

SUFFOLK COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING
COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
MEETING

725 Veterans Memorial Highway
Smithtown, New York

July 19, 2006
9:25 a.m.

Taken by: Joann Bunze
Court Reporter

A P P E A R A N C E S:

Larry Swanson, Chairman
Michael Kaufman, Vice-Chairman
Joy Squires
Vivian Vilorio-Fisher
John E. Potente
Jim Bagg
Lance Mallamo
Richard Martin
Kara Hahn
Penny Kohler

CHAIRMAN: We will call the meeting to order, and I would like to first of all welcome Enrico Nardone. He's over here to my right. Enrico is a new member of the Board, but we haven't received official notification that he is a member, so he will be sitting with us today but not voting. So, hopefully all this will be squared away by August 9th, which is our next meeting. For your benefit, I think it would be helpful if we went around the room and introduced ourselves and gave a little bit about our background so you could be familiar with who you are dealing with. Joy, why don't you start?

MS. SQUIRES: Hello, I am Joy Squires. I am the chair of the Town of Huntington Conservation Board. And the way CEQ is constituted, our Conservation Board has a right to a member of -- a Conservation Board has a right to vote on something either home county or in their own town. So, I have no right to vote on something that is occurring in Brookhaven, but anything in Huntington I could vote on.

MR. POTENTE: My name is John Potente. I am the health professional that's been appointed to the Board. My background is a masters in medical biology and doctorate in dentistry, and I have been on the Board for one year.

MR. KAUFMAN: My name is Mike Kaufman. I'm an escaped felon. I'm the vice-chairman of this committee. I'm a real estate attorney and also corporate counsel. I also am heavily involved with land use, in terms of government inside the villages of Nissequogue and Head of the Harbor. I'm a member of coastal management group over there, also.

CHAIRMAN: I am Larry Swanson. I'm the chair right now of the CEQ, and I'm a physical oceanographer and a professor at Stony Brook University in the Marine Science Research Center.

MR. BAGG: I'm James Bagg. I'm a chief environmental analyst with the Suffolk County Planning Department and I'm the primary staff person to the CEQ.

MR. MARTIN: My name is Richard Martin. I'm the director of Historic Services within the Suffolk County Parks Department, and I am a staff person here to represent the issues relating to the Historic Trust.

MS. HAHN: My name is Kara Hahn and I am representing presiding officer Bill Lindsay.

MS. KOHLER: I'm Penny Kohler and I'm on the staff of CEQ. I'm the clerical for CEQ.

CHAIRMAN: One other thing, on Friday we are getting together with the authors of the Vector Control Plan in Yaphank. I'm not even sure what time it is or exactly where it is.

MR. BAGG: It's at 10 o'clock.

CHAIRMAN: It's 10 o'clock at the Health Department in Yaphank, and the purpose for that is, the subcommittee that has been dealing with more of the nitty-gritty of the Vector Control Plan, to sit down and go over the public hearing comments and other comments that have been received with regard to the Vector Control Plan and what the next steps will be. The Vector Control Plan is something that will probably be on the agenda for months to come. I would like to invite you to attend that meeting, although you clearly won't be in a position to vote one way or the other. Well -- he's not a member of the subcommittee, but it might be a good educational experience for you, since Vector Control Plan doesn't ever seem to go away. We have minutes from, let's see, January 18th of this year to go over. Did anybody read them?

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Chairman, I have read them. From my dim memory, they actually look like they are substantively correct. I have no corrections to make to them.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: I make a motion to accept the minutes.

CHAIRMAN: Second.

MR. MALLAMO: Second.

CHAIRMAN: All in favor. (Board members respond.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carried. All right, Jim, do we have any correspondence this month?

MR. BAGG: No correspondence. Basically, however, at the end of the meeting under other business we have to discuss the Vector Control. So, the comments are in everybody's file that have been received and they are very voluminous. So, at that point in time I assume you will discuss them.

CHAIRMAN: I just like to remind the audience that this is a public meeting, so if you like to speak, please let us know and we will accommodate you. Moving on to recommended Type II Actions. Jim, are there any Type II Actions you want to call to our attention?

MR. BAGG: No. The packet is fairly straight forward. Either they are straight Type II Actions

or the actions in the packet have been previously reviewed by the CEQ and SEQRA is complete.

MR. KAUFMAN: Larry, based upon Jim's recommendations, I would say that SEQRA classifications of resolutions laid on the table I would make a motion to accept.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?

MR. MALLAMO: Second.

CHAIRMAN: All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Proposed upgrading of electric service and repairs to dock located at the Long Island Maritime Museum, Town of Islip. Do we have anybody here who's going to speak to that?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. I'm from the Suffolk County Parks, and the Maritime Museum buildings are on the West Sayville Golf Course in West Sayville, and we are just upgrading, as it says here, the electric service. The dock is now in poor condition and we need to add some plankings to it and resupport the bulkhead for safety reasons. In the future, there is a plan to rebuild the dock, but we are not going forward with that right now.

And also, I wanted to add to this that we just wanted to go ahead and do some plastering and painting on both the interior and exterior of the museum building at that site. And all these work items are covered in our comprehensive survey, I mean the plan that the museum did for the County. So, there is nothing changed or extraordinary from that plan.

CHAIRMAN: Did you have a question, Mike?

MR. KAUFMAN: The bulkhead needing to be resecured, what is going on with that?

MR. MARTIN: It's pulling away from the ground. The supports there are actually pulling away, and so they need to be resecured.

MR. KAUFMAN: How are you going to resecure it, dead men or –

MR. MARTIN: Actually a planning part of this, we need to go forward with an engineer to give us a full plan. Right now it's blocked off from the public. We can't use the dock at this point.

MR. KAUFMAN: Is this right by the marine railway aspect of it?

MR. MARTIN: Right adjacent to the railway. This does not include the railway work that was approved previously.

MR. KAUFMAN: I make a motion that this is a Type II Action.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?

MR. MALLAMO: Second.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion that is Type II and a second. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

Proposed restoration of Sagtikos Manor, Sagtikos Manor County Park, West Bay Shore, Town of Islip.

MR. MARTIN: With this site, there is a number of buildings and features in the landscape there. It's a ten-acre site and we are looking to basically just restore to the existing materials, the buildings, and these items on that site. It will include painting the buildings, carpentry repairs of the porches, window repairs and brick and masonry work on the garden features, and it's just all a replacement in kind. No changes of design or anything of that sort.

CHAIRMAN: Any comments?

MR. KAUFMAN: How long do you think this is going to take, Richard?

MR. MARTIN: Overall, it's a combination here above private funds, New York State grant funds and County funds that will go into these projects. So I think, or my experience, we are talking upwards of a five to ten-year plan to complete everything at that site.

MR. KAUFMAN: Larry, I don't really have a problem with this, per se. I mean I think it's a good thing to try to restore the property. I'm very familiar with it. We have gone through it several times. And obviously I don't have a problem with restoration. I have it more from a technical SEQRA sense, in terms of -- I mean it's obviously a Type II activity at this point in time, and it's been described adequately to us, but I'm just wondering whether we should ask for a plan on something like that, or some sort of sketch plan or something, giving us an idea of what we are looking at.

MR. MARTIN: Most of these work items will not have a plan, just be painting, like I said, or if you had a rotted piece of the siding, that would get replaced, or if a roof needed to be replaced. It would be -- a lot of the items can be done with our County contractors, and we don't put it out to bid, and also the State grants we would hire a local carpenters to do the work with the Historical Society. None of these items raised to the point of needing that kind of design work. Anything that would relate to that, which you would probably be seeing in the near future, something let's say with a carriage house that's planned to be the visitor's center, we discussed adding a new handicapped bathroom to the exterior. That would not be included under the restoration program. That would come back to you with the full set of plans, and that would have to go out to bid, and you would be reviewing that work.

MR. KAUFMAN: So, basically, you are saying that this is rising to a very minor threshold. We are not talking about major reconstructions or major repairs or anything like that. It's just sort of what you would do around your own home to fix things?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN: I don't think we need a plan then.

CHAIRMAN: Is this a wooden structure?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. It's a wooden structure, and the garden features are masonry brick.

CHAIRMAN: Are you going to be stripping the paint on the house?

MR. MARTIN: The paint will be stripped using no chemicals, though. We don't use any chemicals.

CHAIRMAN: Is it lead-based paint that is being removed?

MR. MARTIN: Some of it, I presume, will be, yes.

CHAIRMAN: What precautions are you taking to assure it doesn't get into the ground?

MR. MARTIN: They have to put tarps out and they have to dispose of it properly in the locations.

MR. MALLAMO: I think you are really continuing the policies that have been established in the Historic Services Division for many years. It's going to be the same procedure?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MR. MALLAMO: You are not replacing the windows, you are restoring windows?

MR. MARTIN: Everything's being restored.

MR. MALLAMO: Any of the asbestos abatement or lead paint removal will go by the existing County policies?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. And again, we have County contractors that also deal with the asbestos issues and the lead at this point that we bring in when we need to.

MR. KAUFMAN: I make a motion Type II Action.

MR. MALLAMO: Second.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion, second. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion passes.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN: Welcome.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Thank you. I did want to let you know that we finally have the signature from Albany that I am a member. I was informed this morning. So, I am a member and I will be voting.

CHAIRMAN: Wonderful. It's good to have you.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Thank you. It's good to be here.

CHAIRMAN: Vivian, this is Enrico Nardone. I don't know if you met.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I voted for him to be a member of this at the other place that I was able to vote.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. All right. Proposed public health and safety improvements. This is a fence on County Road 67. We know it as Motor Parkway.

MR. PETERMAN: Good morning everyone. My name is Jim Peterman. I am the assistant to the chief engineer of the Suffolk County Department of Public Works for the Highway, Bridges and Waterways Division.

CHAIRMAN: Welcome.

MR. PETERMAN: Thank you. I trust you all have a copy of the AF in front of you.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. PETERMAN: The Department, along with the County Executive's Office has received numerous complaints and concerns over the quality of life issues in the subject roadway. The Department, along with the members of the County Executive's Office, have met with these members to identify critical issues and the methodology to remedy such. The issues include increased traffic volume and congestion, idling truck traffic on shoulders, many dead or sickly tree specimens and increased noise with respect to traffic. The elements of the proposed plan include the existing 100-foot right-of-way contains two travel lanes in each direction with accommodations for center and left turn lanes at intersections. The unused or lightly wooded area from the northerly edge of pavement to the right-of-way line from Redleaf Lane to Shinbone Lane ranges from between 20 to 25 feet.

The project will clear the majority of the existing vegetation from this area and replace with a ten

foot high cedar fence atop a five foot earthen berm enplanted with Norway spruce, eastern red cedar, forsythia, dwarf burning bush and packed sand ground cover as outlined in the attachment 2- B of the AEF. Guide rail will be installed along the northerly edge of the pavement. Since only ten feet of the unused area exists between the edge of pavement and the right-of-way line from Shinbone Lane to Melwood Drive, no berm would be installed in this area. A 2 foot high cedar fence will be installed along the right-of-way line along with the planting of emerald arborvitae, Wasan cherry trees, dwarf burning bush and packed sand ground cover, as outlined in attachment 2-B. Guide rail will also be installed along this northerly edge of the pavement. Plantings, in combination with cedar fences and guide rail will improve the visual esthetics of the corridor, increased community cohesion, reduce idling trucks using shoulders for rest areas and prevent off- the-road crashes and damage to private property and possible bodily injury.

If you have any questions, I will answer them.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I have questions, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Can you just -- which hamlet does this go through?

MR. PETERMAN: It's Commack.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: It's Commack. There has been a great deal of discussion at the legislature regarding a sound wall in parts of Motor Parkway. Is this one of those areas? I know that Legislator Kennedy has been asking for a sound wall.

MR. PETERMAN: The difference, as outlined in the environmental procedures manual of the New York State DOT, if something reduces noise by less than ten percent, it's not really called a noise wall. Our projections on noise reduction are not over ten decibels. That's when you become a noise wall, and heights range from 16 to 20 feet in height.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: What are the projections on this?

MR. PETERMAN: Between six and nine.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Between six and nine, okay. And Legislator Kennedy has been part of the discussions, as far as you know? I know that that's not your purview.

MR. PETERMAN: I know he is interested in it. I'm not sure if he's part of the discussion.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Okay. I had another question.

CHAIRMAN: Vivian, can I ask you, is it your belief that this should be designed as a noise wall, as well as –

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: The legislature did vote on having a noise wall here. Well, I'm sorry, I

think what we had was a sound study that we voted on. There has been a great deal of back and forth, and it's been a rather contentious issue between the legislature and – especially some members of the legislature -- and the County Executive's Office. And you know, we are not voting on that policy statement here at CEQ, but I did want to ask these questions so that I could, you know, have this discussion with Legislator Kennedy, because it is his district, so I wanted to be aware of what kind of discussions there were. I have another question which is more in line with the purview of this council, which is, and the saying a little knowledge is a dangerous thing might be relevant here, but yesterday I attended an Invasive Species Task Force and learned that burning bush is actually on the list of invasive species, and I'm not sure if this particular burning bush, the dwarf burning bush, would be under the same category, but I do know that there are some areas where indeed the County is planting invasive species, because there is a lack of complete awareness of some of the species that are part of that group.

And so I would like the committee to know that we should look at this carefully in this landscaping plan, and the invasive species, the task force, going to be, as one of its recommendations, going to be informing all agencies of the County as to which have been listed as invasive species here in Suffolk County. I just wanted to let you know, we have a representative from DPW on that Invasive Species Task Force, and in fact, I was surprised because I was going to put some burning bush in front of my fence, and I am rethinking that, because I wasn't aware of that.

MR. PETERMAN: I will check with our landscape architect as soon as I get back to the office. If, in fact, a dwarf burning bush is an invasive species, we will replace it with something similar.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Thank you. I appreciate that.

MR. PETERMAN: Just to get back to you with the noise versus fence issue, we are trying to meet the wishes or needs of the community without breaking the back of the Suffolk County tax payer. So, this is more something of meeting in the middle here to try to satisfy everybody at the cheapest price.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: We do know how expensive sound walls are, and they really become prohibitive, but we do want to also protect the quality of life of those people who were there before Motor Parkway became the highway that it's become. That was there first, but it wasn't the level of use that it is now.

MR. PETERMAN: Correct.

MR. POTENTE: I would like to support Legislator Fisher's comment on the invasive plants that you used. I don't have an issue with the actual project, itself. It's warranted. But, in terms of the plants in this area, you are going to be removing native vegetation and replacing it with non-native vegetation, and we've seen this come up a number of times before our committee. I don't see why now isn't as a good time as any to stress the point that, while there are some plants that are designated as invasive species, there is a degree of invasiveness. Sometimes just the replacement of native vegetation with non-native vegetation can have environmental impacts, and the burning bush is an invasive plant, but you also have forsythia down there. Forsythia

looks very nice when it's first planted, but then it becomes very gangly. While it may not be designated at this point in time as an invasive species, the dangers that it poses to our native habitats may be seen in the very near future. I may also mention Norway spruce. Unfortunately, a lot of these plants that have been used traditionally in Public Works projects are now coming into view as maybe something else could be used instead. Sometimes even a simple grass right-of-way may be better and less expensive than going ahead and using some of these plants.

MR. PETERMAN: There are certain reasons that we do pick the plants that we do. They are not next to a building where somebody is going to be watering them every day. They have to be drought tolerant, salt tolerant. It's a tricky line that you are going to be walking trying to plant certain plants that you would like to see out there, but we have to make sure they are going to grow.

MR. POTENTE: I can appreciate that. But if we look at the map and we look where these are being planted, you could see the extent of the native vegetation. This is not in front of a building, so I would request that these plants not be used in this project.

MR. PETERMAN: Do you have any recommendations?

MR. POTENTE: You do have the eastern red cedar, that's fine. I would look into some of the native plants that are available and not use the non-native plants. The non-native plants listed here are the forsythia, the dwarf burning bush, the Norway spruce and the Wasan cherry tree, and actually arborvitae is more of a northern species. So, the only one that you do have that's here is the eastern red cedar, which is a fine tree to use. It's native to Long Island. There are other trees that can be used. There are oaks and hickories.

MR. PETERMAN: One of the reasons we also picked these plants is different bloom times of the year to help provide a visual pleasing experience when you are driving down the road. Every different time of the year you would see different colors and different blooms out there.

MR. POTENTE: I understand, but this is a committee to assess environmental impact, not esthetics. Well, esthetics are part of it, but environmental impact is the main issue.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Legislator, if I may.

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Clearly the planting portion of this is the last segment of the project or the last piece of the project.

MR. PETERMAN: I believe the large evergreens behind the wall would have to be planted before the wall goes up or the fence, because we won't be able to get back there.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Mr. Chair, because there is an Invasive Species Task Force that could make recommendations, could we refer this to that task force to look at to make recommendations to DPW? I don't know if that's procedure.

CHAIRMAN: We could certainly do that and ask them to come back in a month, you know, next month to review what task force is recommending. That could be –

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: With only that piece of it, because I would hate to delay the whole project?

CHAIRMAN: You can, you know, pass a motion that allows them to go ahead with certain phases of it, but we want them to come back with their final planting plan. Although, he raises an issue that some of these trees have to apparently be planted before they can actually go ahead with wall production.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: And also the need for low maintenance. In our Invasive Species Task Force, the issues that have been brought up have been discussed that, just because something is not indigenous or non-native, doesn't mean that it should be prohibited, because it's not necessarily invasive just because it's non-native, and you could become very -- too restrictive if you say that anything that's non-native has to be prohibited. But, there are some that are listed as invasive and very -- what was the word that they used -- very voracious, and that's why the burning bush jumped out at me, because that was the one that was high on the list that wants to be avoided. I don't know if forsythia -- I know that forsythia at this time it's not on that list, but I believe we should take a look at this and have the task force take a look at it. So, I think Jim Bagg wanted to say something, so I won't make a motion yet until I hear from the other members.

MR. BAGG: I would recommend that basically, if the counsel is going to act on this particular project, that, and consider a possible negative declaration, that you could place in your negative declaration that the landscape species could not include anything on the invasive species list, and leave it that way. And then you might say that the plant should also be referred to the Invasive Species Task Force for further consideration, and those would be mitigation measures rather than try to bring it back in here again.

MR. PETERMAN: Could I add something to that?

MR. KAUFMAN: There is a piece of institutional knowledge that I think everyone should be aware of. This issue was dealt with about ten years ago with Sharon Cast, Nancy Manfredonia and myself, and also Richard LaValle when he was at the County Department of Public Works, has since retired. We looked at a lot of these particular issues. Previously, the County had come in very bluntly just and cleared areas and they had no replanting plans whatsoever. CEQ, over a period of a year, pressured DPW to try to reconsider those policies, and finally the department did agree to reconsider those policies and include planting plans in all of these road reconstructions and these projects, et cetera. One of the criteria that we came up with was both the cost, low maintenance factors, and we also looked at indeed some of the restrictive aspects of types of species that were going to be coming in. There was a mix, if you will, of planting ideas that were advanced. Forsythia I happen to remember and also eastern red cedar were specifically discussed as being some of them were native some of them were not; but again, we were looking also at the low maintenance, we were looking at cost, we were looking at esthetic values, et cetera. Some of the plants you are seeing in the plants that have been presented here today do

come from that agreement that was struck ten years or so ago. Again, I do want to emphasize that there was a cost factor involved with it, et cetera. I have no problem right now with negating this thing, letting the project go forward with a reservation regarding the plants and having a new look taken at some of these plants; whether some of them are too, you know, invasive, et cetera, but I would simply remind the Council that it has to be closely looked at, and there are certain issues beyond just vegetational issues that have to be considered in all of this. So, what I would suggest is maybe getting together a task force here at the Council, figure out where we want to try and go on all of this, talk to the Invasive Species Board and then also possibly having a meeting with DPW and have their input on all of this and maybe reach some sort of a compromise. What boils down to sometimes, an invasive species, when you are talking a road project, is not necessarily a horrible thing. That's my opinion.

MR. BAGG: Larry, if I might point out that in the past CEQ has reviewed various planting schemes with DPW, and the recommendation was to use wherever possible indigenous species. That is the policy, and there is a list in DPW as to what is considered indigenous species for use in landscaping that has been presented to the CEQ.

MR. KAUFMAN: That's the list I was talking about.

MR. MALLAMO: Can I make a couple of comments? I have concerns with this project, as well, and I'm very torn, because I can clearly see the need for the people that back onto this. Not just the Motor Parkway, but this is very close to the Long Island Expressway and the access ramps to the Sagtikos Parkway, which parallels this. So, they are kind of getting a triple dose of traffic, noise and visuals. But the issue that I think we haven't really discussed is that this is, even though the EAF says it is not a historic site, we have always considered the Long Island Motor Parkway as a historic roadway. It is the first roadway built for automobiles in the world. It has many, many different features with it that were engineering firsts. While I'm not overly concerned with this section, because I know the roadway was moved right in this general area to make way for the Expressway/Sagtikos interchange, I am concerned that we are establishing a precedence for the future of other sections of the Motor Parkway where a request will be made to eliminate the original vegetation and to berm and relandscape it to a suburban appearance. Clearly, it meets the needs of those that live in those residences right now, but that is an issue that I am going to be concerned with, and I think we will have that request. And maybe, Mike, to talk about your task force, maybe what we really need, because we had issues on the Motor Parkway for years on this Council, is a Long Island Motor Parkway task force to address these issues. We have a consistent plan for how we are going to treat issues like this for the Motor Parkway.

MR. KAUFMAN: Realistically, we have segmented some of our reviews of the Motor Parkway. We haven't looked at it as a whole. We have tried to in the past and we actually have said a couple of sections could be reconstructed with the caveats that you are bringing up. I would say, knowing this particular road, I have travelled it several times, it's lost some of its historic characters, as you are pointing out, and the citizens in the area do have legitimate concerns. I think maybe we need to look at something, and overall look in the future, as you are suggesting. But for this particular project, I'm not as -- what's the right word for it -- looking at it strictly from a CEQ perspective as opposed to a historic trust perspective, this would seem to me to be a

neg dec.

The Historic Trust aspect, we have to divorce ourselves in that sense, because it may have been nominated, but it's not included at this time. I don't know if we could bring those particular concerns in.

CHAIRMAN: We have a couple of people that would like to speak from the audience. Michelle Paykar; is that correct?

MS. PAYKAR: Good morning. Hi. I am one of the –

CHAIRMAN: Could you just say your name?

MS. PAYKAR: Michelle Paykar, and I'm one of the -- I represent the neighborhood organization that has been very concerned about the project here, which is -- we have the Tulip Wood community, and it's a wonderful neighborhood, it's a wonderful community. I lived there the last five years. I have two young children. I love the area. The problem that has come about in the last several years is the noise issues, as well as esthetic issues. Motor Parkway, that strip, you made a point about the historical aspect of it, and I understand the historical aspect of it, but several years ago our portion of Motor Parkway was expanded, so now it's a four-lane road in which an enormous amount of cars and trucking go down. Noise, noise is a huge issue. The vegetation and the growth and the trees there, because you know LIPA's come by and they hack up at the trees. Most of the trees are dying or dead. The vegetation that lines the Pinewood section to Shinbone, which is the section that my house is located on, there is nothing behind there. It's just shrubbery. There is few and far between on the trees. We have had numerous issues where, you know, trucks come, tractor trailers do U-turns there. It is a danger. There is an issue further down on the road between the Deepdale side and the Shinbone side, that section. There was a car that lost control and came through, and thank goodness there was a number of trees and shrubs there that, you know, that prevented the car from careening through the back yard and killing a child that was out on a swing set.

So, there is a safety issue. We understand, you know, the concern about vegetation aspect. What we are looking for is we don't want to become a cookie cutter suburban community with our plantings, but what we would like is something that's; A, esthetically pleasing and also helps with the safety issue that, you know, is in the area. So, we just hope that you take into consideration, as a community, that you know, we are willing to work with all the organizations, but this is an important project. This is a project that we have been seeing through for the last four years, and we need to do something and address something, because, as the gentleman over here had said, the area, you all have driven through it, it has changed. There is an enormous amount of traffic and it has become a quality of life issue.

So, I just want to thank you. Do you have a question? I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN: No. I just wanted to thank you for taking the time to come and let us know your feelings.

MS. PAYKAR: Thank you. I appreciate giving me an opportunity to speak.

CHAIRMAN: I would like to go back to this issue of the sound barrier and ask why this wasn't designed to reduce sound more than the six to eight decibels that you have referred to.

MR. PETERMAN: Basically, when you go to a noise wall status you are talking to a 15 to a 20-foot height, and the cost that's involved to do such a wall is exorbitant. Like I said before, we are trying to balance the needs of the community with not putting an extra bearing on the tax payers of Suffolk County.

MR. MALLAMO: I have a question. There is no sound wall on the southern portion of Motor Parkway at this location, is there? Where it parallels the Sagtikos and Expressway access ramps.

MR. PETERMAN: There is a wooded area between the Expressway and the Sagtikos off ramp between Motor parkway. Ranges between 50 to 200 feet in width. The State, when they had done the Sagtikos interchange had did a noise study and did set up receptors in the community in different receptor locations. And their projections within their report, which I believe was done in the early 90s, showed that the noise that was coming from the receptors in the area of these residences were for a fact Motor Parkway, not Sagtikos or the Expressway, because of the distance involved.

CHAIRMAN: We have a couple of other speakers. Carolyn Miller and Sharon Lehrer.

MS. MILLER: Good morning. I just want to say respect everything that 've heard today.

CHAIRMAN: Who are you?

MS. MILLER: I'm Carolyn Miller, I'm sorry. I back Motor Parkway. I live on Deepdale, and I learned a lot of things today from the discussion that you have been having, and I have been living in Tulip Wood for almost 4 years now, and I've seen the change. I have seen the road be reconfigured. I have seen it expand to four lanes. So, I do respect the historical aspect of the road, but the surrounding area has changed. The way it affects my community has changed. People move out of the neighborhood because of noise, not because of schools or drugs, but because of the noise. The trees behind my house are dying. I have had trees crack in half and I have had to call the police and the Town and the County to try to get them removed from the road because cars would swerve around late at night after the tree is cracked. My husband and I have pulled numerous huge branches off the roadway and tried to push them back behind my house. I've had branches from the trees fall from the County side with wildlife nesting in them into my pool and I've had to fish them out. So, the trees are diseased. They are full of carpenter ants. They are dying. When I first moved in I thought that they were beautiful and lovely and I loved them, because Tulip Wood is full of trees. Just the whole environment of it was very appealing. But, like I said, over the years things have changed. LIPA has hacked away at them. They are unstable and they are diseased. They are dying, and we need to do something, because the noise issue is a big thing. I started this noise situation and pushing for this with my coach here, Sharon, over four years ago, and this has been a compromise between my neighborhood. We had a meeting. Legislator Kennedy does know. We did speak to him. We were looking at a wall. It just was financially impossible, but also people in the neighborhood enjoy the trees and

they were a little concerned about that. So, we had a meeting with the neighborhood without the County, without anybody involved and sat down and discussed and said what would be good for our community, and a lot of people were concerned with the removal of the trees and the environment. So they were very – you know, the suggestions were plantings and berms and privacy fences, which we then took up with the Suffolk County office, and they were all for that more than a wall. So, we had another meeting in the community and the community then decided that yes, it's time that the trees is past their season. They were lovely and they were beautiful and they attracted us there, but they are dying. They are full of ants. They are falling apart, and now it's a safety condition. Cars have hit them in the past and they break in half. We have one right now lying on our LIPA wires, and if something was to have been done to save the trees 0 to 15 years ago, maybe we wouldn't have had this problem. But, I think it's just everything has a season, and I think these trees are past that. So, I think that for the future, we need to put in new plantings, and our community does want that. We want the plantings. We want the berm. Please, I understand that certain species are better and everything, but please don't hold up this project. It's been -- maybe you could watch over what they are doing, because I do understand how some plants do choke out the native species and then down the line they are overgrown and a dangerous thing, but --

CHAIRMAN: Please summarize.

MS. MILLER: Please support this project.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Yes. I just wanted to let you know that the discussion that we're having here will not be holding up the project. As far as it seems to me, what I am hearing from my colleagues, and certainly my feelings, and I know how important this has been for the neighborhood, and we are certainly not opposed to vegetating. We like the idea of having many trees and plantings. We just want to make sure that they are the right ones. And what we had said earlier is that we would have -- that we would vote for the project to move forward, but put that caveat that we take a good look at the plantings. That's all that we are looking to do, you know, I believe. I will speak for myself. What I am looking to do is vote this forward, because I know that the community has been looking for remediation here and mitigation of sound and the esthetic issues that are involved. We want to support your community. We want to support what you want. And Legislator Kennedy has been very articulate in saying that within the legislature, but we want to do it the right way. We won't be holding up.

MS. MILLER: Thank you.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: We could achieve all of the purposes.

MS. MILLER: That would be great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. And Sharon Lehrer, do you have anything that you want to add?

MS. LEHRER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: You have to speak into the microphone. Identify yourself.

MS. LEHRER: My name is Sharon Lehrer. I live on Pinewood Drive in Commack. I don't want to be redundant. They just said everything that is to be said. I just want to let you know that we came down here with our children. I'm sorry if they have been disrupting your meeting, but this really – we want to show you how important this project is to our community and to our quality of life, because it really, really is. We understand the vegetation and everything that they said, and we are willing to work with, you know, with you, and we hopefully we could get to a good medium and to, you know, really get going with this project. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, and your children have been wonderful. Sometimes we don't behave as well as your children.

MS. LEHRER: Thank you.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I would like to make a motion.

CHAIRMAN: Please.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I would like to Type II Action, you know, Listed Action with the caveat that we look at the planting plan. Is that okay to put together that way as a recommendation?

MR. POTENTE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Any discussion? (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Is this going to in any way hold up construction?

MR. PETERMAN: No. In the few months, at that point we will be talking about about what type of plants we need to replace on the planting scheme, put it out to bid this fall and get it under construction in the winter and planting in the spring and completion in late spring of next year.

CHAIRMAN: We had a motion and a second. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

MR. PETERMAN: Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Just to continue on this just for a second, now that the motion has passed. What I think we need from DPW is to get a list of what plantings they have right now on that list, and maybe it could be forwarded over to Jim, and then maybe we could start looking at it ourselves and see what we see and revisit what we did ten years ago.

MR. PETERMAN: The plants we typically plant on our roadway jobs.

MR. KAUFMAN: There should be a list someplace. If Richard LaValle's files are in tact in any way, shape or form, it should have been transferred to Ralph Murkowski or one other LSAs or something.

MR. PETERMAN: Ralph is the one that put this plan together. So, hopefully they look at the list.

MR. KAUFMAN: He should have a list someplace of the approved plantings, and then I guess we could start revisiting that and see what we see in terms of invasive species, et cetera. Maybe change the list around a little bit.

MR. PETERMAN: All right. I'll get the list over to Mr. Bagg.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Mr. Chair, the next meeting of the Invasive Task Force is August 22nd. However, if we need to get them together before that, I am the chair of that committee, and I don't know what the time line is, but could you get in touch with me and let me know how soon you would need some kind of input from them, if you need it sooner than August 22nd?

MR. PETERMAN: On the planting scheme or planting plan, it's more of just a detail. It's not going to really hold up our design of the project. It's just replacing the wording; plant this plant or X plant or Y plant.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I will be sure to put this on the agenda of the August 22nd meeting of the Invasive Task Force. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Proposed sewer district number three, southwest sewer construction, Town of Islip.

MS. McGOVERN: Hi. My name is Janice McGovern, and I'm a civil engineer with the Suffolk County Department of Public Works Sanitation, and basically this project involves providing sewer service to parcels that have not been developed in the original sewer construction program.

MR. KAUFMAN: Little bit louder and closer to the microphone.

CHAIRMAN: Give your name again, please.

MS. McGOVERN: Janice McGovern, Suffolk County Department of Public Works. This project involves providing sewer service to parcels that have not developed in the original sewer

construction program. The district is obligated to service all parcels within the district boundaries. However, during the original construction, the use of some of the parcels in the location of connecting sewers was not to be determined. The project is to serve a number of parcels that are now defined.

CHAIRMAN: That's it?

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Are they residential parcels?

MS. McGOVERN: Basically they are houses, parcels on paper streets that were not developed and now owners are approaching the permit department.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: So, it is residential parcels?

MS. McGOVERN: Residential. We have several that -- one location is in East Islip, a marina, East Islip Anglers on Bay View Avenue.

CHAIRMAN: How many gallons per day is this going to add to the southwest sewer district?

MS. McGOVERN: I really didn't figure that out, but we weren't worried about this, because the plant was designed to take what was encompassed in the district. These are all within the district.

CHAIRMAN: Is the plant, because of other connections, over capacity at this point or is it under capacity?

MS. McGOVERN: At this point -- it was already planned to take their flow, and this flow is very small compared to what it is already handling. So this wouldn't cause a problem at all.

MR. KAUFMAN: You are talking about the Bergen Point Plant?

MS. McGOVERN: Yes.

MR. KAUFMAN: We dealt with this issue before about five years or so ago. I remember Tom Kramer and Terry had comments about this. Unfortunately, I don't remember what it was. There was a legal issue involved, a zoning issue involved, and something in terms of the people opening up the lots on the paper streets and things like that. That's what I am trying to remember.

MS. McGOVERN: Basically we don't provide the sewers unless they provide us first with the undeveloped lots. They have to show us building permits from the Town, approved highway drawings, a survey, a layout for the sewers. We don't just run in and put the sewers in before there is already approval and that the areas are mostly cleared.

CHAIRMAN: I have a question on point eleven of your short environmental assessment form. The question is, does any aspect of the action have a currently valid permit or approval, and you said no permit or approval, but is a requirement of the Suffolk County Sanitary Code. What

does that mean?

MS. McGOVERN: Basically, I think I called out which part of the code it related to on the next page, but in the Suffolk County –

CHAIRMAN: What is -- I don't understand.

MS. McGOVERN: No. The Suffolk County Sanitary Code it says anybody within the district has a right and must connect to the treatment plant.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Actually, I was going to say that I'm very happy to see that this is a connection that is within the sewer district. It's usually much more controversial. We have commercial entities that are looking to connect into the sewer district. So, I think this is the use that it was planned for. So I certainly support this project.

CHAIRMAN: Do you want to make a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: I will make a motion, an Unlisted Neg Dec.

CHAIRMAN: We have an Unlisted Neg Dec, and Jim reminds me that there was a Federal Environmental Impact Statement when this district was originally proposed.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I second the motion.

CHAIRMAN: We have a second. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

MS. McGOVERN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MS. KOHLER: Excuse me, did Potente oppose?

CHAIRMAN: No opposed. Proposed Cornell Cooperative extension, Suffolk County Farm and Educational Center. This is the Global Village. Is there somebody to represent it?

MR. WILLIAMS: Good morning. Thank you. My name is Tom Williams and I'm the executive director of Cornell Cooperative Extension, and with me is Tom Lyon who is a member of our Suffolk County Farm and Education Advisory Committee. We have applied to the open -- or to the space use committee on the County for the use of this small piece of property. It's .2 acres. It's next to the newly rehabilitated infirmary and the Suffolk County Farm. It is our wish

to use this property to develop a project that we are calling the Global Village, which is an educational program focussed on high school and middle school youths; and it will focus on various issues of food and hunger, peace and diversity, preserving and healing the Earth. It is not currently part of the farm, but it is adjacent to it. We would like to be able to put some trails in this little parcel and to build some impermanent structures that would replicate a small farm or a house that might be a farmer's house in different locations in the world; perhaps in Africa, Thailand, South America. We would then bring the students to the area. They would do work projects both in this little Global Village area and on the farm, and we would provide them with educational opportunities to exchange ideas with each other and look at these global issues. We provided you with a sketch which is a really informal sketch of what it would be. It's really a very minimal impact on this area. And as I said earlier to Mr. Swanson, the Chair, it does not take away any farm land, but it does add to the educational facility of the farm and education center.

CHAIRMAN: How many animals will be on the project?

MR. WILLIAMS: I'm not sure of the numbers. Just to the south of it we do have quite a number of goats and sheep, and there might be some animals rotating through on these farms, but there wouldn't be very many.

CHAIRMAN: So, the animal waste is not going to be an issue?

MR. WILLIAMS: No.

MR. KAUFMAN: There are quite a number of animals in the area. I was there yesterday, and the noise. I think the boys at DPW and Department of Health might want one.

MR. WILLIAMS: E-I-E-I-O, right?

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I have been involved with Mr. Lyon and this project, I think when it was first buzzing around in his brain, and I think this is an incredible addition to the wonderful educational work that's being done by Mr. Lyon, Cornell Cooperative and the farm, and it gives a global view to farming and a great opportunity to our kids in Suffolk County. I looked at this and, well, I'm not a scientist, but it doesn't look like it's any problem, would form any adverse impact on the environment, in my point of view.

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kaufman.

MR. KAUFMAN: Technical question for Richard Martin. Is this in the historic area? Does it have any historic designations?

MR. MARTIN: It's right next to the infirmary, which is the Historic Trust, and also near the barn that's there. So, I'm just looking at the plan now. Is the vegetation here being added or is that existing that we are seeing?

MR. WILLIAMS: There is exiting sort of second growth vegetation there, bitter sweet

multiflora rose. It's kind of a tangle. And that's to the north of an area that's cleared where we do currently we have farm animals.

MR. MARTIN: So, the parking lot we're seeing to the right here of your sketch plan --

MR. WILLIAMS: That's existing.

MR. MARTIN: That's existing, and that would be the west side of the infirmary?

MR. WILLIAMS: Correct.

MR. MARTIN: Okay. So, this, the Expressway then would be just to the north of this area?

MR. WILLIAMS: There is an additional field to the north.

MR. KAUFMAN: The Expressway, Richard, in this particular plan, I believe, is to the bottom of the drawing, if I'm not mistaken.

MR. MARTIN: It would be on the north side, wouldn't it?

MR. WILLIAMS: I have a map of the farm, if you'd like. MR. MARTIN: Yes, if I could, to take a quick look. I'm just trying to see how it relates to the historic features in that location.

MR. WILLIAMS: Do you want me to bring it up there?

CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR. MARTIN: It's good to point out, this is north of where the barn is, north-west of the infirmary in a treated area that would, I would think, not affect the visuals at this location for the historic views from the historic buildings. And it looks like it would be separate from the historic farm used area around the barn, that it's well north of that historic area, which possibly could be viewed in the future as a historic district around the barn and the buildings that you are using.

MR. WILLIAMS: Uh-huh.

MR. KAUFMAN: What it boils down to for me is, it's not in a historic district at this point, and it doesn't look as if it has had historic impact.

MR. MARTIN: No.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: I make a motion Unlisted Neg Dec.

CHAIRMAN: Second.

MR. POTENTE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: I have a motion, second. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Any opposed? (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries. Thank you.

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

MR. KAUFMAN: Thank you very much. I think it will be a great project.

CHAIRMAN: Proposed reconstruction of County Road 67, Long Island Motor Parkway, Wheeler Road.

MR. McMAHON: I would like to present some photographs for the benefit of the council.

CHAIRMAN: With regard to the shelters that you just showed us, can you, when you do your presentation, include how these are maintained with regard to cleanliness and so forth around the County where they already are in place?

MR. McMAHON: The bus shelters are typically maintained by the towns.

CHAIRMAN: They are?

MR. McMAHON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. McMAHON: My name is Paul McMahon. I am an associate civil engineer with the Suffolk County Department of Public Works Highway Division. I am here to represent, actually to address the issues which were brought up at the April meeting for the benefit of Mr. Kaufman who wasn't present at this meeting. This project, Mike, is the reconstruction in traffic safety improvements of Motor Parkway from Exit 55 LIE South Service Road to just east of CR 17, Wheeler Road. It's going to include capacity improvements at the intersections of State Route 11, County Road 17, complete pavement rehabilitation to repair the poor pavement conditions, drainage improvements and installation of bus shelters and other associated infrastructure improvements. The issues that were brought up at the meeting in April were warrants for the project based on traffic capacity needs and accidents. Also brought into question was, is this going to have historical impact. As we know, this portion, this was nominated for inclusion in the historic register. There was a question of are we going to be disturbing some of the original concrete paddles that were constructed many, many years ago. Also, would we be willing to install decorative bus shelters, not the typical aluminum structures that were used in the past. And you also wanted to see a preliminary landscape plan. We also, back in June and May, we submitted the State, you know, the federal aid design approval document, which has all the capacity analysis, the original traffic counts, the accident histories, the soil borings and the pavement cores. All the findings of the report are documented. That was submitted to the

Planning Department. I also prepared a summary which also goes into a little more detail, although it doesn't have all the graphical standards of the report, which was also submitted to the Council back in June. So, what I am going to reiterate is, this project does have a warrant for capacity improvement. Traffic counts were taken in 2003 and projected out over a 20 to 25-year period, and the project will show capacity improvements at the intersections. There will be a slightly level -- there would be a capacity improvement, which will allow for safer operational efficiency.

More importantly, though, there is a high accident experience. Currently this corridor, you know, between the two terminuses of the project experience as an accident rate of 65 percent higher than the state-wide average. The proposed improvement will reduce these counts. One of the other contributing factors, in addition to the capacity problems, is on the poor pavement conditions, particularly when they are wet. We have a lot of wet pavement type of accidents. The pavement is going to be reconstructed to provide a long life asphalt pavement. So, the report details this, but we do have -- we will be providing, you know, an alleviation to the congestion, and also we are going to reduce the accident experience and bring it to below the state-wide average. Furthermore, this project does not adversely affect the historical character of this roadway. We will not be disturbing existing concrete panels. The pavement cores demonstrate this, and two of the cores out of 30 cores that were taken we encountered some concrete subbase which is typically used underneath asphalt pavement, but they were not concrete panels.

I also have a letter from the New York State Office of Parks and Historic Preservation. It states this project does not have any adverse affects to this roadway. In terms of bus shelters, we lately, on some of our requirements contracts, we install more decorative bus shelters, not the traditional aluminum ones. You have some examples there, as Lance had requested, which are, it's like kind of a retro look.

CHAIRMAN: Do you have-- you mentioned that the towns maintain them. Do you have an agreement with the town to maintain them?

MR. McMAHON: We could produce that.

CHAIRMAN: I think it would be good, because bus shelters seem to have a way of becoming very shabby very quickly, and since we are trying to some degree preserve the historic character of this, it would be nice if they were reasonably maintained. How many acres is this total project? I don't think it was supplied.

MR. McMAHON: It's on the original EAF.

CHAIRMAN: Right.

MR. BAGG: If I might request, I think the question is how many acres of any new area would be disturbed, not the existing roadway.

MR. LYON: In terms of additional pavement?

MR. BAGG: How many trees or other things will be removed by the project area.

MR. LYON: It's pretty minimal, Jim. I have to dig it out.

MR. KAUFMAN: By the way, while you are looking, I'm flipping through the plans and there is information in here about replanting evergreens, things like that.

MR. McMAHON: We have a landscape plan, which any disturbed areas typically are going to be restored with native species, which the list will be provided shortly.

MR. KAUFMAN: Nice catch.

CHAIRMAN: The question I think really is, is this greater than ten acres?

MR. McMAHON: No. There will not be greater than ten acres disturbed. Not even close to that. And the plantings are going to be a combination of street plantings and some evergreen plantings and, you know, where they are actually in existence. An example of the plan was provided to you, and of course, it will be finalized once we get the final design.

CHAIRMAN: I have a hard time remembering back to April, though. That's why I am asking. Are there any other questions that we have?

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Have you decided where you will use the different types of bus shelters, or has that decision been made? I see various designs here. I'm kind of --

MR. McMAHON: Those are standard examples. There are some existing bus stops on the roadway where the actual structures will be replaced and upgraded, and then there is also, we of course during final design will be coordinating with the transportation division of DPW for the final placement.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Getting back to the maintenance question, I saw yesterday on 347 that there is a bus shelter where the glass has been shattered. So, you are saying I should contact Brookhaven Town and not DPW?

MR. McMAHON: That's a state road facility. I don't know what their maintenance agreements are.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Okay. So I will contact all three.

MR. McMAHON: Probably the Department of Transportation would be the initial call.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Department of Transportation of Brookhaven Town?

MR. McMAHON: The State of New York Department of Transportation.

CHAIRMAN: What about this one?

MR. McMAHON: Excuse me?

CHAIRMAN: What about this one? Is this still the State?

MR. McMAHON: Those right there are examples of shelters --

CHAIRMAN: When they are constructed who are you going to contact? You are going to contact the town?

MR. McMAHON: Right. Typically with traffic signals, bus shelters, we have agreements after construction is complete, typical maintenance agreements. Sometimes it also applies to recharge basins.

CHAIRMAN: So, there would be a formal agreement between you and the town to maintain --
MR. McMAHON: We have active agreements.

CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. POTENTE: This is Town of Islip Department of Transportation?

MR. McMAHON: Town of Islip Highway Department.

CHAIRMAN: Does anybody ever check that these agreements are being lived up to?

MR. McMAHON: I don't know. If there is complaints, they are forwarded to the appropriate offices. Sometimes we receive -- if we receive complaints from our maintenance department, we would forward it to the appropriate individuals. What their turnaround time is on actually maintaining something or repairing it, I'm not really sure. I haven't been made aware of any major problems with it. After a certain period of time, the structures have to be replaced. There is a certain design life. If they are hit by a vehicle, we would probably have a requirements contract to replace it. We have a standard requirements contract through transportation where we actually choose locations. We provide the design and the construction contracts. So, other than minor maintenance, the responsibility is DPW. Say a structure is severely damaged. It would probably be replaced, during a requirements and needs contract.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Dr. Potente.

MR. POTENTE: I don't know, it's just a thought. You know, if someone's utilizing -- presumably these are going to be utilized.

MR. McMAHON: These bus shelters?

MR. POTENTE: Yes, and in the event there is a problem with it, I wonder how easy is -- I mean Legislator Fisher didn't even know who to contact.

MR McMAHON: The DPW structures a phone number for initial point of contact.

MR. POTENTE: Legislator Fisher would be somebody who would be more aware than an average person, I would think. For an average person, I am just thinking, for the ease of keeping track, it doesn't seem like these are being regularly monitored, which is fine. But in the event it does go into disrepair, an ordinary resident would really be at a loss to know who to even contact. Perhaps it could be – you have right on top, bus info. That's bus information –

MR. McMAHON: Any complaints could also be called to that number. We have a maintenance department which typically handles phone calls on any type of roadway complaint, whether it's a drainage problem, a pot hole, a bus shelter issue. It's all forwarded to our maintenance department.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Let me clarify my question, because I don't want to cast these versions on DPW. What would automatically do would be to call DPW Division of Transportation, and I only asked the question because you said the maintenance was done by the town, but my inclination would be, and I think most people would just call DPW, I would assume.

MR.POTENTE: I'm just saying to make the call. You have the bus information over here. You might also include some sort of indication --

MR. McMAHON: That could be done. We have a phone number on there. We could also have a posting for any complaints or service issues. That could easily be done.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I didn't mean to make them look bad.

MR. POTENTE: No, no, no. I'm just saying to make it easier for someone to know where to have their calls directed, that's all. A little some sort of indication on there.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion Unlisted Neg Dec.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I second that.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion, a second. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries. Thank you very much.

MR. McMAHON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Proposed acquisition of land for open space. Good morning.

MS. FISHER: Good morning. Good morning, Council.

CHAIRMAN: Good morning.

MS. FISHER: Loretta Fisher, Suffolk County Planning Department. The first acquisition on your agenda is an acquisition for a portion of the property known as the Knox School in the Town of Smithtown. It is on and located adjacent to Stony Brook Harbor, and we are acquiring approximately 0.5 acres of a 56.7-acre parcel. The remaining portion of this property is used as a school facility, and this portion of it is an undeveloped area of wooded, and portion of it also has a fresh water with title wetland adjacent to the beach access portion of the property. So, we are acquiring this with funds from the new SOS, save open space, open space component of this program.

CHAIRMAN: There are no plans to develop it?

MS. FISHER: No. It will be a passive recreation park with, you know, a very localized trail down to the water with a very small parking area with gravel type of base. Maybe six to eight parking space capacity at the most.

CHAIRMAN: I recently received notification that the planning council, or whatever it's called, in Suffolk County is under changes to New York Municipal Law getting new powers, expanded powers, and that a village or another municipality will be affected by those new powers. Can you explain how the Village of Nissequogue will be affected by those powers as it relates to this Suffolk County property?

MS. FISHER: I'm not familiar with --

CHAIRMAN: Tom Isles sent it out to village officials.

MS. FISHER: Okay. I would have to go back and talk with Tom. I'm not familiar with the legislation, per se.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. I was just concerned that it was going to maybe take away from some of the authority of the village, you know, if the County has expanded authority within smaller jurisdictions.

MS. FISHER: I'm not --I don't know.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any questions on this piece of property? (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Do I have a motion?

MR. POTENTE: I make a motion Unlisted Neg Dec.

CHAIRMAN: Second?

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I will second it.

CHAIRMAN: Very good. We have a motion and a second. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed.

MR. KAUFMAN: Just mark me down as recused.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Motion carries. Okay, Laretta, thank you. Do you have another one?

MS. FISHER: Yes. The next one is an open space acquisition in the Mastic/Shirley conservation area called the Erb property. There are two parcels owned by this same individual that totals 0.2 acres of property, but again, it's in a very important area of acquisition down on the Mastic peninsula, to include this in our efforts to acquire this low lying wetland area.

CHAIRMAN: Is this on the map that you have of Mastic/Shirley conservation area? Is the waterway just to the east of your map? Is that the Forge River?

MS. FISHER: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do you have any questions on this one?

MR. POTENTE: How much of the land in this immediate vicinity is preserved through the Suffolk County Parks, and how much of it is existing residential area? Rough percentage off the top of your head.

MS. FISHER: In the conservation area, itself?

MR. POTENTE: I see all these lots. Are some of these developed lots?

MS. FISHER: Yes. The ones not outlined in the green are developed lots, and the ones we are not acquiring. The ones in green are the ones proposed for acquisition.

MR. POTENTE: We don't have a map.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: He's looking at a black and white map.

MS. FISHER: That doesn't help. Hold on. Let me get you another map. I'm sorry.

MR. POTENTE: Maybe I have another one. Is this the one? Okay.

MR. KAUFMAN: He's got a color map.

MR. POTENTE: I see the green. Okay, fine. I was looking at the black and white. So the greens are already preserved.

MS. FISHER: Yes. No, they are in the process.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: May I say, Laretta, if I may jump in, because I'm chair of the Environment Committee, we are really making great strides in that Forge River area in land acquisition in order to protect that water shed area. So, I congratulate planning and real estate.

MS. FISHER: Thank you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Just for Dr. Potente's edification, this is listed as a conservation area, and the County has had a longstanding project to try and acquire the small paper parcels that something could be developed if combined with other, some of them might not be developed, but basically the County has had a longstanding project to try and grab a hold of as many of these as they can in order to preserve this area. It's relatively sensitive, and it does need preservation efforts.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I would like to make a motion Unlisted Neg Dec.

CHAIRMAN: I have a motion and a second for Unlisted Neg Dec.

MR. POTENTE: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second is by Dr. Potente. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: The motion carries.

MS. FISHER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Next is the Ralph Capurso property, Town of East Hampton.

MS. FISHER: Yes. This is -- actually, the next five proposed acquisitions on your list are all within the same area, and this is the Montauk Down State Park addition. We're looking to acquire all of these lots, including the ones under the Estate of Ralph Capurso. The entire area includes approximately acres of wetland and associated upland, and this is 3.34 acres of that 7-acre area that we're trying to acquire.

CHAIRMAN: Before you go on, there was not a map with each one of these, but there was this.

MS. FISHER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: So, could you identify for us where we are talking about each time.

MS. FISHER: Sure. Unfortunately, I didn't identify them specifically. I put them all on one map, unfortunately, for you. This acquisition includes five lots within that area. They are interspersed, actually, almost like every other parcel. It's a typical pattern where individuals mass properties and they alter the ownership every other one with other members of the family, and this is an example of that. So, this first group of four lots -- five lots are interspersed throughout that area shown.

CHAIRMAN: The area shown in red?

MS. FISHER: Yes, yes. They are all the ones that we're proposing today are outlined in red.\

MR. KAUFMAN: Just for the counsel's edification, the reason this is done, this interspersment, is if you have properties contiguous to each other owned by the same people, there is a legal doctrine wherein those properties are combined together and become one property and lose their separate status. If you have it owned by separate people; A owns property A and B owns property B and A owns property C; you preserve a separate and equal ownership of the parcels, and they theoretically can be developed. So, that's why you're seeing this sort of staggered pattern in this area and you have different names on there.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a motion on this particular – on these parcels?

MR. KAUFMAN: I will suggest that we do it as a single motion, that being number 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and --

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: No. It's actually 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12. 7 was the Mastic/Shirley.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay. So we won't combine Mastic/Shirley into Montauk. I can't count. In which case, I will make a combined motion that the parcels as enumerated numbers 8 through 2, Unlisted Negative Dec.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?

MR. POTENTE: I second that.

CHAIRMAN: All in favor.(Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

MS. FISHER: I just want to mention, this is a partnership with the Town of East Hampton as an acquisition.

CHAIRMAN: 50/50?

MS. FISHER: 50/50, yes, under the multifaceted land preservation partnership program.

MR. KAUFMAN: Some of those are wetlands as I'm seeing from the map?

MS. FISHER: Yes. Yes. Special water wetlands. It's a very undulating – actually, the Montauk downs name comes from, you know, specific vegetation habitat that's very sensitive out there, maritime habitat.

MR. KAUFMAN: Oh-oh, better be careful, someone might burn it if they are with the nature conservancy.

MS. FISHER: Larry, do you want me to continue?

CHAIRMAN: Go ahead.

MS. FISHER: The next presentation before you is a donation, proposed donation, of property as part of a Suffolk County Department of Health Services transfer of development rights requirement. This has come before you in March of this year and was approved. Unfortunately, there was a connection disclosed with Tom Kramer, and we were requested to bring this back to you to get your approval a second time, hopefully.

MR. KAUFMAN: We reviewed this previously and we found no problem with it.

MS. FISHER: Correct.

CHAIRMAN: Do I have a motion?

MR. KAUFMAN: I make a motion Unlisted Negative Declaration.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I second it.

CHAIRMAN: We have a motion, second. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: Opposed. (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Motion carries.

MS. FISHER: Thank you, very much.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Down to other business, CEQ discussion and recommendation concerning the public hearings records and comments received on the DGEIS for Suffolk County Vector Control. All the people from Vector Control left?

MR. DAWYDIAK: We're here.

CHAIRMAN: Are you going to come forward and speak?

MR. DAWYDIAK: Vector Control?

CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. DAWYDIAK: It was my understanding that we could answer questions if you like, but we weren't planning a presentation.

CHAIRMAN: Mike.

MR. KAUFMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: We don't have a quorum without you.

MR. KAUFMAN: Let the record reflect that I rejoined the group.

CHAIRMAN: We have, thanks to Jim, received a compilation of the comments on the Vector Control that have been received. Clearly, nobody's had a chance to read through this hundred or so pages of material in the last 5 minutes or so. Hopefully, we will have a chance to review it before we have our meeting on Friday, but let me remind you of what we need to do, and this is in the Suffolk County code. The CEQ shall forward DGEIS and all comments on the DGEIS received from the concerned parties together with the record of the hearing, if held, including any written statements accompanied by CEQ's recommendations, if any, to the initiating unit, which, in this case is the legislature, and the County Executive within 30 days. So, we have 30 days following, I think it's July 9th, to get our -- to forward this material.

MR. BAGG: The cut off is the 17th.

CHAIRMAN: The 17th, okay. We have until the 7th of August to get material over to the legislature. We have a meeting scheduled with Vector Control for this Friday at Yaphank, at least the subcommittee will be meeting to talk about the comments, and what we need to do today is decide whether we want to recommend going forward with a final EIS at this time or we could make such a recommendation at our August 9th meeting next month. Because of a scheduling conflict with the legislature, our meeting is a week earlier, so we fit within the time frame of a month to get the -- make our decision on whether final EIS is needed.

MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Chairman, if I might, I participated in the public hearings and I have also participated in a lot of this process. In my opinion, we can't Neg Dec this. We have to go to an FEIS on all of this. We have to respond to the comments that have been received, both by the agencies, the packet that we received today, and also the public comments. So, it's very clear to me that we will have to go to an FEIS stage, get -- what's the right word? And basically have the County respond to the comments and change the plan, if necessary, or make more clear what is going on inside the plan in order to deal with the issues that have been raised. If there is not a technical problem with it, I suggest we wait until August 9th before the actual vote. I would like to read the comments and see what we have on there just to make sure. That's my own personal opinion.

CHAIRMAN: Anyone else have an opinion?

MR. POTENTE: I would like to read through the comments.

CHAIRMAN: So, Vivian, do you have any reason why you want to move this forward before August?

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: No. I need time to read this before -- there are a mix of comments here, so I would like to have the time to look at it carefully.

CHAIRMAN: So, we won't take any action today on whether we go ahead with the FEIS, but I think you could probably assume that is based on the comments and the public hearing and some of the formal review comments that you have gotten, as well, that we will probably go ahead with developing your final environmental impact statement. Do you want to comment on, given that process?

MR. DAWYDIAK: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to state that we budgeted and planned for an FEIS. There has been major improvements and the refinements between the September draft and the May draft of the plan. It's a dynamic process. We hope to continue to refine it, and we have every expectation that FEIS will be prepared.

CHAIRMAN: I know we have our meeting scheduled on Friday, but just to give you a heads up and talking to people, that I think some of the issues that still will need further resolution involve the 15 acres, the nuisance control versus public health issue and whatever you want to call it, the concerns that people have raised. So, those are at least three things that I think we will need to discuss in some detail. Any other comments from the Board? (No response from the Board members.)

CHAIRMAN: Anybody in the audience that would like to comment on this? Oh, my goodness.

MR. ATKINSON: I am Matthew Atkinson with Peconic Baykeeper. I have no comment on the substance of this, but I would like to have these comments that have been submitted to the CEQ be made available to the public somehow. I don't know how you might want to work that.

CHAIRMAN: Jim, will they be posted? Essentially they will be put -- they have to be, I think, in the final EIS, which you know everybody will have an opportunity to review, but whether they will be before that or not, I don't know. Do you know?

MR. BAGG: Basically, we will probably put the testimony to public hearings, once we receive the transcripts, on the Planning Department internet site under the CEQ. The other comments, as mentioned, have to be part of the FGEIS and responded to. We are still waiting to go through, you know, the comments, but I assume we could make them available to, you know, various individuals once we completed, you know, they have been duly received and noted. You know, we could provide, you know, provide -- they are not going to be available to everyone and his brother.

MR. ATKINSON: I understand that. If they were simply available as like a library at your offices, for example, I could look in the conference room.\

MR. BAGG: That is no problem. As a County entity, the CEQ, our records are public records and anybody could come in and review the file. We don't have any problem with that.

MR. ATKINSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Any other comments? David, you don't have any comments? I'm shocked. Okay, so, we will see you all in Yaphank on Friday at the old infirmary, right? Is that where we're meeting?

MR. DAWYDIAK: I get my schedule in the morning and go where I'm told. I'm sorry, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN: That's the way I do it.

MR. DAWYDIAK: I thought we were coming your way, but I will be happy to meet in our office, whatever is most convenient to you.

CHAIRMAN: I have on mine it's in Yaphank. I just want to make sure I go to the right building.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Do you have enough space? I thought you were going to invite the new members of CEQ.

CHAIRMAN: I am.

MR. DAWYDIAK: So we could have, theoretically, as many as 15 people. Do we have 15 spaces at Yaphank.

MR. NINIVAGGI: The Board of Review room would be fine. I will confirm it is available if we're going to have that many.

CHAIRMAN: I don't think you will get 15, because our other proposed new members don't know that we have made the offer to have them come and listen.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: But I think some of them might be interested.

CHAIRMAN: Can we contact them, our proposed new members?

MR. BAGG: Yes. We will try to send something out. Hopefully, we are going to receive the resolutions that the duly appointed members -- we'll try to get something out to them.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: They were all voted out of the legislature, but we need to hear from Albany, don't we?

MR. BAGG: I believe that there is an oath of office that has to be received and logged in by the legislature, but we haven't been notified that that has been completed. So, as soon as we will, then we will notify the various members.

CHAIRMAN: I just wanted to invite them so that this might be an easier way to come up to speed and they could get the 500 pounds of paper and read it.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Larry, are we meeting at 9:00 or 9:30?

CHAIRMAN: 10:00.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Even better.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you, gentlemen.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN: If we could confirm room and so forth that would -- and send an E-mail.

MR. DAWYDIAK: I will E-mail both you and Jim as soon as I get back to the office. It would either be our Board of Review room or possibly Dominick's commissioner room if it's available.

CHAIRMAN: And Jim, you will notify our perspective new members?

MR. BAGG: Yes, most definitely. We will give them a call.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. BAGG: Enrico is already here.

CHAIRMAN: All right. Historic services. We save the best for last, as always.

MR. MARTIN: The Historic Trust Committee met out at Theodore Roosevelt County Park to take a look at the restoration that's now in progress on third house, and it went through all the theories of the restoration process that came to the point of restoring it actually to the dude ranch time period of 1939, and we walked through the sites so everyone could take a look and ask questions. The committee also was given an update on the progress of the Montauk Observatory, which has already been approved by the County legislature, to be at Theodore Roosevelt County Park, but the initial site that they did bring to the CEQ, they are now telling us will not work for their needs. So they will have to come back to the CEQ with a new proposal and a new site within the park lands, and the committee –

CHAIRMAN: Why wouldn't it work?

MR. MARTIN: They said the site lines wouldn't be tall enough to go past the roof lines and the trees that were at that location, which they had not, you know, taken a serious look at that before. I think they are very eager, to be honest, to open up the observatory. And the information was apparent to the committee, also. I don't have a full study done on what the exact needs are for the location of the observatory, and that became obvious to the committee. So, they did ask to please go back and come back with a more broad study of the park and where they would think the best location would be. So they will be preparing that and the full plans and site will have to come back here to the CEQ at this point for review and approval, and the next meeting has not been scheduled at this point. Probably will be in September.

CHAIRMAN: Okay. That's all?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I have a question regarding the Interpretive Center at the Scully property, because it's come to my attention that, because the progress is going so slowly and because there is no -- there are no eyes on the property, in other words there is no one living there, because the caretaker's --

MR. MARTIN: The caretakers --

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: -- cottage isn't complete.

MR. MARTIN: Well, the caretakers that have been there under the Autobahn Society --

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Yes, are no longer there.

MR. MARTIN: -- did not stay through the closing of the County. They were asked to move actually by the Autobahn Society before the closing.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I understand that there has been some vandalism on the property, that the leaded glass windows on the first floor have been destroyed and that there is graffiti.

MR. MARTIN: Yes. There has been extensive damage to the leaded glass windows that will now have to be repaired, and some graffiti on the court yard garden wall.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: What would the estimated cost of doing the repairs be?

MR. MARTIN: I'm estimating now with the damage done there is approximately \$50,000.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Okay, and it would seem to me, and I know this had come before the legislature as kind of a scandal a couple of years ago, that people were receiving below market rental price to live on properties. But it would seem that we should have a presence there to keep an eye on this property. Is there any way that we could get someone who might be employed by parks to live in the caretaker's cottage or have somebody there? It would seem a disgrace to lose tens of thousands of dollars, and I understand we are going to be running short of money before the project is completed, because it's only \$1.2 million for the Interpretive Center.

MR. MARTIN: Yes. I agree with you completely that we should have someone on site and should have had someone there really at closing. The architect, Peter Caradonna, that is working on the Interpretive Center is now doing the plans for the apartment that was set as the priority to get the apartment on line, to bring the water, whatever is needed to get that apartment done and to get somebody to move into that. So, the department and the architect are working together to get that done as soon as possible. And the budget that the funds from the Greenways program that has been appropriated to that site is actually \$2 million.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: I know there was a two. I just put it at the wrong side of the decimal, I guess, the comma.

MR. MARTIN: We are working very closely with the architect now. We have been told that we need to expend all of those funds by the end of the year. We were hoping that if we had started contracts we could extend the work into 2007, but we were told no, that we have to expend all those funds within 2006. So, we are working –

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Feverishly, I guess.

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: But why would there be that restriction when that was by referendum that that money was set aside for an Interpretive Center? That wasn't based on a budgetary decision this year.

MR. MARTIN: I am just told that they gave 2006 as that deadline, and that's been a legal opinion I guess handed down. We don't have the directives to the Parks Department at this point.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Thank you, Rich.

MR. MARTIN: Just to follow up a bit with Ms. Fisher's concerns, we have boarded up the building, the majority of the first floor and second floor, to protect the leaded glass windows, and we are now working on creating storm windows made out of lexium, which is strong Plexiglass that we can put up to provide light, and those will remain through the use of the window.

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Thank you. I am glad there is some mitigation being done there.

CHAIRMAN: Mike.

MR. KAUFMAN: Rich, two questions. One, deep wells, status regarding the friends group that was trying to form in the area; what's going on?

MR. MARTIN: The Deep Wells Farm Historical Society is still working on getting their paperwork registered with the State, the non-profit 501C3 non-profit, that is still going forward, and we're also working with them, the parks department with the County is to work on their contract with the County at the same time. Usually we wait until they get their status first, but we realize both will take a certain amount of time. So we are working on both at the same time.

MR. KAUFMAN: So, something is at least happening with that?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. And the organization now is, just by our regular permit process, sponsoring events at that site. They just had a movie night that just actually got rained out, and a concert this past Friday, and that we are doing just through our regular permit process that they provide the insurance for those specific events. So, we are allowing them to go forward with

some of their programming on site.

CHAIRMAN: Before you leave that, I'm not familiar with the Friends of Deep Wells or whatever you call it. Who's doing it?

MR. MARTIN: The name of the group is going to be actually the Deep Wells Farm Historical Society, and it's from local community members. A lot of the members are from the St. James Chamber of Commerce, actually, that is very interested in that property, but it will be a completely new and separate organization from the Chamber of Commerce.

MR. KAUFMAN: Who is the president?

MR. MARTIN: Scott Posner is the president, and he's from St. James.

MR. KAUFMAN: Are the Halls involved with this at all?

MR. MARTIN: Oh, yes. Gordon Hall is the vice-president. The organization that has initially started up was from the volunteers that we had at the site that helped with the County programming there, and the Chamber wanted to work with them. So, they actually joined forces, and the title of the group now is, like I said, the Historical Society, but they are both working together.

MR. KAUFMAN: You realize Larry and my interest in this particular property?

MR. MARTIN: Sure.

MR. KAUFMAN: One other thing, with the Blydenberg Mill Dam, has anything gone forward? Are the plans finally drawn?

MR. MARTIN: We do have a DEC permit in place, and we are working with a public works and an engineer that they brought in. The plans have been created actually just for the drainage, which we need to do that so they could study the building and come up with the recommendations. That drainage has not occurred yet, but it should soon.

MR. KAUFMAN: But the repairs to the dam itself, anything, you know, the thing that got washed out?

MR. MARTIN: No, that has not been completed yet. The dam, itself, at that location had some bricks that were, you know, washed away from the interior, but the dam itself is secure. What happened was the scoured, the piers of the mill, that's where the real damage is to the foundation of the mill, itself, not as much to the dam.

MR. KAUFMAN: And that's basically not been repaired at this point in time?

MR. MARTIN: No, it hasn't.

MR. KAUFMAN: Okay.

CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Richard. I think that completes the agenda. Do we have a motion to adjourn?

MR. KAUFMAN: Motion to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?

MS. VILORIA-FISHER: Second.

CHAIRMAN: Second. All in favor. (Board members respond.)

CHAIRMAN: No objections. I guess we're adjourned. Thank you. August 9th is our next get-together.

-oOo-

(Time noted: 11:28 a.m.)

I N D E X

DESCRIPTION PAGE

Ratification of Staff Recommendation For Legislative Resolutions Laid on The Table -
June 27, 2006 4

Proposed Upgrading of Electric Service And Repairs to Dock Located at the LI Maritime
Museum at Charles R. Dominy County Park, W. Sayville, Town of Islip 4

Proposed Restoration of Sagtikos Manor, Sagtikos Manor County Park, West Bay Shore, Town
of Islip 5

Proposed Public Health and Safety Improvements Fence on CR 67, Motor Parkway from
Redleaf Lane to Melwood Drive, CP #5559, Town of Smithtown 7

Proposed Sewer District #3 - Southwest Sewer Construction, Town of Islip 17

Proposed Cornell Cooperative Extension, Suffolk County Farm and Education Center - Global
Village, Yaphank, Town of Brookhaven 19

Proposed Reconstruction of CR 67, LI Motor Pkwy., from I-495, LIE(ex.55) to CR 17, Wheeler
Rd., CP #5172, PhIv, Town of Islip. Tabled at April, 2006 Meeting 22

Proposed Acquisition of Land for Open Space Preservation Purposes Known as the Knox School
Property in the Town of Smithtown 26

Proposed Acquisition of Land for Open Space Preservation Purposes Known as the Mastic/
Shirley Conservation Area Addition - Erb Property in the Town of Brookhaven 28

Proposed Acquisition of Land for Open Space preservation Purposed Known as the Montauk
Downs State Park Addition
- Estate of Ralph Capurso Property in the Town of East Hampton
- Burke Property in the Town of East Hampton
- Ralph Capurso Jr. Property in the Town of East Hampton
- Ralph Capurso/Eileen Schutt Property in the Town of East Hampton
- Estate of Edna Capurso Property in the Town of East Hampton 29

Proposed Donation of Property to SC Parks for SCDHS Transfer of Development Right
Requirement - File #R02-03-0866 and 0867, Town of Brookhaven 31

CEQ discussion and recommendation concerning the pubic hearings records and comments
received on DGEIS for the Suffolk County Vector Control and Wetlands Management
Long Term Plan 31

Historic Services - Director's Report 35

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, JOANN BUNZE, a Stenotype Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of New York, do hereby certify: That the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of my stenographic notes. In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this 2nd day of August 2006.

JOANN BUNZE