's a comp plan online. There's  
16        lots of data showing how streams  
17        have actually gotten cleaned up. In  
18        western Great South Bay, water  
19        qualities improved as a result of  
20        sewering and removing the nitrogen  
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source. So that's been a good-news story.

On the other corner of the Island, in northeastern Suffolk and Southold, historical agricultural
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We have two sizes that we used in the comp plan; half acre and one-quarter acre. And these are going to be critical with potential sewer ing studies.

This shows the one-half acre lots. They're the ones that show up in yellow (indicating).

Roughly 61 percent of the parcels in the County are less than one-half acre, and roughly a third of our parcels are less than a quarter acre.

That's a pretty dramatic number, and that's a number that nobody really has ever come to terms with. All the studies in the past were really dealing with what we have to manage in terms of degrees of freedom. These things have already been developed.
There's things we can do in terms of fertilizer control and other management. Sewering is really the long-term answer for the most sensitive communities, potentially to address some of the environment issues.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIK: In terms of the Sanitary Code, we're looking at potentially amending it. There's a recommendation to consider one acre lots in unsewered areas County-wide, but the highest priority is really going forth.

If you look at the saturation numbers, most of western Suffolk is pretty near saturation population, but there's a very significant development potential in eastern Suffolk.

The numbers of the five West End towns times are only 5 percent, but in the East End, it's upwards of
60 percent growth. So that's the area where there's a lot of opportunity for development and the most meaningful Sanitary Code change to one unit per acre, and that's something we're going to be looking at over the next year.

Next slide.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: This is an example of one of our case studies. We looked at a Mastic-Shirley pilot area.

Right now groundwater in this area is already exceeding the maximum contaminant level of the groundwater standard for nitrogen of 10. At full build-out, it will get even worse at 14. If we sewer the area, it would go to 4.

This would have immense benefits for the Forge River system, which is very stressed, typically anoxic in summertime conditions, and greatly in need of nitrogen reduction.

The issue here is funding.

This area is one of several areas that the Department of Public Works
is looking at in terms of regional -- subregional sewer ing feasibility studies.

Next slide.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: Wastewater treatment plants have really been a big issue. It's a controversial issue. We have a lot of them. 184 in Suffolk County right now. We have more than any other county in New York State. There's only about 600 in the entire State.

Historically, operation has been mixed. Just a couple of years ago they were right at the drinking water limit, or just above it. Due to aggressive operation, Suffolk County Planning Commission maintenance, enforcement, and inspection, we've gotten that number down to 7.

Wastewater treatment plans significantly reduce nitrogen to the environment. They can potentially induce growth, have storm water impact, development, open space, habitat impact. But in terms of nitrogen, unbalanced when a
development uses wastewater
treatment, it's a good thing for
groundwater and drinking water in
terms of nitrogen removal, and
that's one of the tools in our
toolbox as we come to the end of
this study.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: This shows a
diffuse network. Southwest sewer
district is the big green one in
this lower left corner, obviously.
The rest of them are the other

There's sort of three related
processes going on right now. We,
in the Health Department, we're
undertaking a study. It's underway.
The results are online also for the
first tasks. An innovative and
alternative wastewater treatment for
small flows. There is areas where
30,000 gallons per day or less are
an appropriate area to -- to treat
to mitigate prior problems or to
accommodate smart growth.

The Department of Public Works
is looking at subregional large-flow
plants. And it really hasn't been tied together. So our study recommends that these two processes be fused and that there be a County-wide sewer needs assessment looking at sensitive localized sewerage, whether to accommodate smart growth or address groundwater and surface water problems. And
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that's something we're looking at probably in the 2012 window.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: Pesticides are a problem primarily in private wells. Agricultural environmental management is one of the key components. We're recommending that it be required as an element of anything that the County has an interest in. When we purchase development rights, there should be some mechanism to require that some agricultural environmental management to reduce or control nitrogen and pesticide pollution be in place.

Next slide, please.
MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIK: Not everybody knows this. Roughly 200 to 250 toxic and hazardous cleanups County-wide are overseen by the Suffolk County Planning Commission each year. That actually is a very good thing, because these are sites that would eventually potentially become superfund sites and problems had we not caught these with our inspections or monitoring, and cleaned them up.

It's a bad thing because it's an alarming number that that many sites need to be cleaned up, even with best management practices and regulations. So this again speaks to the fact that, you know, we're making headway on the toxic problem, but we're a long way from solving it.

So we've commissioned a study called "Reducing toxics," funded with County quarter-percent monies. We're going to look at our entire decade-long database of toxic contamination and risk with -- with relation to facility types. Is it
just the gas stations and the dry cleaners, or are there other types of facilities; auto body shops, print shops, plating shops?

Why are we really getting all these problems County-wide and nobody's taking a hard look at this?

This may result in amendments to Article 7 and 12 of the Sanitary Code which deal with toxic and hazardous materials, storage, and use.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: Not much to say about pharmaceuticals and personal care products other than it's a big emerging problem and it's not going to go away.

In 7,000 wells we've detected these in 4 percent. There are programs to manage disposal of these, but most of these are excreted by humans and they go to

sanitary systems. They're not all
easily broken down in waste treatment processes, particularly in on-site disposal systems. The thumbnail sketch is, there's a potential ecological impact. In terms of human health concerns, not a whole lot is known. It's definitely a concern. There's no data out there that shows any alarming concern, but it's something we're going to continue to measure, watch, and keep abreast in terms of national studies and management programs.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: Made a lot of progress in stream corridors. This is one of the Carmans (indicating). And we've actually delineated contributing areas as a function of travel time, which is scientifically interesting and it also helps us in
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management. What's the area that we can do something where it's going to effect that water quality?

We've taken it a level further and we've characterized the percent of water that goes into surface
waters is a function of travel time.

So on that slide, we're showing that the ten-year area -- and my eyes aren't all that good -- the ten-year area, I believe, is the green one there.

Fifty-eight percent of the groundwater coming into the Carmans is from the ten-year area. And that's pretty typical of stream corridors.

When you go to the 25-year contributing area, that number jumps to 80 or 90. So the planning target that we're using in terms of setting study areas or management zones is proposed to be 25 years for right now. And that's got a lot of
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Going further than that, there's such a tiny component and it's so diluted, some of it passes under. That didn't make sense going shorter than that, and you actually don't capture a lot of the groundwater going in. So 25 is our number right now.
Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: We have done this for the entire Island. Really the only area that's not necessarily a major concern is probably the south side of the south fork because it flows to the Atlantic Ocean, which is not of particular language and concern right now. There's other reasons to worry about that now, obviously.

So the Sound Study, Peconic Estuary Program, and South Shore

Suffolk County Planning Commission Estuary Reserve, portions of those are all subject to total maximum daily loads, which would require nitrogen controls, and they're all certainly subject to eutrophication stressors, which effect dissolved oxygen, aquatic habitat, and ecosystems.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: We were kind of hoping for a different result here. We were looking for places where we could usually accommodate smart growth. And we plotted these
recharge areas, special groundwater protection areas, pine barrens, various areas including stream and surface water contributing areas, and there's really nothing left. I mean, there really is no easy answer about where to put growth while protecting our resource.

Next slide.
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MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: How have we done?

We think the Sanitary Code has done really pretty well in terms of its intended use. We still have a ways to go with respect to toxics in terms of nitrates. We've done well for unsewered areas, but maybe not well enough for surface waters.

Public supply wells are being monitored and protected.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: I didn't talk a lot about open space. This Commission is well aware of the value of that and the tremendous benefit it's done to the aquifer and
to surface waters, but we really need to do more for agricultural environmental management, volatile organic chemicals for industrial and commercial activities, and emerging issues.

In terms of a Sanitary Code for the lots which predate Article 6 and development restrictions for unsewered areas, these wastewater studies are going to go a long way, but again, the Planning Department is proposed as the lead agency for the County-wide sewer needs assessment. That was just voted as a proposal. We're open to suggestions about how to do this differently on a different time scale with different people.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. DAWYDIAK: We have a lot of very specific changes that are going to be happening to the Sanitary Code and how development is going to be happening. Again, pretty much the entire East End, all five East End towns, a large portion of them allows half acre lot subdivisions
right now. With the exception of a
portion of Southampton in Zone 5 and
a portion in Zone 3, again in
Southampton and Riverhead, the
East End now allows half acre.

I think we're going to go to
one acre as a proposal to the Board
of Health. We're going to have to
look at cost benefits and impacts a
little bit more in detail, but
that's going to be one of our first
priorities at amending the Sanitary
Code.

We've defined sensitive areas,
and that graphic there shows those
sensitive areas (indicating).
The blue is contributing areas
of public supply wells, and the
yellow -- now, that's a 50-year
travel time for public supply wells.
Again, most of the groundwater that
enters public supply wells enters it
in that 50-year travel time. You
could go to a hundred, but you get

very little benefit for a very large
travel time at that point.

And that shows the 25-year travel time for streams, which we discussed (indicating).

These are essentially in a sense overlay districts to our Sanitary Code where we're going to be considering additional protections. We're proposing that these be priority areas for open space as part of the Open Space Review Program.

We're also re-evaluating the Sanitary Code Transfer and Development Rights Policy. Previously, you know, the town had a plan to let you go to four units per acre, or if you got a Board of Review determination, we would let you go to four units per acre if there was any offset anywhere. The recommendation is that in these sensitive areas, you certainly
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shouldn't be going above two, because you want to keep your nitrogen level below 6.

This may affect Pine Barrens transfer areas, other than Zone 3, because previously Pine Barrens Page 56
could be used in Zone 8 on the north shore and in Zone 6 on the south shore to go up to additional densities of up to four units per acre.

We're going to be discussing with the Pine Barrens folks how this all works out, but I think the two units per acre in these sensitive areas, unless there are special circumstances, is going to be where our Sanitary Code is heading.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: May I ask a question?

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE:

Well --

MR. DAWYDIAK: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Are
areas or these Sanitary Code Overlay Districts, so to speak, but there's going to be more required of them. Siting is going to be such that they be moved as far away from either surface waters or short travel times to public supply wells as we possibly can.

Nitrogen is going to have to be significantly lower to the baseline that's allowable as of right when it's not sewered.

And the big thing is that we're going to require performance of Suffolk County Planning Commission wastewater treatment plants essentially to limit technology. Plants that meet 10 can go down to 4 or 6 or 2 depending on the type and size of the plant. That's not a permit requirement, but we're going to make it a permit goal. And if that's not met, then we're going to require additional operation and maintenance to make sure. It's a reasonable cost effective thing. It's easy to do in these sensitive areas. We think it should be done. Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)
MR. DAWYDIAK: Where we head from here in the next couple of years, after the comment period ends, we're hoping to wrap this plan up by June.

The first thing we do is look at our transfer of development rights standards. We hope to wrap that up this year, and we hope to get our wastewater study done this year.

The Sanitary Code itself is going to have to go through a bunch of Board of Review hearings and State Environmental Quality Review Act. That will probably be 2012.

Our reducing toxic studies should be done in 2012. And we have another phase of this. It's a very complicated arrangement whereby the Water Authority is reimbursing us $200,000 which allows for more study. And this is going to allow additional nitrogen modeling.

One of the things we didn't really finish here, because it wasn't in the scope and there weren't enough resources. We're
adding full build-out scenarios
under multiple management scenarios
for the entire Island in terms of
what that does, and I include
several contaminants useful --
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useful for managing groundwater,
drinking water for planning, for
land use, and for surface waters.
The Water Authority wants to
see source water protection
standards. Right now, this whole
program is very focused on the
County and the County Sanitary Code
and what we can do. The Water
Authority wants and we agreed to
bring this down to the town level,
dealing with towns and villages and
localities, dealing with State and
Environmental Quality Review Act and
planning.

Dan Gulizio had mentioned the
fact that we need to address the
issue of old filed maps and how to
give them credit for development or
how to manage them. That's being
done on a town-by-town basis, and
that's certainly something that's
going to require a lot more work.

We want to take a harder look
at the Lloyd Aquifer and eventually get to the sewer needs assessment, which is probably in the 2012 to 2013 time frame.

That was my fast-track presentation. I thank you for your time. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you very much, Walt, and appreciate all the hard work that went into this.

Also, I think you know, we -- Marty Trent kind of gave us the hour-long version, though it was more preliminary, I think it was about six or nine months ago, probably. So this is -- it's great to see now that the process is done to get the overview from you, so we certainly appreciate that.

I know Commissioner Holmes had a question.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Yes, I did.
You're considering requiring one-acre lots?

MR. DAWYDIAK: Yes.

What that means, basically in Southold, Shelter Island, and in portions of Southold and Southampton and East Hampton Town where it's not required, if you have a lot which is greater than one acre, it is not sewered, the Health Development will not let it be subdivided to a size less than one acre per lot. And so most of that area's unsewered.

Now, a lot of those areas have already by upzoned, but not all of them, and there is the old filed map size lottage use also.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Well, the question was raised very recently on Shelter Island because there was a subdivision that has been before the local planning board for so many years, it was on -- on the docket
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test well on each lot. So that was something that wasn't required when they started, and they had to redo their map.

But I'm thinking more in terms of the many families on Shelter Island who own lots that are half acre, and they're empty lots, and they've had them in their family for years, and then, you know, a son or grandson comes along and wants to develop the lot.

Would those be preexisting nonconforming, or would they be subject to your new standards?

MR. DAWYDIAK: The way that it worked when the Sanitary Code was amended back in 1980, then it will
ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE:
Commissioner Taldone.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a couple of quick questions.

One, you mentioned earlier, projection on the east-- for the eastern end of a 60 percent increase or growth opportunity toward saturation.

Does that include any calculation for the number of second
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MD. DAWYDIAK: That number -- I want to put a few caveats on that number.

That's an older number. It's several years old. It came out of the Peconic Estuary Program. So that number may be lower.

I believe that the number is year-round permanent residents, but I can check on that and follow up and get you an answer.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Okay.

Great. Because my one concern there
is, of course, Southampton, I believe, is around 50 percent; East Hampton, 60; and I think Shelter Island takes the cake at 70 percent second homeowners. So I always think back to Mastic Beach since there was no outflow problems when people went home in September and didn't return

Suffolk County Planning Commission until June. But once the folks started retiring into those houses, we started seeing more and more problems at the bay. And I'm concerned about the East End with all those second homes, as those people start moving into those second homes, working out of those second homes, they're spending more and more time utilizing the existing septic systems. So I was just wondering if you were taking some portion of that into your calculation as well.

My second question -- actually, I have three all together, if you'll forgive me. One is related to the MTBE problem out on Shelter Island.
know a number of people have had test runs -- tests run on their wells showing this is appearing in all sorts of places on the Island.

Is your agency involved in
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MR. DAWYDIAK: What happens when MTBE is detected is that it's reported to the State Department of Environmental Conservation. Most often MTBE is related to petrochemical storage used or discharged.

What we're involved in so far is if the MTBE is significant enough to pose a health risk, we want to ensure that the drinking water is safe. It's a development factor in our review of subdivisions.

In terms of where the MTBE came from and whether it's a potential long-term impact of the groundwater and other residencies, that's an area in the State Department of Environmental Conservation's jurisdiction.

I don't know if that answers your question.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I think
It does.

And lastly, but not least, I wanted to address the issue of on-site or source treatment of wastewater.

On the East End, many communities, it's virtually impossible to get a community to accept a multiunit dwelling into the 40, 50, 60 units, 100 units, where sewage treatment plants, even the Cromaglass, not my favorite, but systems for treating wastewater can be economical.

When you come down to trying to build something with ten units, rental units, multiunit housings, the cost of running a small Cromaglass or other methodology is cost prohibited to affordable housing in many instances. So I was wondering if you are looking at the source treatment.

I know places like Norway where the ground freezes for 30, 40 years,
they've been treating at the source,
they take a little brick and throw
it away at the end of the day,
there's -- they don't have septic
systems. They've never had septic
systems, and they don't have sewage
treatment plants within the areas
either.

So are you investigating those
technologies to see which ones could
apply to enable the East End to
build more affordable multiunit and
denser housing?

MR. DAWYDIAK: When you say
"source treatment," can you expand
on that a little bit because I'm
not --

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Rather
than using a wastewater or septic
system, there is a mechanical
treatment of the wastewater coming
out of a unit --

DIRECTOR ISLES: On site.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: On-site
treatment.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: On-site
treatment, but not in an -- not like
ten units are feeding into it in a particular facility.

MR. DAWYDIK: Yes. Okay. I thought you might be talking about composting toilets and that kind of thing which has zero discharges and is a whole different issue.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: All --

that's --

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: That's one alternative.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Yeah, that's one alternative.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: That's one out of five that --

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Yeah, there's many. I don't --

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: -- was --
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COMMISSIONER TALDONE: -- I don't --

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: -- today.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: We don't have time for us to go through all of them, but there's a whole bunch of these things that --

MR. DAWYDIK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: -- have been used for decades in other
MR. DAWYDIAK: Essentially, the scope of our innovative alternative waste treatment system, there are two classes of systems that we're looking at.

We're looking at one system which can deal with an individual residence or a group of two or three residences. Because you were right, most of the systems that are out there require a flow. For even a Cromaglass, you're looking at 10- or 15,000 gallons. A full-scale treatment plan needs to be at least 30,000 to be cost-effective.

So we're looking at two different universes of systems. One are for very small flows, and one are for what I call moderate flows. Up to 30,000 -- that area, 10,000 to 30,000, where it might be too much flow for a Cromaglass, but not enough for a full-scale system. So those two gaps are exactly what our study is looking at addressing.

The results of that first literature, if you were online, in terms of the systems specifically...
that we'll be looking at. There is some funding in there to do one pilot study at the end of this, as long as everything else goes well. So the idea was to take potentially one system in one community and install it as a test to look at the operation maintenance and the results of this. So there's an
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So the short answer is yes, by the end of 2011, this study should be completed and coupled with DPW's base study. This will give us a leg up on sewers.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Thank you.

MR. DAWYDIAK: You're welcome.

I'd like to just add one thing to your first question.

Household size has gone up since the 1970s. I didn't mention this in my presentation, but going into this study, we thought we might allow five units per acre rather than four, because in the 1970s, five acres per unit equals ten parts
per million. Fast forward 25 years, our average household size is now 3, 3.1 versus 2.5. So four units is really the maximum allowable number that we can use to accommodate

But in addition to seasonal homes, the other big stress that's happening is, more and more people are living in the households County-wide, which is not just a social issue, it's a groundwater issue and a surface water issue.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: I would just note, I know the comprehensive plan that we're working on right, the draft of it at least, indicates that the per household numbers are actually going down. So it might be something to discuss between the departments on that. But --

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: (Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Secretary Esposito.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: I just want to add a little bit to Vince's
question, Walt, and I just want to say I'm a little disheartened and discouraged to not see anybody yesterday from the Health Department attend the forum that was held right here. It actually was very, very good.

They had the New Jersey team who are doing the large-scale pilot tests on five different treatment technologies that Vince was asking about. They had data on each of those treatment technologies. And it's not a small pilot, there are actually hundreds, apparently, of each of these various types and meth- -- and technologies in place.

The Cromaglass was taken out of the pilot because of its failure. It was emitting about 32 to 35 parts per million. Their goal for this test was between 11 and 14. Some of the technologies -- I don't have my notes here -- which ones were...
was even before dilution occurred, which would obviously bring that number down even greater.

So I think that as Suffolk is doing their study, which is great, we actually need to include other area studies, as you well know, I don't need to tell you, but for everyone else.

New Jersey's very similar -- has some direct similarities to Long Island in hydrogeology, and their data would be, I think, valuable to us, and they're working to achieve the same goal as we are.

So as we do a comprehensive water management plan, I think it's really urgent that we look at these new technologies and we incorporate them.

Some were, as you said, between 30- and $32,000 per unit. Some were as low as 20,000 per unit. And they...
service contract and all this other stuff.

So there were some encouraging, I think, signs, not only with the test results, but also with the economic ramifications as well.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Thank you, Commissioner Esposito.

I just wanted to note for the record, we regretted being unable to attend as well.

We were working with Kevin McAllister and with Legislator Romaine in advance of this symposium.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Yes.

MR. DAWYDIAK: We were aware of the speakers and its systems. It turns out our consultants are actually using the very same system as a pilot in their study. We did research on New Jersey, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Washington State to scour the literature and came down with a subset of systems, which overlaps the systems which were presented. Which is good, we are working...
SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Good.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's certainly heartening to hear.

Both Adrienne and I were able to attend, and it certainly -- just to second her point, it was good to hear that there's innovation going on in this field and that we're not caught between the big treatment plant and the -- you know, the old cesspools, and that there is a middle ground. And, perhaps, particularly when we're talking about sort of potentially significant and drastic steps which are changing, you know, lot size and those kinds of things, that there are, perhaps, middle grounds we can explore.

MR. DAWYDIAK: If I could just expand with one other comment. I mean, historically, we've been looking into these systems informally. And the problem with it has been, really none of them were ever shown to consistently meet ten, and ten is the State number that you're required to meet.
for a point source which will allow you to circumvent on sewer density requirements as part of the Sanitary Code. So none of these systems have been able to allow densities greater than the Sanitary Code. So there are two questions:

Do you want to look at the systems as land use density
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Can we optimize these systems to operate them even better to get them under ten so that we can accommodate additional density.

So they're both important questions that we're working on, and we appreciate the input.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KELLY:

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE:

Commissioner Kelly.

COMMISSIONER KELLY: Thank you, Commissioner.

Couple of questions.

One, it looks like siting new
plants, especially out on the East End, we'll have much more difficulty trying to site a new on-site treatment plant.

So if that's the case, is there any way or any studies that are ongoing right now to increase any capacity at current plants? And particularly look at the Selden area where there's District 11, which from what I hear is at capacity. But -- but there's a -- that area of the Island -- the Town of Brookhaven is ripe for redevelopment, and there's a lot of plans to redevelop -- or they would like to redevelop that area.

What can be done to try to increase capacity at a plant? Because I think that would definitely help in terms of not causing any new on-site treatment plans.

MR. DAWYDIAK: This is on the radar screen of the Department of Public Works. I have not gotten an update from them recently, so I don't want to speak to specifics. I do know that there's about
ten or 12 studies that have been funded or proposed throughout the Island in specific areas, either to expand existing treatment plants or to potentially provide new sewer systems where they don't exist.

What I can do is get an updated table from the Department of Public Works and forward it to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER KELLY: Great.

Thanks.

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah.

Please continue.

COMMISSIONER KELLY: Just a follow-up.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And we'll wrap up in a second.

COMMISSIONER KELLY: Right.

On this standard of 300 gallons per day, has the County ever gone back to look at that standard to ensure that -- you know, it seems like that's a burdensome number.
From what I hear, some of the plants that are operational right now don't get sufficient flow to work at capacity or work sufficiently.

MR. DAWYDIAK: I can't speak for Public Works.

For Health, we did re-evaluate the flows a few years back. We found that for certain types of uses, due to low-flow plumbing fixtures, for example, flows have gone down. But on the other side of the coin, sewage strength has gone up. And most of the systems, from Health's perspective, are sized in terms of strength of wastewater and impacts on groundwater.

From Public Work's perspective, same deal. It's the pounds of BOD and nitrogen that enter into a plant that are a concern rather than total flow. I know it's an issue that they're looking at.

COMMISSIONER KELLY: Thanks.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE:

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes, Vince. Last words.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Very
I just have to repeat what Chairman Calone had mentioned regarding the -- the population densities are, in fact, household size.

We've been getting lots of information over the past years that tells us that household sizes has been dropping quite consistently; and you've just mentioned, if I'm not mistaken, that your estimation is that household is actually rising and you need to incorporate that into your calculations.

Where would you be getting those numbers from?

MR. DAWYDIAK: That number came from our consultants, and I'm glad you brought this up, because I need to reconcile it.

They were basically looking at two points in time. They were looking at some point back in the 1970s when the initial modeling was done and some point in the mid-2000s when this study was done.

So what's been happening in the
last ten years or so, I can’t speak to, but is three people per household about the number that you’re finding now?

DIRECTOR ISLES: That’s about it.

Back in 1970, it was about 3.5 per household, approximately?

Peter Lambert is the County’s expert on all that. So certainly, you can get information from Peter. There’s also the situation, of course, of accessory apartments, illegal apartments, and things like that. But in terms of households, that number dropped. I think it’s now level, and it’s been staying level for a while.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: I think you have more seniors, right? There’s a different flow for seniors, and that’s a growing population.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Right.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: So I think there’s a lot of difference --

A person is not a person when it comes to --

COMMISSIONER WEIR: Seniors --
listen, we do everything much slower.

(Laughter)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: On that note, thank you, Mr. Dawydiak, for coming --

MR. DAWYDIAK: You're welcome.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- and for all the work on this. We look forward to working with you and inputting on this in the future.

Thank you.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Next on the agenda, we have -- Dan's going to -- Deputy Director Gulizio is going to give us a brief update on the Long Island Regional Planning Council, their Sustainability Plan.

And, if you'll recall, our question to Dan was sort of what are the things that the County, to be specific, the Planning Commission, could or should be being asked to do as a result of the Sustainability Plan.

So a brief overview with that...
in mind would be great.

Thanks, Dan.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: In light of the use of the word "brief" three times, I will indeed be brief.
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The Long Island Regional Comprehensive Sustainability Plan

2035 is a project built upon the Long Island 2035 Visioning Statement prepared by the Long Island Regional Planning Council in cooperation with the County and the RPA, the Regional Planning Association.

The structure of the document, the Regional Comprehensive Sustainability Plan, is broken up into five different sections.

The first section is an introduction consisting of both the executive summary and a list of strategies or policies to guide developing into the future, and then there are four thematic areas that are covered by the plan. The first is Tax and Governance, the second is the Economy, the third is Environment and Infrastructure, and the fourth is Equity.

So these five sections...
essentially make up the Comprehensive Sustainability Plan. Each of the thematic areas in turn were broke up into a number of subchapters, including Context, Challenges, Assets, Visions, Linkages, Actions, Implementation, the Role of the Long Island Regional Planning Council, and Individual Case Studies.

The plan provides a wide variety of strategies and actions. Actions are subcomponents of the strategies or specific tasks that are to be undertaken to accomplish the strategies.

For instance, Tax and Governance has five strategies and 23 actions; the Economy section has nine strategies and 39 actions; the Environment and Infrastructure chapter is broken up into Transportation Strategies, Environment and Infrastructure strategies, and Land Use strategies.
with 104 actions; the Equity chapter is broken up into five strategies and 23 actions. Other than a recitation of the numbers, I'm just trying to give you an idea of the complexity of the document and the contents of the document.

The big picture items, the actions and strategies, include such things as providing additional economic incentives; streamlining permanent processes; the creation of the regional oversight tools, one is the code to handle both wastewater, as well as groundwater protection; affordable housing initiatives; topics like tax increment financing; simplifying the 700 governmental taxing jurisdictions that exist in the bi-county region; and one of the principal initiatives that they looked at is the idea of education

A couple of general comments on the plan is that, like any regional
plan, it talks of big picture in
terms of items like protecting our
beaches, protecting our natural
environment, promoting economic
development. But one of the things
we would like to see as this process
moves forward is to get into some
more of the specifics in terms of
how we're going to accomplish some
of these initiatives.

And one thing in particular
that is a concern, and I think will
be the challenge as we move forward
with the plan, is that often
planning revolves around a set of
competing interests.

I have to tell you, it's
totally distracting, trying to hold
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your thumb down this entire time.
(Laughter)

DEPUTY DIRECTOR GULIZIO: I
can't multitask, I guess.

But the idea of planning being
an exercise in balancing competing
interests is something I think us,
as planners, we've -- we've come to
expect over the years. But the real
challenge of meeting that, kind of
properly balancing those competing interests, is something I think this plan and many plans are going to struggle with as we move forward.

For instance, we want to talk about minimizing government costs, and that being an important theme throughout the plan. The increasing tax burden for Long Islanders, both residential property owners, as well as business owners. Yet the plan also talks about a fairly robust expansion of services in terms of infrastructure, both the roads, mass transit, sewers, and a host of other issues.

On a micro level, the idea of properly ensuring that educational quality is uniform across all of our individual districts is an important element, because while we have a number of school districts that do exceptionally well and have historically done exceptionally well, we also have a number of school districts that have historically done poorly, and it is not directly related to cost.

So how we balance that idea of
increasing the quality of education for everyone, while at the same time recognizing that the cost to taxpayers of our educational system is frayed, is one of those balancing acts and it’s going to be difficult to accomplish.

In addition, the plan talks about how traffic is an increasing burden along our roadways and the increasing congestion, and yet the panel still talks about growth throughout the document. And how we properly balance the growth through our transit-oriented development and our downtowns while still addressing issues -- big pictures such as minimizing our traffic congestion is something we need to look at also.

Just on a specific level -- and again, the complexity issues are something that I think we all need to appreciate.

Many times we just say how transit-oriented development is a way of reducing the volume of traffic on our roadways, and that is certainly true if you keep density
equal; and that if you locate the same amount of density away from public transit that you do near public transit, you reduce the number of trips on local roadways which are absorbed by public transit.

But typically, as I think we're all familiar with, most transit-oriented developments are not at the same density that the existing zoning permits. So when you allow for a specific increase in density, even if they are situated within close public transit, the likelihood is that traffic will also increase on local roadways even with the absorption of some of those trips of public transit.

One of the other themes that's talked about throughout the document is the idea of streamlining our permitting processes, particularly related to regionally significant projects. Yet it also talks about adding additional layers of the government and regional layers of the government to the review process in order to attempt that.
And again, I think the plan is a great start. We were happy to participate in the development of the plan. And while there was -- I think one of the benefits of the plan was also based upon broad stakeholder participation. And when I say "stakeholder participation" -- I'm sorry, I can't talk anymore -- what we're really talking about is bringing together environmental interests, building interests, academic interests, and a host of other special interests to the table. And that's certainly helpful to the dialogue of that.

I think one of the other challenges of the plan as we move forward is figuring out a way, in a bi-county region of nearly 2 million people, and getting the public involved in the process also so the public can participate in a meaningful way and help to shape the document and move forward before all.
the policies are set in place.

That's a brief overview of the plan. Again, it was a year in the making, so I'm being very restrictive in the amount of information I'm providing. But if any of the Commission members have any questions, I'd be happy to try to address them.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Dan.

Any comments or questions about the Regional Plan?

You'll all remember Michael White was here, oh, about four or five months ago now and kind of gave us a more in-depth presentation. That was before it had been formally released. And now that it's been released, it's good to get an overview.

It certainly sounds to me, and I was on the Leadership Advisory Group for this, that a lot of -- as we used to say in law school, a lot issue spotting has been done, but a lot of the details, you know, are left to be -- yet to be worked out.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE:
Acting Chairman Calone: All right. Vince, and then we'll move on.

Commissioner Taldone: A quick comment regarding Dan's discussion of the TODs and its effect on congestion in terms of roadways.

Of course, if one increases density at transit centers without offsetting in other locations of the town or municipality, clearly, that's the case.

Are you looking also at the -- you know, the huge storehouse of banked transfer of rights that the County and the townships and villages are accumulating as they
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buy and preserve land as a means of transferring into particularly affordable transit-oriented developments so that the Town-wide density is not affected by increasing the density at hamlet centers?

Deputy Director Gulizio: Sure.

Obviously, that's something we would want to look at and we would want to
The only -- one of the other things we would want added to the mix is the idea, again, that that linkage between the idea of increases in density in one location and the preservation of open space and the protection of natural resources in another location.

And again, in theory, I think most people tend to agree with that type of concept, and practice is something a little bit more difficult to apply, as I think this Suffolk County Planning Commission has experienced over the last year or two.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: True enough.

Other thoughts or comments?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: If not, thank you, Dan, for the overview, and we'll obviously be keeping up to date as the plan moves forward and as some more specificity is developed around the action items.

We have with us Jefferson Page 94
Murphree from the Town of Southampton. Jefferson's going to speak about the Hampton Bays Corridor Strategic Plan that the Town has worked on putting together, and then we'll move into our administrative portion.

Mr. Murphree, welcome.

MR. MURPHREE: Good afternoon.
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I'm Jefferson Murphree, Town Planning and Development Administrator.

I'm going to avoid the evil word that you've been saying all morning, "brief."

So by way of introduction, in 1999, the Town Board of Southampton adopted a hamlet center strategy for the hamlet of Hampton Bays.

Five years after that adoption, the community of Hampton Bays said it wanted an update to its corridor plan, but it wanted a much broader plan. It won't encompass the entire hamlet.

We did not do the entire hamlet. We came close to it. We tried to identify those areas where
there were important issues, while trying to avoid the areas that really were not going to be subjected to any sort of scrap in development or have any real
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pertinent issues that warranted, you know, additional analysis.

Having said that, in our last five years, I think we've had well over 30 meetings with the Advisory Committee reaching out to the community, individual meetings with key stakeholders.

To say that it's been an exhaustive process, that would be a major understatement.

Somebody upstairs was looking in after us. We were supposed to have our first public hearing last night. The meeting was cancelled, and then it's now been rescheduled for next Tuesday night. If anybody's listening, next Tuesday night at 6:00 p.m. we'll be having our first public hearing on this. So the timing of meeting with you is very, very well timed.

So I'm going to turn it over to my Deputy, Freda Eisenberg. She was
the project manager on this project.
She has endured the majority of the
wrath of the -- from the
participants who are on this study
and played a key role of carrying
forth that message between the
stakeholders and the town board.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank
you, sir.

If you would state your name
and spell it for the record, please.
MS. EISENBERG: Sure.
Freda Eisenberg, F-R-E-D-A,
E-I-S-E-N-B-E-R-G. I'm assistant
town planning and development
director for the Town of
Southampton. And I am going to try
and do this briefly.
We do have a PowerPoint
presentation for you. It's about
19 slides. Some of them are -- are
placeholders, some I will go over --
gloss over fairly quickly on it, and
some we'll spend a little bit of
time on.
First slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MS. EISENBERG: All right. As Jeff said, we are beginning the SEQRA process. And, as I understand it, the purpose of the presentation to -- to this body is to look at the -- this plan in the context of County-wide needs and goals. Specifically, in terms of --

And even though this is a plan for a specific hamlet, with respect to this forum, we're going to focus on looking at the recommendations of those plans in the context of regional land use considerations such as sustainability, affordable housing, energy efficiency, public safety, coastal zone management, economic development, and natural resource protection.

This is a list that we culled from the Planning Commissioners' Suffolk County Planning Commission Guidebook, and we'll try and -- as this presentation moves forward, we'll present elements of the Corridor Strategic Plan and relate them to the County goals.

Next slide, please.
MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MS. EISENBERG: Just to give you an overview of how this is structured, we'll give a little bit of project background:

You know, what is this part of the strategic plan and what does it hope to achieve;

An overview of some of the issues. Obviously, there are a lot of issues. We're not going to go in-depth, but we'll gloss over them;

And as we look at some of the major recommendations, I think we'll also look at how they align with regional planning goals;

And then we'd hope for time for questions and comments, but --
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Jeff gave a little bit of background on -- in terms of, you know, the process and the different plans.

Essentially, what's happened is we have two planning documents here. We have a document of Corridor Strategic Plan -- the Hampton Bays Corridor Strategic Plan that is a -- a specific land use plan for the...
Montauk Highway corridor in the hamlet. That plan was done through a charrette process, and it looks at really it takes -- almost takes a walk or a drive down the hamlet from the West End to the East End. You know, what should happen here, and it's very design oriented. When that plan was done, the Town initiated a SEQRA review for the Planning Commission, a DGIS. And the public scoping for the DGIS brought forward a lot of community comments and concerns. And what

Suffolk County Planning Commission 117 they sought to do was to turn the DGIS process for this corridor study into more of a comprehensive planning effort for the community. So it's turned into a little bit of a hybrid. And I think the -- you know, Jeff alluded to a little bit of a rocky road, but the fit wasn't quite always -- you know, it wasn't always very smooth, but it's -- the bottom line, it's what we're dealing with. So we had two distinct documents. The DGIS did add a number of things. It added a mission
statement for the hamlet. There was
no overall visioning process for the
corridor strategy; it added a
build-out analysis for the entire
hamlet; and then there were
additional supplementary
recommendations.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)
at the moment. It has gone through -- you know, prior to the economic downturn, it's gone through several decades of rapid postwar growth. The result being that there

really is little remaining vacant land in the hamlet so that each new project takes on added significance and visibility because, you know, of that small amount of land that's -- that's left.

The hamlet itself is like Long Island, bounded by water to the north and south, and to the south, it's environmentally constrained. There have been some demographic changes, just getting back to the population discussion of a few minutes ago. We have also found the population decreasing, but recently family sizes increasing. And that's actually affected the school system.

The school district in Hampton Bays has, while we were doing this plan or the DGIS, hired an independent consultant. And their conclusion interestingly enough was that the land use
 wasn't development wasn't necessarily a feeder into the school system. That the school population was growing, but it was growing in part because family sizes were growing. Also in part because, with the economic downturn, people were taking their children out of private schools and putting them into the public schools.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MS. EISENBERG: This is the corridor plan from the corridor perspective. The hamlet's seen a lot of new commercial development backed in, branching away from the traditional hamlet center, so they've started to see some land use sprawl. Larger projects, more national chain-oriented stores, outside and away from the hamlet center, newer, shinier, taking away business, and -- and that's been a concern and also a threat to
And as always, traffic is a continual concern. Montauk Highway runs through the hamlet. It's a major thoroughfare, and there isn't a lot of other capacities in the hamlet.

Okay. Major recommendations, I'll -- I'll look at them in a few different categories. I mentioned it was a visioning process. The outset was a set of community planning goals which I'll get to in a moment. There was some zoning strategies.

A lot of site-specific projects, because I -- I just said the corridor study was design based. I won't go through all of them, I'll just highlight two, and then we'll do an overview of some other long-term recommendations and the additional recommendations from the
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DGIS.

Okay. First, after the hamlet study was concluded and the Town did put an advisory committee together for the DGIS, one of the first things they said they wanted was an
overall vision for the hamlet. And
a vision statement was developed
that, you know, aside from guiding
the plan, it was intended to
actually almost serve as a screen
for new development.

So that when a project or,
perhaps, a rezoning proposal comes
before the Town and community, they
can look to the vision statement and
say, Does it -- Does it, you know,
fulfill this set of goals or
objectives? You know, is it what we
want it to be.

And, you know, it's been
developed as a -- you know, in a
brief form. And mainly, although
there are -- you know, is some text,
and -- and then the final is, they'd like to be distinctive. I mentioned earlier that, you know, there is a threat to loss of community character, and they wanted to reign that in.

Next slide, please.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MS. EISENBERG: Just looking in terms of the regional planning considerations -- Planning Commissioners' Guidebook, you can see that the goals for Hampton Bays are -- you know, they're, you know, basic, you know, general planning goals that almost every community can have. Except for the -- the seaside, obviously. But they -- you know, they aligned largely with regional planning considerations, the vibrant economic development, the -- you know, coastal zone management, obviously, is a concern with the -- with the coastal community; all these other things.

The one regional planning goal or issue that -- it has not been embraced by the community, quite frankly, is affordable housing.
Hampton Bays is both the geographic center and a population center of the Town of Southampton.

Property values tend to be lower there. They're not--well, not the absolute lowest in the Town. They are considerably lower than elsewhere in the community, and there's a feeling that they have their fair share or--or more than their fair share. The issue of affordable housing is a sensitive one.

Next slide.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MS. EISENBERG: Getting to some of the proposals.

Rezoning is one of the major recommendations of the hamlet center strategy. In the Town's 1999 Comprehensive Plan, two new zoning districts were proposed called "Hamlet Office" and "Hamlet Commercial." And the intent of those zoning districts was to create commercial development that was more residential in scale, appearance, and would fit in more with, you
Those zoning districts have been rolled out over the past decade on a hamlet-by-hamlet basis.

Suffolk County Planning Commission

They're not universal. And one of the tasks for this project was to take a look at Hampton Bays and say, Okay. Where can we go? And the idea was to convert some of the areas existing, highway business zoning to these new zoning categories.

In terms of County goals, this changeover would do things like create a sense of place, a character issue;

There is allowable, you know, upstairs affordable housing in the zone, which is not allowed in a highway business, so it allows some mixed use;

It, you know, promotes design types and commercial uses that I think are more acceptable to the community and can contribute to economic development because, you know, it's potentially faster;

And then there's also open --
minimum open space thresholds in these zones which would add to environmental resource protection,
as one would imagine, and so on.

Another major zoning discussion in both the corridor strategy and --
and more recently in the DGIS process that's actually coming
bearing some fruit is a discussion of the town planned development
district zoning.

At the time these plans were being put forward, there were a
number of PDD zoning requests that were controversial, and there was a
lot of community discontent in the process. Recommendations from the
DGIS have now been forwarded to a planning task force in the Town and
are (inaudible) in legislation.
That is also under public hearing at the moment.

One of the major changes in the code amendment are features that

would allow a greater public process
and -- and -- which would, you know, again, relating to County goals, contribute to the issue of equity by enhancing public information and participation.

And also, the intention with the code amendment is to create a really more rigid tie between any kind of increase density going to -- that -- that may result from a PDD zoning and preservation.

The final set of zoning strategies is a series of overlay districts. And I won't go into the details of all of them.

One -- the major one would be what -- something that a consultant had termed a transitional overlay district which would be applied on the outer end of the -- the hamlet corridor. Out- -- outside of really the -- the hamlet center. And the idea behind that transitional overlay would lead to --

If you'll go to the next slide, I'll illustrate it.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MS. EISENBERG: In front of
this -- it would create a wooded buffer that's sort of transparent. And there are some examples elsewhere in the community so that instead of, you know, having parking, you know, right up to the front, you would have -- I think the first 50 or 100 feet, the -- a wooded buffer, and it would revegetate the corridor, restore some of the -- the raw ambiance that's been lost and -- as well as have storm water management benefits.

There are a number of site-specific proposals in the -- part of the strategic plan. As I said, I'll go through two.

One major one is a proposal for a new road, albeit a small one, and an access lane into a piece of the parkland that was purchased and bought by the County a number of years ago. Creating a new access into the park would be parallel with Montauk Highway, and the proposition or the proposal is to create this new -- what would be a North Main
With the new road would come new opportunities for development. And so we’re -- right now the -- the development pattern in the hamlet center is pretty much along Montauk Highway. One, there’s no depth there. It would create more of a grid; it would, you know, in essence, you know, promote redevelopment and centers as an alternative to sprawl.

Another site-specific recommendation of the plan is to take an area of Montauk Highway that’s referred to as the "Asphalt Jungle" because it’s wide and treeless, not very attractive, and also, frankly, dangerous, and create an access lane in front of a row of businesses there through a landscaping median so cars can turn off and have, you know, safe -- safer access into the businesses there, and also, you know, create some aesthetic improvement.

We think that this can be implemented using the existing right of way that’s there. It would
require taking -- property owners have been receptive and, you know, there's potential that there could be some kind of taxing district to pay for it. Maybe not in this economy, maybe within a few years, but, you know, we are looking for alternative funding mechanisms to achieve this.
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The last two slides, we'll just sort of gloss over a number of the other recommendations from the Corridor Strategic Plan.

The Corridor Strategic Plan was initiated in 2006 and the first draft came out in 2008, before what we've seen happen to the economy. Economic development was a lot less on people's minds then -- than controlling and managing growth. We now know that we really need economic development.

There is a lot in the plan, but there's a recommendation that the next step would be an economic development plan for the hamlet area. Particularly to strengthen the core -- the center area and help
it be more competitive and free up the outlying sprawl that's coming. There are a lot of transportation improvements recommended. I mentioned the new Suffolk County Planning Commission North Main Street. There's another road extension proposed that would connect with Route 24 and has the support of County DPW.

Montauk Highway is a county road, and we have been coordinating with the County DPW on this to some extent. There is a long list of recommendations for alternative road enhancements by increasing pedestrian access and safety, transit, bicycling.

That section of the transportation improvements have been embraced by the community with a lot of intensity, and they would like to see that move forward.

Open space acquisition, always a community priority.

There are also some recommendations for projects and additional site-specific development concepts like the two that I presented, but, you know, it's a
long corridor and there are more of them.

Next.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MS. EISENBERG: Through the GIS process, a whole host of mitigations have been identified. There's been a little bit of a -- not necessarily a tension, but questions have come up in terms of whether issues are appropriately addressed at this hamlet specific level in this hamlet plan, or whether they're best left for future development or effort at a Town-wide level.

We haven't quite split the difference, but there are a number of Town-wide initiatives ongoing that we'll address.

Specifically, a sustainability plan that's been initiated by the Town's (inaudible) Committee;

There is a study ongoing Town-wide of motel to condominium conversion in the Town.
What's not on this slide but certainly needs mentioning is Southampton is in the process of embarking on an LWRP. We have a State grant that we're expecting to inaudible), next week actually, to structure -- to develop a local waterfront revitalization program.

TDRs, actually, the County's having a TDR conference later this afternoon. In terms of the density issue, it's -- it certainly is an important tool and something the community is pushing. Southampton, in the past, had started a program for -- was analyzed in a standard usage of TDRs, and that's something the community specifically would like to see jumped on.

There are some Town-wide regulations they'd like to see towards a preservation ordinance. We'll be looking to the Guidebook...
mention that we are -- have launched
the SEQRA process. We are trying to
go green with this project. So
while we do have some paper copies
available, we are attempting
distribution via disc and also
through downloading on the Town's
Web site. If you would like a paper
copy, we'll certainly make that
available.

I'd like to open it up for
questions.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank
you. Appreciate that.

Appreciate the presentation
and also for all the -- obviously,
the work that's gone into this
corridor study. Also I know -- I
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appreciate -- speaking for all of us
around the table who put together
kind of the County planning
guidelines and priorities a couple
years ago, we appreciate you keeping
those in mind as you're, you know,
looking at these kinds of, you know,
corridor studies and these kinds of
things because at the end of the
day, County policies and priorities
don't really matter if they don't --
aren't put into place by those of
you who are actually touching the
pieces of property and setting the
actual development in your
townships. So we appreciate that.

MS. EISENBERG: Well, thank

you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank

you.

I know that was a fairly
thorough conversation, and we also
have a presentation in a few minutes
from our staff, but does anyone have
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any particular questions from -- for
the Town of Southampton on the
Corridor --

COMMISSIONER TALDONE:

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Vince.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Thank

you.

Freda, just a quick note.

You have an illustration there
of the service lane concept --

MS. EISENBERG: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: -- for
Montauk Highway. As you know, the
S92 is the second busiest route in
all of Suffolk County. It runs along main street.

Were you anticipating keeping the bus out on main -- on Montauk Highway or bringing it into the service lane with bus turnouts?

MS. EISENBERG: That's a good question. I think the design that's shown could probably work either way. I don't think the businesses in that section are the type of businesses to need a bus stop, but if that were to change, certainly a pulling could be designed to accommodate them.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I would just suggest you consult with Tom Neely, your Town's --

MS. EISENBERG: He actually has been involved and the two of us went and talked to Bill Hillman at the County with respect to that and all of the other transportation recommendations in the plan. So he's actually played a big part in all of this.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Thank you.
Now, on a final comment, I'll just suggest you go out and do some traffic counts. Count the number of passengers getting on and off the bus in Hampton Bays, especially during rush hours, in the morning and -- and late afternoon, and you'll see quite a number of people utilizing the bus on Montauk Highway in the hamlet at the center.

MS. EISENBERG: Absolutely.

And as I said, there are a lot of recommendations that are mentioned. Among those are identification of new bus shelters.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.

Thank you so much for your time and presentation.

We'll move on to our administrative agenda, and who --

DIRECTOR ISLES: Andy.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Andy has the Hampton Bays Corridor Plan.

MR. FRELENG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the board.

The first application referred to us as part of the Commission's regulatory agenda comes to us, as indicated, from the Town of
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Southampton. This is the Hampton Bays Corridor Strategic Plan.

You did just hear a presentation from Town of Southampton staff, so I will be brief going through the staff report. If I miss something that you'd like to elaborate on, please call it to my attention.

The jurisdiction for the Commission is that this proposed Hampton Bays Corridor Strategic Plan will be an amendment to the Town's Comprehensive Plan.

In terms of an overview, this referral from the Town of Southampton Town Board of the Hampton Bays Corridor Strategic Plan features parcel-specific recommendations to establish new zoning districts in Hampton Bays, primarily through the rezoning of property currently designated Highway Business or Village.
the use of a Transitional Overlay
district and Planned Development
District zoning designations.

The Hampton Bays Corridor
Strategic Plan study area is along
New York State Route 27A, Montauk
Highway, bordered approximately by
the hamlet of East Quogue to the
west and the hamlet of Shinnecock
Hills to the east. The study area
encompasses an approximate ten-mile
segment of Montauk Highway. Land
use in the area is reflective of the
zoning and consists of residential,
highway commercial and downtown
hamlet densities. The Shinnecock
Canal area is also part of the study
area.

If I could, I'd just like to
take a look at some slides that
staff took of the corridor just to
give you an idea of the character of
the area.
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Why don't you go through the
pictures, John.

MR. CORRAL: (Complying)

MR. FRELEN: This is the
Shinnecock Canal area (indicating).

That is part of the eastern boundary
This is the Canoe Place Inn, an abandoned or underutilized, I should say, facility (indicating). This is the type of uses that the Town is targeting for renovation and rehabilitation.

This would be a typical style, if you will, of the new development being proposed (indicating). This is a commercial use in a residential character, if you will.

This is a view looking down the corridor -- I think that's east, John?

MR. CORRAL: West.

MR. FRELENG: West looking towards the hamlet of Hampton Bays.
this is just east of the Village Business district -- this might actually be in the Village Business district, I'm not sure.

This is the downtown Hampton Bays Village Business district (indicating). As you can see, this is looking west towards their four-corner intersection, and this is the typical style. You can see the height and the character of the structures that the Town is looking to promote.

Again, this is a not-so-recently-developed shopping center on the west end of the hamlet (indicating). This is the United Artists Theater.

Some more of the characteristic shopping centers on the -- in the Village Business district (indicating).

This is looking at the edge of the Village Business district looking back into the village (indicating). We're on the west side of the Village Business district now looking back into Hampton Bays.
This is on the north side, just -- I think you just turn around from where we took that last picture, and this is an existing shopping center which has undergone some renovation over the years (indicating).

Further east, this is again a look at some older PDD sites, I believe, or some more recent development in the corridor (indicating).

And this is further down (indicating). This is in the transitional areas. These are structures that would be targeted for the type of renovation that they're talking about.

And then this is the far western end of the study area (indicating). This is the Quogue Wildlife Refuge and part of the open space component in the corridor.

So in terms of environmental conditions then, there really aren't many to speak of. Generically, the Shinnecock Canal area is on the eastern end of the study area, and
there are some tidal wetland pieces
that may be part of the study area
or even freshwater wetland pieces on
some private parcels.

In terms of its relationship to
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Town's Comprehensive Plan
recommendations, as indicated by the
Town staff, multiple community
driven, participatory and
collaborative studies have
culminated in the recommendations of
this Hampton Bays Corridor Strategic
Plan. The subject plan currently
referred to the Commission follows
the recommendations of the Town's
1999 Comprehensive Plan and the
1999 Hamlet Center Study for Hampton
Bays.

When staff took a look at the
referral, we weighed it against the
Commission's five general critical
County-wide priorities. Staff saw
that there was hardly a mention of
energy efficiency in the overall
corridor study. Such condition --
such considerations may be found in
other sections of the Town of
Southampton's development code, but
they're not outlined in this
The proposal for conversion of properties to HO/HC from predominantly office, village, and highway business categories may be growth inducing. We note this because the minimum lot size for the Office district and the Highway district is currently 12,000 to 40,000 square feet respectively. The proposed HO/HC minimum lot size is 10,000 square feet. And in addition to lot width for the HO/HC zones has been increased, so this may allow some of the larger parcels to subdivide.

We did not analyze, though, the actual scale of that growth-inducing aspect. And it should be noted that this aspect may be modified by the Town's addition of stricter dimensional standards and open space requirements for the HO/HC by comparison to the existing Village Business standards.
In terms of housing diversity, there appears to be little information in the referral material that was -- that it was a consideration along the corridor.

It was indicated that in terms of the transportation framework, there are numerous recommendations to improve the transportation circulation situation in the hamlet area.

With the exception of landscaping and lighting and some corridor improvements in terms of medians, the material referred to the Commission does not really include an examination of public safety elements.

Staff is recommending to the Commission an approval of the referral subject to the following comments:

The first comment relates to energy efficiency and notes that the Commission has a Guidebook related to energy efficiency, and that should be reviewed;

The second comment relates to a residential housing element, and
that the Commission Guidebook should be reviewed and that this should be folded into where practical, into the corridor study;
And the third recommendation to the Commission for approval subject to this comment would be that the Commission does have a Public Safety policy goal and the Commission's Guidebook should be reviewed for elements that could be incorporated at this level in the Strategic Plan.
That is the staff report to the Commission.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Andy. Appreciate that.
Any initial reactions?
Unfortunately, our Commission member from Southampton wasn't able to make it today, but does either Diana from East Hampton or Vince from Riverhead have any particular regional comments in that regard?

COMMISSIONER WEIR:
(Indicating)
ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Go ahead, Commissioner Weir.
COMMISSIONER WEIR: I think
it's an excellent plan. It's long overdue. But you do have a lot of small lots in Hampton Bays which I think -- you know, just listening to what the Suffolk County Health Department said. So I know a lot of those places up along Lynn Avenue and stuff, that's why they kind of feel they are affordable housing. I know I live that every time you try to propose something there.

But I think this is long overdue and it's great because it is an important part. And I shop at

Suffolk County Planning Commission 152 that King Kullen shopping center. I remember the furor over that, and it ended up being very nice with the parking where you can't see it and the -- you know, the buildings made frontage upon the street and sidewalk. So it gave it a very downtown feel, which is kind of what we're looking to do, and you can't see the parking in the back. And then the railroad is right behind that, the railroad track. So that was very smart planning, and I'm glad to see it and I hope it continues that way.
I like the North Main Street kind of approach, too. That will take some of the traffic off. And if it all connects properly, I think it'll be great for the hamlet. So thank you, I spend a lot of time there.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Commissioner Weir.

And, obviously, it's a critical area of our County in terms of the gateway to the whole south fork, et cetera. It's great.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: (Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE:

Commissioner Taldone.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I would like to draw your attention to the second floor apartments that are imagined for this corridor, and the universal design standards of the County.

My concern is that if stairwells are not wide enough, if landings aren't designed properly to accommodate a turning wheelchair on the second floor, even chairlifts
won't work in those buildings, so none of those units will end up being accessible to people with mobility problems. So I would -- I'll propose that
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we -- you know, when it's time to add just in a comment that the Town consider or review our Guidelines on Universal Design as they move forward in terms of the design specifications for those buildings.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: I just have one other question --

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: -- to bring a dirty word into this whole thing. "Casino" --

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: You know, considering that --

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: We weren't going to mention that.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: No, no. I mean, we might as well, what the heck.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Go ahead, Diana.
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COMMISSIONER WEIR:  I mean, I know that, you know, the tribe is looking -- the nation now is looking, you know, to relocate somewhere else, but they have a little federal issue being able to transfer land, so I don't know how well that's going to work.

And has any thought been -- well, a lot of thought has been given, as we know, but on -- on their -- you know, on the reservation, but has any of that consideration been taking place in future infrastructures?

MS. EISENBERG: You get the big guy.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE:

Mr. Murphree, yeah.

MR. MURPHREE: Actually, yes, it is. I had to testify in federal court about that very issue. They actually have plans known as West Woods, which is actually located in Hampton Bays, and that
was the subject of the lawsuit.

And the Shinnecock Nation really has not identified that property in Hampton Bays as a priority site. They're looking elsewhere.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Mr. Murphree.

Did that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER WEIR: Well, yes and no.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Oh, okay. Well --

COMMISSIONER WEIR: Because if they don't get that -- the ability to -- you know, to be able to transfer land to land and build somewhere else that is not active tribal land, and that's the federal legislation that they're looking to fight now because -- now, under the BIA law, any tribe that was recognized before a certain period had the ability to transfer, and they do not because they were recognized at a later time. So I'm thinking, you know, like the alternative plan B, plan C, that if they decide to build on the tribal
land, you know, what would the future ramifications be?

MR. MURPHREE: We didn't -- the lawsuit did not target the reservation itself. We recognize that they're a sovereign nation and that is part of their reservation proper.

So our lawsuit was more physically target for some land that we consider to be private land that they acquired, you know, through a private transaction late in the -- about a hundred years ago. And that was the subject of a lawsuit that was upheld. The Town's position is that was private land and not part of their sovereign nation, and
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COMMISSIONER KELLY:

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.

Commissioner Kelly.

COMMISSIONER KELLY: Andy, just a quick question on the hotel conversions.

Is there a different standard
on these or a different calculation
on the flow for a hotel unit that
is -- versus it being converted to a
condo unit.

MR. MURPHREE: Yes, there is.
It has to do with the cycle use and
also with the square footage, and
that's one reason why the study has
not been completed. Because trying
to come up with a conversion factor,
so to speak, so that, one, that's
fair to the -- you know, to the
property owner, recognizes that he
has certain rights; at the same

time, it doesn't increase
dramatically the density of our
hamlet areas that have these older
hotel units. And it's a very
difficult equation to try to come up
with that that's -- one that's fair,
that's also that -- you know, one of
the issues is that, when you convert
a motel unit to now a year-round
residential unit, now you have
potential impact in terms of school
kids, infrastructure, police, things
of that nature. So it's a very
delicate balancing act.

COMMISSIONER KELLY: So the
sewer capacity or the additional sewer capacity, based on that calculation, is that accounted for in the sewer study?

MR. MURPHREE: Not physically in the study. We do have a section that has the preliminary recommendations of the motel study. So it -- it, in generic, paraphrases it, but we haven't come up with the final numbers yet, so we -- the study that you see before you does not come to the conclusion yet.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you, Mr. Murphree. Appreciate it. Any other questions for staff, or any other comments around the table?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: If not, there was an indication to add the Universal Design Guidelines as a comment. Any objection to doing that?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing
none, we'll include that, and I'll entertain a motion.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Oh --

(indicating).

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Motion
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SECRETARY ESPOSITO: No, I don't want to make a motion.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right. We will suspend the Rules to allow a question.

Go ahead.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Well, actually, I just want to know if we could add a comment?

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Oh, you can. Go for it.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: What's your proposal?

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Thank you. Which is to simply say that the Commission would like the plan to look at or consider the storm water guideline document put out by the Suffolk County Planning Commission.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Right.

Okay. Everyone remembers we passed that two months ago. It's just a
guide- -- in fact, the towns don't actually have it yet. It's going out --
SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Right.
ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- I think the end of this week --
SECRETARY ESPOSITO: That's right.
ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- and I need to sign the letter for that.
But we -- but it will be coming, and it's basically just green methodology. It's for storm water runoff, just recommendations to the town on things they can consider.
So any objection to adding a comment about -- about adding that?
(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none --
Andy, did you get that?
MR. FRELENG: Got it.
So we have five recommended comments, and the recommendation -- staff recommendations for approval. I'll entertain a motion along those lines.

COMMISSIONER KELLY: (Indicating)

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: (Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Motion by Commissioner Kelly, and seconded by Commissioner Holmes.

All in favor of adopting the staff report with the five comments, please raise your hand.

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And all opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's 11 to zero.

Thank you.
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The next item on our agenda -- we actually have a group of items on our agenda.

Thanks again to the folks from Southampton.

We have a group of items -- let
me give you the background on this, because I think this will be something we want to deal with in just a -- a couple of minutes.

The Village of Quogue, as you may recall, had an issue with the State whereby they were permitting building to be done in the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area, and the -- Newsday did a -- I think a front page story on this back in December.

At that time, the officers here decided that the Commission -- because those projects are, you know, within the Commission's jurisdiction, we would want to see Quogue related waterfront projects to make sure that we're keeping an
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eye on -- on the Village in terms of their approvals.

Now, in the last few weeks, the State and the Village have entered into an agreement, whereby the State is now going to review the -- any proposals on the waterfront.

That's the right result.

But since we had this sort of policy --
Director Isles: Right.

Acting Chairman Calone:

-- that we instructed staff to bring the Quogue projects forward, and they have done the review of these three, you know, I think it makes sense, as you'll -- as you'll all notice from the staff report, the recommendation is a local determination for those.

Again, these would typically be projects that wouldn’t even come to the Commission because of their single-family nature. Even though
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the fact that they are on the water, we don’t usually get into that level of detail. These are the projects that would typically be just local determination by the staff and never even come to this table.

So we had the policy for a brief period of time that we would see waterfront properties in Quogue. As you can see from the staff reports on the three of those, there are some, you know, minor impositions on the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area. Most of them actually are improving. They were way over
into the area, and they're mostly pulling back. So I don't believe that this needs or deserves much of our -- our time, is my personal opinion. But I do want to give -- Ted's going to give a brief overview of the analysis that the staff did, and then we'll vote on the three -- the
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three applications.
So, Ted.

MR. KLEIN: Okay. I'll -- you did a very good job of, you know, bringing up the issue.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: I try.

MR. KLEIN: I believe it's mostly an environmental protection and public safety issue regarding the Commission's Guidelines for like regional significance where they hold their priorities.
The environmental conditions regarding the three subjects are that they all lie partially within the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area established in 1988 by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. So the area as
established is based on the location of the dunes, more or less. And in the Village of Quogue, the land with boundaries of that line -- the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area line is
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25 feet landward of the toe of the primary dune.

I'd just like to note, New York State DEC established this line in 1988. So I'd like to reiterate that point. And as established in the Act, the law that, you know, created that area, they were supposed to amend these lines every ten years, and they haven't done that. So when the staff analyzed these three applications, we noticed there is a difference between topographical maps and surveys that were provided us with those applications. And in two cases, because one didn't have -- show the toe of the dune, they were all different. So, you know, we took that into -- you know, we looked at that.

So we based our recommendations on the fact that the -- the State is basic- -- basing their -- their disagreement with the Village has
been doing, you know, in the past, based on historic lines. So we based our -- you know, we based that -- and we gave our recommendation that they should re- -- you know, reestablish the coastal erosion line in today's -- you know, today's -- in today's scenario.

Another thing that the State had a problem with the Village of Quogue is that they amended their -- since this stayed as the model law, and the Village adopted that model law into their ordinance, which is the Coastal Erosion Hazard Area ordinance in the Village of Quogue -- they adopted that law. And then in 1992, they amended the law. And that was formally approved by the DEC at the time, that addressed certain non-major construction in the -- in the Coastal Erosion Area and within the primary dunes. And those are
There was a bit of room for interpretation regarding the -- you know, the impacts of the construction and whether it is classified as non-major.

So those -- that's the other issue that I think the State has with the Village. They're not pleased with the code as it stands. Even though they did approve it, you know, 19 years ago.

So staff made two recommendations regarding two of the applications, because those two did depict the toe of the dune in those applications. And then the third one, I added that they should require the applicant to provide a topographical survey that shows the toe of the dune.

So staff recommendation, it's for local determination and offers
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the following comments to the Village for their use and consideration:

One, the Village should come to an agreement with the State as to the current location the Coastal
Erosion Hazard Line, and if and/or when there is a discrepancy between the established Coastal Erosion Hazard Line and the topographical survey prepared for the application, a clear established procedure should be agreed upon to follow in those circumstances.

And number two, the Village, if so required, should amend their Coastal Erosion Hazard Area ordinance in conformity with the purpose and intention of the New York State Coastal Erosion Hazard Act as so they may maintain jurisdiction over the coastal area.

That's the staff report.

I did leave out one part.
That's what they're talking about now.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: So to be clear, they've delegated to the Village and they're going to keep an eye on the Village, and if the Village sort of approves things that they don't like, they can pull the power back from the Village.

That's what you're saying?

They can provoke --

MR. KLEIN: They can do that, but they cannot disapprove
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SECRETARY ESPOSITO: So let me clarify.

If they take the power back to the Village, which essentially they have, I mean --

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Which is sort of a warning, isn't it?

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: It's more than a warning.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: You're on probation then.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Yeah.
Then what happens? Let's say they take the power back from the Village, fictitiously, and then what would happen to a project if it can't go through that part of the review?

MR. KLEIN: Well, they would have to go through the DEC approvals. The DEC would grant them
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the Coastal Area variance.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: So then, in effect, then the DEC -- the DEC says no, there is no variance, then there would be no project.

MR. KLEIN: I believe that would be -- it would be a denial.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Okay.

MR. KLEIN: -- a denial.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Why don't we get -- that doesn't impact our conversation today --

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: No.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- but that's a good point, and why don't we get clarification of that before we decide we don't want to look at
these anymore. We can just do that in the course of the next few weeks, if that's all right with all of you.

MR. KLEIN: Can I show one of the maps to show the difference --
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ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Sure.

MR. KLEIN: -- in the lines?

Okay. This is one of the applications, 22 Dune Road. This is -- the third condition, as it stands, you see the red line? That's the New York State -- that's the New York State Erosion Hazard Line; the red line. And then the green line is the topographical map provided by the applicant that indicates the toe to the dune.

You'll notice that there's a pretty big difference.

If you go to the proposal?

MR. CORRAL: [Complying]

MR. KLEIN: So proposed for this application is, you're going to be landward of the existing Coastal Erosion Hazard Area. You know, so it's probably less -- has less impact on the existing --

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Right.

MR. KLEIN: -- dune system.
ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Right.

MR. KLEIN: And the Village would like that, and they would approve that.

And there is an issue that this wouldn't even need a variance, because this is the toe to dune, and the deck is 25 feet from that. So based on the map, this is where the line should be (indicating).

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Right.

So, I mean, part -- you're saying, part of this is just the State hasn't updated their maps, and they're out of date, and they -- some of this stuff may be totally fine.

MR. KLEIN: Now, the other point is, the pavilion.

Now, the pavilion is right here (indicating). The applicant is proposing to rebuild the pavilion. They're going to reduce its sides, reduce the decking, there's a walkway, they're going to eliminate
one of the walkways.

So the Village is at a -- you

know, they have to make a
determination whether it is

non-major and would be permitted

based on their codes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Right.

MR. KLEIN: And the State says,

this is not what we really, you

know, want to see.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Well,

I guess we'll hear what the State

wants to see on that or not.

MR. KLEIN: That would be great

if we heard what they wanted -- you

know, they wanted.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.

For our purposes, we have the

three applications, and just to be

clear, we're kind of keeping an eye

on the situation. And we can

decide, I guess, in the next month

or so whether it makes sense to keep

keeping an eye on it depending upon

whether we think the State is -- you

know, has appropriate oversight

here. But, you know, I'd like to

kind of move along unless there are

specific questions.
Diana, do you have a question?

COMMISSIONER WEIR: I was just wondering, is that Coastal Erosion Line, the hundred-year flood line or is that -- that's another line, right?

MR. KLEIN: Yeah, the --

COMMISSIONER WEIR: Because the proposal's --

MR. KLEIN: -- the flood line's another line. That's another line.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: And they have no LWRP, or do they follow Southampton Town or --

MR. KLEIN: They don't have a comprehensive plan.

Do they have an LWRP? I don't know.
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They did do a draft EIS for all the coastal areas.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: They don't have an LWRP.

COMMISSIONER WEIR: Yes.

Because I know we established one in the town, and a lot of the towns were working on them many years ago, something like ten years ago, so I was just wondering why they didn't
Okay. Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right.

We have the three applications. I think Ted’s given us a pretty good and concise overview --

Thank you for that, Ted.

-- of kind of the issues. The recommendation is an LD for all three of these, with the comments that were indicated. I guess I’ll just take them one at a time.

We have 22 Dune Road, which is
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Any discussion on that, or any -- anyone want to raise anything?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: If not, I’ll entertain a motion to adopt the staff report as written.

COMMISSIONER KELLY: (Indicating)

COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND: (Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Motion
by Commissioner Kelly, and seconded by Commissioner Chartrand.

All in favor, please raise your hand.

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And opposed?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
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ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's 11 to zero.

The next one is the Michael Salvatore application. That is the one that Ted also indicated was two --

MR. KLEIN: Three.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: I'm sorry, that's the one with the three. I apologize.

That's the one with the three where you added an additional comment, number 1 there, as he indicated, with regard to the topo survey.

Any conversation or discussion about that?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)
ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion to adopt the staff report as written.

COMMISSIONER KELLY:

(Indicating)
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COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND:

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Motion by Commissioner Kelly, and seconded by Commissioner Chartrand again.

All in favor, please raise your hand.

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And that's 11 to zero.

The last one is Kenneth and Rita Warner, and this goes -- this is the one that goes back to two comments.

Any discussion about that?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion to adopt the staff report.

COMMISSIONER KELLY:

(Indicating)

COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND:

(Indicating)
ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Motion by Commissioner Kelly, and seconded by Commissioner Chartrand.

All in favor?

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And that is also 11 to zero.

Thank you.

And thank you again, Ted, for a concise and -- review of that -- of the issues there.

So we'll have a conversation, and, Ted, maybe you can find out the answer to Adrienne's question just with a -- with a little more specificity in the next week or two, and we can decide whether it makes sense to still keep seeing the Quogue ones or -- or, you know, just kind of keep an eye on it.

Staff always has the option, if they'd like us to see any in particular that's problematic, to bring it to the table. So another
guys just to keep -- kind of keep an eye on it, and if you see something that's out of -- you know, out of the ordinary, you think's a concern, you bring that to the table so we can figure that out.

Thank you, again.

And while I'm thinking of it, can we -- before I forget, can we give John Corral a hand and thank him for all he's done for the Planning Commission.

(Applause)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: John, we'll miss you, and we appreciate all you've done in your presentations and your site visits and -- and everything, and your help with the task force efforts as well. We look forward to working with Andrew, of course, but thank you and look forward to seeing you around the Department.
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COMMISSIONER HOLMES: You could still tiptoe in for some Shelter Island coleslaw when you're in the building.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's right. Commissioner Holmes will
bring you a special allotment.

We have a few things left on the agenda, and I want to, perhaps, take the ones we have to do. The Comprehensive Plan is clearly the most important, but we do need to adopt our Rules and the schedule. And I think I'd like to go through those -- without objection, take those out of order and quickly do those, and then we'll spend the rest of the time on the Comprehensive Plan.

You have in front of you in your packets the schedule of meetings. Those have been E-mailed around at least once or twice to you.

Thanks to Dotty and the team for their efforts in making the calls to find out where we could be in different months, and we had some rearrangement.

But, in essence, you'll recall our general principle is to go visit the town halls that we have not yet visited yet in our recent cycle, and those are Smithtown, East Hampton,
and Huntington; and also we're going
to try to visit two villages,
Patchogue and Port Jefferson; and,
of course, to spend a little time
here in Hauppauge and a little bit
in the Riverhead -- at our
Riverhead -- the Riverhead
Legislature.

So any comments or questions or
suggestions about the schedule?
(WHEREUPON, there was no
response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Seeing
none, I'll entertain a motion to
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adopt the --
I'm sorry, do you have a
comment?

COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND: No. I
had a question.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Sure.

COMMISSIONER CHARTRAND: Are we
going to still try and get over to
Heartland again? I know we talked
about that last year.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: That
would be a site visit, which would
be separate than a regular meeting.
But you do raise a good point.

There have been a notion of doing a
bus tour of Heartland. I know we did one -- was it -- three years ago now, probably.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: It wasn't that long.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Two, at least?

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Two.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: At least two years ago. So we can discuss that offline. If there's interest of having a bus tour of Heartland, we can look into that.

The other thing I'll say is, if -- assuming Heartland comes through this year, I'm going to recommend to the Commission that we do a special meeting on Heartland, because there will more than likely be, you know, public comment and there's a lot of nuance, obviously --

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Sarah says it was three years.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: I trust Sarah.

So it's been a while since we've visited. But more importantly
in terms of it coming here and doing a special meeting. So that's obviously not captured here. This is just our regular monthlies.

Any other comments or
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(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: If not, we'll entertain a motion to adopt the schedule.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO:

(Indicating)

COMMISSIONER WEIR:

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Motion by Secretary Esposito, and seconded by Commissioner Weir.

All in favor of adopting the schedule of meetings as written, please raise your hand.

(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's 11 to zero.

The next item that we need to take care of today is the Rules.

I've got to -- deserve a -- let me give a major tip of the hat to our
attorney, Tom Young, for his efforts in looking over the Rules.

(Applause)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah. It's not an easy thing to do, by the way.

And also -- and also to -- to really look at them from the perspective that I think they haven't been looked at before, which is which Rules need to be part of -- speak about our meetings versus which Rules speak about sort of our general procedure.

And as a result of that, this was sent around to you, I know, yesterday, the proposal is that a few of the Rules of Proceedings be moved into our Guidelines. And since we're redoing our Guidelines, it's a timely time to do it. Those would include the notice of the meetings, the request for services, and our definition of regionally significant projects. Those are all
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sort of instructions to staff, as well as reflections of the County Law and the Charter rather than actual Rules that govern our proceedings, which is actually what the title of the document is about.

Now, I would ask you all to make sure you have the red line in front of you. You should have the colorful version we had to compare against last year’s.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I don’t --

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: It’s in everyone’s packets.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I just took this from my packet.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: And maybe --

Oh, sorry, you have two versions. One is the 2011 minutes, nice and clear as proposed, and the other is the compare version. I think it makes sense to just briefly go through the compare version to show you the changes from 2010.

And again, Tom went through this carefully and identified a couple of places where we should
take things out of the Rules and put them in the Guidelines, and a couple of places where our language and our Rules should better track the County Law.

Also, I want to obviously acknowledge Andy -- Andy who did a bit of the work on this as well.

So if everyone has the red lines, maybe what I'll do is I'll breeze through it; and Tom, if you have anything specific, or Andy, you have anything specific to add, I'm just kind of going to hit the highlights.

There's a couple of typos we found, too, but those hopefully are --
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MR. YOUNG: Before you start --

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah, go ahead.

MR. YOUNG: -- let me just add that Andy did a lot of work.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Hats off to Andy as well.

Andy does a lot of work every meeting. We know that.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: We take
him for granted.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Thank you for that recognition, Tom.

Walking through the document, number 5, the recommendation was to -- to delete the other officers other than chair, because actually there is no requirement in the County Law that we elect anyone other than the chair. The language there is the language in the County Law, which is the chair or other officers as may be -- deemed proper. Obviously, our tradition is we have
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a vice chair and secretary, and we're maintaining that for now.

Ten, you'll see 10 was deleted, and you see the green deletion there, that's moved into the Guidelines with the notice of the meetings.

Moving down, there was a -- the new number 11 with the guests at the meeting. You'll see there's renumbering because we took out one of those -- number 10.

The next one is now -- instead of calling them "Guest Speakers," the recommendation is to call them
"Commission Invited Speakers." And to make clear, to reflect the County Charter, which allows the Planning Commission to invite officials of government to participate in our deliberations, and to assist us in discharging its' functions. The rationale behind that undoubtedly -- or I should say, that is just

Suffolk County Planning Commission reflecting the actual language of the law, and sort of differentiates those folks from the public participants.

A little later in that paragraph, we also mention about inviting other people to participate in our meeting. The idea behind that is to capture the folks that we invite like Walt Dawydiak and others who brief us on issues relevant to the County and its' future.

Number 13, we changed that from "Participating in Meetings of the Planning Commission" to "Public Participation in Meetings of the Planning Commission," and we added the part at the end of the paragraph or the end of the section indicating
that demonstrative materials can be used as visual aids if someone's speaking to us in their three minutes, but they can't submit those to us. As you recall, we've had
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Some ambiguity about that over time. And to Tom's credit, he's helped see us through that kind of on an ad hoc basis. Now we're going to have something to point to in our Rules that actually kind of, you know, lays out that standard.

Fourteen, you know, I think is a minor clarification.

Then you'll see down, the next major edits there are the "Requests For Services." That will be moved to -- I'm sorry, the bulk of that has been moved to the Guidelines. I believe the -- it includes in there -- what remains is simply that we can authorize the --

DIRECTOR ISLES: The Department.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: -- the Department, it is, to issue a -- to provide services, which is something we've done from time to time when it's requested by the
Moving along, there were just a few typos down towards -- when you get to, like, paragraphs 20 and 22, and you can see those.

And then the items down below are where we've moved, just for your information, things into the Guidebook. So you have old number 11, the Notice of Meeting, that's -- the suggestion is to move that into the Guidebook; old number 17 to be moved into the Guidebook; and old number 24, the Regionally Significant Projects, to be moved into the Guidebook.

So those were the edits.

Again, I mean, like I said, credit to Andy and Tom for really giving this a good and hard review, and so we thank them for that.

Anyone have any questions about any of these proposed edits?

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Good job.
Anything to add?

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Good job.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah, I agree.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: And they caught the typos.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes.

Okay. Well, then I'll entertain a motion to adopt the 2011 Minutes (sic) as proposed.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: (Indicating)

COMMISSIONER LANSDALE: (Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Motion by Commissioner Holmes, and seconded by Commissioner Lansdale.

All in favor, please raise your hand.

SECRETARY ESPOSITO: You said adopt the minutes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Oh, adopt -- I'm sorry, adopt the
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(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's 11 to zero.

Thank you for that.
So the last item on our agenda, just -- well, we have two items left on the agenda. Let me just briefly mention the Guidebook.

The Guidebook Committee is working on reviewing the Guidelines, and we'll probably be meeting sometime during the course of the next couple of weeks to be going through that, and it will probably take us a month or so to come back to the full Commission with suggestions.

But we do have -- everyone should have their Comprehensive Plan 2035, Volume I. I think -- Are you doing that or --

DIRECTOR ISLES: I'm going to do that.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay.

Director Isles is going to walk us through this at a high level. And I know many of you had it for the last month, a few of you are just receiving it for the first time today. And so we'll hear about it at a high level, and then we'll need to get edits back to the Department.
either now or in the next kind of two weeks or so.

But, Director Isles.

DIRECTOR ISLES: Okay. Just to, as the chair indicated, walk through at a very quick fashion.

This is Volume I. We do anticipate this to be a -- at least a three-volume process. The second volume being further information/inventory work. The third volume being analysis and the plan itself.

The idea of this -- the
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arrangement is to move forward as informed as possible. So that this process is to gather information to find out where we are, who we are, what we are, what our concerns and challenges are. And we have been integrating this with the public process in a limited fashion in terms of public hearings that were spoken of, the town meetings that are being planned.

We do think that as we go into Volume III, in particular, with the information that's been gathered in these two volumes, we do need to
have visioning in terms of looking forward in terms of what does this County want to achieve in its remaining build-out and redevelopment, and then also public participation in the process of actually generating a plan.

So this is more of a facts and figures volume.
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And just very briefly walking through it, the first major component deals with population. And, obviously, we are very populated. We're more populated than 11 states. We're one of the most populated counties in the country; number 22 out of over 3,000 counties. We're an island, so as the chair's indicated, we're limited in terms of additional growth.

In terms of future population growth, we are slow growing at this point and have been for a number of years. The high growth occurred in the '60s and '70s. We grew about 6 1/2 percent from the year 2000.

And in terms of changing...
demographics, we were a very homogenous population going back here again to the postwar period. We are -- and in terms of some of the changing demographics as we
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know, average age is up from age 26 in 1970 to age 39 in 2010 -- or 2008, pardon me.

Young adult population, a lot of talk about that. The 20 to 34 age group is an important component of our population in terms of regeneration of our population, in terms of labor force. We have 260,000 people in that category out of about 1.5 million in the County as a whole. That's down 3 percent from 2000, it's down 19 percent from 1990. And most of that is due -- a lot of that is due to age cohort changes in terms of the population growth that occurred earlier.

What's interesting, though, is from -- we are now seeing increases in some subsets of that population. So the 20 to 24 age group is up from the year 2000 28 percent, and the 15 to 19 group is also up, and that's about 27 percent. So we are going
to see a bump up as the echo-baby boom works its way through, and then we're going to start seeing it going back down again, here again, just -- based on births and so forth.

Our population also is -- just characteristically, is more educated than the nation as a whole. We have more families, 77 percent, than we do other -- the nation as a whole versus 68 percent. We're becoming more racially and ethnically diverse. We generate higher income than the nation as a whole. Also, that's associated with the higher cost of living, which I'll talk about briefly. And we have 5 percent of our population below the poverty level, which is obviously significant as well, constituting over 70,000 people.

The second chapter deals with the economy, and obviously what I'm doing is just skimming across the surface here. We're part of an
economy, with Nassau and Suffolk on Long Island, of $138 billion gross metropolitan product. That's about on par with Kuwait, so it's rather significant.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE:
Without the oil.

DIRECTOR ISLES: Yeah, without the oil. There are parts with the oil, actually.

The second largest economy in New York State. We have a labor force in the report that's reported as 722,000 people. Since that time, based on Peter Lambert's demographics, we've gone up about to 736,000. What is interesting, in 1970, 36 percent of our population was female, of the labor force. In the year 2000, it was 61 percent. So obviously that's been a significant cultural and national change. In fact, it's effected

Unemployment is high. It's been actually down, however. We are still right up -- unemployment rate in this report of 8.3 percent. More recent figures get us closer to 7 or
7.1 percent. We're lower than New York State. We're lower than the USA. But obviously even 7 percent is a high unemployment, relatively speaking.

In terms of places of employment, we have 17 communities that have over 10,000 jobs. Melville alone has 54,000 jobs. Seventy-three percent of our population of the residents who work in Suffolk County actually live in the County, so we're one of the highest counties in the area in terms of residents working within the County itself.

What's interesting, too, in terms of commutation to New York City -- that was 17 percent of our workforce commuted to the City in 1970, now it's down to 12 percent.

In terms of sector analysis, we look at each of the sectors of tourism, recreation, farming. We're still the number one farm county. Office, we have 24 million square feet of office space; almost 92 million square feet of office space; almost
industrial; 39 million square feet of shopping center space; and 8 million square feet of downtown space.

So those are, you know, just skimming across some of the population statistics and the economic statistics.

As far as quality of life, this was in a chapter that sought to look at objectively the measure of quality of life, which is not easy. Seth Foreman and the Department headed up this chapter. Peter Suffolk County Planning Commission Lambert wrote the chapters on population and economics.

And what Dr. Foreman did on the quality of life chapter were to look at 13 comparable counties around the country that are similar to Suffolk County and -- and to make some comparisons. So some of the comparable counties were Montgomery County in Maryland, Fairfax in Virginia, Westchester, Bergen County, DuPage County in Illinois, Middlesex County in Massachusetts, and Barnstable County, as well as others, and just stacking us up to...
So some of the comparisons in terms of, let's say, crime, as a measure of quality of life:

For violent crimes, we're in the middle of the pack in terms of comparisons to those counties;
For property crimes, we're actually higher -- in the high end

In terms of government, we do hear a lot about the number of governmental units on -- in Suffolk County and on Long Island in general. We have like 415 units, 113 of which are municipal entities, and when we compare that, here again, to other counties, we're, once again, in the middle of the pack.

Traffic congestion in terms of delays to -- and then time of commutation to work and so forth, we also fall in the middle of the pack.

Interesting in terms of cost of living. We are slightly higher than the average in terms of cost of living here, and the report provides
comparisons to what kind of income would you need to maintain a similar cost of living -- quality of life in other counties including Pennsylvania and so forth. And
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there are places where a family income here of $85,000 can be replaced with a family income of 60,000, 59,000 in parts of Pennsylvania and so forth. But on the other hand, there are counties that are higher than us, and counties we hear about a lot including Fairfax County, Virginia, Montgomery County, Nassau County, and so forth.

So we are a high-cost area, but in terms of, here again, this overall scan of quality of life in terms of some of these measures, what constitutes a good quality of life; traffic congestion, educational attainment, and -- and cost of living, crime, and so forth. So the report does look at that, and I think it's interesting, too, in terms of the information it reveals.

There also is extensive discussion on migration patterns,
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both domestic and international migration, that is important to this County.

And then further moving on, Dan Gulizio worked on a section -- the latter section dealing with review of regional plans, which we think is important. We wanted to look up above in terms of -- in terms of what plans affect the County, what plans should we be cognizant of, including the sustainable plans that Dan just spoke of, the water studies that are underway and are completed and so forth.

Andy Freleng's unit headed up the review of the local plans. Here again, the County is somewhat sandwiched in between the regional local entities. We want to coordinate with them, we want to understand their goals and objectives, so we've tried to account for that as well.
So just as a -- in conclusion, this was just a -- a skimming the surface. We invite your review. This is a draft document. The intention of the Department is to produce a final draft with the Commission's comments and the Commission's endorsement, to then move for further public discussion of this, and obviously advancing Volume II.

I'd like to thank the staff in their participation in this study and all of their work, including the cartographic unit which did the production part of this.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: It's beautiful.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes.

Congratulations to the Department, and also to you, Director Isles, for all your efforts
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on this. This is, you know, exactly what we need to be doing as a County. And this is the first step of a few, but it's certainly a good -- a good first step.

I had a question just regarding
whether we're going to include the
2010 census data going forward. I
know there are a lot of references
to the LIPA 2008 data, and obviously
it's been worked on over the past
couple of months before any census
data came out, but I wondered what
your thoughts were on incorporating
that data as it's being released
over the next, you know, foreseeable
future.

DIRECTOR ISLES: It's going to
start being released like soon -- is
that right, Seth -- or -- it's going
to come out in parts. It's not
going to be an entire thing. So I
guess to the extent that it's
available, we can incorporate it.
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We do get ACS data, American
Community Survey, and that's annual
data for the County, so we have
incorporated all of that with this.
And that's always an issue in terms
of the minute you write it down, it
becomes dated, and that's -- like
for some of the employment stats, I
was updating that, for example.

It'll be a decision of the
In terms of at what point do you want to release this and at what point do we kind of back up and update the numbers.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: All right.

DIRECTOR ISLES: But we can do that.

VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: (Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Constantine, yeah.

VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Are there plans to have this data accessible, perhaps online, some kind of interactive database, anything like that?

DIRECTOR ISLES: The data from the plan itself or just census data in general?

VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: Well, ideally the data that supported the conclusions --

DIRECTOR ISLES: Right.

VICE CHAIRMAN KONTOKOSTA: -- or that's cataloged in the plan.

DIRECTOR ISLES: Yeah, the entire document will be online.

Peter Lambert maintains the
inventory. There's extensive database that are already online and available, the inventory by sector. But it's certainly the intention that whatever we have, as much as possible, will be made available online.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Any --

COMMISSIONER HOLMES:
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(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah, Commissioner Holmes.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: I know that different people have worked on different sections, and certain data has to apparently be stated again in, you know, certain sections, but it's my hope that the final draft of this plan can be less repetitive, because many statistics are repeated, and, of course, if they need to be repeated, there is a way to do that without making it sound like you're saying it for the first time. But, you know, that's a difficult thing in a comprehensive plan like this with all the different sections, because each
section may refer to certain data by necessity. So I'm just hoping we can --

**ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE:** Well,

I would encourage any of us if we're
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reading through it, if you notice --
Commissioner Holmes or anyone, you notice something that sort of, you know, sticks out at you in that regard, just make a note of it and let the staff know. The more eyeballs on this from around this table, I think, the better.

**DIRECTOR ISLES:** And that certainly was a problem that we faced and we talked about. A part of it is a little redundant, but we wanted to arrive with the contents within the chapters.

**COMMISSIONER HOLMES:** Yes.

That I know.

**DIRECTOR ISLES:** So the quality of life is repeated, some of the demographic and economic information is repeated, but I just felt that it was necessary to explain and support that chapter, even though it was a little bit redundant.

**COMMISSIONER HOLMES:** Well,
it's just, you know, there are ways
to mention something and -- and
acknowledge that it was mentioned
earlier. You know, that sort of
little --

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: No,
but it goes to being -- making the
document good and that it holds
together well. It's a good point.

One thing I'll note for
everyone who received their book
last time, you do not have the
preface. The preface was written in
the last couple of weeks. You have
it as a handout. People who just
got their books today, it is in
there. It's a draft. So if folks
have suggestions, the idea is the
preface would be under my signature,
Constantine and Adrienne's.

It is only a draft. So if
there's anything people think we
should include in there, let us
know.
rest of us allowed to get the preface?

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: It's in your packet.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Any other high-level thoughts or comments?

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: (Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: I'm not entirely sure how high-level it is, but I note the mention earlier of the declining number of Long Island workforce that commutes to the City; however, there's no mention of what percentage of income for the Island that declining number represents.

For example, it might only be 12 percent of our workforce commuting to the City, but that might be 20 percent of our income.
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So we have to recognize the importance of even that smaller number of commuters to the City as a percentage or a proportion of our income.

DR. FOREMAN: I'd only say that
we know that it's roughly somewhere between 20 and 25 percent, personally. But we -- you know, the plan is to incorporate that into another segment of the plan dealing with economic development and going forward in terms of unemployment.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE:

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Yeah, Vince.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: My second question is related to Riverhead where I'm seeing here in the draft that the population is expected to increase to 46 percent, and I know from our own comprehensive plan and the
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So I'm wondering where these people are expected to live, because we will be built out at a population of you know roughly 40,000 residents, which is a 25 percent increase based on the Town's
comprehensive plan.

DIRECTOR ISLES: Now, that number -- the 46 would have come from a saturation analysis of the Town based on available land and the zoning.

And, Peter, if there's anything you want to add to that.

MR. LAMBERT: I wasn't aware that there was a discrepancy with Riverhead's numbers, but I'll take a look at them.

COMMISSIONER TALDONE: Good.

Take a look at those numbers from Suffolk County Planning Commission.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Let me make one point also on this notion of leaving Long Island terminology. I think the point is well taken if we're careful with it, and I think the Department has shown some data that there are some -- there are significant population trends that are impacting, perhaps, what -- you know, this, quote/unquote, brain drain. So in other words, it may be partially at least impacted by the fact that people -- there are fewer people in that age cohort.
At the same time, I think it's important to recognize that, for people who live here now, we all anecdotally know, you know, plenty of folks from our generation and others who are leaving Long Island because of the pressures. And so I guess it's as good as a reason that's probably being met by people coming in, in terms of an influx. But in terms of how it affects the people of Suffolk County, it impacts us more when it's our family and it's our neighbors and it's our friends who are leaving. So our policy needs to, I think, recognize that part of this is demographic driven in terms of the -- the dip, but also not kind of overlook the fact that it is meaningful when there are, you know, bunches of people who can't afford to live here or go elsewhere for economic opportunity, because -- so that kind of eats at our social fabric a little bit. And not that those who are coming here from elsewhere aren't
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welcome and they won't become our
friends, et cetera, but it's sort of
different from a psychological
perspective, I think, in some ways.
So just sort of to be aware of,
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there's a nuance there, I think we
need to be careful about how we word
that, despite the fact I think it's
the point in terms of demographics
as well.
Anything else --
COMMISSIONER McADAM:
(Indicating)
ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE:
Commissioner McAdam.
COMMISSIONER McADAM: I know
I'm going very far ahead on this,
but once they -- I'm just curious,
once the comprehensive plan is
adopted and there are changes -- for
example, Southold doesn't have a
comprehensive plan yet, but they're
working on it. And let's say this
plan is developed before Southold
can -- is there any process after
this is approved to amend it to --
you know, to include it in a
comprehensive plan, either by
reprint -- I don't want to say
reprinting it, but researching it online as far as updating it?

DIRECTOR ISLES: Well, the County Charter does state that there should be a plan, but it also puts a requirement on the County Planning Commission to review it annually. So once the plan is adopted by the County Legislature, the end of the review period would have to occur.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: The other thing I'll also note, I had the chance to speak with Supervisor Russell from Southold a few weeks ago, and he said they're hoping to finish theirs by the end of this year. And that's sort of very -- you know, no less than, say, 12 months from now. And so it may not get into Volume I, but we might be able to get that into Volume II.

So let me just wrap up by saying this. We need to get sort of feedback from the Commission and edits.1
know some people have edits to provide. They can actually provide their book directly to the staff, and the staff will take that and incorporate it. We have our comprehensive plan working group; Diana, Linda, Tom. If anyone else is interested in working on that with us, it would be welcomed because we need, you know, some good thinking about what's in here. And obviously, this is a tremendous start.

But I know staff wants to, and we need to -- I think at our next meeting, we have to give them permission to kind of let this get out to -- to others and to the towns, the legislature, et cetera. So I think we need to -- you know, within a few weeks here, probably two, get any comments to staff, and then another two weeks to kind of incorporate it, so that at our next meeting we can kind of sort of bless it in a draft fashion to kind of get out.

Again, Volume I is full of the easier one, it's data accumulation.
Volume II is where I think it kind of gets harder, because that's in terms of where we want to be. This is where we are. It's a question of where we want to be in the second volume.

Anyway, any other thoughts or comments on that?

COMMISIIONER WEIR: I just want to say it's a great job. I've skimmed it cover to cover. It's fascinating reading. Thank you very much. I know it's a monumental task.

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Okay. Any other comments, thoughts, or questions?

(WHEREUPON, there was no response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: If not, I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

COMMISSIONER HOLMES: Motion.

COMMISSIONER KELLY:

(Indicating)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: Motion by Commissioner Holmes, seconded by Commissioner Kelly.
All in favor?
(WHEREUPON, the members voted.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN CALONE: That's 11 to nothing.

We'll see everyone next month in Riverhead.
(WHEREUPON, this meeting was adjourned at 2:54 p.m.)

Suffolk County Planning Commission 229

CERTIFICATE

I, THERESA PAPE, a Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the State of New York, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the stenographic notes taken herein.

I further certify that I am not related to any of the parties to this action by blood or marriage; and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 2nd day of February 2011.

THERESA PAPE