

**ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING & AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE**  
**OF THE**  
**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**  
**MINUTES**

A meeting of the Environment, Planning & Agriculture Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on September 5, 2014.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Leg. Kara Hahn, Chairperson  
Leg. Al Krupski, Vice Chair  
Leg. Sarah S. Anker  
Leg. Thomas F. Barraga  
Leg. Thomas Muratore

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Presiding Officer Legislator DuWayne Gregory  
George M. Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature  
Lora Gellerstein, Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
Tom Vaughn, County Executive's Office  
Laura Halloran, Budget Review Office  
Sarah Lansdale, Director/Department of Planning  
Lauretta Fischer, Department of Planning  
Frank P. Castelli, Economic Development & Planning  
Walter Dawydiak, Director/Environmental Quality, Health Department  
Boris Rukovets, Department of Public Works  
Dorian Dale, Economic Development  
Michael Pitcher, Aide to Presiding Officer  
Amy Ellis, Aide to Leg. Anker  
Ali Nazir, Aide to Leg. Kennedy  
Brendan Chamberlain, Aide to Leg. Muratore  
Alyssa Turano, Aide to Leg. Hahn  
Gwynn Schroeder, Aide to Leg. Krupski  
Eva Greguski, Aide to Leg. Calarco  
Sam Kramer, Appointee/SC Planning  
Michael Kaufman, CEQ  
Kimberly Quarty, Peconic Land Trust  
Dominick Ninivaggi, Vector Control  
Camilo Salazar, Environmental Analyst  
Polly L. Weigand, Soil and Water Conservation District  
Gil Anderson, Commissioner/Department of Public Works  
And all other interested parties

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

**THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 10:08 AM**

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

All right, welcome everyone to the Legislature's Environment, Planning and Agriculture Committee. Can we please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Anker.

**SALUTATION**

**PUBLIC PORTION**

So we have -- Summer's almost over. We have one speaker, Kimberly Quarty. Hopefully I said that right. Hello.

**MS. QUARTY:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

You have three minutes. I'm going to start the timer if I can find the remote-control. Bear with us. Just make sure when you speak, that the microphone has the green light on. You can go ahead.

**MS. QUARTY:**

Good morning. I'm Kim Quarty with Peconic Land Trust. And I'm here today to address the proposed acquisition of the farmland development rights on a portion the Brush parcel in Riverhead noted as Suffolk County tax map number 600.44.2.10.4. And I'm just here to remind you of the significance of this preservation and answer any questions you might have.

This subject parcel is located in the heart of Riverhead's farm belt along Route 105 and Sound Avenue, which is becoming endangered with urban sprawl. It's -- if you're familiar with the area, it's a -- it has a beautiful open view shed. It also contains prime ag soils. It's immediately adjacent to another 55-acre parcel that was preserved by the County in 2012. And preserving this farm parcel would satisfy the goals of the Suffolk County's Agriculture and Farmland Protection Plan by preserving agriculture as an industry in the County. Thank you. Any questions?

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Does anyone have any questions? Not at this time. Thank you so very much.

**MS. QUARTY:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Are there any other speakers who would like to speak during the Public Portion? Seeing none, we will close the Public Portion. Figure how to turn off the timer.

**PRESENTATIONS**

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Today we have a presentation on the agenda. Representatives of the Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District will offer a presentation on the agency's 50 years of service to Suffolk County and highlight key accomplishments and programs. Do we have representatives on the Soil -- oh, I'm sorry. I'm looking out into the --

**MS. WEIGAND:**

Can you guys hear me? Is this working?

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

As long as that little green light is on and you're speaking into the mike, keep it close to you.

**MS. WEIGAND:**

I don't know -- I just -- okay, I can hear myself now.

Thank you for having me today. For those that don't know me, I am Polly Weigand. I'm the Senior Soil District Technician for Suffolk County Soil and Water where I've worked for the last 11 years. But I wanted to say thank you for having us here. This is our 50th anniversary this year since our establishment as a Soil and Water District in the State and in the County. It was established in 1964. And in that time, we have advanced numerous different practices for the benefit of soil and water and natural resources across Suffolk County.

We were founded in the the Dust Bowl of the 1930s. I think that these pictures will demonstrate the environmental issues with converting farmland or -- converting land into farmland and then not protecting it from the natural resources. When the grasslands were turned over, they -- there was not the resources to reseed them with cover crops. And so when the winds blew across the great plains, it blue extensive amounts of soil all the way to New York City. And you can see what's left in the upper right hand corner of some wagons of the amount of deposition of soil. And in response President Roosevelt in 1937 established the ability for local governments to establish Soil and Water Conservation Districts locally within their State.

And four years -- or three years later New York State responded creating the Soil and Water District Law in which we govern our activities. And in 1964 Suffolk County Legislature at the time declared Suffolk County as a Soil and Water Conservation District founding our organization an agency.

So there's now a Soil and Water District in every county in New York State. New York City collectively covers the five boroughs. And we're all governed under the State Soil and Water Conservation District Law Chapter 9-B of the consolidated laws. And under the declaration of policy, we're provided with our mission and guidance to preserve the soil and water resources of the County and also to utilize those resources to enhance the quality of life. So it provides not only the preservation guidance, but also the utilitarian goals of utilizing -- but also preserving those resources at the same time. So it's not just preservation-based.

We're a staff of five. We have a District Manager, a Principal Account Clerk, myself a Senior Soil District Technician as well as two Soil District Technicians currently. We have one vacancy due to promotion; recent promotion. And then in the last three -- or 11 years since I've been there, we have unfortunately had three positions that have been abolished due to State and County funding.

The activities that we advance under our guidance and mission is to provide technical service for landowners, municipalities, agencies, non-profits; pretty much anyone that's looking for assistance for managing their natural resources. And in that capacity we'll review site plans and designs. We'll also help design different protocols and best management practices. And we also review policy and provide guidance on that.

With our focus predominantly -- is on agriculture. About 60% of our time is focussed on ag. And then we also focus on non-point source pollution, sediment erosion control, drainage and flood plain issues as well as helping to preserve habitat and open space. And we're very successful in our own capacity, but our efforts are widely -- much more accomplished with our partnering organizations and agencies and our collective knowledge.

This is --the examples that I put up on the slide are just an abbreviated list of our various

partnerships locally and federally and the State. But our closest working relationship is with the US Department of Agriculture's Natural Resource Conservation Service. They have a cooperative working agreement, not just with us but with all districts throughout the United States that facilitates the NRCS, which is the only Federal agency to be able to collectively work on private lands. So they're able to lawfully come onto a private landowner's property and help administer conservation planning.

The return to the districts is that we're able to utilize their standards and specifications for engineering both for agronomic practices as well as more of the soft practices; so the agronomic and the engineering practices. We also can help administer the cost share programs that are developed through the Farm Bill Program. And then we're also provided with the financial reimbursement for our services in helping to implement that programming.

We're funded also in part through the County and as well as the extensive grant writing that our office does. This is a list of the various grants that we have received and/or helped administer. And in the last five years, we brought over -- in over \$2 million worth of grant funding to help advance our programming.

I'm going to move forward here with just highlighting some of the particular practices in dealing with resource concerns with agriculture. We address conservation planning through utilizing the Agricultural Environmental Management Program, which is a state-facilitated and supported program that has a list -- different -- a list and questionnaires that we ask farmers based upon the various commodities that they're growing. And because the State is so variable in our diversity in farming, especially on Long Island, Suffolk County took the lead in creating a majority of these commodity-based workshops for our use on Long Island. Extensively the rest of New York is productively a commodity crops and dairy. So they had limited need for some of the vegetable and greenhouse and viticulture programming that we do down here.

So what we do is we go onto a farm and we -- we -- we'll walk through the farm with the farmer and the farm manager and we'll do the agricultural work sheets, evaluate their stewardship practices. And that helps us understand what activities they're doing, what their goals are and their principles. And also that helps us inform them of the excellent stewardship activities that they're already advancing but then help us guide recommended practices where they can improve their stewardship.

So we put together the Conservation Plan with all the recommended practices. That drives the ability for us to enroll them in cost-share programs, which is very important, especially with increase in cost of farming on Long Island. And then we -- we'll move forward, if they're interested and/or receive cost-share funding to do all of the engineering and agronomic designs and oversight and installation. We don't actually install anything for them, but we make sure that they're doing the installation to our specifications so that it operates correctly. And then we follow-up with them in the operation and maintenance.

The whole program is voluntary. It's confidential. None of this information can be FOIL'd by law. And it's nonregulatory. And I think that's one of the most important components. Because we want the farmers to come to us to help them with their resource and their management. And if they're not in compliance with the State or Federal or County laws, we're not going to turn them in or report them for that. We are there to help them improve their activities and come into compliance. If we were a regulatory, they would not come to our office and utilize our services.

Some of the cost-share funding that we have helped administer is through the Environmental Quality Incentive Programs, the NRCS. This is funded through the Farm Bill. In the last four years, we brought in over a million dollars that benefits Suffolk County alone for various agronomic practices including cover cropping, which you can see in the upper right-hand corner, the mass gully erosion

that occurred. I do not know the farm that this was on, but even though we have some wet flat drain on Long Island that does that exempt us from having problems with water erosion. And I think this photo well illustrates that.

So in the Environmental Quality Incentive Programs that provides the funding for an expensive project such as remediating this erosion control through the installation of grass swale, terracing, cover cropping and also addressing the point sources that contributed to this above where the erosion occurred to mitigate -- to remediate any potential situations in the future.

The Agricultural Management Assistance Program brought in almost \$129,000. And that was specifically for farmers in the northeast. Long Island benefitted well from this program because it was specifically targeted for drip irrigation systems and high tunnels. On Long Island we have such droughty soils that irrigation is necessary, especially in our vegetable production and nursery production. And the drip irrigation systems help improve the crop production reducing diseases, reducing erosion. When you convert from a big gun that throws out 400 gallons a minute of water at high velocities, you can damage your crops, you can -- the soils are highly erodible and can be eroded by that. So converting to micro-sprinkler, underground mains and drip irrigation very much benefits not only the soil quality, but our air quality by increasing efficiencies in that capacity.

And air quality should not be undervalued especially with our propensity for our ocean environments. Higher amounts of acidification of our marine waters is causing detriment to our mollusks by eroding the calcium from their shells and -- but improving your sprinkler -- your irrigation system reduces the amount of time that you have to use your diesel engine to irrigate. So that helps improve air quality.

And then high tunnels improve crop production by extending the yield, improving the plant's health, reducing the amount of amendments, such as nitrogen, which we all recognize as a critical concern with our groundwaters.

The Ag. Fuel Tank Replacement Program is a program that we have administrated almost a million dollars worth in the last five years benefitting 126 farms. There's 207 tanks installed converting many outdated single-wall rusty tanks. The farmers that have these tanks are not currently in compliance with Suffolk County's law for containing fuel oil. And we are able to protect the groundwater from any accidental spills or failures by installing double-wall tanks on reinforced concrete pads that have the crash poles. Not only does that protect against the tank failure, but it also protects against unexpected operator -- tractor and car incidents, which I've run into one of those poles at the gas station. So they're really important.

The Farmland Protection Program was benefitted this year on Long Island. We were able to get over \$2 million for the installation and repair of dikes on the north -- on the south -- excuse me -- on the south shore of the north fork for extensive farmland both in Cutchogue and in Orient to protect the farms so they can continue to operate with their close proximity to the Bay. Even with the conservation practices the Hurricane damaged those dikes. So the money went through this program to repair those dikes. And this is an example of one of the new installations that just occurred, I believe, last week.

One of our established programs is the Ag Chemical Fixing Facility Grant that's funded through New York State DEC Pesticide Violations. Anyone that has a violation, that money that they are required to pay goes into the fund that the District holds. To date there's been almost \$700,000 dedicated into that fund to install these mixing facilities, which is an impermeable surface and containment unit that a grower can back their sprayer onto and mix their pesticides. If there is any sort of accidental leak from the mixing or equipment failure, this impermeable surface contains any of those drips or spills helping to protect our groundwater from pesticide loading.

We shifted focus a little bit two years ago to also address the impacts of air quality and the amount of waste that was going to our solid waste facilities by instigating the Agriculture and Marine Plastics Recycling Program. This is a picture of our big foot plastics baler, essentially a large cardboard crusher fitted with a plastics hopper that we drive along the side of high tunnel. The growers in the nursery industry especially utilize this plastic high tunnel cover to protect their stock over Winter. And then in the Spring they cut it off and generally send it to Consolidated Waste Management Facility.

So through our use of this equipment we're able to bail it into manageable sizes and send it to a recycler that converts it into all sorts of different things including some of those recycled bags that you get at the grocery bag. We're looking to move into pot and pots that are being -- that need to be recycled as well and drip, tape and sediment erosion control fabric. There's many other applications that we can do. But in our two years we've been able to keep 80,000 pounds of this material out of the waste stream.

And the last highlight is the Deer Fencing Grant. I know that it has had a little bit of sensitivity in the community, but it was to benefit the farmers who were being decimated by the deer browse on their farms. And our efforts are to advance pest management. And in that capacity a deer or a pest. And this was a non-harmful way in which to protect the farms livelihood through the erection of deer fencing. And so almost a million dollars was allocated for that project through the assistance of Senator LaValle.

The rest of the presentation I wanted to highlights some of the activities that we do for the agencies and the general public. It's not as much directed at agriculture but it does at times involve agriculture. So we're extensively involved with this Town of Southold's Zoning Board of Appeals. Anytime that they have an appeal for development that is on the coast or the shoreline, then we will go and review that site for any environmental or natural resource concerns and make our recommendations for what can be done with that site as far as improvements to help mitigate any natural resource concerns. And that's very important because a lot of these developments or additions to houses are on the bluffs. And we want to minimize the amount of economic and ecological damage with those installations and expansions.

I personally have worked with the Town of Huntington extensively for a lot of erosion control, especially with houses going in on some of their hillsides where they de-vegetate the upper part of the hillside and then cause an unexpected erosion issue as well as helping them advance some habitat restoration in their natural areas. We work also a lot with the Town of Southampton and East Hampton and the Town of Brookhaven as well.

The Phase II Stormwater Regulations that were developed and advanced in the last five years, which are enforced by the DEC, we don't have a regulatory action with that, but we do help with the education and oversight. We do -- we at one point were inspecting construction sites to make sure that they were in compliance, but that has ceased to occur with lack of funding from the State. But we do continue to advance the sediment and erosion control, trainings for contractors who are required. Anyone that's doing any sort of land disturbance more than one acre is required to have a contractor on-site that has had the training from our office.

As far as trying to identify point sources of pollution, it's very important to delineate your watershed, especially in our urban inner face every time we do a development that interrupts our watershed from its historical direction. So we've worked with the Town of Islip to develop a drainage and flood control plants through mapping their watershed areas.

And then we further advanced sediment and erosion control for homeowners. Like I was suggesting

earlier that I would go out to the Town of Huntington and evaluate some of their sites for sediment and erosion control and recommend the appropriate plantings to mitigate those situations.

As far as habitat restoration is concerned, we're focused extensively on grassland restoration, a lot of which the County owns extensive grasslands; but also recreating ones on farmlands and marginal farmlands; with over 600 acres have been preserved through restorations on 12 properties. And Pine Meadows County Park was one of the benefits of those restorations.

We also serve on the Long Island Inner Agency Fire Crew. We're doing prescribed burning on State lands to help reduce the fire load and also administer habitat restoration to the grasslands and Pine Barrens.

Going hand in hand with habitat restoration is mitigating the effects of invasive species. Our office has served on the Suffolk County Task Force; and then what became the Suffolk County Advisory Committee. I also serve on the State Advisory Committee that blended to the new law that was -- is being put on the State docket on September 10th, as well as sitting on the Scientific Review Committee that did 63 rankings of invasive species that resulted in their banning in Suffolk County.

When you advance habitat restoration, the most ecologically appropriate and genetically appropriate way to do that is to restore with genetically native plant material. In that capacity the District instigated and catalyzed the Long Island Native Grass Initiative, which is now the Long Island Native Plant Initiative, which was a cooperative group of over 30 agencies at the time. It was a loose working group to propagate Little Bluestem and Bluestem, Indian and Switch Grass. And that was to use that plant material directly in our grassland restorations on farmlands. That program has been exceedingly successful and has now become a non-profit organization that is continuing to advance {ecotific} plant production, not just limited to grasses but to forbs and woody species for shoreline and habitat restoration.

And then our educational components that we advance are critically important as well. We host the Long Island Regional Envirothon. It's an educational competition for high school students. And I myself competed when I was in high school. I grew up in Lewis County. I competed at the State level. These competitions are held locally by County. If you win the County, you go to the State. The winners of the State go to the National Competition. And I competed in high school. And to me that shows -- demonstrates the importance of educating your youth to advance environmental and ecological policy in education as a profession. But this competition is as large as the State competition with the number of high schools that are enrolled in our program that we host every April.

These are just examples of educational programming that we have offered this year with the exception of the Native Plant Symposium, which was offered in the Fall of last year. And these are both offered to the general public and also focal groups such as agriculture.

So going back to the grant funding resources of over \$2 million, I just wanted to wrap up that for every dollar that the Suffolk County invests in the Soil and Water District, you get a four to six percent return -- or six times that amount of return depending on the yearly grants that we're able to secure.

So that's all I have. I hope that you received our invitation to join us at our 50th anniversary celebration on September 18th. We have demonstrations of the ag baler as well as our rain gardens and a whole bunch of other information that we'll have. So I hope you'll be able to stop by if you're free.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Thank you so very much. Does anyone have any questions? Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I just wanted to thank you, Polly, for all the work that you've been doing. And Paul and -- the whole gang there at Soil and Water. Legislator Krupski and I are both on the Soil and Water Conservation District Committee. And, you know, I learned something today. And, again, there's just so much more to learn about what you do.

I have a very big problem with soil erosion. And when I contacted you about that, it's sort of like sitting here listening to all the information you have. You have so much information. And you're such a wonderful resource; you as a person, but also the entire Conservation District Program. So, again, I want to thank you. And you have my support -- our support because you are one of the biggest bangs for the buck as far as the investment into the Soil and Water Conservation. So thank you.

**MS. WEIGAND:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Anyone else? Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Just keep up the good work, Polly. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Thank you, Polly. Oh, and Polly happened to mention there was a slide in there with outdoor oil and heating tanks and the securing of them and replacing of them. And it reminds me of an announcement that I have to make: At the Health Committee on Thursday October 2nd at two PM, they're going to have a presentation about the changes to the NFPA 31 National Fire Protection Association Rule 31 and securing outdoor oil heating tanks in residential homes. And so there will be a presentation -- the members of this Committee are invited to attend the Health Committee to hear that presentation on October 2nd at two PM. In the wake of Superstorm Sandy, there were oil tanks that came lose with the flooding and floated away and caused both health hazards as well as environmental hazards. And so I'm sure if you're interested, that there'll be that presentation on October 2nd.

Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Those are -- and I spoke to after -- this is like a year ago, I spoke to someone in the Oil and Heat Institute in the business; and also someone from the Health Department. These are going to be rules that are going to be promulgated from our own Health Department and will be rules or law -- how is this -- how is this going to go forward?

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

So our Charter -- well, what is it? Health Code 12 -- Sanitary Code 12 relies on the NFPA standards. So when the NFPA standards change, our Health -- Department of Health and the Health Bureau -- Board of Health, sorry. I'm not on the Health Committee. And the Board of Health adopts the changes that were made so that they do become part of our own rules. It's almost sort of automatic but it does require action by the Board of Health, not the Legislature.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

If you need more information on that, you can talk to Doc and/or Dr. Tomarken. Any other questions? Okay.

Now, Director Lansdale, I know that you wanted to speak and bring forward individuals to update us about Reclaim Our Water Initiative. Come on down.

Thank you, Polly.

Hello, hello.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

So thank you so much for letting us briefly present. I promise this will be a short presentation even though we have four speakers. I'd like to just kick it off and provide a brief presentation and an update on the County's Reclaim Our Water Initiative since the last time we came before the EPA Committee to talk about our septic tour -- multistate septic tour.

So building off of that, I just wanted to report that Suffolk County participated in the IBM Smarter Cities Challenge. We were one of four places in the United State, one of 16 world-wide chosen to be part of this year's 2014 Smarter Cities Challenge. We're looking forward to the report which will be finalized in the coming weeks. So I'd be happy to share that with you.

The focus of the IBM Smarter Cities Challenge was looking at reducing nitrogen in our surface and groundwaters. And they engaged -- over the course of three weeks they engaged over 90 stakeholders and many of you here today in the room in their deliberations. So I appreciate all of your dedication and investment of your time in working with the IBM professionals.

Also wanted to update you on our film contest that is coming up, which is the Crap Shoot Film Contest. It's in partnership with the Environmental Protection Agencies, Septic Smart Week, which is a national week dedicated to the education of homeowners and industry professionals about septic systems. And that's the week of September 22nd. We're looking for film entries that are -- would be due September 15th; anywhere from 30 seconds to two minutes to be considered as part of this film contest. And I would appreciate your help in helping us spread the word about this important contest. We've already received a number of worthy film submissions and we're looking for some more.

I'm going to turn it over to Dorian to talk about some of our wetlands restoration efforts.

**MR. DALE:**

You should also know as per that last point that we as a component of this are running the ALS Ice Water Bucket Challenge. So if anybody's interested in volunteering?

**P.O. GREGORY:**

You first.

**(LAUGHTER)**

**MR. DALE:**

I figured that would be the way it would roll here.

Very quickly. I'm sure that you've been privy to the really good news that we've received several grant awards for wetlands restoration, the most prominent of which came out of the Department of

Interior National Wildlife and Federation Foundation for \$1.31 million to initiate a variety of wetland restoration projects. That's a collaboration of the Department of Economic Development and Planning and the Department of Public Works. The leads in the respective departments have been Dominick Ninivaggi, who has led a -- already a proven integrated marsh management program that has been realizing great success out of Wertheim, the Wertheim Reserve. And Frank Castilli and Camilo -- Camilo's last name again exactly -- Salazar -- sorry about that Camilo -- in Planning.

And in addition yesterday we had a discussion about hazard and mitigation grant that we received with the -- the folks in FEMA. That's over a half million dollars that's going to be applied to Smiths point. And in conjunction with the New York Rise in Construction Program, there are going to be a number of wetland projects. The first one that's receiving a half million dollars for the Captree to West Gilgo Beach area and the Great South Bay will be done in coordination with the County. So those are all exceedingly, I think, good-news items. It's about two-and-a-half million in grants. And it's, again, part of the Reclaim Our Waters Program. We know that the wetlands have been profoundly degraded upwards to about a third of our wetlands as a result of nitrogen loading. And we clearly are attacking that very sorrowful results on a number of different ends.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

I'd also like to report on a recent grant award for wetlands restoration in Mastic/Shirley area, Mastic Beach, thanks to a cooperative effort led by Laurretta in Planning as well as Real Estate, Janet Longo. We've been able to secure 5.7 to \$6 million in funding for acquisition of several properties that have actually been before this Committee's consideration for acquisition.

So it will be funding for acquisition as well as restoration and any demolition as well. This was a competitive -- nationally-competitive round of funding. And we were pleased that we secured 5.7 to \$6 million in that.

I'd like to turn it over to Walt to talk about the status update on the Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Legislator Hahn, members of the Committee, thank you for having us. Walter Dawydiak, Director of Environmental Quality within the Health Department. We are back in full scale business on the Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan. Dorian Dale has drafted an excellent updated executive summary, which is online. You recall that this was a very nice Health Department Drinking Water Study first published in 2011. It was not finalized. The current County Executive came in committed to make this a more actionable plan involving all levels of government as well as stakeholders. Also lifting it beyond merely public water supply and drinking water to deal with issues of coastal resiliency in a world post-Sandy, most specifically nitrogen related to wetlands and eelgrass. And trying to tackle the biggest single problem that we've been totally unsuccessful as a society in dealing with, which is preexisting nonconforming cesspools and septic tanks in areas which don't meet current density requirements.

The plan is also going to be expanded to deal more proactively with harmful algal blooms, an emerging issue we'll talk about in a moment. Also pharmaceuticals and personal care products, an emerging issue that we made a lot of progress on. So we've already issued an update on the nitrogen status and transits online; 40 to 90% increases in nitrogen. And increases are staying steady, if not accelerating, which is an alarming trend. Public water supply is very safe. Private wells are threatened and certainly the estuaries are overburdened with nitrogen.

The pharmaceutical and personal care product issue we've drafted a report. The bones of it will be discussed next Tuesday. Legislator Hahn and Spencer have been invited. Anybody else who's interested in coming is certainly welcome to come. It's a technical working meeting with the State

Department of Environmental Conservation, Health, Water Authority, US Geologic Survey. It'll deal with what we're looking at, what we found and what we need to do. We're hoping to expand our arsenal of things that we look at from 31 pharmaceuticals and personal care products to 46. And we're also hoping to find out the impacts of waste water treatment and onsite and how to better manage those over time as well.

Camp Dresser and McKee is going to be helping us with some of the technical heavy lifting in terms of updating the groundwater model to look at rising sea level based on current information, source water assessment plan, modeling, state of the art wastewater issues with pharmaceuticals and personal air products. And right now the goal is to finish the Comprehensive Water Resources Management Plan by the end of this year.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Now I'd like to turn it over --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Krupski just has a quick question.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Mr. Dawydiak, the meeting you spoke about on Tuesday, where is that?

**MR. DAWYDIAK**

That's going to be in the Dennison Building in Hauppauge, I believe, in the Media Room. I can send you a notice if you're interested.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Oh, please. Thank you.

**MR. DAWYDIAK**

Sure.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

And then I'd just like Boris to give a -- Boris Rukovets from the Department of Public Works to give a brief update on where we are with the Septic Demonstration Program.

**MR. RUKOVETS:**

Certainly. Legislator Hahn, members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to be here. Briefly, for our Magical Septical Tour in March, which I'm sure you've all heard them, Legislator Hahn, the department -- the tour included visits to four states over three days, with overview of the existing advanced septic management programs. And they also included representatives from State and Federal agencies, EPA and EFC, also environmental groups and academia. Their water quality team, consisting of representatives of my colleagues here, ably managed by Director Lansdale, issued an RFP, a request -- a Request for Expression of Interest in a demonstration of innovative onsite wastewater treatment systems in Suffolk County. That happened in the end of April, only months after we completed the tour.

And we received five responses from vendors with advanced treatment systems. And from our review, we selected four of them to participate in demonstration program. Three of the vendors who have national certification of the National Sanitation Foundation, NSF 245, are recommended for installing their system for the demonstration program on that counts as residences that will be determined through a separate process. And one vendor that has been certified and approved by several States, but doesn't have the national certification, has been recommended to install their units on the County properties. So between those four vendors, we'll have good selection of

different systems that we'll be testing.

I have to mention that there'll be one additional -- and those four are proprietary systems. There'll be one additional non-proprietary system that we recommend to add to the demonstration program, and that's the constructed wetlands system. Legislator Krupski is very familiar with the physical aspect of our program because he was one of the sponsors of the meeting that took place a couple weeks ago where we discussed the systems. So it will be a total of five different types of systems, and was in the innovative systems, that they mentioned some of them have more than one system. Some of them have two systems that they recommend. So that's in a nutshell what we're planning to do.

Our next step is to inform the vendors that they have been selected. And as part of their selection, as I mentioned, we'll look at a number of things, including the financial data of the vendors, their effluent concentrations, especially the nitrogen concentrations. They will demonstrate it in the prior test that they achieve 90 milligrams per liter total nitrogen or less, which constitutes about 50% or more reduction.

We also looked at the references by contacting six different states, Environmental Health Departments in those states. And also look at their costs, their costs, including the installation and their annual maintenance costs. So those were important aspects of our evaluation.

So we will inform the vendors about the fact that they have been selected, finalize their agreements with them, and we are working on developing their approach to selecting their residential properties for installation of their systems. That's going to be part of what they're planning to do. And that's important. We want to make sure that there is countywide representation for those systems. And we have specific criteria that we want to be basing the selection on.

The total number of systems that's part of our discussion with the vendors, so far it's ranging, from what we've hear from them, from definitely ten to up to 22. That's part of our conversation with them. Recognize that those systems are 100% free for the County. So I think the number will be somewhere in between those two numbers. And once we have their residential property selected, as well as the County properties, and we finalize agreements with the vendors, we will start the demonstration program. We'll also be hiring a consultant to help us with experience in that, overseeing the demonstration program to help us oversee the program. And there'll be a separate consultant looking at the training materials for the vendors for their septic professionals and communication materials. Thank you.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Thank you so much for allowing us to give a brief presentation. One last thing that I wanted to note is that we have been -- we submitted -- the County submitted a pre-proposal through the USDA's Regional Conservation Partnership Program in partnership with the Soil and Water Conservation District NRCS and many, many other groups and towns and municipalities. And we submitted this proposal to reduce nitrogen specifically in the Peconic Estuary through agricultural practices through improving nutrient reduction as well as soil conservation and providing funding for agricultural easements to conserve these properties within the Peconic Estuary. We submitted a pre-proposal. We were amongst 600 pre-proposals. Our proposal was for \$12 million and we have advanced the second round. Two hundred proposals of the 600 were advanced to the second round. So we're not selected yet, but we're close to -- we're advancing our proposal. So thanks so much for letting us speak on Reclaim Our Water.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

I have two questions. Walt, did I miss you mentioning VOCs?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

I'm sorry. I glossed over a couple of elements that I'd like to take a moment to recap. The first is there's going to be a Harmful Algal Bloom Symposium this Fall, sometime around Thanksgiving, which is going to be a great event to galvanize --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Will Legislator D'Amaro be the keynote speaker?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

(Laughter). He'll be invited. The Legislature funded this project. Sea Grant's going to do it. The contract is being finalized. There's going to be an Early Action Plan dealing with causes, effects as well as what we can do to manage this and where as well as how to better do monitoring and research to address this emerging issue. So come Fall we're going to have a symposium as well as an Early Action Plan. Then in 2015 we're going to have a full synthesis and a Full Action Plan.

The other element was the BOC Action Plan, thank you, Legislator Hahn, for bringing that up. We have in Suffolk County the Health Department, the County Executive has authorized hiring five people and they are on board or coming on board shortly. We have an engineer, three sanitarians and a chemist. Those folks are reinstating the High Priority Industrial Inspection Program.

VOCs in a nutshell are safe in a public water supply and they're generally not present or present in low concentrations; however the trend is going in the wrong direction. The most commonly detected VOCs have doubled in concentration and quadrupled in a number of wells that they're being detected in; still well within the mid to over 98% of the time but going in the wrong direction. And these are chemicals that shouldn't be there at all. Certainly a threat for private wells and for estuaries. So we're reinstating Highest Priority Inspections and sampling analysis at gas stations, dry cleaners and other high risk facilities. We're going to reviews the results every year and come up with the performance-based system to target a tiered inspection program at highest risk facilities moving forward.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

That's very important. Do you have anything in writing about this new action plan that you're taking? Because I really -- this is a big deal and --

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

I do. We actually have a one-pager that I can share with you summarizing the program.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Excellent, excellent. Hire new staff, reinstating the inspections that had kind of fallen by the wayside when we lost all that other staff. And -- good, good, good. I'm very excited about that. Very timely.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

We are, too. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

I have to talk to you before you leave about that. Any questions? Any other questions? Oh, I did have one for Boris. Can you mention again -- I might have missed it -- how the residential sites will be selected? Was that part of the RFP for the consultant that you're using or the --

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**MR. RUKOVETS:**

It wasn't part of their Request For Expression of Interest but we are working internally on this. We may use a consultant that I mentioned to validate some of the assumptions. This is currently a work in progress. We're planning to finalize it soon.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

No, no, I just want to make sure that it's going to have enough variability that it includes different soil types. Because of the geography of Long Island, there's north shore -- you know, there's a real difference between north shore and south shore soils and -- all across the Island there's differences that are important and that may -- that may -- that may impact the success of some of the systems. So I just want to understand that you're going to have -- if it's only ten, you know, I don't know how that would be enough to test the different, you know, the different areas and different geographies. But I would hate to find them all winding up on the south shore and not -- and not testing on the north shore as well.

**MR. RUKOVETS:**

Fair point. It's, you know -- as I said, we'll try to do geographically diverse across the County. And we're definitely going to work expeditiously.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Excellent. Excellent.

**MR. RUKOVETS:**

And it's probably going to be more than ten. Ten is the absolute minimum.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Right, right, right.

**MR. RUKOVETS:**

It's around there. It's going to be more than I expected.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you, Legislator Hahn. I just want to thank everyone here for their work and their willingness to be flexible on these -- looking at these different systems. I think it's -- you know, the County, as Legislator Hahn said, has diversity of soil types, you know, distance to groundwater, timeliness of groundwater flow to the surface waters. And I think by looking at a number of different systems, that they could -- I appreciate that kind -- kind of flexibility to test everything and look at everything with, kind of, a global view.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Thank you. Thank you so much for all your work. You're so dedicated to this issue. And we appreciate all your -- all your work on this. Okay.

## **INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS**

First we're going to -- I want to make a motion to take out of order **IR 1733, To appoint member of the Suffolk County Planning Commission (Samuel E. Kramer) (Co. Exec.)** Motion by Legislator Muratore; seconded by Legislator Krupski. So all those in favor of taking it out of order? Opposed? Abstentions? 1733 is before us. So I'll make a motion to approve **Introductory Resolution 1733, To appoint a member of the Suffolk County Planning Commission Samuel**

**E. Kramer (Co. Exec.)** Mr. Kramer is here. I'm sorry that you had to wait through the presentations, but welcome.

**MR. KRAMER:**

I found it all very interesting.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Good. Then you may be in the right place. (Laughter) Tell us why -- tell us your interest in the Planning Commission.

**MR. KRAMER:**

Legislator Hahn and members of the sub-committee, thank you very much to the Committee. Legislator, thank you very much -- (adjusted mike) is that better? Legislator Hahn, members of the Committee, I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me and to give me the opportunity to answer your questions, tell you a little about myself and about my past service and what I hope to be able to achieve on the Suffolk County Planning Commission if you approve my nomination.

Shortly after my wife and I bought our house in Wainscott 20 years ago, I read an article in the East Hampton Star about how the Wainscott Citizens Advisory Committee was discussing whether Wainscott could be an incorporated village. Since our house is considerably north of the traditional hamlet of Wainscott, I wanted to know what those boundaries were -- were mine. And I was concerned that depending on how the lines of the proposed incorporated village were drawn, I might not be able to use the beach at Wainscott. So it was of great concern to me.

It turned out that Wainscott was never incorporated, but that began my involvement with the Town of East Hampton, in the government of East Hampton. I soon became a member of the Wainscott CAC. And after three years of attending meetings, I was elected as co-chair. And I served in that capacity for eight years. The Wainscott Citizens Advisory Committee addressed the plans for development of property at its most nascent stage. I learned about the value that our community placed on preserving farmland and open space as well as the rural character of the community; and how, for example, the installation of a single traffic light on Route 27 could have impacts miles away.

I also saw up close the value of the zoning laws and the -- when large, blighted properties were proposed for various uses. And I also saw the danger to the community when local businesses were unable to expand as their businesses' needs dictated. As co-chairman of the Wainscott CAC, I became involved in East Hampton's update to its comprehensive plan. And I got to hear it from the public across the Town of East Hampton to learn about some of the Town's broader problems.

After eight years as co-chair, a vacancy occurred on the Town Planning Board and I was appointed to fill out that term. I served for about 20 months on the East Hampton Town Planning Board and I found that to be a very rewarding experience. I personally visited each and every site which was up for discussion. And I learned a tremendous amount just by observing and talking to property owners. Among the most memorable was a commercial -- large commercial fishing operation in Montauk, which had made an application for a lot line modification to enable them to divide their property in order to build a restaurant and preserve the fishing business. I didn't know anything about the fishing business in Montauk. And I in a few hours and a couple of days learned quite a bit. And I found myself a strong supporter of that proposal because of the need to preserve that business and the impact that it had on the local economy.

The Planning Department, which serviced the Planning Board, always did highly detailed and comprehensive reports on the environmental impacts of proposals before the Planning Board. And I always read those through and took them very seriously. And I particularly found myself drawn to

issues involving transportation as -- the limited amount of space that we had and the impact of even the smallest change in land use could impact traffic for miles away. The Town was divided into different sectors. And in the sector that -- for which I was responsible, I -- in the brief time that I was on the Planning Board, I worked on a number of projects. The one that comes to mind immediately was the redevelopment of a small commercial structure which had been kind of run down and was turned into a very attractive martial arts studio, which every time I drive pass it, I kind of feel a little proud to have had something to do with it.

On a larger scale, the planning board was involved in a large senior housing project on Route 27 in Amagansette, which is now a thriving community. I was pushing to have basements included in these properties, but that didn't come to pass. I guess the economics didn't permit it.

There was another time that there was a large smoke stack on Cranberry Hull Road up in the Devon section, which was the last vestige of what used to be many factories that we used to process menhaden in that area. I thought it was a valuable bit of historic preservation. I would like to have seen the Town do something about it, but it was on private property. And so we were limited. And it was a bit of a disappointment, but the last time I drove by, I checked and it's still there I'm glad to say.

The good outweighs the bad by a wide margin. And the value of the work of the Planning Board in East Hampton and, of course, the Planning Commission on a countywide level can't be underestimated. Suffolk has myriad issues which it must face including protecting its groundwater, its open spaces and its agricultural lands and enhancing economic opportunities, especially with respect to sustainable businesses.

I do remain particularly concerned about transportation issues, which are always daunting in an area as developed as Suffolk County and as surrounded by water as Suffolk County is. But I'm also very concerned about housing, which in my mind, is one of the key aspects of preventing the brain drain of young people from the County. I'm an attorney. I have an office in New York City and an office in East Hampton. My practice is primarily commercial litigation and bankruptcy. And for the past several years, I've been involved in a lot of mortgage foreclosure cases. And I've seen up close many young families who, because of the mortgage crisis, found themselves in an impossible position, losing their housing. And you can't but help understand that this is a situation of immense importance to the County. And if we're going to grow and if we're going to continue to be successful, it has to be addressed whenever big projects, such as the ones that the Suffolk County Planning Commission address, are before it. You should know, by the way, I don't do real estate development. I do litigation sometimes involving real estate, but mostly I deal in business disputes.

Since I was recommended to the Planning Commission by East Hampton Town Supervisor Larry Cantwell, I've attended the last three meetings of the Suffolk County Planning Commission. The work is important and it's fascinating and it's essential to the continued healthy and environmentally sustainable growth of this County. It's my hope that if I'm appointed to the Suffolk County Planning Commission, I'll be able to visit as many sites as I can manage which come before the Committee. I don't think that it's -- that one can do real justice to a major application without actually going out in the field, looking at the proposed action and getting a sense of the regional impact that the proposed action is going to have before you make a decision to approve or not approve or modify or issue comments.

The Planning Commission is also charged with updating the Suffolk County Comprehensive Plan, which is a matter of great interest to me. The Comprehensive Plan is important not just because it provides the framework from which the future growth of the County can be established, but also because it's an aid for future Legislative decisions in funding and in budget issues. And it's also, as an attorney I can tell you, an essential tool for judges in future litigation over land use issues. I was

involved in that -- in the East Hampton Town Comprehensive Town. And I would look forward, if appointed, to helping with the County's comprehensive plan to develop the best possible balance between environmental conservation and economic growth.

And, again, I thank you very much and would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Any questions? Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So you come here with quite a bit of experience.

**MR. KRAMER:**

Some.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Quite a bit being on a planning board for years and the CAC. That kind of local experience gives you a different view of the -- I'm sure of the County. What do you think the -- and I think you're absolutely spot on when you say you have to go and look at all the applications. Because if you don't go, you're looking at a map, it doesn't do it justice; or you're looking at a survey, you just don't know.

**MR. KRAMER:**

It's a big county and it requires driving around but --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

A-huh. And I applaud you for that.

**MR. KRAMER:**

I hope I'm able to do it. I mean, you know --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Oh, you've committed already. It's too late. It's on the record. (Laughter)

**MR. KRAMER:**

If it's in Orient, it'll be fine with me.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

What do you think the role that Suffolk County Planning Commission should be in relation to the local governments? How should they -- how much interaction should there be?

**MR. KRAMER:**

There should be considerable intersection and considerable understanding of the local concerns. But it's -- it really needs to be a counterweight against -- to use the phrase -- NIMBYism. Because it's important that the Suffolk County Planning Commission take a broad view, take a -- I've heard it described as *from 30,000 feet*. Because sometimes there's a project that the local community may have an issue with and look at that from a broader perspective. There's going to have to be some compromise and some movement on what the locality wants. But at the same time people live in the locality. And you can't just shove it down their throats. So it really is about striking a balance, in every aspect of it. In terms of the economic development versus environmental conservation; and in terms of the local needs versus the County needs. And the Suffolk County Planning Commission will not last long as -- this is a pretentious thing to say -- but it requires that it pay attention and pay deference to the localities. But the mandate is countywide.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**MR. KRAMER:**

I hope that answers your question.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

It does. Because you come to the Commission with that -- assuming that you're approved, that you would come to the Commission with that experience of the needs of the local government and how, like you said, you look at things from the other side of it. So I appreciate that.

**MR. KRAMER:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay. So we have IR 1733 before -- oh, I'm sorry Presiding Officer Gregory.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, sir, for your willingness to serve and for all that you've done so far in your service to the public. I just -- maybe I missed it. I just wanted to ask just to clarify in your efforts since East Hampton, have you ever worked on any projects -- workforce housing projects and what's your thoughts of workforce housing? I know you mentioned young people and keeping --

**MR. KRAMER:**

It's essential. East Hampton is in a unique situation sadly because the -- I don't know if you're familiar with the trade parade on Route 27 every morning, but if you drive -- attempting to get from, say, Hampton Bays or Westhampton to East Hampton in the morning is an incredible ordeal. It can take you an hour to just make that -- what is it, 30-mile stretch -- actually it's not even that. It's about a 25-mile stretch. Because a tremendous number of workers come from up island. At the same time in Springs, which is the northern part of East Hampton Town toward -- northeast from the main core -- from the Village, I should say, is overpopulated with people in two and three families living in single houses. It's overcrowding the schools in Springs. It's an ongoing issue in the Town of East Hampton. It's essential.

Workforce housing, I'm trying to recall, didn't -- I don't think there was any particular issues that came up during the brief time that I was on the Planning Board, but I'm very well aware of it as an essential issue. And it's -- there are a range of different ways to house people. And there are -- and these have to all be explored. You can't have a county grow. You can't have the County move forward if you can't house the people who live there. So I'm very aware of the issue. And I would hope that when matters -- if I'm approved, when matters come before me, that's something I'm going to give very deep consideration to.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

We need a second. I made a motion, correct? We need a second. Second by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)** Congratulations and you do not need to attend the General Meeting on Tuesday.

**MR. KRAMER:**

Thank you very -- thank you very much. I'm very happy and I look forward to serving. Thank you for hearing me.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

I mean you do not need to --

**MR. KRAMER:**

It's a kind of a long agenda.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Yeah (laughter).

**MR. KRAMER:**

It's probably just going to be one of those -- if you want me to --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

No, that's fine. No. Thank you.

**MR. KRAMER:**

Thank you very much.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay, back to Introductory Resolutions: **IR 1661, Authorizing appraisal of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007 - Mastic/Shirley Conservation Area properties - Town of Brookhaven. (Co. Exec.)** I make a motion; seconded by Legislator Anker. On the motion, we'll bring forward Director Lansdale and probably Laretta. We have the maps supplied by Laretta. Everyone should have gotten them in their e-mail.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

They were e-mailed this morning.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Yes. And this is one, two, three, four, five, six -- looks like seven parcels.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes, this is seven parcels which total 1.2 acres with the average size of each parcel being less than one quarter of an acre.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Do we have a rating?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yep. Laretta's going to hand that out. So overall we have a rating of 56 points out of a scale of 100. And these parcels are part of that larger grant application that I mentioned during the Reclaim Our Water brief presentation where we've received funding from NRCS, which is the Natural Resources Conservation Service, a division of the USDA, for federal funding to acquire these properties. The County funding would be used to acquire the underlying fee title.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

So --

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

And the NRCS would buy the conservation easement.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

And is there a percentage that it usually -- the underlying fee title cost and the percentage --

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

-- of the value of the property?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes. It's usually between 80 and 90%, which was the conservation easement. And so it would be 20 -- 10 to 20% for the underlying fee title.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

And it requires that we pay for the appraisals? That we'll get reimbursed for the appraisal costs?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right. And any demolition costs and any restoration.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

So this property's already been approved for that grant so we just have to do it.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

And we get paid back.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's our recommendation.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Yeah, I don't see why not. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Ultimately these parcels will end up in parks or where --

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes, they'll end up in parks.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And is there any sort of plan for their, you know, future use or is it just going to be totally passive open space?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

It's going to be passive recreation.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Will they be -- so any homes on the property will be demolished and will they be re-vegetated?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right, yeah. The restoration is part of the Federal funding that we've obtained.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Excellent. We already have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**Introductory Resolution 1672, Authorizing the acquisition of Farmland Development Rights under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2000) for the Volmut and Fleming property - Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-098.00-01.00-019.000). (Co. Exec.)** Motion by Legislator Krupski; seconded by myself. Any discussion on this? Anything you would like to add on 1672? 46.6 acres.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

The agricultural product grown on the property is sod. It received points out of a 25 point rating scale 14.75.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Excellent, excellent. Good, good. Any questions? Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I'm looking at the map. There's a -- is it a sand mining? What's over to the -- is it west of it? The west?

**MS. FISCHER:**

Yes.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. Will that have any impact as far as -- it doesn't look like it's having an impact at this point on the parcel for farmland. Will that have an impact on the farming parcel?

**MS. FISCHER:**

No.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay, thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

What was this farmed as, did you say? Sod?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Sod. It's grown on --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

And you don't know -- you're not looking for an answer, are you? I thought you were looking for an answer to her question. Did you answer it? You did. I missed that.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

(Laughter) Sorry. All right. Any other questions?

**LEG. ANKER:**

And the reason why I ask we just had Polly up here about erosion. And I have such an issue with erosion. If there's sand mining, you know, I wouldn't want it to detour from the farmland. You know, I don't want to see half the property go into the -- you know, the area where it's being sand mined but -- we're okay with that?

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

All right. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1672 is approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**Introductory Resolution 1673, Authorizing the acquisition of Farmland Development Rights under the New Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program (effective December 1, 2000) and the Farmland Preservation Program for the Brush property Brush Family Farm Town of Riverhead (SCTM No. 0600-044.00-02.00-010.004 p/o). (Co. Exec.)**  
Motion by Legislator Krupski; seconded by Legislator Anker. On the motion.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Sure. So this is for the acquisition of development rights. It's 12 acres out of a total of 21.9 acres. The agricultural product sold -- produced on the property is sod. It received a score of 15.75 points out of 25 based on the Suffolk County Farmland Rating Sheet. And the -- it has already appeared before the Suffolk County Farmland Committee.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Excellent. Any questions? Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I'm just curious. A lot of these are sod farms. Is that -- is that the top agricultural product? I don't know if you know that or -- no?

**MS. FISCHER:**

No.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

It's corn maybe?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Just as a coincidence, sod is a large acreage but it's the current crop. There was a parcel across from the Greenport Brewery of Peconic that was sod for over 30 years. We actually got the Federal government to cost share development rights purchase on that even though they didn't typically preserve land. It was in sod production and this year it's in lettuce production. So it's currently in sod. Doesn't mean that it's going to be in sod forever.

**(OFF-THE-RECORD COMMENT)**

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Well, no, it's just a matter of what the current owner has in mind.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Right. And that's -- that's interesting. And, you know, as I'm sure as everybody's interested in health concerns with the pesticides -- and we've looked at this in the Soil and Water Conservation District at the meetings. But to figure out what crop we can use less pesticides and less chemicals,

because we just had your great presentation on, you know, nitrogen and trying to figure out what to do with the nitrogen issue, you know, encouraging those crops that basically produce less nitrogen. And I'm assuming sod's probably a little on the high end?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I wouldn't presume that. I don't know. Because don't forget they have to buy -- buy nitrogen so -- they're running a business so they're not buying any more than they need to and applying any more than they need to.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And they apply -- you know, they stagger the applications throughout year. So if the crop needs so many pounds of nitrogen, it's staggered as the crop needs it.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And again just having all these conversations here this morning about, you know, with the Soil Conservation and your presentation -- Planning Department's presentation about reducing the use of chemicals, it's just great that we can all work together. But again as we acquire these properties for farmland preservation, I think we really need to think about, you know, how we can implement, you know, those practices with the land that we're investing in, so, thanks.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

I think there's a good question in here. So there are types of crops, though, that -- that uptake of nitrogen is a higher percentage like -- than others. Like there are -- there are certain crops that handle it differently. And there is waste when it's put down.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Well, no. It depends on the crop --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Yeah, depends on the crop.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

But it depends on the growth stage of the crop. Say you apply corn, when it first comes up, it's not using many nutrients at all. When it's growing -- rapidly growing into the full plant, that's when it's using most of the nutrients. And that's when the nutrients need to be available to it. Now, you know, this time of year obviously it's -- it's -- you know, it doesn't have any nutrient uptake. So -- and that's why -- what Polly was speaking about before, the importance of cover crops, is when you -- once the crop is harvested, you put the cover crop down, that's going to recover immediately all the available nutrients in the soil.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Right, right.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Anker, did you have another question?

**LEG. ANKER:**

No. I'm just saying, you know, there is -- there is that, you know, again, the question of, you know, can we -- and I held up the paper as far as the -- how you evaluate your points for farmland preservation. And you said there's -- it's not really -- it's not included on the form right now

whether the crop produces higher nitrogen levels or not, but it would be interesting maybe to see if it were part of that discussion.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That was part of the discussion last year when we were in the process of updating Chapter 8. And it's certainly something that we could consider in the future. It was specifically requested by several environmental groups for us not to include that particular evaluation point.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And, again, it's not to detour farmers from farming any particular crop, but it's just to help us, you know, reduce the nitrogen which is a huge issue. Thanks.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved.  
**(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**Introductory Resolution 1676, Authorizing acquisition of land under the Old Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program [C12-5(E)(1)(a)] - for the Ethel and Alexander Nichoson Foundation property - Watson Avenue Wetlands -Town of Babylon - (SCTM Nos. 0100-211.00-02.00-010.002, 0100-211.00-02.00-020.000, 0100-211.00-02.00-024.000, 0100-211.00-02.00-025.000, 0100-211.00-02.00-031.000 AND 0100-211.00-02.00-032.000). (Co. Exec.)** I'll make a motion; seconded by Legislator Muratore. On the motion.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

The property contains six contiguous parcels, specifically in West Babylon in the Town of Babylon comprising 6.25 acres. There are no structures on the site. These parcels are listed on the Comprehensive Master List update of 2012 for open space preservation. All of the six parcels contain a New York State DEC regulated designated freshwater wetlands and are near County parkland to the south. This has received an assemblage rating of 36 points.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'm not familiar with this site. Are there -- are there drain issues associated with this that affect the -- impact the adjacent property owners that the County's going to inherit?

**MS. FISCHER:**

Not that we are aware of. It's actually a wetland that hasn't been disturbed interiorly. Obviously there's residential developments surrounding it, but we haven't gotten any indication from the Town with regard to drainage issues at this time. It seems to be intact as a wetland in and of itself.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Even though the -- the DEC does -- it is regulated by the State, is there any -- is there any active use of it as a, you know, sort of, as a sump for local drainage?

**MS. FISCHER:**

No. Just from its natural, you know, topography it acts as a low point obviously, but it isn't engineered in any which way at this --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And that certainly has great value.

**MS. FISCHER:**

Yes, absolutely.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And then is there any discussion turning something like this over to the Town so that it would become a town -- town-managed site instead of the County.

**MS. FISCHER:**

Well, we do have other -- you know, other property adjacent. You know, we pick up these parcels throughout the County. And they're important countywide. So we -- you know, we would prefer to keep it on a county level. We acquired it. We certainly can go into a management agreement with the Town at any time.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So what sort of management agreement? I mean, it would add value to the Town as much as the County, or the Town even more so.

**MS. FISCHER:**

Exactly. You know, if they wanted to look at any kind of, you know, trails or access point, you know, for, you know, for that type of passive use, that would be acceptable if the Town wanted to put in funds to create such a thing. They certainly could, you know, offer that and go into a management agreement with the County to do such trail system.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. And this went through the Triple A process.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Correct.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Presiding Officer Gregory.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Thank you. I'm looking at the -- I know it says West Babylon. This was former Presiding Officer Horsley's. I thought it was the Village of Babylon. No.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

I thought it was Lindenhurst.

**MS. FISCHER:**

North of the Village. A bit north of the Village.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. And then if I recall -- maybe it's a different property altogether, I think it was like a road or something -- you recall that?

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

It's on the map here.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Right, okay. Oh, right, Old Farmingville Road. Okay. All right. Great, thank you.

**MS. FISCHER:**

Okay.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Thank you. Okay, any other questions? We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**Introductory Resolution 1684, Authorizing an appraisal for the purchase of Development Rights of Farmland under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Eberhard Nurseries Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No. 0200-679.00-01.00-006.000). (Krupski)** Motion by Legislator Krupski; second by Legislator Anker. On the motion.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

This is for your consideration. It's located within the hamlet of East Moriches in the Town of Brookhaven. It's a proposed acquisition of the development rights for farmland of approximately 10 acres out of 11 acres. The current products grown on the site include trees and shrubs. And it received a rating of 16 out of 25 points. And the Farmland Committee approved this -- has recommended this for your consideration.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Any questions? We have a motion and a second. Sorry, Lora. We'll wait for Lora. So we had a motion by Legislator Krupski; second by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1684 is approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**Introductory Resolution 1697, Establishing a Suffolk County North Shore Coastal Erosion Task Force. (Anker).** Motion by Legislator Anker.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Second by Legislator Krupski. Any discussion on the motion?

**LEG. ANKER:**

I'd be happy to just give a brief description. Bottom line is my district, probably more so than yours or Legislator Krupski, along the north shore has a severe erosion problem. Just alone Miller Place Surf Club lost 30 feet of prime real estate just in Sandy alone; just in Superstorm Sandy. Thirty feet, just gone in -- within one -- one storm, so -- and all along the north shore, we have a severe erosion issue.

What I'd like to do, you know, what this resolution proposes is to create a task force of experts, you know, that understand erosion, from the DEC to our Soil and Water Conservation, Polly, that was here today. They have wonderful programs that a lot of my constituents do not know -- they're not familiar with how can they prevent and reduce -- you can't really prevent erosion but you can reduce it. So we're going to get the great minds together, come up with some ideas. And then, you know, produce a report and perhaps a community meeting following the information that they come up with.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Excellent. Thank you for your work on this. Any questions? Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Can I just -- I'd like to say I think it's a very good idea. Most people who live on the shoreline don't go through this that often so they're not really familiar with the different government agencies that are involved and they're not familiar with their options. And I think this will help the landowners work better with the different agencies that have jurisdiction here. And it would give the contractors also the needed guidance. And it'll be beneficial to everybody because it -- there's a problem in the whole north shore of Long Island. And the more people you get involved with something like this, the more engaged you get the landowners, the better.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And, you know, I did receive an e-mail from a woman, I guess, in Nissequogue, and she -- she was like *we don't have a problem with erosion*. And she may not. She may not over any in Nissequogue but boy do we get hit hard every storm, you know, hurricanes. I guess my area has a large exposure to the hurricanes when they whip back around.

Couple of the issues that did pop up that I've heard from -- directly from my constituents are the bulkhead permitting process. And hopefully we can expedite that through the DEC.

The other issues, too, is a lot of the coastline is owned by private homeowner associations. And if they get together as one voice, we might be able to do more and to help them. They will go and they will try to do something. But with their erosion problem -- and one area I'd like to focus on is the plantings. And they have done plantings. Because when you view the entire -- or as you drive along or in a boat or airplane along the north coast, you'll see the areas of white. Now that's the sand. That's the erosion. Where you see vegetation, there is very, very little erosion. But what's happening is the -- they're planting the wrong plants. They're putting tarps down or material and so the water's going underneath the material and it's creating more erosion.

So, again, there's so many questions and so much good information out there. We're going to gather it and then present it and hopefully help with the issue.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Thank you. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-1. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE. LEG. KRUPSKI NOT PRESENT)**

**Introductory Resolution 1729, Authorizing appraisal of land under the Suffolk County Drinking Water Protection Program, as amended by Local Law No. 24-2007, Menu of Homes, Inc. Town of Brookhaven (SCTM No. 0200-825.00-03.00-026.000). (Browning)**

I'll make a motion to approve; seconded by Legislator Muratore. And on the motion, Laretta is handing out information we need.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

This property is located south of Montauk Highway in the -- along the Forge River in the hamlet of Mastic, Town of Brookhaven. The property is less than one acre in size and consists mostly of underwater lands within the Forge River watershed and contains some upland freshwater wetlands along the Forge River. It's just north of 18 acres of County-owned parkland. The rating for this potential acquisition is 52 points because it's contained within the Forge River Watershed assemblage.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

We know how important the Forge River assemblage is to us. However, underwater -- well, I guess --

**MS. FISCHER:**

Half underwater, half upland wetland.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

I mean I guess the obvious question is can it be developed, but, you know, the appraisal will reflect that. It will cost nothing if it can't be developed -- well, next to nothing. Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Is this one of the parcels that are targeted in that area?

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

NCRS, or whatever it is

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Federal funds?

**MS. FISCHER:**

Not the Federal funds, no.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

No?

**MS. FISCHER:**

Near Montauk highway. Just south of Montauk Highway.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I'm looking at the aerial. And what's next to it with all the buildings? Nurseries or trucks or --

**MS. FISCHER:**

Yeah, I believe it's a nursery operation.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And it looks like it's within maybe 200 feet, yards of East Mill Pond; is that correct?

**MS. FISCHER:**

Yeah, Mill Pond's north of Montauk Highway.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I'm just curious. You may not know, but is there a run-off type of program implemented in situations like this where you have some large nursery or business so close to a water body?

**MS. FISCHER:**

That would be a question for DPW. They would, you know, be involved in issues with regard to run-off running onto County roadways. I'm not sure if the County owns this stretch of Montauk Highway at this juncture, but I do know that they've just recently done some work on this road in this area. And I believe they have done some stormwater work here, but I would defer to DPW.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Who owns the lands immediately adjacent to this parcel? What's the ownership? Is it municipal or is all private? And is it the same owner?

**MS. FISCHER:**

The owner of this parcel?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

The lands immediately adjacent to it.

**MS. FISCHER:**

The farm or -- which parcels are we talking about?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I'm looking at the map of the intertidal marsh and the Forge River south of the highway.

**MS. FISCHER:**

Okay.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

The Menu of Homes?

**MS. FISCHER:**

The property outlined in red, the proposed acquisition parcel, is owned by Menu of Homes. And then to the southeast is -- adjacent to that parcel, on the southeast corner of the property is county-owned land in green. And then on the other -- to the west are two proposed acquisition parcels that we had on the Master List that we haven't owned -- that we haven't acquired yet.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

What about to the north between the proposed property and the highway?

**MS. FISCHER:**

That's also a piece that was on the Master List to be acquired.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And are those parcels owned by the same landowner?

**MS. FISCHER:**

I don't believe so because I believe Menu of Homes was sent a list to Legislator Browning of those parcels that they were interested in selling. I -- that they owned, but I'd have to double check and see if, in fact, they also owned other adjacent parcels. I'm not 100% sure.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1729 is**

**approved. (VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**1733** we did already.

**1743, Amending the Adopted 2014 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2014 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with the innovative alternative on site Wastewater Treatment Program (8710.140). (Co. Exec.)** I'll make a motion.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Second.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Second by Legislator Krupski. On the motion, we have several individuals walking forward anticipating all the many questions that we as a Committee are going to have for them. Director Lansdale, if you'd like to just start off and remind the Committee of all the great things that this innovative -- Alternative Onsite Wastewater Treatment Program is going to be doing.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Sure. We have in the near term a few goals for the -- for the Suffolk County Septic Cesspool Upgrade Program Enterprise known as SCUP. Specifically our near-term goals include to test a variety of innovative alternative on-site wastewater treatment systems on private residential properties and at County facilities. And Boris previously gave you an update on where we are in that -- in achieving that goal; that we've approved four companies to test on, three of which to test at private residential homes. And then the fourth company will test at County facilities, County parks, etcetera.

So the second goal is to develop a local program in conjunction with the Department of Labor to provide job training to the industry for these innovative alternative wastewater treatment systems. And then the third is to provide educational opportunities for local homeowners to showcase and demonstrate the innovative alternative onsite wastewater treatment systems and proper septic system maintenance, etcetera. And these were really -- this was -- these near-term goals were developed as we were listening and participating in that multistate septic tour. And we were most impressed with Rhode Island and all of the efforts that they had done to both engage the industry and the industry leaders to facilitate and generate a new system -- new jobs for these innovative systems and to provide the proper training for the installation and ongoing maintenance of these system; and also to provide homeowner training, which is the other critical component of that.

So with these three near-term goals, we hope to issue a series of Requests For Proposals to help us evaluate technical proposals first round and subsequent -- second round for these septic technologies to be part of our demonstration program; and also then help us develop a methodology, as you had questioned earlier, for homeowner site selection looking at the variety of soils, geographic distribution, etcetera. And also to help us develop and design and implement a contractor training program, a training program for homeowners as well, a training program for the Department of Health to oversee as well as developing specific construction standards necessary for the approval of such systems; and overall to help us develop the -- at least the construct for a responsible management entity to oversee this entire enterprise.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Is there a reason why you're not including a business pilot like a restaurant?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Legislator Hahn, systems of a thousand gallons per day or over, which is a good percentage of our

commercial systems would be subject to SPDES permit requirements. And the treatment would have to be to ten milligrams per liter or less. That's a subject of a separate series of studies that have been ongoing to make those technologies available. These particular projects are geared towards small flows of under a thousand and we limited the first round to residential. These could theoretically be used for small commercial facilities as well. And that's a good point. Anything under a thousand gallons per day that doesn't have to remove nitrogen per SPDES permit requirements or ten milligrams per liter could use one of these 50% removal systems. Our first round, though, is targeted at the residential similar to the way that the Rhode Island went about their model.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay. So just to make sure I understand, there's already something going on with the 10,000 -- thousand gallon or more -- there's already a study going on of the alternative systems (inaudible) --

**MR. DAWYDIAK**

Yeah, because --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

-- to get to ten.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

The output was produced about a year ago. And anything from 1,000 to 15,000 gallons per day now has a half dozen off-the-shelf technologies. It can be used to meet ten milligrams per liter. Previously it was just Cromaglass. Now it's Nitrex, Best, Bioclear, Air Rotor and another one that I'm not remembering, but basically --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

All right.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

-- we're open to these technologies. We call those clustered decentralized systems. Those can be used to -- for up to 50 residential development units as of right; potentially up to a hundred if we change our code, which would be 30,000 gallons per day.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

But a restaurant-type business could utilize that kind of system?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

They could if it was over 1,000 gallons per day. And if they were over density, they would be require to utilize that kind of system for a newly-permitted development. Again, we're looking at the other piece of the puzzle, which is small flows. About 90% of the wastewater nitrogen problem is individual single-family residential lots. Commercial is by no means insignificant, but the lion's share of the issue is the small grandfathered residential lots where parcels were subdivided prior to the Sanitary Code's existence.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay. Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

It sounds like, you know, a great program and much needed. Now this \$250,000 will come from 477. And that's to start this program; is that correct?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right. And to achieve the goals that I outlined previously including the -- reviewing technical proposals, helping us come up with a homeowner selection criteria so that we could kick this off as well as a contractor training program and a homeowner training program as well.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yeah. As far as the funds, so that will start it off. Is there a way to sustain this program maybe through, you know, think of the IBM Smart Cities Program or other grants that are available?

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

It's a good point. We'll certainly keep on the look-out. We're hoping to design this in a manner whereby once it's jump-started, it'll be substantially self-sustaining. We in the Health Department have done a capacity analysis. We're proposing an engineer and a sanitarian for the additional applications. It'll work next year. And as this grows, this will be addressed each year as part of the budget cycle. But looking for external funding sources, and there's nobody more creative than Director Lansdale in doing that, it's certainly on our radar screen.

**LEG. ANKER:**

That's good to hear again. You know, it's a great program. You know, I -- I'm supportive. I'd love to invest in this. I just want to make sure that it's not going to be more of a financial burden once you get it going. But it sounds like what you're saying, Walter, is that it's going to take off and it will more or less sustain itself through what you do at the beginning through the programs. So, thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I have a question. I think it's kind of -- a, that, Walt -- because you've spoken so often of making sure these systems -- whether they're existing or any kind of new system that's properly maintained and operated, is there -- and Director Lansdale talked about training for the contractors, of course -- you know, the contractors, the incentive is to do the right thing because they want the business of the next door neighbor and they want the business from the whole neighborhood. So they have -- they really -- the incentive there is do a good job, do the right job. Talk about training for the homeowners, is there going to be like an annual permit or some way of having people comply that they are, in fact, maintaining their systems properly? Or -- I'm sorry -- is it going to be like more of a one-shot -- like this is -- *here's -- here's your system and here's the brochure on how to maintain it.* And you're done for the day.

**MR. DAWYDIAK:**

Part of this project is to work out the mechanics of all those nuts and bolts, but in a nutshell most other jurisdictions require an annual maintenance agreement whereby once or twice somebody has to come by and service your system. It could be on the order of two to \$300 a year. It's not an insignificant expense, but it's not sky high either. The best of the jurisdictions have automated this whereby the contractor who inspects electronically sends the results of the report to the local health department. And if there's a problem, an overflow of failure, it gets flagged. If it's addressed, it's fine. If not, the Health Department follows up.

There's also an element of QA on the part of the health departments where they sample a certain subset of these to make sure the contractors are doing their job honestly and the systems are performing as expected. So all of those things are elements that we're formulating as we get into those programs and they're all good points.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Presiding Officer Gregory.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

All right. Thank you. This is a result of the tour that you guys did, right? Okay.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

(Nodding head yes)

**P.O. GREGORY:**

I think it's a wonderful idea. I -- because of taxpayer dollars, we have to be very, very careful on how it's spent. So it's \$250,000 is -- what is that going to go towards? It's going towards the purchase of the systems or --

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

The systems will be donated so it's going towards specifically a series of consultants that will help us -- advise us on the development of this program through the technical components that Walt just outlined as well as looking at the evaluation of technical proposals that are submitted for round two of the program, as well as the development of a training program with the Department of Labor looking at perhaps hiring legal assistance to help us look at forming the construct of a responsible management entity to oversee the entire rollout of this program on a much larger -- larger scale.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Okay. All right. I'm glad to hear that. I was a little concerned that we may have taxpayer dollars purchase this system. And I wasn't sure if it was somehow the homeowner was going to be -- paid for it or it was going to be given to the homeowner. And that opens a whole host of questions and concerns. But it's being donated by, I think -- and you haven't worked out the logistics yet on how the selection process is going to be but that's going to be critical as well. So, great, great. Thank you.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

We have -- we have ideas on -- certainly the Health Department has come up with some draft criteria looking at homeowner selection. But we'd also like to draw upon the expertise that's within our region that's gone through the creation of programs like this and other states, to draw on their expertise to help guide our program so that, you know, we avoid any pitfalls that have been made possibly by other states.

**P.O. GREGORY:**

Great. Thank you. Good work.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Any other questions? Okay, we have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**Introductory Resolution 1746, Approving a Settlement Agreement relating to the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund. (Co. Exec.)** Do we have -- Dennis is here, right? Do we want -- anyone want to make a motion?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I'll make a motion.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Motion by Legislator Barraga; seconded by Legislator Muratore.

**MR. BROWN:**

Actually it's only if you have any questions.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay.

**MR. BROWN:**

You know, this is part of the overall negotiations that took place with respect to the amendment of the Drinking Water Protection Program. We passed 1575 on July 29th. 1574 is on for Tuesday, which at this point, I think, is ready to be passed on Tuesday. And this is essentially one of the final components of that.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

So just explain -- or can you outline this settlement agreement? This was the piece we were waiting for to have ready before we passed the other piece that's ready to go on Tuesday.

**MR. BROWN:**

Yes, this is part of it. As you know, there were two actions. One from the 2011 legislation. That's still pending. The settlement agreement does not cover that. The second action, this covers that. And this would be discontinued.

As you know they also -- the Plaintiffs also had sponsors with respect to a voter-initiated referendum. The stipulation covers that. It ceases current efforts. In the event that the bill would be passed on the 29th, 1575 fails during the vote in November, they would have the right nevertheless to reactivate, to recommence their initiative at the time in the future.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

I thought part of the agreement was that regardless of what happens in November, they would not --

**MR. NOLAN:**

I think it -- yeah, I think we should also put on the record that as part of the stipulation, if the referendum fails, the Legislature's making a commitment to go ahead with the \$29.4 million worth of bonding for the -- I don't know what they're calling that program but --

**MR. BROWN:**

That's correct. A new -- a new, an enhanced water quality protection program.

**MR. NOLAN:**

That's notwithstanding what happens with the referendum.

**MR. BROWN:**

That's correct.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Just for clarification, it was my understanding that if by chance the referendum failed, the environmentalists would have the right to go back into court and litigate and proceed if they wanted

to.

**MR. BROWN:**

As far as the litigation is concerned, the second action would be discontinued with prejudice. The first action is not covered by the stipulation. So as far as reserving any rights are concerned with respect to this stipulation, it only has to do with the voter-initiated referendum. According -- according to their representations currently and the stipulation, they have ceased all of their activity with respect to moving forward this year. But what they wanted to do going back to negotiations early on months ago, they just wanted to suspend their efforts at that time. And they also really just wanted to hold in abeyance the action to litigation. And there were various types of agreements, we tried -- tried to reach out with respect to the first litigation as well.

In the end this was the best that we were able to come up with with them. And that would be the cessation of the vote-initiated referendum at the present time. Not -- it would have no prejudicial effect on their rights in the future. And since there are sponsors for that referendum, in any event there could always be new sponsors and it wouldn't be binding on them because there could be only so many signatories to this stipulation. And it results in a discontinuation of the 2000 and -- the current litigation, the second action with respect to the proposed budget amendments that were made last year. That would be discontinued with prejudice.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

But it doesn't -- after saying all of that, it doesn't preclude them if the referendum fails to go back into court with further legal action against what the County did in the past in terms of taking money from this particular --

**MR. BROWN:**

No, it would. It would preclude them with respect to further legal insofar as the allegations were the same that are in action number two.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Oh, I see.

**MR. BROWN:**

Would preclude them, yes.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

All right. Thank you.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

And just for clarification, if the bond -- the resolution failed, that that 29 million and change had to be borrowed by the -- bonded by the County and then spent, what are the conditions under which that money would have to be spent?

**MR. BROWN:**

The stip -- there are no conditions set forth in the stipulation, except that in 2015 it would be proposed and adopted as part of the capital -- as part of the Capital Budget. It's \$29.4 million. There would be a couple of components to it; a land acquisition. A portion of the money would go to sewer infrastructure improvements and a portion of the money would go to -- we had -- water quality projects and -- but everything would have to have a water quality nexus.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

So it's basically -- it's got the same parameters as -- the bond passes?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes. Identical.

**MR. BROWN:**

Yes.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay. So we have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, it's approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**MR. BROWN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

**1752, making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed SunEdison Francis S. Gabreski Airport Solar Installation Project, Town of Southampton. (Pres. Off.)** Motion by Legislator Krupski; second by Legislator Anker. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Passes. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**1753, Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed pedestrian safety improvements to CR 35, Park Avenue, Town of Huntington. (Pres. Off.)** I'll make a motion; seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**1754, Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed modification to the Vector Control and Wetlands Management Long Term Plan. (Pres. Off.)** I'll make a motion; seconded by Legislator Krupski. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It is approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**Introductory Resolution 1755, Making a SEQRA determination in connection with the proposed Indian Island/Terry's Creek Tidal Wetland Restoration, Town of Riverhead. (Pres. Off.)** Motion by Legislator Krupski; seconded by myself.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Can we get a -- from -- I see we have representatives from the County who are involved in that wetland restoration. Can we get someone here to go over the -- some of the specifics about it. Because I know that plan has changed.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay, Legislator Krupski, did you have specific questions or you'll ask --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

No, just a general overview.

**MR. CASTELLI:**

Frank Castelli from the County, Department of Economic Development and Planning. This is a -- an exciting project that's being planned for several years now in that we're going to -- we're proposing

to restore tidal connection to a former wetland in the Indian Island County Park in Riverhead. And the site is currently -- was historically used as a dredge disposal site. And the disposal of the dredge material has separated the site from tidal connection at Terry's Creek. And the purpose of the project is to restore that tidal connection so that we could bring back a functioning wetland. And it's a really great opportunity to expand on a wetlands where -- to try to mitigate some of the losses that we've been experiencing with respect to development and sea level rise. And this project -- we've been working with the State Department of Environmental Conservation very closely on this. And they are -- they are in favor of the project. And we are to the point now where we have a pretty much final design on how we're going to do the project.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Can you share that? Because I know there was -- there was some concern in the community about how they -- the final project would look. And also, you know, the impacts to the park; and also the -- what's the fate of the old dredge material that's going to be moved as the restoration takes place?

**MR. CASTELLI:**

Well, I think I can answer the last question first. The -- there's been extensive sediment testing done prior to us removing any of the former dredge material. And there are some contaminants in the dredge material, primarily old DDT resident arsenic materials. The -- because of the materials that we found during the testing, the dredge material will not be allowed to be placed in a -- the Long Island Landfill. Our original intention was to have the material placed at the Brookhaven Town Landfill. But we have been precluded from doing that due to the result of the testing.

Now, I -- what will happen is, we've been in communication with an off-Long Island site. The site happens to be in Staten Island. This is something -- a location that was suggested to us by the DEC. So the current plan is that we -- we haven't entered into any negotiation with the owners of the Long Island Fill in Staten Island, but that is the thinking right now. And it's also important to point out that we -- the project has been redesigned to avoid the dredging of any -- the excavation of any of the former dredge materials in the areas that came up showing the highest levels of contaminants. And that was the -- a large part of the time that's been spent during the last year, was to -- coming up with a design that would allow us to go around the areas that had the highest concentrations of contaminants so that they would not be disturbed.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

What are the concentrations? And wouldn't they be tied up in the dredge materials? It's pretty fine material there. Fine -- but, you know, it looked -- to me it looked like fine mineral material. Wouldn't they be tied up in that? Would there be -- and the follow-up question is, is there any possibility of -- since the contaminated material's on the site today, and it has been for 40 or 50 years, wouldn't it be -- make more sense just to leave it on the site; just to move it to the marsh restoration and leave that material on the site since it's there anyway?

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

We had discussions. It's a County park. And Parks Department feels that for the purposes of managing and running the park, they would like to see the material removed from the park. I don't have the concentration levels in front of me, but they are similar to what's already in Terry Creek now, which should surprise no one, because basically the material came out of Terry Creek. So it's basically a background level material. So we don't have concerns and DEC has no concerns about reconnecting that area to the creek in terms of whether it would cause any kind of additional contamination.

But the issue of moving the site, moving material offsite is basically a Parks' management issue. And, you know, I could understand the concern. And, you know, you'd have to then dike it and, you know, stabilize it somehow, so I could see that there would be a problem with doing that in a County

park.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

What would the DEC say about leaving the material on the site?

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

I can't answer that for sure, but I don't think they would have a problem if -- with leaving it on site. It's really a matter of County Parks not wanting us to relocate that material within another, you know, to another part of the park. The DEC is in favor of beneficial reuse on-site when applicable and when feasible. So while I can't answer for them, you know, with 100% surety, I think that would be a possibility that we would get approved to do that.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

I mean I would still -- I'd be for that if the levels are such a background level of contamination that they're not -- and they're kind of, at this point, indigenous to the area, to the whole ecosystem anyway, I would argue that it's taxpayers' money and should not spend if not necessary, to keep the material -- do the restoration, keep the material on-site. There are certainly plenty of areas there where you have an existing dike system that could be added to; then have it stabilized and that would be -- that would be the end of it.

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

Well, that's something, I suppose, we could still work with Parks and see what they have to say about it. I know that the contaminated material is fairly fine stuff, so it's hard to find a beneficial use for that kind of thing. You know, there is some coarse grain that's not contaminated that might still be used for things like beach nourishment. But that fine material, it's hard to find a good place for it because it's not a very useful material sort of by definition.

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Right, I understand. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Anker.

**LEG. ANKER:**

I would argue against getting it out of there. You know, again, you're talking about DDT and arsenic. You know, some chemicals, unless you can reverse their components by, you know, adding another chemical to them, just need to be a way, especially in parks where kids play and for the ecosystem. And I'm assuming you've looked into that, you know, you've looked at other, you know, other uses. And it sounds like it's just not available. But I'm just curious, so the question to you would be where did this stuff come from? Where did the contaminants arrive at the designation where they are? Was it from stormwater run-off? Was it from illegal dumping? Was it from the farms? Maybe from past pesticide use?

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

Well, arsenic was at one time used extensively as a pesticide in agricultural areas, maybe many decades ago. And that's probably the source of the arsenic. DDT is very ubiquitous in the Long Island environment. It was used for a variety of purposes; some of it even mosquito control. And basically if you go into any, you know, Long Island salt marsh and you use sensitive-enough equipment, you know, you will detect DDT, which, again, should surprise no one because you can detect DDT residues in the Antarctica. So, you know, that material is out there but that's not a great concern because it's background-type levels. And of course DDT binds very tightly to sediment and organic matter. So it's detectable there, but it's probably not available biologically to be -- you know, to cause problems.

**LEG. ANKER:**

And just to remind, I guess, the people listening, what are the health issues with DDT?

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

I don't think I'm qualified to comment on that as a biologist. That'd be more the Health Department issue.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Well, from what I remember, again, it's not a good chemical to be around. I believe there's, you know, possible birth defects, you know, especially with pregnant women, our children. It was banned for a reason; let's just put it that way. So it's something -- I think we do need to get it out of our environment. And I do support removing it into a place, a landfill or a place that's acceptable. Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

All right. Any other questions? No? Okay. We had a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. It's approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0. P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN VOTE)**

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Legislator Anker, you have a question?

**LEG. ANKER:**

Yeah, and I apologize. This has to do with the previous resolution. And it was, you know, with Vector Control. And so allowing the use of a new adulticide containing permethrin. Why is that changing and how is that going to affect our environment?

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

Okay. Prallethrin is chemically very similar to the current materials we use sumethrin and resmethrin. It's particularly similar to resmethrin in that it's a material that degrades extremely rapidly in the environment.

In this use -- for instance the products we currently use, such as anvil, sumithrin is the active ingredient. And that's what actually kills the mosquitos. Same thing with scourge, our resmethrin product, it's the {resmeth} in itself that kills the mosquitos. We're looking to use a product where it has sumithrin, the same thing as our current anvil product, but it adds -- it's 5% sumithrin and 1% prallethrin. Now that prallethrin is a not enough to actually kill the mosquitos outright. But what it does do is it causes what's called benign agitation where the mosquitos are stimulated to fly, which is good from the point of view the type of technique we use, because our technique called ultralow volume aerosol relies on the mosquitos flying and hitting aerosol droplets. So this material doesn't itself even kill the mosquitos. It just makes them available for the actual pesticide that kills them.

And it's very similar in terms of its environmental properties and toxicology to our existing resmethrin product, but goes into the environment at a much lower dose because it's a much smaller component of the product. For instance, in our anvil product that we use now, it's 10% sumithrin. In our scourge product, it's 18% resmethrin. In the duet product, you have 5% sumethrin and 1% this new material prallethrin. So basically this is a material that stimulates the mosquitos to fly. It has a very, very short residence time in the environment. So when we looked at this, we said the environmental toxicology is basically going to be the same as the existing sumithrin that we already looked at, because the sumithrin is around for a lot longer and it's a much

higher concentration.

So basically CEQ looked at this and said, this is not really an additional impact beyond the materials that we already use. It has an advantage in that -- because it stirs up the mosquitos, it's important for mosquitos that tend to fly in the daytime. And the number one culprit there is our Asian Tiger Mosquito. Now you may be familiar with the Asian Tiger Mosquito if you're sitting in your yard in the daytime and a little bitty black and white mosquito comes to bite you. That's our exotic species. It's a problem because it does tend to be active in the daytime. It's an aggressive biter. It's also a good transmitter of a lot of diseases. And our current materials we apply at night don't work very well or as well with that species because it doesn't fly as much at night.

Other programs and districts have looked at this. And by adding prallethrin to the mix, the Asian Tiger Mosquitos will fly up and they get a better control. So that's the primary motivation for bringing this material into the program. It also has -- would have that same advantage for salt marsh mosquitos, which also tend to fly in the evening -- the daytime. And it also has an advantage in that we can shift our spray time to later on in the evening when fewer people are around. So it has a couple of benefits in terms of adding to the program. And it shouldn't have any significant adverse effect. So with the Asian Tiger Mosquito becoming more common, you know, this is something that we'd like to have in our toolkit to deal with that. You may be aware that's the mosquito that transmits Dengue virus, which we had last year. And this is also the mosquito that can transmit chikungunya virus, which is an emerging problem in western hemisphere. So this is something we would like to have in our toolkit to deal with these threats.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Okay, and I appreciate your explanation. Again, my concern is that, you know, using any chemical disrupts the ecosystem. And, you know, you're agitating mosquitos to fly. Are you agitating, you know, fire flies and pollinators? You know, again, we need to consider the entire insect field because if there's pollinators that have been reduced substantially that we need for our agricultural products. So, again, there's this wider perspective. And I'm assuming you considered that and that has been vetted through?

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

Yes, we have considered that. And ultimately I think we can all agree that we should only use these materials when they're really necessary, primarily because you are applying them in residential areas because you're trying to kill the mosquitos that are biting the people. So the County already has very strong controls in terms of using these materials. And we continue to refine them. And, of course, what we primarily do is try to avoid situations where we have to use these materials in the first place by improving our larval control. And we've made big strides in that over the years. As a matter of fact, with the salt marsh mosquitos, this has been the first season in my 21 seasons at Vector Control that we did not have to treat Mastic Beach with adulticides for salt marsh mosquitos. So between natural conditions and our control efforts, you know, we worked very hard to minimize these materials.

**LEG. ANKER:**

So you're using a form of integrated pest management for this process?

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

Exactly. Our long-term plan, which we put together and was finished in 2007, we spent four-and-a-half million dollars to look at exactly the right way to use these materials and the right conditions. And we recognize that a good program is an integrated program that uses a variety of techniques. And, you know, we're particularly excited to be working on these wetland restoration projects that, you know, you've been hearing about because that's an opportunity to eliminate the source of salt marsh mosquitos by restoring the wetland and eliminating entirely the need to use

pesticides to control them. So we're very excited that we've been getting some outside funding to greatly expand this kind of effort. And, again, that all goes to this integrated approach.

**LEG. ANKER:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

I did ask about the bees at CEQ. And that was something you were going to get back to us on; correct?

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

Yeah, I provided some information in terms of -- there were concerns about applying materials near marine areas. And I did submit some materials that showed the type of mapping that we use. And it turns out, if you look at the mapping, we avoid marine areas. We avoid open water areas and we minimize any treatments in tidal marshes. And since we're not going to be -- we're still -- there are still concerns about marine areas, the uses that we would have for this material right now would be the upland areas. But we also -- the primary way you protect the marine areas is by keeping the material out of the water in the first place. Because all the materials we use have potential to be toxic to fish and invertebrates if too much of it gets in the water. And this material is no different than all of them, the materials we currently use. And the key thing to do to prevent the -- it's not so much the toxicity of the material as the way you use it that prevents the impacts.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

But I specifically asked about bees and agitating bees during CEQ and I --

**MR. NINIVAGGI:**

Yeah, we haven't found any additional information on that. Bees are in the hives at night. So it's hard to see how they would be exposed to this material. And that's the primary way we protect bees is the timing of the application. And, you know, the materials we use in enough quantities will certainly kill bees. Again, we've never had a claim from a beekeeper for bee mortality. We haven't even had reports of bee mortalities so I expect that to continue.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay. Okay. Any other questions? Oh, and we were going to have Director Lansdale come back up to talk about Sepenowski Farm. So thank you for your assistance on these. And we did just finish the agenda, right? We finished it, yeah. One more -- just this one more item of discussion. That was a question from Legislator Krupski. Would you like to state the question so all Committee members can know what you're asking?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Earlier this year we authorized an offer -- purchase of development rights which is 50/50 percent with the Town of Southold and Suffolk County. And in looking at the -- I think Director Lansdale described it better than me. But in looking at the map, we see that there's a potential for adding a significant trail with a few other parcels -- adjacent parcels that would eventually hook up to the Goldsmith Inlet County Park. And this has -- but if we don't put an easement on this parcel which is -- we authorized farmland development rights. But if we don't put an easement on here for a trail, then we'll lose that opportunity and this other -- these other acquisitions won't have the same -- won't have the same meaning in the future.

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

That's right. So we're here to answer any questions about this. It would be a change to a procedural motion that was approved earlier this year. And we will have a map illustrating this. We don't have it today, but we will have it at future meetings that clearly illustrates the proposed

change. Laretta, do you want to just provide a brief --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

How is the change being proposed? Through -- you have a resolution?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

We'll have to amend the resolution -- the procedural motion.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Procedural motion is going to have to be amended. But to comply with our Triple A acquisition procedures, we need to do it at the next meeting so the issue is properly noticed all Legislators. And then we can take it up at our next meeting.

**MS. FISCHER:**

This is the Sepenowski Farm in Southold. It's approximately 40 acres in total of about --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

You're cutting in and out. If don't know if it's your mike or --

**MS. FISCHER:**

I'll hold on real tight. The Sepenowski Farm is approximately 40 acres. There was going to be a five-acre cutout. Now we're proposing that the Town of Southold will cut out ten additional acres as a conservation easement leaving about 25 acres to be acquired with the Town and the County as a farm PDR.

So the Town of Southold will be buying 50% of the entire, you know, 35 acres. But they will be buying the conservation easement on their own, that ten acres. And then the remaining amount of funds to -- to come to the 50% will be put towards the farmland PDR acquisition with the County.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Okay. And you'll have maps the next time we talk about this?

**DIRECTOR LANSDALE:**

Yes, we will. We'll have large maps for this one.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

You will. Any questions?

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. I appreciate the work on this. This is something --

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Yeah, sounds like a really good --

**LEG. KRUPSKI:**

-- that in the future when it all comes together, it'll be well worth it.

**CHAIRPERSON HAHN:**

Thank you. So seeing that we have no more business before us, we are adjourned. Thank you.

9/5/14 EPA Committee

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 12:27 PM  
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**