

Minutes of a Scoping Hearing held by the Town Board of the Town of Riverhead at Riverhead Senior Citizen Center, Shade Tree Lane, Riverhead, New York, on Wednesday, May 4, 2005, at 2:00 p.m.

Present:

Edward Densieski,	Councilman
George Bartunek,	Councilman
Barbara Blass,	Councilwoman

Also Present:

Diane Wilhelm,	Deputy Town Clerk
Dawn Thomas, Esq.,	Town Attorney

Absent:

Philip Cardinale,	Supervisor
Rose Sanders,	Councilwoman
Barbara Grattan,	Town Clerk

Councilman Densieski called the meeting to order.

Councilman Densieski: "Good afternoon everybody. My name is Ed Densieski and I'm a Riverhead town Councilman representing Supervisor Cardinale who had a death in the family and will not be able to be here today. I welcome you to the Riverhead town senior resource center in Aquebogue on this beautiful Wednesday and the purpose of this hearing is to identify the significant adverse impacts relating to the site plan application of Headriver LLC for a Wal Mart store to analyze the supplemental draft environment impact statement being prepared by the applicant.

The applicant has prepared a draft scope of environmental issues which has been available for public inspection since April 24, 2005. Copies of the draft scope are available here. Rick, you have copies here— they're in the back if anybody needs a copy.

Upon completion of this hearing, the Town Board will compile the comments of the Board and the public and issue a final scope to the applicant to initiate the preparation of the DEIS.

Could you please read the official publication, please?"

Diane: "I have affidavits of publishing and posting for a public hearing to be held at Riverhead Senior center, Shade Tree Lane, Riverhead, New York, on May 5, 2005 at 3:00 p.m., the draft supplemental environmental impact statement of the site plan petition of Headriver LLC - Wal Mart Store."

Councilman Densieski: "All right. It's 3:15, consider the meeting opened."

Before we start business, I received a letter from North Fork Environmental Council, Inc. from Mr. Howard Meinke (phonetic). I'd like to submit that to the Town Clerk to be put into the record.

With that said, can we get the applicant to summarize the site plan application, please?"

Charles Vorhees: "Good afternoon, Councilman Densieski, Members of the Board, Town Representatives. My name is Charles Vorhees. I'm with the firm Nelson, Pope and Vorhees, with offices at 572 Walt Whitman Road in Melville. And our firm assisted with the preparation of the draft scope which is the subject of today's meeting for input on the scope in accordance with SEQRA Part 617.9."

The project itself is the subject of pending plans with the town. It involves the 21.21 acre site that's opposite Kroemer Avenue on the north side of Route 58. This was the site of a prior draft environmental impact statement that involved a Lowe's home center. I think we called it a lumber yard use at that time under the prior industrial A zoning.

Since that time, the site has been rezoned to Destination Retail and this application is pending for a Wal Mart store on the subject property, subject to site plan review.

Because the site had a prior draft environmental impact statement and there's a change in the project, there was a determination made that was appropriate to study the changes and specifically the adverse impacts related to the change as a result of this current pending application.

What is before you is a 167,951 square foot Wal Mart store as well as 27,000 square feet of additional retail space. We will be comparing this to the prior application which was for a Lowe's store with additional restaurant space and office space and we'll be looking at comparing those projects as well as updating any information with

respect to environmental resources.

The outline is fairly complete and it does address all of the points necessary pursuant to SEQRA for a scoping document and the document itself will address geology, water resources, vegetation, air resources, land use zoning and plans, traffic and parking, community character and community facilities and services.

So we are here today. The applicant's attorney, a member of my staff, Bill Maleke (phonetic), and we would be interested in hearing comments from the public and looking to have the draft scope finalized for the purpose of an accepted scope so that this project can move forward through the supplemental EIS process.

That concludes my remarks unless there are any questions."

Councilman Densieski: "Okay, thank you. At this time, I would like to acknowledge Councilman Bartunek and Councilwoman Sanders that are also here today- I'm sorry, what did I say? I'm sorry, Barbara, and I' like to open it up to the Board members for their comments and questions now if they'd like to before the public. (Inaudible)

Do you have any comments now or- "

Councilwoman Blass: (Inaudible)

Councilman Densieski: "Okay, let's hear from the public. Anybody have a comment on this public hearing?"

James Gaughran: "Good afternoon, members of the Town Board, ladies and gentlemen. My name is James Gaughran. I'm an attorney with offices in Huntington, New York at 191 New York Avenue. I am here today representing Local 1500, the united food and commercial workers union.

And first I want to start by thanking Supervisor Cardinale- I'm sorry for his loss. I would like to thank him as well as this Town Board for opening up this process and giving the public the opportunity to be heard on this Wal Mart site plan proposal.

We also would like to commend you for recognizing that the Wal Mart proposal is significantly different than the former Lowe's lumber yard proposal that you had before you and we also commend you for making the proper determination giving it a positive declaration and declaring it a Type I action pursuant to the State Environmental

Quality Review Act otherwise known as SEQRA.

Concerning the scoping, I just want to say that the draft scope was not available on Monday when, you know, we went to Town Hall to try to get a copy of it. I went to the Planning Department where we were referred from— by the Town Clerk's office. It was not in the file.

The only reason I mention it is that I haven't had a chance to read it. My clients have not had a chance to read it other than quickly glimpsing at it and so we would like to have the opportunity to submit something in writing to respond to it after today which I believe is part of the process if that's okay."

Councilman Densieski: "We're going to close the public portion today but we're going to leave the written comment portion open until May 18, close of business on May 18th."

James Gaughran: "Okay. Then we can respond in writing to the scope."

Councilman Densieski: "I'm just curious because we just advertised that it was there since April 25th. Rick?"

(Inaudible comment from Rick Hanley)

Councilman Densieski: "Okay."

(Some inaudible comment)

Councilman Densieski: "We're recording this so unfortunately you're going to have to stand at the microphone because we have to catch it on the tape."

Charles Vorhees: "The scoping process is intended to solicit public input but there are no specific requirements in the law for noticing or public notification or notice in newspapers as there is for a draft environmental impact statement.

I'd have to check exactly when the draft scope was e-mailed to the offices. I thought it was here for the 25th, but I'm not exactly certain. I think the May 18th date for written comments will provide more than adequate time thought. And then there's a full 60 days from the submission of the draft scope to adopt the final scope. So, again, there's more than enough time to finalize this."

Councilman Densieski: "Thank you."

James Gaughran: "And, you know, we're not making any big deal about it. We understand that, you know, sometimes everything doesn't get in the right file at the right time but we just wanted to make sure that we had the time to respond which you're giving us and we appreciate that."

Part of the scoping that I feel you need to address very clearly is what is the land use process that has to be followed by this application. I believe that pursuant to your town code, before it even got to this stage, it needed to go through a pre-application process. I know the old application did but I believe the new one does as well.

And the reason for this is because first of all, I don't believe it should be treated as an amended application. I believe it really should be treated as a brand new application. It's completely different. It is now being reviewed by you pursuant to a totally different zoning code, zoning category and updated master plan.

You know, as pointed out by Mr. Vorhees, the old zoning was an industrial category and now it is in your newly created destination retail center, DRC zoning. So I think if you go through the process of looking at what approvals they will need, you will find that there are some problems with approving this application as simply a site plan application. I don't believe it can be approved as a site plan application.

DRC according to my reading of your code and I'm using your on line versions so maybe I'm looking at the wrong section of the code as it relates to DRC, but it appears to only permit two specific uses. One is retail stores and one is hotel which obviously is not relevant here.

You define retail stores in your code as a building dedicated to the sale of goods in small quantities to the general public, which goods may be brought to the premises in their finished state or improved at such store or shop prior to sale.

In addition, the code states as its intent in Section 108-257 in part quote to provide for large retail centers along Route 58. Further, the section states quote development is intended to have a campus style layout with no strip or free standing businesses permitted.

Therefore, I suggest that the Wal Mart store by virtue of it being a large, big box store, is really a free standing store that is not permitted in this zone. And it is clear that through the process of updating the master plan and amending the code, the Town Board, I recognize that some members and not all members that are currently on the Board were involved in this, did recognize it seems the big box concept. Because while you didn't put permitted in destination retail, you do permit it in other zones.

For example, in Business F, in addition to permitting manufacturer's outlet centers, you also permit quote establishments engaged in selling goods or merchandise to the general public for personal or household consumption provided that the entire structure housing such use is occupied by a single tenant or single owner use and shall be in a structure of no less than 100,000 square feet.

That seems to me to be a big box store such as a Wal Mart.

There's also provisions in your business center for free standing businesses and you have a special permit provision that if it's to be over 10,000 square feet, an applicant has to get a special permit. That is one problem that I believe you have with enacting this strictly as a site plan.

The other issue is a restaurant. I believe- I don't know if I heard Mr. Vorhees mention but I believe the application also includes a 27,000 square foot restaurant. That's what I thought I saw on the site plan. Twenty-seven thousand square foot retail. Okay. Okay. So it's not a restaurant. Thank you for that clarification.

The other issue is I notice that it includes a snack bar. I believe that this type of a snack bar would come under the definition of a food court in the Riverhead Town Hall- code, which you define as an establishment for the preparation of food which by design of the physical facilities, permits or encourages limited consumption of food on either counter tops or seating areas but something that's not a restaurant.

You do permit this with a special permit in some of your other zones. It was not included in my reading of the DRC zone.

In addition, the proposed tire and lube center is totally prohibited in the DRC zone. In fact, you very carefully make sure that it is only permitted in areas of the town in mostly industrial areas where it's not going to be a detriment either to residents or

commercial activity. And, in fact, in those cases, you require that an applicant obtain a special permit before you would permit such automotive use. It's not included in this zone.

There also may be other aspects of the Wal Mart store that is proposed and also perhaps this other store that's proposed which I'm assuming we'll get more details about during this process, that maybe because of their use or activity, might also have something that is not permitted in the DRC zone and I urge the Town Board to look at that very carefully as they go through the process.

I don't believe you can allow Wal Mart to stretch the town code and allow these additional things to go in as accessory uses. Because I think that is very, very dangerous and particularly since you have a situation where I think this is one of the first major development applications you have before you under your revised master plan and town code that has been significantly revised.

And I think it is very dangerous to allow something to come in as an accessory use that's specifically prohibited in the zone just because it's attached to something that is permitted. And, particularly when it comes to the tire and lube center. Because if you say that a tire and lube center is an accessory to a retail, then people can put these just about anywhere in your commercial zones and I don't think that is something that you would want.

And, you know, maybe a little extreme example but I think one that is not beyond the realm of the possibility, you take great care to make sure that adult uses are significantly limited pursuant to the constitutional provisions in this town as to where they can be placed.

What would stop a retail book and video store if you allow this type of precedent of allowing accessory uses to be stretched in terms of definition. What would stop them to have an adult video, adult book section and just say, well, that's accessory to the overall use as a commercial book and video store. I think that would set a very, very bad precedent that you should not enact.

I'd also like to, you know, when I conclude, present to you a copy of the page from your master plan which I think has a very good chart that shows very clearly that in addition to this violating the zoning code, these uses also violate the town's master plan.

So, again, I think after you review all these issues, the only conclusion you can come to is that the DRC zoning does not fit for

this particular proposed use and the applicant really has to come back to you with an application for a change of zone to a commercial zone that would permit the type of use that they are proposing.

Maybe- I don't even see how they can do the tire and lube proposal in this zone at all unless they come up with some sort of a very creative use variance application that I guess they would have to present to your zoning board.

The second thing that I believe is very important. In my quick look at the scoping- draft scoping statement, I did not see much of it, but Section 8-0103 of the Environmental Conservation Law, which I'm sure you are familiar, sets out the legislative intent of SEQRA when it was originally enacted, says in part, it is the intent of the legislature that the protection, enhancement of the environment, human and community resources, shall be given appropriate weight with social and economic considerations and public policy. Social, economic and environmental factors shall be considered together in reaching decisions on proposed activities.

Therefore, I think the Town Board has an obligation under SEQRA to make sure that there is a thorough review of the social and economic impact of this proposed Wal Mart center.

When the former Board had the Lowe's application before it, the original submissions by the applicant didn't present much in terms of the economic impacts and the Board forced the applicant to do a thorough review of the economic impacts of a Lowe's store on other home improvement, lumber stores, paint stores, business supply stores, anything else that would be sold in a Lowe's.

You have to do- I believe you have to do the same thing as it relates to a Wal Mart, particularly since Wal Marts have had a history of closing down stores, Mom and Pop's, entire downtown shopping area, even entire malls. And you need to know that if this Wal Mart goes in, what is this going to do to your Mom and Pop service stations. Is this going to put any of them out of business?

What is this going to do to your downtown area which, you know, has had some problems in the past when large new development has come in? What is this going to do to your Route 58 corridor? What is this going to do to the Tanger Mall? Because there may very well be some products that will be sold by Wal Mart that could put some of those outlet stores out of business, creating some vacancies.

It's very important that you focus on the economic impact of this and require that the applicant submit to you the information that I believe they are required to do under law.

Other than the draft scoping document which I received today, I am not aware of any new SEQRA documents that have been submitted by the applicant with the submission of this Wal Mart site plan which they are calling an amended site plan and we respectfully disagree and feel that it is a new site plan. And, in fact, in Miss Margolin's letter, it's my understanding that the environmental assessment form that she was submitting— she actually wasn't submitting one, she was just referring this Board to the one that was originally submitted, which I have a copy of here.

My concern with that is that this is dated May 9th, 2000. It was for a totally different project. It is six years old and I really believe that pursuant to SEQRA since this Board has already determined they want to begin the SEQRA process anew and have a thorough review of it, that you really require them to start the process with a new EAF and submit all the information to you.

I recognize that there's a lot of stuff going on with the property even though it's six years old, that they don't have to redo, some of the physical characteristics of the property. Obviously they can just resubmit to you aspects of what is in the old SEQRA. But I don't think they can just submit this to you and state that it covers this project.

For example, the description of the project that they have in the opening is, you know, as you know for a Lowe's center, something totally different than a Wal Mart.

The existing vehicle traffic study that they refer to in this EAF, that SEQRA decisions were based on and which is the only EAF you'll base your decision on, was a 1999 traffic study. I would venture to say that there has been a significant change in traffic in this area particularly on Route 00 on 58 in the past six years.

The EAF was filed under an old zoning category, industrial zoning, with totally different rules, a totally different set of procedures and guidelines. That has to be changed.

Question 12 in the application. Is surface liquid waste disposal involved? They wrote no. Obviously they wrote no when it was a lumber yard. Now that you're going to have oil waste from a tire and

lube center, that question I believe would change.

Question 16, will the project generate solid waste? They give you some information. There's no information about what they're going to do with all the used tires that they're going to have to dispose of somehow, presumably in this town with their large tire and lube center.

Question 18, will the project use herbicides or pesticides? They say yes but only reference lawn care. They're going to have a large garden center as part of this that's going to be open. I would presume to preserve and protect that merchandise, they're going to have to use some type of chemicals that they're going to have to disclose to this Board before they do anything.

A lot of technical stuff is wrong with this such as, you know, question 25. They talk about the permits that are required. They say a special permit and a site plan. Well, you know, they no longer need a special permit but I think they also need to add a change of zone application.

Other local agencies, other regional agencies, they say no. I believe they have to involve the Suffolk County Planning Commission. In fact the Planning Commission, as you are well aware, rejected, ruled against-- recommended against the Lowe's application because they felt it had major negative potential impact to the regional planning in Suffolk County.

I believe this application affects the entire east end, particularly in dealing with traffic and its impact on the economy of the east end. And I think the Suffolk County Planning Commission must be included in this review. In fact, I think, you know, we need to know, have them participate in the scoping.

Also find out if they are consenting to the lead agency status by this Town Board which I presume they probably will since they usually do. But I think due to their interest, they're going to want to be involved and have some consultation with that.

The other, you know, some of the other questions, just very quickly and I'll submit more of this in writing. They have on questions 3, 4, 5 and 6, deal with the maximum potential development of the site if developed by the present zoning. They put NA, not applicable all the way down the line in all these questions.

Well, that is totally not valid right now, particularly since this is going to involve transfers of development rights and I think they have to disclose to you what they think they can develop, what they intend to develop, what they may not develop, what they may want to decide they're going to develop in the future.

Question 12, again, traffic. They say is the traffic sufficient—are the road networks sufficient to handle the traffic? They say yes, but it was based on something totally different.

The areas dealing with surface and ground water. Questions about whether or not it will require a storage for petroleum or chemical products. Questions about discharges and oil and waste. Well, they're going to have propane tanks there. They're also going to have the tire and lube center. They're not disclosing any of that in this EAF because it wasn't something they were thinking about doing to develop the property back in the year 2000.

So these are all issues that I think you really need to address and ask the applicant to come back in and really present more to the public in terms of SEQRA.

I'll try to quickly finish this. You mention the 60 day clock which we're very appreciative of and the extra time to review this. I think it's also important that you incorporate in your scoping process as much of your master plan process as is relevant. Because obviously, the Town Board and other residents of the town I see who recommended changes to the code and the master plan. Citizens put in a lot of time to update the master plan and code and you really should be commended for that because most towns don't—talk about doing it but never do it. You did it and I think now with this first application, you've got to make sure that you're implementing it correctly.

Your staff reports also that were done under the old Lowe's project, you know five and six years ago, you know, I'm not going to go through them but I think they all have to be redone. Because they all were kind of based on a lumber yard and the impact of lumber on property as opposed to some of the economic and environmental issues that we have before them now.

That pretty much concludes, you know, what I have to say and unless you have any questions. But I very much thank you for this opportunity on behalf of my client. I know—I think a couple representatives of my client would like to address you briefly. But

we thank you for this process and we look forward to working with you as you continue it."

Councilman Densieski: "Thank you, Mr. Gaughran. Are you going to submit papers-- "

James Gaughran: "Yeah, I'm going to submit something in writing. (Inaudible) Thank you very much."

Councilman Densieski: "Would anyone else like to speak?"

John Woods: "Good afternoon, members of the Town Board. First, I'd like to thank you for this process and to be-- the ability to be heard on the Wal Mart site planned proposal.

My name is John Woods and I'm the political director of the United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1500. Our union represents over 22,000 members through Long Island, the five Boroughs, in New York City, Westchester, Putnam and Dutchess Counties.

We represent the employees at supermarkets like Pathmark, King Kullen and Stop and Shop to name a few.

I'm here this afternoon to bring you a message from our members. The preservation of economically responsible employers combined with the increased and intense scrutiny of big box stores must be part of any sensible economic development plan.

I would first like to talk about reasonable-- responsible employers, I'm sorry. I would like to take a moment to compare and contrast for you what I think makes a responsible employer.

A responsible employer provides a fair wage, a living wage. Our employers provide full time employees with a starting wage of over \$10.00 an hour. More importantly, they provide a minimum of 40 hours of work every week. Far too many of these big box stores, including Wal Mart, categorize full time workers as working more than 28 hours. That is not a full time job.

A responsible employer makes health care available for all employees. They provide a package that includes basic health care needs such as doctor visits, hospitalization, prescription coverage, dental and vision care. Furthermore, the health care must be affordable. Our employers pay the full premium for health insurance for all their employees, both part time and full time.

This employer, Wal Mart, actually educates its employees on city, state and federal programs and aid that is available to them rather than to pay their own health insurance. That is one of the reasons why big box stores average less than 50% of their employees with health care coverage. Some of them with less than 40%. If these employees are not covered for health care, your constituents will pay the cost of their insurance.

Now more to this specific application. You have an obligation to the commercial and residential property owners and citizens of this town to review the economic impact of this Wal Mart store. This proposed Wal Mart is very much different than the one you currently have. It is larger and in turn will carry more items. This store is proposed to be roughly 140,000 square feet plus some 30,000 square feet of garden center.

Wal Mart says this store is not a super center. Wal Mart super centers are typically 180 to 250,000 square feet. We have one such super center in our jurisdiction in Fishkill, New York. Down the road from this super center was a vibrant shopping center, the Dutchess Mall. This mall had numerous small shops, a movie theater and a supermarket. The Dutchess mall was part of Fishkill for decades. I'm using past tense because this mall is now closed. It took Wal Mart one year to close all of the small businesses in that mall and that mall is now an eyesore.

But Wal Mart says this isn't a super center. Maybe it's a mini super center. Wal Mart just announced yesterday that it's opening its first mini super center in Denver, Colorado.

The focus of our union is to help our members attain the American dream. If we lose that vision of the American dream, we lose the nation. We lose this great town as we have known it.

The proliferation of big box stores will destroy the fabric of Riverhead. We clearly believe the new master plan and the DSR provisions clearly prohibit this applicant and this project should not be approved. Do not trade empty promises for what in all probability will be the final nail to downtown Riverhead. I thank you for your time."

Councilman Densieski: "Thank you, Mr. Woods. Mr. Meinke."

Howard Meinke: "Thank you, Town Board. My name is Howard Meinke. I'm actually a member of the Board of Directors of the North

Fork Environmental Council. We have approximately 2,000 members on the north fork and we're not particularly employees of anybody or do anything, but we are very interested that the north fork maintains its livability and its ambiance and is still a nice place to be that those of us who are members of NFEC are members because we like where we live and we don't want to see it change and if it has to change we want to do it the best way possible and not louse it up through poor planning, poor approvals, etc.

And to that regard we did some fast homework here and we saw that the original traffic study, the old Lowe's site shows 647 parking places. The new Wal Mart proposal contains 882. That's a 36% increase in parking plus what I think would be more rapid turnover of the cars than it would be in the Lowe's past application, so that's really a lot more traffic. So clearly whatever was done in the year 2000 traffic study, is outdated and has to be redone.

And I do think the socio-economic forces here are very great. I do know, I can't quote who it was, but one or two downtown businessmen who had originally voiced approval for the Tanger project said after it was over and the shuttle bus ceased running and a little more food was served in Tanger and so forth, they thought they were snookered by that and they were very displeased with tanger.

Now I think this Wal Mart is a bigger kick in the head than Tanger was and I think Tanger may have interrupted the growth of downtown, I don't really know. But Riverhead is relying on a vibrant downtown and an interesting riverfront to keep Riverhead with the small town interesting place it's supposed to be. It could be just another big Long Island wasteland of big stores and malls if that's what they want but I don't think they want that.

And I think that this incoming Wal Mart proposal is a real threat to downtown and I think it has to be looked at very carefully from that point of view because I don't think it's the antithesis of what we're really all trying to do for Riverhead.

And the real intent of the current zoning, it's interesting, the first speaker mentioned this also, we just picked out very quickly whereas they talk about what's supposed to be in that zoning category, there is this auto and tire store which I know I've seen elsewhere. A lot of people go there because the tires are expensive and they're a little cheaper there and batteries are expensive, they're a little cheaper there and oil changes.

So that will be a pretty high volume thing at Wal Mart and it is not in the list of what belongs in that zone and if this is going to be possibly, I'm not sure, the first or one of the first businesses to come in under the new zoning, let's be very careful that we understand what we're approving and don't set precedents that will come back to bite us downstream. I think that's very important.

And it was mentioned that the Suffolk County Planning Commission should be involved. I think by rule it has to be involved, but we're very interested to hear what they have to say because from studying other things that have come down the line, I think Suffolk County Planning has had very good opinions. They've not always been agreed with but I think the Suffolk County Planning has had a good vision of what should happen in both Southold and Riverhead and I wait to hear that.

And obviously this oil and tire- auto center gives rise to the potential of various types of spills of material that weren't part of the application from Lowe's so that also has to be considered.

So it does appear that it needs a new analysis from start to finish and that bouncing off the old application could lead to errors and omissions and I think there should be a totally full new review of this application because I think this is very important. This is very large, has big ramifications. Thank you very much."

Councilman Densieski: "Thank you, Mr. Meinke. Any other speakers? Come on, Bernadette. Okay. You're up, Larry."

Larry Oxman: "Larry Oxman. When they did the EIS, how far of a range does it go? In other words, are we only looking for the impact in the town of Riverhead? I guess the shopping- the Wal Mart will be the largest retail center on the east end and so what about its effect in other communities besides Riverhead and going west?"

Councilman Densieski: "We're going to ask our resident expert, Rick Hanley, head of Planning."

Is the EIS, you know, for regional economics (inaudible)."

(Rick Hanley made an inaudible comment)

Larry Oxman: "I mean, you deal with villages like Westhampton Beach and they're probably closer than Jamesport or Quogue, Southampton. I know typically we don't look on that side of the river

but nonetheless this is a large retailer. Thank you."

Councilman Densieski: "Thank you, Larry. Bernadette, you want to come up? You'll be next."

Bernadette Voras: "Bernadette Voras, a Riverhead resident. Number one, I believe that you have to start at ground zero right from the beginning with a brand new investigation of all the effects of this. I think that the two projects, the original Lowe's and this, is quite different.

Secondly, this little packet, I may have missed it but I don't think so. There's no answers here. This is almost like a little cover sheet that says, you know, all- where does one get all of this- the result of all of this information? In other words, it tells about an analysis of the project's potential future traffic generation. But it's not there. Where is that analysis? Is it available at this moment?"

Councilwoman Blass: "Miss Voras, the purpose of this hearing today is to list all of the things that will be studied, such as what you are mentioning there, so that in the document that they- the applicant has to produce, will answer and address all of these issues that are on this outline."

Bernadette Voras: "Okay. All right. Then I would like to consider this project. I've never gone in a Wal Mart store except for here. Not in the one proposed like this. But that doesn't really make that much of a difference.

The scope, just the mere mention of over 100,000 square feet in which there will be a waste stream of car batteries, tires, and so forth. It's not just employment here.

I understand that Harrow's and Staples and Shop Rite or one of the Shop and Saves, there are a few more businesses that want to come here. I cannot think if the store is placed here where it wants to go, I cannot see how those, even those large businesses, can exist for very long. And that is not counting places like little Paints Plus and all our shops. I can see them dissolving away.

Now I remember with Tanger, I didn't think that all our shops would dissolve away, like Riverhead Building Supply was going to be replaced by Home Depot. I could never see that because they're two totally different things, the different, the lumber carried is

different and so forth.

But this is like a mammoth project. This is the biggest thing I think we're every going to see and if we don't give every modicum of consideration to this, this cannot be done instantaneously or even over months. This is so big. I would like to see this project in a little further, for instance along William Floyd Parkway, there's a great amount of land in there. Because that would then include the folks from Shirley and all of the towns in there.

Because I can't envision our stores, our local businesses, the people that have put this town in existence all these years, all those little stores. I can't see them existing for too long. And I'm not, you know, one of these people that just anti-business, I'm really not. But for-- this entire concept is a mammoth undertaking and I really am asking the Board to please look at it this way, to really think what's going to happen to each and every one of these little stores.

I don't see where you're going to get all the people, not here on the east end. Even if you were to empty out from Montauk to Orient. Okay? I just don't think there's enough business for everybody at this point. But locating this in a little bit further so that, you know, we would have to travel maybe 10, 20 miles down the road. Think about it. Okay? Please, thank you."

Councilman Densieski: "Thank you, Bernadette. I just want to remind all the speakers, if we can possibly stay on the issue, the scope, so we don't get on tangents. Okay, next speaker, please. I just asked the speakers to stay on the scope. I'm not picking on you, Bernadette, yet."

Regina: "Hello, my name is Regina. I'm a member of ACORN. Understanding that there is a written comment period, on behalf of ACORN members who couldn't attend today, I'm strongly urging another hearing like today's for public input. The time of day as well as lack of notice to the public does not serve the community well."

Councilman Densieski: "Lack of notice?"

Regina: "Yeah, it's my understanding that, you know, that this meeting was not-- and the issue that was going to be, you know, the issue of Wal Mart, the Wal Mart store, it was not published on the internet or in the Times Review, and there weren't even flyers really put out."

Councilman Densieski: "It was posted in the Traveler Watchman, the official paper of the town of Riverhead. As far as the website, I'm not sure (inaudible)."

Regina: "Well, I believe it was not and that would really, you know, we'd like more notification so that more people could be present."

Councilman Densieski: "Could you just tell us what the acronym for ACORN, just for the record?"

Regina: "I'm sorry."

Councilman Densieski: "ACORN, you said you represent ACORN?"

Regina: "ACORN. That's an Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now. It's a, you know, community based grass roots kind of organization for, you know, local concerns. Okay? Thank you."

Councilman Densieski: "Thank you."

Councilwoman Blass: "Can I ask- just reiterate that there will be public hearings on the documents that are going to be produced as a result of today's outline of issues that we're asking the applicant to consider. Okay? This is not a hearing of whether we think Wal Mart is a good applicant or not. We're trying to start the environmental review process."

Councilman Densieski: "We need to get your last name for the record, please."

Regina: "Sure, Regina Corby, C-O-R-B-Y, Graham, G-R-A-H-A-M."

Councilman Densieski: "Thank you. Any other speakers? Sir?"

Tony Speelman: "Hi. My name is Tony Speelman. I'm the Executive Vice-President of Local 1500 UFCW and I won't give you any further arguments, I think you've heard enough of those."

I do want to thank you for letting us speak today though. Also on behalf of 800 residents of the town of Riverhead, I'd like to present a postcard mailing that was done to you, all of them in opposition to the site."

Diane: "Can you spell your last name?"

Tony Speelman: "Sure. S-P-E-E-L-M-A-N."

Diane: "Thank you."

(Inaudible comment - unidentified)

Councilman Densieski: "Thank you. Any other speakers? Okay. We're going to close the public hearing portion of this meeting and move- leave it open until May 18th close of business. This meeting is officially closed at 3:59 p.m. Thank you all for coming."

Scoping hearing closed: 3:59 p.m.
(Left open for written comment until May 18, 2005)

Barbara Hutton
Town Clerk