

Minutes of a Scoping Hearing held by the Town Board of the Town of Riverhead at Town Hall, 200 Howell Avenue, Riverhead, New York, on Wednesday, May 29, 2002, at 3:00 p.m.

Present:

Robert Kozakiewicz,	Supervisor
Barbara Blass,	Councilperson
Rose Sanders,	Councilperson (arrived 3:15 p.m.)

Also Present:

Barbara Grattan,	Town Clerk
Dawn Thomas, Esq.,	Town Attorney

Absent:

Edward Densieski,	Councilman
James Lull,	Councilman

Supervisor Kozakiewicz called the scoping hearing to order at 3:05 p.m.

(Scoping Hearing opened: 3:05 p.m.)

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Let the record reflect the time of 3:05 p.m. and we are here for a public hearing that was noticed for 3:00 p.m. which was the scoping on the generic environmental impact statement in connection with the master plan.

Barbara, would you read the affidavit of publishing and posting, please?"

Barbara Grattan: "I have affidavits of publishing and posting for a scoping hearing to be held at Riverhead Town Hall, Riverhead, New York on May 29, 2002, at 3:00 p.m. regarding the consideration of the adverse environmental impacts associated with the preparation of the Town of Riverhead Comprehensive Plan being prepared by the Riverhead Planning Board at the direction of the Town Board."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Before I start, a little bit of a difference in protocol. I'm going to ask any speaker who wishes to address us with respect to the generic environmental impact statement submit a card in writing so that we also have all of the people who have spoken before us a memorialized document a note as to the speakers

who are going to address the Board on this particular scoping hearing.

I will be turning it over initially to Dave Emiletta (phonetic) but, one, I have some preparatory comments. Usually we're here when we're talking about scoping to deal with a project that's come before us as a result of a developer or an applicant. So we're usually in a little bit of a different scenario than we are today.

Today we're here as a team. And I want to stress that, as a team, so that we can further the process of this master plan which is, I think, on all individual's parts, stakeholder's parts, interested citizens, Board members, staff people here in the town of Riverhead, something that we all want to have happen. It's a process that we all feel strongly about and something that, I think, we all want to be in the same canoe or the same kayak, paddling in the same direction upon.

So it's a little bit unique in that process. So I want to make those comments initially that this is not our typical scoping scenario. This is a scoping scenario to further a process, which is a master plan.

Also, as set forth in the treatises, the purpose of a scoping is to ensure that the DEIS accomplishes its goal providing relevant information about an action's potential effects upon the environment, including methods and alternatives to minimize or avoid such effects, so that an informed decision can be made by the involved agencies.

In addition, the DEIS, the draft environmental impact statement, should be capable of being read and understood by the public, should address those quote significant adverse environmental impacts which can be reasonably anticipated-- end of quote, and should contain no more detail than is appropriate.

Saying all that, I am going to at this point turn it over to Dave Emiletta to describe in a little more detail the purpose of today's scoping hearing. Dave."

Dave Emiletta: "Thank you, Mr. Supervisor. You said half of what I was going to say but before I begin, I'd like to introduce Mr. Joe Ferrucci (phonetic), of the firm of (inaudible); who is in the process of preparing the comprehensive plan, and Joe, if you'd give us a few words of where we are in that process?"

Joe Ferrucci: "Sure. We are in the process right now of completing- compiled and complete proposed version of the

comprehensive master plan. As many of you know, many of you have been involved in the process over the past year, year and a half. About a year and a half ago, we had- in which we discussed- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Joe, I'm going to ask you just so that everything is caught on the record."

Joe Ferrucci: "Sure. Would you like me to start over?"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "If you would, please."

Joe Ferrucci: "We're in the process right now of completing a final compiled draft of the comprehensive master plan for the Town. As you know, many of you have been involved in the process for the past year and a half through the CAC meetings that have been taking place.

About a year and a half ago, we had workshops on the downtown strategy and about one year ago, I believe in March of last year, we started releasing draft chapters of the comprehensive master plan which were released one by one and as those chapters were released and made public, we had meetings and we had a discussion on those chapters and received very important and valuable input.

Since those public workshops have concluded, we've been going back and going through all of the comments and ideas that we received from the public and putting the plan together as a whole. One thing that we've done recently is compiled the land use- proposed land use plan that you see in front of the room. This synthesizes many of the ideas that were proposed in the draft chapters and also incorporates many of the comments that we received from the public.

Another thing we've been working on is a build out analysis. A build out analysis is an estimate of what sort of population would result from this new proposed land use plan. And so we've been working with David Emiletta and the town to prepare that. And, again, most importantly, we've been preparing and completing all of the draft chapters.

At this stage, we expect that compete draft text to be done within the next month. So that will be shown first to the town and be reviewed internally to ensure that we've covered all our bases as consultants and then it will be introduced to the general public.

At that point, public hearings through the- at the Planning Board

level will begin on the whole plan. So you'll have a lot of time to actually review the plan and comment on it formally.

So, on that note, we've determined that because we are so far along in the process, this is an appropriate time to begin the scoping process of the environmental review and so I'll go back to David."

Davie Emiletta: Thank you, Joe. Okay. The state environmental quality regulations require the town like any other proposer of an action, to determine what significant impacts may result as a proposed- as a result of this proposed action, and to examine those impacts in the form of a generic environmental impact statement. It's called generic because we're at a planning level. We're at a level that at this point doesn't commit the town to any specific hard, concrete action, but it does give the town and the public a chance to assess what potential significant impacts may result as a result of the comprehensive plan and basically what to do about it.

Now, in order to systematize that assessment, we are embarking on a process which will end up with this generic environmental impact statement, or GEIS. In order to provide that GEIS with some structure and as we would do with any written treatise, we would want to at least come up with a well rounded, well thought out, table of contents and if we may call the scoping document a table of contents, then I think we can understand a little bit about the beginning of the process that we are at now.

The scoping document before you is a draft of the table of contents so to speak. We have begun to identify areas in which there may be significant impacts occurring as a result of the proposed action. We have begun to identify areas which we believe may not be significant and need not be further studied. However, we don't claim to know it all at this point. As Joe said, we are early in the formative process of the comprehensive plan.

One of the basic tenets of the SEQRA process is to begin the environmental analysis as soon as possible so we're opening up this process now to give us several months of examination, both of the plan document itself and of potential impacts that may result of it, and of measures that we may employ- the town may employ to mitigate those impacts.

So with that as a basic introduction, I think what I'd like to do today just so we understand the subject matter, is to go through the I guess six or seven pages of actual outline here and I think because it

may be most useful to you to comment, if you wish to make comments, on any of these sections as I'm going through them.

Okay, does everybody feel comfortable with that? Great.

Then we'll start on page number 4 of the document. Page number-page numbers 1, 2 and 3 are introductory material identifying lead agencies and interested agencies that the town itself has to notify. Page number 4 begins the actual table of contents of the GEIS or the scoping document itself.

So first we will have the major section number one. We'll have a description of the proposed action and its background which as you know the comprehensive master plan of the Town of Riverhead that's in existence today was originally written in 1973. The most recent comprehensive update of the ordinance was adopted in 1970, with amendments along the way.

In this document, in the GEIS, the existing zoning ordinance and comprehensive plan will be discussed. The updated comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance amendments proposed for adoption will also be discussed. The methodology and process whereby the updated comprehensive plan and zoning amendments were drafted will be detailed.

The next item, public purpose, need and benefits. The central purpose of the proposed action and, the proposed action again is the adoption of the comprehensive plan, is to establish the nature level of potential development in the Town of Riverhead under current land use and zoning practices, that is, the current zoning and comprehensive plan, and to make such changes as are necessary to current policies and regulations to ensure that future development will be keeping with the character of the town, will be developed in accordance with sound environmental planning and engineering principles and standards, and will protect the public safety, health and welfare.

There will be- as I said, there will be a summary of the comprehensive plan and the zoning amendments and the Town Board, the Town Board will be the adopting agency and the Town Board will also be the adopting agency of the rules and regulations that implement the plan, that is to say the zoning ordinance.

Okay, the next major section of the GEIS and we'll be getting into the meat of the subject matter here, is the environmental

setting, the existing conditions and the future baseline conditions, and I'll describe a little bit of what that means, and the probable impacts of the proposed action.

Existing conditions will represent conditions as of the date of the preparation of the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance. That is, basically, today. The future baseline will reflect the conditions 20 years hence without the proposed action. In other words, if the town did nothing, the town didn't amend its zoning code, if the town didn't adopt a new master plan, what would the town look like in a general sense 20 years hence. That is what we call a future baseline.

And then, finally, probable impacts of the proposed action will reflect conditions as of the year 2022 or 20 years out with the proposed action. If the town adopts the comprehensive plan and the zoning ordinance amendments that implement it, what would be the proposed impacts? What would be the impacts? And that will be measured against as I said the baseline if the town did nothing.

So if we could summarize quickly what the GEIS would assess, that would be it.

The basic element, of course, in any comprehensive plan is land use. Existing conditions and patterns of land use in the town will be discussed and an inventory of vacant and underutilized sites that could be subject to development or redevelopment, will be provided. Recent land use trends will be discussed including the types of new development that are occurring in the town and in the region of eastern Long Island.

For future baseline conditions, current trends, market factors, and the inventory of potentially developable or redevelopable sites as well as any proposals or projects which have recently received approval or are in the approval process, will be used as a basis for projecting the amount and type of land use developments that is likely to occur by the year 2022 assuming the proposed action does not take place. So there's a description of how we establish the future baseline.

Similar projections will be prepared for 2022 assuming the proposed action, the comprehensive plan, is adopted and these will be compared with the future baseline. Land use impacts will stem from changes in permitted land uses as well as changes in the allowable density of development or redevelopment, changes in bulk requirements, and changes in design standards or guidelines.

So that summarizes how we will assess the impacts of the proposed action in the subject area of land use, the general subject area of land use.

The next section on the water resources. This section will address groundwater, surface water, and aquifers. Existing conditions regarding surface water, meaning streams, ponds, and wetlands, groundwater and aquifer resources will be described in general. The potential impact of development under the updated comprehensive master plan and the zoning ordinance amendments on the water quality of groundwater, surface water and the aquifer resources both within Riverhead and the surrounding areas will be examined.

Information on existing water quality such as surface water bodies will be described. Known sources of groundwater, surface water contamination within the town will also be discussed.

With regard to future baseline conditions, the draft GEIS will note any actions or changes in conditions that are expected assuming the proposed action is not taken, that is, the future- meaning the future baseline.

The question of whether the proposed action would affect possible sources of groundwater or surface water body pollution especially with respect to storm water runoff will be examined. Since less development is likely to result from the proposed action, there will be a decrease in the demand for potable water and sewage treatment facilities. That is, compared to the future baseline.

Such impacts will thus be handled at a screening level. In other words, at an earlier level in the GEIS.

The next section will deal with air quality. Impacts on air quality stem from either one of two sources. One, increases in mobile source emissions, meaning motor vehicles. And, two, increases from point stationary sources such as new industrial plants or power plants. Since the proposed action would not be expected to result in either one, air quality impacts will not be analyzed in the GEIS.

The next section deals with plants and animals. Woodland areas, estuary marine areas, that is, areas subject to tidal flow, and other habitat areas may experience greater disturbance as a result of the proposed action. Potential impacts to endangered plant and animal species and the habitats where they may be found will be examined as part of the draft GEIS.

Yes, sir?"

Hal Lindstrom: "On this plants and animals- "

David Emiletta: "Yes?"

Hal Lindstrom: "The thing I feel that there has been very little said as far as the impacts on the different species of animals in these open areas. I've studied some species as a wildlife (inaudible), that's my profession, and I feel that there should be a greater study of all open space to establish what kind of species are in these areas and what the impact any kind of development is going to have on them."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "I'm going to intervene a little bit on this one. Because I'm not sure we're going to get all this on tape if we do it this way. This is part of the problem and one of the reasons why I wanted to kind of- I think rather than have a give and take on a particular subject, Dave, have you go through the summary and then have speakers who filled out cards come up and then they can address the particular areas of the scoping document that they want to address."

I hate to do that to you but I don't want to miss any of this and by not having it with somebody standing in front of the mike, we may or may not pick up and then the comments that were just made, for example, Hal, may or may not be reflected in the minutes of this scoping hearing, and I don't want that to happen. I would rather that we stay according to the plan which was to have the cards filled out, have the speakers come up and, you know, I don't mean to jump over you, Dave, but I think what I'll do is have you finish up your analysis or your synopsis and then go to the cards."

David Emiletta: "Okay."

David Amper (from the audience): "Just a question, Mr. Supervisor Kozakiewicz. Is it the plan simply for you to read this document to us?"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "I- I think that's what he's doing just to give an oversight of the particular areas he's dealing with and then have the individuals who are here who wish to address the Board, address how that scoping document can be beefed up. Right? I think that's- Dave, would you agree with that?"

David Emiletta: "Today I think is the first time that many of you had a chance to look at this and if you have any opening comments to make upon hearing the first reading, may step to the podium and make those comments. The public comment period itself will be open for several months and this is simply the opening session of it. So- "

Richard Amper (from the audience): "No. I just wondered about the (inaudible) of reading a document we've looked at verbatim for however long it takes to do that. If that's something that's essential for the record- "

David Emiletta: "Well, if no- let's put it this way. If no one wants me to read this, we can cut to the chase and you can make your comments. If, however, you feel you want to hear it read, I'll read it. I see two people saying no, don't read it. It doesn't matter. This is not a very- "

Richard Amper (from the audience): "If somebody wants it read- "

David Emiletta: "This is not a very- "

Richard Amper (from the audience): "-- listen to it. I'm just saying we can- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Well, here's a way to short that. We can just say, you know, without any due delay, if there is nobody who's indicating they need it to be read, what we can do is the following. We'll just make that document part of today's record. And since there doesn't seem to be objection to that concept, that's what we'll do and then if Dave needs to respond to any individual questions that come up with respect to it, then we'll have him come up."

Richard Amper (from the audience): "I don't want to discourage anybody from asking any questions about any of this that they don't understand or the- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "No, no, no. That's why we're here. Any questions, you know, please put them forth and Dave, hopefully, will be able to address them for us today. That's why we have him here. All right?"

David Emiletta: "My job at least initially is made a little bit easier."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Okay. And with that, one of the first cards I have is from Joe Gergela."

Joe Gergela (from the audience): "I have nothing to comment at this time, but maybe later."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Okay. Richard Amper."

Richard Amper: "My name is Richard Amper. I'm Executive Director of the Long Island Pine Barrens Society, 547 East Main Street, here in Riverhead."

A couple things. I want to join the Supervisor- the spirit of what the Supervisor said in terms of everybody wanting this master plan process to move ahead and be good for Riverhead. We are in the same boat going into this process and we're eager to make any contributions that we can to the process.

I noted in the document, a list of interested agencies, and I'd ask that the Pine Barrens Society at the address we gave, be added to that list so that we continue a good dialogue throughout the process.

We're a little concerned exactly about where we are in the process. I think that the number of people here and the general familiarity with this document in the community is not what I think we'd all like it to be. There's sort of two ways of looking at scoping. You can say what is it that we need to look at as we evaluate a proposed action, in this case, a master plan, okay. And there's also a desire to make sure that we're evaluating everything, and this seems to be coming to some extent, after some portion of the process. This is not happening at the beginning of the process. There has been work on the master plan update at this point and yet neither is it a case where we're evaluating or commenting of a complete document.

Presumably there are many things that are going to go into the master plan and which aren't here today which cause a little bit of a confusion just as (inaudible) process. And that is we do a GEIS not just to comply with SEQRA, we do it so that we can evaluate a plan or action of government and also reasonable alternatives to that action and when we look at it we see that there has been some- a sentence or two given to no action or no density reduction in the aquifer overlay district- I mean the agricultural overlay district. But I assume and I- if anybody disagrees, certainly wise me up, but I assume that there are going to be all kinds of alternatives that are going to be laid

out here and what happens if this and what happens if that. That this process is not getting us to and it would be useful from our point of view to have the alternatives, all of the various alternatives looked at so that we can comment on those. I mean, if only so to avoid having to do the GEIS again. So keeping the comment period open, I think, is useful but I think some sort of pro-active public education campaign, and, please, I know in some of your cases you've bent over backwards to get the public's ear on this.

I know people are concerned about Riverhead paying an enormous amount of attention to how it's covered in the press and what the implications are. I'm not sure how well the community as a whole understands it and it may be useful for you to schedule yourself some additional hearing or public input when- especially when some of these alternatives are laid out. It would be easy to comment on what's here in a very general way and I'm willing to make one or two of those suggestions today, but I've got to tell you, we're very, very interested in this and we don't think we know exactly what this plan is likely to look like down the road, all of the alternatives that are worth exploring, and that you people, I'm sure, welcome exploring. So if we don't, there may be any number of other citizens that don't quite know what we're reacting to.

So no fault being found here, it's- you had to do some scoping to decide what you were going to look at and you can't really know how you feel about it until you've gotten into the process. So it's hard to find out whether the cart is in front of the horse or the other way around. But, I think we all benefit if we do both. In effect, say, these are things I think we ought to do and these are things we just don't know enough to comment on at this point because we haven't looked at- and I would say those are especially the alternatives.

Looking specifically at the document, or the summary, I think we need to look at a whole range of alternatives, not merely whether it's adopted or not adopted but is it adopted in part? Is it adopted with a TDR program? What are the economic impacts of the TDR program as experts suggested?

Joe and I and Sid and others went through the process of doing the GEIS for the Pine Barrens Act and we discovered things in mid process that we hadn't considered at the beginning and had to go back and say, okay, how will this play out?

One of the things that came up in this particular one is the decision or the determination on air quality. The particular section

says, impacts on air quality stem from either motor vehicles on the one hand or point stationary sources such as new plants or something of that sort. Since the proposed action wouldn't be expected to result in either one, well, but failure to take the action might result in additional car emissions or other construction of that sort and there may be something in between. We may do some of what is contemplated and not others. So it's hard to know what the environmental impacts are and the environmentalists have- are routinely accused of coming out late in the process and saying, we don't like something. We don't want to find ourselves there, so the object of the game is to look at the whole panoply of alternatives as we're going through the GEIS process.

So I think you can do it by some community education and maybe the community- maybe our organizations have to do that, too. Maybe it shouldn't be left just to government. Maybe we've got to get the people who are going to be here screaming at you if they don't like it, in the process early saying this seems right, could we also look at that? Could we also look at that?

But I don't think any of us knows enough about where the plan is today to confidently say that. I'm not the best expert and the more we know about it, the more helpful we'll be able to be. And I think this is a case as we did in the Pine Barrens- during the Pine Barrens plan portion, after the act and before the plan was adopted, the people- the community group joined government, joined members of the Commission, and went out and spoke to- at public meetings and so forth and said here's what's happening here. And people would put their hands up and say, could you look at this or would you consider that?

I just don't think we're there yet. And I would love to have been there six months ago, mind you. I'm merely saying I don't want- certainly in our case, I don't want what we don't know enough to comment about to hurt the process down the road.

So I think there's an education of a GEIS, too. I think that we need to say not just what if the project goes ahead, what if the plan is not adopted, but what if we do this instead or we do a portion of it or we do some transfer of development rights or some upzoning or we- whatever it is that's there, I think it would be really, really useful for us to look at not just a no action alternative or a limited alternative but a fairly broad range of what those might be.

Once everybody's read the reasonable alternatives that are going to be evaluated, then I think we can make a much better presentation

than I'm sure as heck making today, I just- to a large extent, I don't know what I'm talking about because I'm only reading what is really a basic summary of areas to be covered.

In the interest of simply not having to redo the GEIS at the end and making sure that we've looked at everything we want in the plan, we're suggesting, yes, keep the comment period open but don't expect too many comments because I'm not sure how final or complete this plan draft is. Let's schedule a further public hearing if we can possibly do that and let's figure out together how we can be sure that we've got people are fully aware of what it is that this plan means to do and how it can be improved upon.

I do not want to be at some future point coming back here saying what we should have done was this. What you should have done was that. Let's all do it together now."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "I'm just going to comment with respect to that while you're there. This is something that we talked about. And the concern was at what point do you start the SEQRA process given the where we are with the master plan. And, of course, SEQRA says that you're supposed to start as early on in the process as you can. So we have that particular aspect of SEQRA that's there.

As Joe Ferrucci indicated earlier, the hope is that all of the elements will get released in approximately a month. We're talking about at the very least and we'll certainly take into consideration the possibility of further public hearings, keeping this open for at least three months. So that would give the public at least an additional two months once all the elements are released to read them, digest them, and then provide written comments to the Board so that this process can continue."

Richard Amper: "We are in no way faulting you folks for wanting to get an early start. The earlier we start, the earlier we complete this. We're perfectly happy. It's just we're not entirely sure all of what we're reacting to. We want to be fair about that. That's all."

Councilwoman Blass: "Just to further punctuate what the Supervisor said. I think the plan also is to have a final scope adopted after the Planning Board has actually held its hearings on the plan. So we will have a plan that has some validity if you will to it, after which we probably, if we decide to actually have additional scoping hearings, that's a possibility, but certainly the comment

period as the Supervisor indicated, would be held open at least until the conclusion of the public hearings on the plan at the Planning Board level. Was that consistent with what the strategy was, I believe."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "We've had some discussions about, you know, (inaudible) of keeping the comment period open or do we set a time so that we kind of, you know- when we set a time period, we tend to know that we've got the time period set so it makes us work a little bit more to get things accomplished by that time, talked about and I haven't had a chance to run this by the rest of the Board, putting comment period, written comment period for the Tuesday after Labor Day which I think is September 3.

And, of course, we know in the past when we've had a deadline but we received commentary from someone who says, listen, I need an additional week, two weeks to provide comment, we've done that. We've opened it up and allowed it to continue so that we can have, you know, a full and complete opportunity to hear anybody who wishes to be heard on a subject."

Councilwoman Blass: "Just as long as we're all on the same page and I think we are in that we need to know what document exists in that complete stage, if you will, before the final scope of issues is adopted by this Board."

Richard Amper: "That gives everybody to say okay, now we know what we're talking about for sure."

Councilwoman Blass: "Exactly."

Richard Amper: "What we suggest and don't suggest. And, again, my focus again and my emphasis again would be let's look at alternatives. Because we frequently get-- a lot of times town boards get faulted for not doing one thing or the other. Well, the answer is, this is likely to be a spectrum thing in the end. Some stuff's going to be adopted and some isn't and so looking at the alternatives and evaluating the alternatives, I think is going to be very, very good for the process and if there's a possibility of developing a consensus, it will come at that point and at least if there are differences of opinion among stakeholders, we'll understand where we all agree and we like to hope the few areas where we disagree."

Councilwoman Blass: "Very few, hopefully."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "I know, Hal Lindstrom also filled out a card to comment. Oh, and Sid. Okay."

Hal Lindstrom: "Hal Lindstrom, Riverhead. As I mentioned before there's not really that much mentioned about the different species of animals and plants that live in these open spaces, especially today when there's so much pressure on these open spaces to be developed. You know, I've done a lot of traveling and I've done a lot of studies on the different species of animals, especially some of them in this area.

Just an example. We have a lot of species of birds that travel all the way down to South America and it's a few thousand miles of flying. They spend the winter there. They come all the way back here and they basically breed in the same area, I would say within 50 feet of where they bred the year before. And when these areas develop, it affects those species. It's their- their homes are taken away. They are displaced and as these areas get smaller and smaller, the species decreases.

Just an example of that- there was a woodpecker down in the south and it's called the Ivory Billed Woodpecker and it was quite abundant in the bayous and in some of the swamps of the south. And if they had done a study on it back then, that particular species would not be extinct today. What happened was they cut- they needed to- they only foraged in large hole trees for these large grubs and what they did is they cut down all of the old growth for the lumber and this particular species became extinct.

So I mean as time goes on, I think we have to consider that. These different species live alongside of us and I think that we have to learn to- there has to be a balance when we consider any kind of developing and we have to consider all of the different species on this planet that we can share this planet with and not just develop everything and not consider their lives and, you know.

Another example. I had- my next door neighbor had a- it was a small shore bird, it's call a (inaudible), it's a small bird. It was probably nesting in that area for generations and each generation is taught that, you know, to come back to that area. Well, they nested in my neighbor's yard and my neighbor didn't know anything about them and he ran the first nest over with his lawnmower and the second year they came back again and his kids, of course, stepped on the eggs. So this is just an example of what happens when you have development coincide, you know, or overdevelopment reacts to different species of

animals, you know.

And these animals can't speak for themselves. I mean they can't tell you, you know, I live here. This is my home. This is where, you know, I live for generation after generation. So there has to be more consideration when it comes to developing these open spaces. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Sid Bail."

Sid Bail: "Sid Bail, President of the Wading River Civic Association. I think the Supervisor's comments at the beginning of the meeting were very apt that this has got to be, hopefully, this is going to be a very cooperative endeavor. And being on some of the committees, you get to see that there are a lot of stakeholders who come at this from a different perspective.

I'd just briefly like to comment on something that Dave pointed out in his introduction and something that Dick Amper followed up on in his presentation. Dave talked about like land use and he talked about looking at the proposed action versus- measured against the baseline. And I think what Dick was saying is it isn't quite clear what the baseline is and that was the thought that occurred to me before I came here.

Being on the committee, there are some things that already in terms of land use, not being a professional, you know, I see that a lot of the stakeholders seem to be more easily- more acceptable to a wide range of stakeholders like perhaps improving the purchase of development rights, improvement of the transfer of development rights, giving people in the agricultural community more options in terms of staying in business and etc.

Obviously, one of the more controversial elements is upzoning to two acre zoning. Now, one of the things, if- Dave, is that is the baseline or will that be in the baseline, the two acre upzoning?"

David Emiletta (from the audience): "No. That would not be a future baseline (inaudible)."

Sid Bail: "Okay. My suggestion is that it should be at least considered somewhere along the line as a- in other words, you're only- you say you are comparing the proposed action- measured against the baseline but, you know, what Dick was talking about is things in between, other than, all right, I think should be concluded because,

you know, I haven't seen your charts but I was looking at the SEDES website and they were talking about the build out here in Riverhead town and the number that they used with the existing zoning was 59,000 and another 10,000 in terms of summer, seasonal population on top of that 59,000.

That, you know, is a mind boggling number and it would certainly have significant environmental impacts, etc. So, I think I agree with Dick, we need more clarity and we need more options and I personally think that two acre zoning and is it within the realm of this document or this exercise to examine the economic impact upon the farming community?"

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "These mikes-- no. You can use this one- Dave, this one, just as long as you turn on the switch, you can use one of these. Be a little bit cumbersome for you, but you can use- yes. Just flip it up. Okay, it's on."

David Emiletta: "To- okay, to answer your question. Future baseline would mean to change from existing so that would mean no adoption of a rezone to two acres. A plan alternative would be- a reasonable alternative would be to consider a rezoning to two acres. That might be alternative number one.

Alternative number two may be with a TDR or without a TDR so we could start to (inaudible) among different alternatives.

Your second question was would there be a socio-economic analysis of the effect- impact on the farm community. I think we did one in 1987. I think we'll do one now."

Sid Bail: "Okay. That's- I guess the point I was trying- thank you very much."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you, Sid. That's all the individuals who handed up cards. Oh, Joe, you want to speak at this point?"

Joe Gergela: "Joe Gergela, Executive Director of the Long Island Farm Bureau. I think that Dick made some excellent points and some of the same concerns that we have at this point. And I thank Sid for representing the farmer's point of view because that was one of the questions I was going to ask in the alternatives and the whole discussion about land use policy. We certainly want to make sure that that issue about impact on the business of farming is considered as

part of the discussion.

In fact, in Southampton's master plan update, there was a provision about protecting the business of farming and also somewhat of a fairness issue and maybe through the Ag portion that we'll address this, but trying to protect fairness in the equity issues of land use policy. So we would ask that that would be considered. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Eve Kaplan."

Eve Kaplan: "Eve Kaplan. I'm representing the North Fork Environmental Council. As the other speakers have said, I'm looking forward to a time when we'll be able to speak at a hearing on the scope for the GEIS with a copy of the master plan in our hand and I would encourage you to hold another hearing because as you probably know, it's very difficult for a lot of people to put into writing all of the comments they would like to communicate to a Town Board. If you truly want input from residents, you will hold another public hearing, preferably not during the day when it is difficult for a lot of people to come. So if there is any legal way to hold it concurrent, for example, with the Town Board meeting, I think that would benefit the town as well as the residents.

Just a couple comments on what we do have in front of us. Again, not knowing exactly what the proposed action is or will be, but I think I agree with some of the comments about the importance of looking at the impact on air quality, of no action or a baseline action. And I think as far as 2.4 plants and animals, 2.5 historic and archeological and energy, I think it's important to also consider preservation as an alternative. If there are properties that will be preserved or being considered for preserved- preserves, I'm thinking in particular of open space properties as opposed to farmland development rights purchases.

I think an alternative, for example, might include a certain percentage or a certain acreage of land that the town had a goal of acquiring. I know there's money that was bonded so I think the town has already set some goals and that would obviously have an impact on some of those things, on the habitat. For example, plants and animals, it says habitat may experience greater disturbance as a result of the proposed action. I think it should also look very carefully at the lessened disturbance as a result of preservation. And I think that that section particularly should include inventories that have already been developed, for example, by environmental

consultants who have done work in the town for other projects and from environmental groups such as the North Fork Environmental Council, the Nature Conservancy, Pine Barrens Society and other groups that have volunteered to come forward with inventories and lists and locations and research data essentially that exists for the Town of Riverhead.

Because if that's not catalogued in some way, it's never going to be available to anyone in the town. Right now, it sort of sits in little bits and pieces in different reports and that's just a shame because it's valuable information.

And it should include a wetland inventory as well, a map that either a reproduction of the current map that is used, the Town of Riverhead wetlands map, or some other map that makes sense to use.

And, again with historic and archeological resources, that should include inventories that have been done for different development projects and should highlight the areas in town on a map that are particularly important, historic value and archeological value such as-- I know Maidstone, they were-- the whole-- essentially a lot of the bluff was found to have Indian artifacts and on the bay as well, (inaudible) Point and some other areas.

On energy, I don't quite-- there's a section 2.9 on energy on page 7 and there's a section on page 10 on energy and I don't really-- one says that it won't be analyzed and one says it will and I don't see how those two go together. But I do think it is important that the town analyze its role in the energy-- the total energy use of the town because municipalities do have a role to play in either encouraging conservation or encouraging energy use. The utilities chapter I'm sure will address any kind of new infrastructure that's planned or proposed as far as electricity, natural gas I know they talked about. So those things should definitely be discussed in there as well.

And I guess finally I would just say that I am a little bit concerned about the master plan process. I've been-- I'm a big advocate of planning. I think it's-- this is the key to Riverhead's future and I have tried to publicize as many of the meetings including this one and the hearings to as many residents as I could to really get people out so you could hear their input.

And I'm a little concerned that while I think the last round of meetings were really for residents to hear what was being proposed and somewhat for residents to give their ideas, kind of like a brainstorming session, I'm a little concerned that there's going to be

a step missing between that and final chapters that go to hearings because there's a step where people give input on a whole range of alternatives like maybe five acre zoning, maybe 25 acre zoning, maybe like you were saying, maybe like a two acre zoning without a TDR program, and where they hear what the impacts of those will be. And I hope that this GEIS will also address some of those alternatives where residents have a chance to shape alternatives and not just respond to those that they're given.

So I know that you may feel that, you know, over the last many years, three years, four years, that you've been trying to get people out and hear what they have to say, there is still time and there is still a need to keep reaching out for people's input and to make materials available as much as you can, as freely as you can, because people have a lot of information to share with you and a lot of ideas and I think that when presented with a plan that doesn't always resonate with people as far as the way that they would like to communicate their vision for the town. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Before I call up the next speaker, I just want to comment briefly. I think that we have tried to disseminate the information, get it out there to the fullest extent possible to get commentary from interested individuals by placing summaries on the website. There was a great deal of television coverage with respect to the meetings that were held earlier in the year where, in fact, this boardroom was, you know, pretty well occupied with individuals who had different give and take as to what makes sense, what didn't make sense, what they saw was appropriate for the master plan and what they saw was not appropriate.

My only comment is at some point we've got to take that information, bundle it, put it together, and reissue a final document to keep the process moving along because if we keep going through it and then submit a document and then get input again, we will never get out of, you know, that endless cycle. So I know I appreciate the comment but at some point the comment- the response is that we have to take it to the next step, that we have to take it to the next level.

I think with respect to this master plan if we go through it historically and see everything that was done, there was the survey which included a tremendous response to a typical mailing survey of commentary from businesses and residents in the town of Riverhead which was a tremendous first step to get the process going and then we had the meetings to get the input with respect to where it was going, so all of us are concerned about how quickly it goes along. All of us

are concerned to see that it gets to the end of the road, and all of are concerned that it happens, so we share. And as I said at the very beginning, we all want to see this go in the right direction."

Councilwoman Blass: "And also if I might add the purpose of the Citizens Advisory Committee which is a 30 plus group of individuals who have been reviewing the chapters, each of this individuals represents a constituency. That's why they were asked to serve, to represent the school district, the various environmental and hamlet-environmental communities, geographic hamlets, business interests, other stakeholders. And it was really their responsibility to act as the spokesperson and to be the liaison back to their respective groups and interests and we were relying and made it very clear from the beginning that they had that responsibility to act as a conduit to bring the information back from the Citizens Advisory Committee meetings to their groups. And when they held their monthly meetings and when they had an opportunity to exchange ideas that they were to do that. And it was to be a two way street. So we relied upon and will continue to rely upon the input from that Citizens Advisory Committee and hope that as they make their comments, they do bring forth a consensus or issues that have been expressed to them by the various interest groups that they represent. That was the purpose of assembling that Committee."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "I just want to also, I think Barbara's comments were great. This is a community effort and we all have a responsibility. Eve, if you want to come up and respond? All right. And then I want to get to Ann Miloski who is sitting patiently."

Councilwoman Blass: "Ann is a patient person."

Eve Kaplan: "Actually, I just want to say that I would also request that the North Fork Environmental Council be added to the list of interested agencies- "

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "I already noted it. I figured you were going to say that and you didn't and you surprised me."

Eve Kaplan: "Okay. We are on the CAC and we have been active at those meetings."

Councilwoman Blass: "Yes."

Eve Kaplan: "And I would also say that it's a fact that not all the CAC members have been treated equally, that there are different

amounts of information and input that the CAC members have on the alternatives which then become finals in this plan. So I guess those are some of the things that sometimes input is asked for, like I mentioned I felt that we tried to give some input particularly on the natural resources chapter and I really didn't get a response from the consultants more than, you know, we'll send it in and we'll see what happens. So you'd like to know that it is incorporated and that you see it in the next draft. Thank you."

Richard Amper: "One further clarification. Maybe we're not so far apart. We just wouldn't want the input that has been accepted up to this point to be the end of the process. And what we're really talking about now is the opportunity for the community and those 30 representatives of the CAC now to react to a complete document and to a series of alternatives in terms of the- we're not suggesting that you're not interested in hearing from them, but it needs to occur at the beginning and then once you put forward a proposed action, then it's important for them to have something complete that they can react to, including all the alternatives. That's all we're saying."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Ann Miloski."

Ann Miloski: "My name is Ann Miloski and I'm concerned on this 2.3, the air quality and the 2.10, the noise, where you dismiss it as doing a GEIS and I think that is very important because at this time we're already seeing what's happening through different types of development that we do have poor air quality, and we do get a lot of noise and I think Sid Bail could even tell you about the Shoreham power plant that now will be running diesel turbine engines and they're going to have to put up noise barriers so I think in whatever we do in our zoning, we should be concerned with that. Thank you."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Thank you. Anybody else who would like to submit a card and comment? I want to- the one comment which is to continue the process and have some further discussion, I know Barbara and I just had a chat as far as maybe a final CAC meeting-- once all of the 12 elements are here in a more formalized version to have a summary or update meeting, a comprehensive meeting if you will to go through that which I think would be beneficial to all parties and certainly then for all those CAC members to go back to their respective memberships and individuals of interest to disseminate that information. But that's something that we talked about and decide and it's something that's in conjunction with this GEIS process. That's, I think, a comment that we've heard and we think it's a great idea. So, just to make that note."

Anything else? Any closing comments? Dave?"

David Emiletta: "No."

Supervisor Kozakiewicz: "Okay. If not, and we talked about keeping it open until I think it's September 3 for written comment. As stated, if there's as in the past a request from somebody who finds that the time constraints being what they are, they cannot adequately respond by that time, in the past we've entertained requests to keep the public-written comment period open longer. And certainly comments also as far as a future public hearing, we will take up for consideration.

With that said, the time being 4:05 p.m., close this public comment period. And thank everybody for being here and participating today."

Public comment period closed: 4:05 p.m.

Barbara Gutton
Town Clerk