

Minutes of a Meeting of the Town Board of the Town of Riverhead, held in the Town Hall, Riverhead, New York, on Tuesday, March 3, 1981 at 7:30 P.M.

Present: Joseph F. Janoski, Supervisor
Francis E. Menendez, Councilman
John Lombardi, Councilman
Antone J. Regula, Councilman
Victor Prusinowski, Councilman

Also present: Kevin Duffy, Town Attorney

Supervisor Janoski called the meeting to order at 7:30 P.M., and the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Councilman Prusinowski offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Regula,

RESOLVED, that the Minutes of the Town Board Meeting held February 19, 1981, and the Special Town Board Meeting held February 24, 1981, are dispensed without objection and be approved as submitted.

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

BILLS

Bills submitted on abstract dated March 3, 1981 as follows:

| | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| General Town | \$63,732.46 |
| Street Lighting | \$ 8,675.27 |
| Highway Item #1 | \$ 7,830.70 |
| Highway Item #3 | \$19,199.75 |
| Highway Item #4 | \$ 171.25 |

Councilman Menendez offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Lombardi.

RESOLVED, that subject to complete audit, the following bills be approved for payment.

| | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| General Town | \$63,732.46 |
| Street Lighting | \$ 8,675.27 |
| Highway Item #1 | \$ 7,830.70 |

| | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Highway Item #3 | \$19,199.75 |
| Highway Item #4 | \$ 171.25 |

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

Supervisor Janoski: "I would take this opportunity to explain the yellow flower on my lapel. I've been asked a number of times what it is. Today is the 50th Anniversary of the Riverhead Garden Club and that organization was kind enough to give me this boutonniere.

We have with us a number of department heads who are certainly available to answer questions you might have."

OPEN BID REPORTS - SIX POLICE VEHICLES

After being duly advertised the bids for Six (6) Police Vehicles of the Riverhead Police Department were opened by the Town Clerk on Monday, February 23, 1981 at 11:00 A.M.

J.J. HART, INC.
Route 58
Riverhead, New York

I. BID: FOR ITEMS 1, 2 and 3.

| | |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Make & Model of Item #1 | Ford LTDS 4 Door |
| 2. Make & Model of Item #2 | Ford Fairmont 4 Door |
| 3. Make & Model of Item #3 | Ford Fairmont 4 Door |

Cost of vehicles described in items #1, #2, and #3.

\$46,597.88

Net cost of vehicles described in items 1, 2, and 3
less excise tax on delivery \$8,558.78

ALTERNATE BIDS

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|
| 1. Make & model of Item #1 | Fort LTDS 4 Door |
| 2. Cost of vehicle (s) described in item #1 | \$8,558.78 |
| 3. Net cost of vehicle (s) described in item #1 less excise taxes on delivery | \$8,558.78 |

OPEN BID REPORT - SIX (6) POLICE VEHICLES - continued

BID FOR ITEM #2

1. Make & model of item #2 (2) Ford Fairmont
2. Cost of vehicle (s) described in item #2 \$15,275.52
3. Net cost of vehicle (s) described in item #2 less
excise taxes on delivery \$15,273.52

BID FOR ITEM #3

1. Make & model of item #3 Ford Fairmont
2. Cost of vehicle (s) described in item #3 \$22,763.58
3. Net cost of vehicle (s) described in item #3 less
excise taxes on delivery \$22,760.58

FILED.

KINNEY CHEVROLET-OLDS, INC.
East Main Street on Route 25
Riverhead, New York

BID: For items 1, 2, and 3.

1. Make & Model of Item #1 1981 Chevrolet Impala 1BL69 4dr
2. Make & Model of Item #2 1981 Chevrolet Malibu 1AT69 4dr
3. Make & Model of Item #3 1981 Chevrolet Malibu 1AT69 4dr

Cost of 6 vehicles described in items #1, #2, and #3
\$52,232.00

Net cost of vehicles described in items 1, 2, and 3 less
excise tax on delivery \$52,232.00

ALTERNATE BIDS:

BID FOR ITEM #1

1. Make & Model of item #1 1981 Chevrolet Impala 1BD69 4dr
2. Cost of vehicle (s) described in item #1 \$9,122.00
3. Net cost of vehicle (s) described in item #1 less
excise taxes on delivery \$9,122.00

BID FOR ITEM #2

1. Make & Model of item #2 1981 Chevrolet Malibu 1AT69 4dr
2. Cost of vehicle (s) described in item #2 \$17,424.00
3. Net cost of vehicle (s) described in item #2 less
excise taxes on delivery \$17,323.00

OPEN BID REPORT - SIX (6) POLICE VEHICLES - continued

BID FOR ITEM #3

1. Make & Model of item #3 1981 Chevrolet Malibu 1AT69 4dr
2. Cost of vehicle (s) described in item #3 \$25,686.00
3. Net cost of vehicle (s) described in item #3 less
excise taxes on delivery \$25,686.00

FILED.

REPORTS

Manorville Fire District report for year ending
December, 1980. Filed.

Building Department report for the month of February,
1981. Filed.

Tax Receiver's report dated February 27, 1981. Filed.

Supervisor Janoski: "The time has not arrived for
the first public hearing, so we will do the communications."

COMMUNICATIONS

H2M Corp, 2/03/81 - Re: vouchers for drainage
facilities & Peconic Park. Filed.

General Code Publisher Corp., 2/17/81 - contract for
professional services for code book updates. Filed.

Gregory Blass, 2/24/81 - Re: compost program &
deposit beverage container legislation. Filed.

County Department of Planning, 2/23/81 - if no
objection to adoption of Sec. 85-1 (definition - Junkyard)
to Brookhaven ordinance by 3/12/81, it will be assumed there
are none. Filed.

Mary Ella Richard, 2/20/81 - copy of letter sent to
William Carney regarding pine barrens proposal with resolution
supporting preservation. Filed.

COMMUNICATIONS - continued

Patrick Perrella, 3/01/81 - advising Board that tennis courts at County Park will be delayed & submitted minutes of County Parks Committee. Filed.

7 Z's Divers, Inc. - requesting assistance in energy programs (Community Development) Filed.

Southampton Town, 2/24/81 - notice of proposed change to zoning ordinance. Filed.

Sears, Roebuck & Co. - requests permission to demonstrate gas grills in front of store. Filed.

Gregory Blass, 2/20/81 - advising Town Board that Parks Committee will meet 3/04/81 to consider resolution re: acquisition of land along Peconic River in Riverhead. Filed.

Planning Board, 2/20/81 - recommending that special permit of Halandia Corp. to develop 40 units be approved on condition that planting buffer & windbreak be put along north & west boundaries. Filed.

Brookhaven Town, 2/18/81 - notice of adoption of amendment to Chapter 85 of Town Code. Filed.

County Department of Planning, 2/19/81 - having received no adverse response to notice of amendment to Riverhead Code, Section 108-3 & 95. Filed.

Wading River Senior Citizens Club, 2/23/81 - commending Recreation Supt. Stanley Grodski for cooperation, assistance, etc., and asks that letter be put in his personnel file. Filed.

N.Y.S. Div. of Equalization & Assessment, 2/23/81 - listing documents required for certification for payment #1 & #3, and commending Assessors & staff on excellent job done. Filed.

Marcia Hefter, 2/24/81 - requesting renewal of lease for Eastern Suffolk School of Music for premises at 141 East Main Street. Filed.

COMMUNICATIONS - continued

Governor Carey, 2/25/81 - acknowledging receipt of Town Board Resolution. Filed.

John Foley, 2/25/81 - re: Health Committee meeting on 3/06/81 at 9:30 A.M. Filed.

Environmental Quality Review Board, 2/26/81 - memo to Town Board re: proposed expansion of Glenwood Mobile Park and impact of sewage. Filed.

At this time, Irene J. Pendzick read the whole communication from the Environmental Quality Review Board.

'The proposed expansion of Glenwood Mobile Home Park will result in approximately 500 units in this park. This coupled with the expansion of Barney's Trailer Park, will result in approximately 700 units discharging sewage in an area of approximately 2 square miles. The Environmental Quality Review Board urges the Town Board to consider either requiring the construction of a sewage treatment facility which would serve both parks or expanding the Riverhead Sewer District

We also urge consideration of a moratorium on future parks pending review of regulation by the Town Board, and the County Health Department.' (Filed.)

Polish Town Civic Association, 2/23/81 - requesting permission to hold its annual Street Fair & Festival on third weekend in August. Filed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Halandia Associates special permit for multiple housing.

River Center Associates special permit for family recreation center.

Glenwood Mobile Park special permit for expansion of park.

Supervisor Janoski: "Under unfinished business we have Halandia Associates special permit for multiple family housing.

River Center Associates special permit for family recreation center and Glenwood Mobile Park special permit for expansion of the park.

I have four minutes remaining before the beginning

Supervisor Janoski continues:
of the first hearing and I would recognize anyone who wishes to be heard on any matter excluding those issues that will be taken up at the public hearings. Mr. Nohejl?"

Bill Nohejl, Wading River: "I've got to compliment Irene on the way she has things set up here tonight."

Irene J. Pendzick, "Thank you."

Bill Nohejl: "It looks very nice. I hope that things will keep going like this and added to, because we, the public, appreciate this. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "I wish that you could have taken a couple more. Anyone else wish to address the Town Board?"

No one else wished to be heard at this time.

RESOLUTIONS

#97

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Councilman Regula offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Prusinowski.

WHEREAS, this Town Board and the Highway Superintendent have agreed to undertake a Town Road Safety Study,

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that the Supervisor has authorized the transfer of \$25,000.00 from Highway Funds into FAUS - Safety Study Capital Project.

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

#98

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Councilman Lombardi offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Menendez.

RESOLVED, that the Supervisor be, and hereby is authorized to transfer the following:

FROM: A7110.470 Contractual Exp.- Capital Imp. \$5,000

TO: A7140.403 Contractual Exp.-Utilities \$5,000

RESOLUTIONS - continued

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

#99 AUTHORIZES RENTAL OF SNOW REMOVAL EQUIPMENT - HIGHWAY
DEPARTMENT

Councilman Menendez offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Lombardi.

RESOLVED, that the Superintendent of Highways be and is hereby authorized to pay rental for snow removal equipment in the total amount of THREE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED and 79/100 DOLLARS (\$3,700.79), in accordance with vouchers submitted and filed in the Office of the Town Clerk, at rates established by the County Commissioner of Public Works.

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

Supervisor Janoski recessed the meeting to hold a public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING - 7:45 P.M.

The Town Clerk submitted affidavits of publishing and posting of a public notice for a public hearing to be held at Town Hall on Tuesday, March 3, 1981 at 7:45 P.M. to hear all interested persons regarding the proposed code amendment regarding swimming pools.

The affidavits were ordered to be placed on file.

Supervisor Janoski: "Would the Town Attorney please give a presentation explaining the proposal?"

Kevin Duffy, Town Attorney: "Well briefly, before I start the presentation, I would like to answer a few questions that had been discussed concerning public hearings which are authorized under Section 130 of Town Law.

Basically, the position the Town is taking is that we made proposals available at the Town Clerk's Office and additionally, we have posted the proposed changes on the bulletin board out in the shallso they're available to the public to see. The reason that a formal elaborate presentation is not made, is that the Town is supposed to remain neutral, that is open to both sides. If the Town were to get involved

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedKevin Duffy, Town Attorney continues:

making an elaborate presentation, there would always be the possibility that we would be viewed as being selected in what we present. That is we may appear to be favoring one side over the other.

The third and final point I'd like to make before I finish up is why questions are usually deemed inappropriate under Section 130 of the Town Law. Basically, it's because a public hearing is not the proper forum. If the public asks a question at a public hearing and receives an answer, they really have no right to rely on said answer.

In my opinion, this could create a situation worse than what you would have if questions were not allowed. Now briefly to explain what is happening in this proposed change, we're redefining our use of the word swimming pools as a use. Under the old laws we had swimming pools only as an accessory use. We're amending it for dropping out the words only as an accessory use and of such dwelling and adding that the swimming pool is now for the use of his owner and or guest."

Supervisor Janoski: "Would you explain that that simplifies . . ."

Kevin Duffy, Town Attorney: "Well it basically simplifies and it removes a cumbersome interpretation."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you Mr. Town Attorney. Is there anyone present who wishes to address the Town Board regarding this issue?"

No one wishing to be heard and no communications having been received thereto, Supervisor Janoski declared the hearing closed at 7:48 P.M.

RESOLUTIONS

#101 AUTHORIZES TOWN CLERK TO PUBLISH AND TO POST WANT AD NOTICE FOR MINI BUS DRIVER

Councilman Regula offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Prusinowski.

WHEREAS, there now exists a vacancy in the Town of Riverhead for a mini bus driver for the Nutrition Program, NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk be, and is hereby authorized to publish and post a want ad notice for a mini bus driver for the Nutrition Program as follows:

RESOLUTIONS - continuedHELP WANTED
TOWN OF RIVERHEAD

MINI BUS DRIVER - Must have a valid New York State Class 5 driver's license with no moving violations. Apply to the Accounting Department, 200 Howell Avenue, Riverhead, New York.

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes; Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

#102 AUTHORIZES TOWN CLERK TO PUBLISH AND POST NOTICE FOR HOME CHORE PROGRAM

Councilman Lombardi offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Menendez.

WHEREAS, the Home Chore Program for Senior Citizens is in readiness to proceed, and

WHEREAS, it is to the benefit of the program and its beneficiaries that its availability be made aware to qualified Senior Citizens,

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk be, and hereby is authorized to publish and post a display ad in the News-Review and the Long Island Traveler Watchman, and Suffolk Life, publicizing the availability of the Home Chore Program to Senior Citizens.

The vote, Prusinowski, Abstain, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

#103 TRANSFER OF FUNDS

Councilman Menendez offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Lombardi.

RESOLVED, that the Supervisor be, and he hereby is authorized to transfer the following funds:

\$160.00 from Receiver of Taxes Cash Books Acct. #A1330.404

to

A1330.405 Maintenance Contract Acct.

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

RESOLUTIONS - continued

#104 AUTHORIZES ADVANCE FOR BURROUGHS B 800 OPERATOR SCHOOL

Councilman Regula offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Prusinowski,

WHEREAS, the Town Board approved Resolution #61 authorizing Janice Carney's attendance to the Burroughs B 800 Operator School located in Paramus, New Jersey for the period of one week, March 9th - 13th, and

WHEREAS, an advance of \$250.00 will be used for all expenses incurred during this period.

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

#105 AUTHORIZES SEARS TO CONDUCT DISPLAY

Councilman Prusinowski offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Regula.

WHEREAS, Sears, Roebuck and Company has requested permission to use the sidewalks for a display of a single gas grill, and

WHEREAS, the Town Board approves of such use,
THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board grants permission to use said sidewalks for the period commencing on Saturday, April 4, 1981, through Saturday, August 1, 1981, with the understanding the demonstrations will only take place on Saturdays and Memorial Day, Monday, May 25, 1981.

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

#106 AUTHORIZES SUPERVISOR TO SEND LETTER TO ENERGY DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Councilman Lombardi offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Menendez.

WHEREAS, Energy Development Corporation had made an initial presentation to this Town Board outlining the application of an incinerator to dispose of the municipal solid waste and septic sewage generated within the Township, and

WHEREAS, Energy Development Corporation has requested that this Town Board authorize a letter stating the interest of the Board in pursuing research and investigation into the feasibility of its application to the Town,

NOW, THEREFORE, be it

RESOLVED, that the Supervisor is hereby authorized to send a letter to Energy Development Corporation stating the interest of the Town Board in pursuing research and investigation into the feasibility of the application of an

RESOLUTIONS - continued

incinerator to dispose of municipal waste, to be conducted by Energy Development Corporation, at no cost to the Town.

Before the vote, Supervisor Janoski stated: "I think I just better explain that — well certainly I think most people are aware that the Town of Riverhead faces a problem with the disposal of our solid wastes in the future. We're talking about garbage. The DEC has mandated regulations regarding landfills and indeed has said they must phase out by 1984.

The Town of Riverhead is seeking an alternative to landfills. This incinerator proposal is one and what we are doing is authorizing the company to go ahead and make a study of Riverhead Town so that the information can be presented to the Town Board for its consideration."

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

#107 AUTHORIZES TOWN CLERK TO PUBLICIZE WANT AD FOR PARK ATTENDANT

Councilman Menendez offered the following resolution which was seconded by Councilman Lombardi.

RESOLVED, that the Town Clerk be, and is hereby authorized to publish and post a want ad for a park attendant for the Recreation Department as follows:

TOWN OF RIVERHEAD
WANT AD
PARK ATTENDANT

Park Attendant - interested and qualified individuals are requested to apply to the Accounting Department at Town Hall, 200 Howell Avenue, Riverhead, New York. The Town of Riverhead is an equal opportunity employer.

The vote, Prusinowski, Yes, Regula, Yes, Lombardi, Yes, Menendez, Yes, and Janoski, Yes.

The resolution was thereupon declared duly adopted.

Supervisor Janoski recessed the meeting for five minutes after which the meeting resumed at 8:02 P.M.

Supervisor Janoski recessed the meeting to hold the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING - 8:00 P.M.

The Town Clerk submitted affidavits of publishing and posting of a public notice for a public hearing to be held at Town Hall on Tuesday, March 3, 1981 at 8:00 P.M. to hear all interested persons regarding the proposed amendment to the Town Code regarding Animals.

The affidavits were ordered to be placed on file.

Supervisor Janoski: "Mr. Town Attorney."

Kevin Duffy, Town Attorney: "The proposed ordinance is setting out various criteria dealing with horses and other domestic animals kept in property that is zoned residential. It only applies to property which has been zoned residential. The ordinance specifically states that owned or maintained in residential district or any plot or land designated at residential and any other type of district and therefore the proposed ordinance will only apply to residential property. The seven criteria that are set out, are as follows:

Basically, it requires one acre lot for each animal that is kept. The second criteria sets out conditions if there is a corral or stable making it exclusively for the use of the owner and or his guest. This second criteria would prevent the running of a business or property.

The third criteria sets out height for corrals. That is a fence for a corral shall not exceed six feet in height and shall not be less than five feet from the property line.

The fourth criteria is that the stable shall be located not less than fifty feet from any street or property line.

The fifth criteria states that no animal, corral or stable shall be maintained in an area that is designated as a front yard.

The sixth criteria deals with the storage of the wastes of the animals which basically shall not be fifty feet from any street or property line.

The last criteria sets out that it is felt that compliance with such sections is impractical that the applicant may appeal to the Board of Appeals."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you Mr. Town Attorney. I would do well to point out with this particular public hearing that a five minute rule does exist with regard to public hearings. That does not prohibit a person from using the five minute allotted time and then returning after everyone is heard. It is just an effort to make sure that everyone has the opportunity

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedSupervisor Janoski continues:

to address the Town Board. Should you use up the five minutes, you can avail yourself later on after we have heard from everyone wishing to speak.

I would recognize Mr. Nohejl."

Bill Nohejl, Wading River; "Representative of the Farm Bureau. The Farm Bureau believes it's too restrictive.

Now Bill Nohejl, Wading River, I feel as though this is a rural area some about — as far as the manure and the stable fine, but we have chickens. We have rabbits. We're going to put one rabbit to an acre? We're going to put one chicken to the acre? What is the chicken going to do without her rooster? Or a bunny without her bunny? If this thing is vague than I can't see it.

Now downtown here if you want to take Second Street or something like that, okay. But a person with an acre of land is much much too restrictive.

I also must say one horse on five acres if not properly kept could be worse than three horses on one acre properly kept."

Supervisor Janoski: "Mary Beth. Mary Beth I've got three minutes before the next public hearing."

Mary Beth Andresen: "I think it's three minutes and eleven seconds."

Supervisor Janoski: "That looks quite extent."

Mary Beth Andresen: "No, no that's petitions."

Supervisor Janoski: "Oh, okay."

Mary Beth Andresen, Church Lane, Aquebogue; "I have 687 names of Riverhead Town residents who are in opposition to this proposed amendment. I'll bring them up to you in a minute.

Members of the Town Board, I'm here this evening to speak on 108-110 concerning animal one-acre zoning.

On one hand, it appears that Riverhead Town is welcoming a new agriculture commodity by changing zoning from industrial to agriculture, that's the next public hearing. On the other, one animal per acre almost nullifies any prospective growth for the first amendment with relation to animals.

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Mary Beth Andresen continues:

New York State is a highly agricultural state from the dairy farms of the Cortland Valley to the Sheep Farms of Western New York, to the poultry farms in the Catskills, and the horse farms spread throughout.

I defy anyone on the Town Board to see a working commercial livestock farm that allows one animal per acre to be its living space. Animals on commercial farms, are usually kept on minimal acreage, to allow the rest of the land to be used for the raising of hay, silage, corn, etc. It also allows for more tender meat if we are talking about beef, or swine products. The practicality of one animal per acre is idealistic and economically unfeasible.

With specific reference to horses, according to the New York State Horse Council, Suffolk County has the third highest density population of equines. The horse commodity brings in more per capital monies than any other agricultural commodity because one has to take into consideration race tracks, OTB and the thoroughbred breeding program. Pleasure horses can be seen showing every weekend on Long Island. The draft or work horse is finding his way back in small farming throughout the country (with the increased cost of machinery and fuel).

Many people are under the assumption that livestock needs one acre to maintain that animal's nutrition. Many areas of the country maintain pasture for their animals as a complete feeding. We on Long Island are not that fortunate. Our soil and climate does not permit good hay growth or lush fertile pastures, so in fact, most of our animals bulk foodstuffs are purchased items, and our pastures are nothing more than fresh air and sunshine. Because we have to buy many of our feeds, we support local agricultural businesses that exist in town, and the farmer that grows rye straw as a cover crop now have a nearby outlet for their excess crop for use as animal bedding. Encouraging livestock in Riverhead Town we are also providing new agriculture foodstuffs to be grown on now vacant land. Feeder corn, oats, sugar beets can be seen as a future crop in this area.

To sum it up, Riverhead has to work for growth that is here. Let's expand and expound on what we have — agriculture and tourism. Let's encourage our land for agricultural growth by encouraging farms and discouraging many housing developments.

- A) Population does not lower taxes, it raises them by populace demands. One has only to look west to Brookhaven and Smithtown to see that this is true.

Let's expand our tourism industry, because with traveling expenses on the rise, we're only a tankful of gas from New York City. Lovely pastoral scenes, horses frolicking, sheep grazing, and farm stand produce. Tourists don't stop to visit Brookhaven to see the "country".

Let's be practical when it comes to livestock production,

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedMary Beth Andresen continues:

and not make zoning amendments that we don't have the foresight for and then must have the hindsight to change. Are there any working farmers on the Zoning Board, Town Board and Board of Appeals?

As the country is deregulating, so must we. Regulations mean enforcement. Enforcement means jobs, which incur higher taxation.

Let's not make neighbor disputes a town problem or law. Neighbors will always have disputes regardless, Riverhead town does not have to be their arbitrator.

Finally Riverhead, lets develop what we have, agriculture, tourism, appropriate growth, encouraging new by-products if the livestock commodity and supporting local agri-business.

I encourage you town board members not to look a gift goat, a gift pig, or a gift horse in the mouth. Thank you."
(Filed).

Supervisor Janoski: "I will recess this public hearing to hold the next public hearing."

PUBLIC HEARING - 8:10 P.M.

The Town Clerk submitted affidavits of publishing and posting of a public notice for a public hearing to be held at Town Hall on Tuesday, March 3, 1981 at 8:10 P.M. to hear all interested perons regarding the proposed amendment to the Town Code regarding Agricultural Production.

The affidavits were ordered to be placed on file.

Supervisor Janoski: "Mr. Town Attorney."

Kevin Duffy, Town Attorney: "What this proposal is doing is redefining our term agricultural. This would be basically for property that is zoned agricultural. The present definition of agriculture only allows the raising of crops. What the Town has attempted to do is bring our definition into agreement with Section 301 of the Agricultural Markets Law. It basically would permit the production for commercial purposes of crops, livestock and livestock products. It would allow the raising of certain crops which are described.

The only deletion we've made to Section 301 of the Agricultural Markets Law is that in Section E, we do include the raising of furbearing animals, butter, cheese, meat, and furs."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you Mr. Town Attorney. I will recognize anyone who wishes to address the Town Board with regard to this ordinance. Mary Beth."

Mary Beth Andresen, Church Lane, Aquebogue: "Members of the Town Board, I am here this evening to speak on two proposed amendments. They are both so intertwined that it is difficult to speak on one without referring to the other. Concerning the amendment 108.3, referring to agriculture to be changed in term and definition for agricultural production.

Some years back Riverhead Town sought appropriate growth by instituting zoning. At that time, Riverhead's master plan was to be the heavy industrial center of Eastern Long Island. Many areas bordering on Sound Avenue, Main Road and large crossroads were zoned industrial. By and large many farms suffered industrial zoning, which elevated their tax base, however, with potato farms suffering many bad years, these farmers were assured that their land would be more marketable if zoned industrial. Also at that time with many farms parceled on deeds for future sale to developers someone in the Zoning Board felt that future development horse owners might object to a cow or sheep on neighboring properties, so that the raising of livestock was limited to industrial zoning areas where it still exists today.

Therefore, people who wish to raise livestock commercially on agricultural properties in the Town of Riverhead have been unable to do so. The Suffolk Co. Farmland program was started to preserve agricultural lands on L.I. Many farms sold their development rights to the county to maintain agriculture in the East End and so get a buyer for their property. Now people wishing to raise livestock on the farmland are unable to do so because of the zoning in the Town of Riverhead. An example is the Foley family of Manor Lane.

Finally, Riverhead Town has had to propose an amendment to change their previous error in zoning or in definitions. Webster's Dictionary has always known the difference between agriculture and industry.

We, in Riverhead, the past fifteen years have seen growth, not the heavy industrialization which was proposed, but rather towards new agriculture field, especially in the area of livestock production.

I welcome this amendment to finally allow the raising of livestock in an appropriate setting, the agriculture community where it belongs.

I feel that this amendment will encourage land usage, agriculturally based business in this area, marketable agricultural products and at the same time encourage tourism in Riverhead by maintaining an agri-ecosystem on Long Island. Thank you." (Filed).

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Bill Nohejl, Representing the Long Island Farm Bureau; "We congratulate this Board on taking — on having this public hearing and look forward to you implementing this here into amending the town zoning. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you Bill. Is there anyone else who wishes to — yes Sir."

Nils Burglund, "I work with Suffolk County Cooperative Extension and I'm a livestock and poultry agent and I'd also like to encourage the Board to approve this proposed amendment to the change. And I'd like to bring to air a few facts. Many people here are aware of it already. The Suffolk County is the number one County in New York State for agricultural production on a dollar volume. Not many people realize it, but we still produce just about one third of all the ducks that are produced today in the United States. We have four processing plants in a fifteen mile radius of the Riverhead area. We employ about 1,000 people either on the farms, in the feed mills, in the processing plants and this generated about thirty million dollars, that comes right back to the Riverhead areas.

In the past, duck farming has especially been put down on because of the pollution factors that are involved with it. That's not the case today so much. The pollution causing factors, the duck farmers are getting away from it because they found out raising ducks on water isn't the way to do it. They're going total confinement. The state of the art today is almost non-polluting, and it's something where the Town Board and the Council can encourage an existing agricultural enterprise right here on Long Island and I think it would do well to approve this."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. Is there anyone else present who wishes to address the Town Board on this issue?"

No one else wishing to be heard and no communications having been received at this time, Supervisor Janoski declared the hearing closed at 8:18 P.M.

Supervisor Janoski re-opened the hearing on code amendments dealing with animals.

Supervisor Janoski: "Is there anyone present who wishes to address the Town Board on that? Yes Sir."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Bill Roberts, Baiting Hollow, Calverton; "I have absolutely no objection at all to the purpose of the amendment. I feel that it is correct. There is one aspect, however, which has caused me and a lot of my neighbors a great deal of grief and that is the way our local streets are front yards, in this case the beaches. Our driveways have been defecated upon, urinated upon. We've been insulted by riders, horses have soiled our properties because now we see signs all on Sound Avenue, horses boarded, game farm horses rented.

Now are we going to be farming horses, training horses, breeding horses or we're going to make a Coney Island out of Sound Avenue for one with just a couple of years ago was intended to be one of the senior gateways of the Town of Riverhead. We regulate jeeps on beaches. They can't be on the beaches at certain hours, yet horses come barreling down there driven by reckless, possibly owners, where you can rent horses. These horses throw clouds of sand into the eyes and laps of the property owners. One time last summer three women rode into our road, which happens to be a private road, which is right off Edwards Avenue and you know what horses hooves do for a loam road. And I stopped them and asked them will you please not go through here, this is a private road. And this one just put her hands on her hips and said we will go where ever we God damn well please. I believe a little bit of regulation is called for here because I don't think anyone of you would like to see horses on Church Lane, on Riverside Drive, on Roanoke Avenue, Ackerly Drive, anything like that. You respect — you want your property to be respected. We want our property to be respected too. As I said, I have nothing against the amendment but tighten it up so we have safeguards otherwise we have none."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you sir. Is there anyone else present that wishes to address the Town Board. Yes Sir."

Wally Binger, Main Road, Aquebogue; "I'd just like to say to the gentleman prior to me what the amendment as it is written states nothing about limiting horses on roadways or anything. I think what he has said its just taken away from the context of this paper and we do believe number one, I have a pony. I don't have a horse. I use that horse. My wife had horses. We have a pony for the kids and we do have some chickens. But what I believe his amendment should be is a different completely amendment. He's talking out of text, what's happening here. He has private property. He has rights to his private property. We believe in his rights to the private property. There is also something I don't think the Town of Riverhead can control which is what he said down the beaches.

Now for an instance, my parents have property in Flanders. They cannot stop the people from going off the end of the road

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedWally Binger continues:

in dune Buggies down below the high tide line running down the beach. Nothing they can do. They tried it, they put up fences, they were told to take them down. So that's what the gentleman said before me.

Above the high tide there is property rights and you have a Town of Riverhead Police Department which will uphold the property rights. What you're talking about is the simple instance — please don't include all horse riders."

Supervisor Janoski: "Wally. . ."Wally Binger: "As people that are . . ."

Supervisor Janoski: "Wally, please address the Town Board, Sir, I will not tolerate any remarks from the audience. I will certainly welcome you back up here again."

Wally Binger: "I'm sorry. I believe my point has been made on that subject. But what I would like to say is on the subject of the zoning ordinance in itself as it's written. We — a fifteen acre piece of property, we have one horse on it right now. I should correct that. I don't have it. My father-in-law owns it. I am now using it. We have one horse, ten chickens, and I am fully under fifteen acres. I could have up to fifteen horses as the amendment is written. My corral is more than six feet from the property line. My barn is more than fifty feet from the property line. More storage of manure, is more than fifty feet from the property line, but I just want to say, the way it's written as Bill I believe said, it is much too confining. If I have a one hundred foot wide piece of property, miles long, I can't keep animals on it because I've got to move my fences in six feet that leaves me with eighty-eight feet. I can't store my manure more than fifty feet from the line. It's just written in such a way that is much too restrictive. We believe, my wife and myself believe that yes the amendment is correct as people have said before me. There should be some sort of limitation to how you can hold horses. You can't have ten horses on one hundred by fifty plot next door to your neighbors, I understand all the way it's written. But as it's written now, it should be defeated. It's just obviously written to — as I say, it's just not — as I can't say it's much too restrictive."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. Let me just explain that the purpose of a public hearing for the residents of the

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedSupervisor Janoski continues:

community to express their feelings about a particular issue to the Town Board. Really to have an interchange between a speaker and someone in the audience shouldn't take place, so that I would ask that if you want to come up and address the Town Board, please do so. But don't make any off the cuff remarks to the speaker. Yes Sir."

Roger Nicosia, Peconic Bay Blvd., Aquebogue; "As this amendment is written is much too restrictive. I have kept three horses on less than an acre that my children enjoyed. I don't have any now. I don't have any intentions of having them. As a matter of fact, I'm glad I'm not feeding them anymore. But I don't have any children around that can grow up with, that need to grow up with animals. But I'm glad that we did have the opportunity having them see animals, take care of animals and if any of you gentlemen passed down Peconic Bay Blvd. you saw a young baby that was born. We had many many people stop, bring their children around to watch this filly as she grew up and I never heard anybody, my neighbors included, any complaints about having three horses and this was on less than one acre so I feel that you have to use a little discretion. It doesn't mention the hamsters, and the rabbits and the things like that. But evidently they're animals, but it could exclude them too. It's just much much too restrictive. Perhaps there ought to be some sort of regulation, but I think the areas have to be considered too. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you."

Lynn Harris, Riverhead; "Good evening. I believe the amendment that is written is taking away and it's not giving. In other words what are you going to give me, if I give up my horse, or if I have to give up my horse if I do not have one acre of land to keep it on. You're going to give me air pollution with more cars. You're going to take the residential area and pave it with concrete. You're going to bring more people into a Town that doesn't need more people. You're going to take away twenty-five years of my life. Forty or fifty years of somebody else's life. What are you going to give? You're asking us to give me something that we love. Some of these people here that hack horses out, rent them out should be a little bit more careful to who they rent them.

But you can't take our life away from us because of someone that comes out here for a weekend. And I believe that's what it's all about. Somebody made a complaint and that's why the amendment is trying to go through. More of the horse owners here on this end of the Island, I believe have a love for the land and I don't believe that they are going to run across

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedLynn Harris continues:

someone's property just because there's no place else to run. There are places here in Riverhead where you can ride. I ride them. And you don't have to desecrate somebody's property to do it. So my question is what are you going to give me if you ask me to give up twenty to twenty-five years of my life. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. I would note that the cameras went off a little more regularly while she was speaking."

Evelyn Beatty: "Mr. Janoski, and members of the Town Board, I'm acting — I'm representing Nassau-Suffolk Horsemen's Association tonight and also Evelyn Beatty of Church Lane, Aquebogue, representing Nassau-Suffolk Horsemen's Association.

Approximately two years ago when this ordinance was first proposed, Nassau-Suffolk was at the Town Board Meeting and volunteered its services in aiding new, in developing a workable solution. What was obviously a feuding problem in the beginning. We will again offer our services to you. We are the largest Horseman's Association on Long Island and the largest association in the State of New York with exception to the Racing Authority and the racing people. And we've worked with Smithtown. And we are presently working with the Department of Environmental Conservation and developing horse related use in the RCA property and we feel we have the expertise necessary. We also feel that a provision of this magnitude should not be undertaken lightly and we offer our assistance and that's what I have to say for Nassau-Suffolk.

Acting as Evelyn Beatty, I would just like to know I have been a resident of Long Island all of my life. I grew up in Coram, lived in Coram and choose to move to Riverhead because Coram was so over developed. I have had horses all my life. I have never had a neighbor problem. When we moved out to Riverhead I didn't complain about my taxes. I didn't complain about my school taxes because I do not have children and I pay \$1,000 a year for someone else's. I didn't complain about any of them. I really thought I would be able to keep my horses in my house for my enjoyment. Unfortunately, we — unfortunately, we have not had a problem with our neighbors and I don't think anyone who is conscientious will have a problem with neighbors. I certainly would ask my neighbors permission.

I can ride anywhere, and by the way, I live on Church Lane. I can ride anywhere because I am active in a lady like or in a manner that I would certainly — has been responsible. I don't think that all the residents and all the horse owners of Riverhead should have to suffer for one particular problem. I think the Town Board should work with any individual it is, or whatever group they're having a problem with individually.

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedEvelyn Beatty continues:

I certainly feel, not if I were a goat on, or a chicken on, or I would be up in arms if I had to have one hundred and fifty acres for one hundred and fifty chickens the way it's written it's a little ridiculous to say the least. And I'd just like to voice my opposition at this time."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you Evelyn. Is there anyone else who wishes to be recognized. You already spoke. You were on the other one. Come on, on this one then."

Nils Burglund, "In my job with the Cooperative Extension, I have quite a few horse people calling me. In the past, I've had a couple people call me to complain about horse people. But in the four years that I worked there, I would say that 90% of the horse people that I see are very conscientious. The ones, the 10% even less than 10% sometimes give the other 90% a bad name. So I'd say all in all, horse people, goat people, chicken people, whatever love for animals and generally take good care of them. Recently in one of our local papers, our east end legislator said that in Kentucky, they recommend that one care horse to put that into a better context. In Kentucky, they're grazing their horses about ten months out of the year. This is taking into consideration the forage production for the horse and also so that there's enough grass for the animal. Here we don't graze our animals that long. It should be dealt with on an individual basis.

Like Mr. Nohejl said, before, you can have five horses on an acre and take good care of them and you should have no problem. But one horse on ten acres that isn't cared for, can be a problem. Here in Suffolk we have a way of dealing with problems. A health problem if it ever presented itself, Suffolk County Health Department you can, but if you have an obnoxious pile of manure around and you're a Suffolk County resident, all you have to do is give Suffolk County Health Services a call and they'll be beating on your door. I think the Board should deal with each of these things on an individual basis. That's what I'd like to see."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. The gentleman with the red shirt on."

Edward Connors, Wading River; "In considering this ordinance particularly that part which describes having a horse on what is called a front yard, I'd like to point out that my house is 600 feet from the road and I have pastures between my house and the roads for my horses. I've always

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedEdward Connors continues:

had them there for at least twenty-years. Now am I suddenly going to find that this is going to be called a front yard and I can't keep horses there no more. I wonder who's going to pay my taxes if I can't use the land the way I see fit. (Tape ended) (Tape began) side of Roanoke Avenue about opposite where First Street comes in and Harry Litchard had a barn on a piece of property I don't suppose it was over seventy-five feet, wide and it might have been considerably less. He has a barn there just south of the Post Office on Second Street. And there he kept four horses. One belonged to the President of the National Bank. One belonged to Ray Kreiger. One belonged to himself, and there was one other horse there and the paddock was only fifty feet square and nobody complained. Mrs. Bert Griffing kept up a piebald horse on Main Street opposite where Tim Griffing lives and she rode that horse up Roanoke Avenue every day of the week and nobody complained about any of the droppings. They enjoyed seeing the horse. Now we've always lived with horses out here and I think this attempt to control them is a little bit ridiculous, because that's why we're all here. We think of this as a rural area and I think it ought to remain that way. And if some of these strap hangers don't like it, well they ought to move into a restricted area where developers have put restrictions on property. You know there's such things as covenants and restrictions and there are those places in Riverhead. And if they don't like what their neighbor is doing, they have recourse. They can move into those places where they'll be no animals. It doesn't need to apply to the whole Town of Riverhead. I think it's carrying the thing to extremes to even consider such a matter. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. I saw a hand in the doorway back there. Does that person still wish to address the Town Board? Please state your name and address."

Patricia Hogan, 100 Sound Avenue, Calverton, Baiting Hollow Stable; "And I invite the Town Board and anybody else who wants to come out to check out our stables and you tell me that they're dirty and they're an eyesore."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. Yes Sir."

Richard Kantel, Jamesport; "I was a little late for the meeting, but I didn't hear anybody tonight talk about anything other than horses. A couple of years ago, I started to raise pigs as a lark and since the taxes in Riverhead have gone so sky high to do it out of economic necessity. When one little piggy has some piglets, it would necessitate that my three

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Richard Kantel continues:

acres might have to spread out to fifteen, maybe twenty and I don't have it. And I'm also speaking for the people that might have parakeets and may be some of those little animals that the kids might have at home. Some pigeons, or chickens or ducks and this has to be addressed and recognized. If somebody's parakeet is violating somebody's air space, then maybe they ought to get on 911. I don't think you need an ordinance for it."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. The gentleman in the rear."

Kenneth Lohr, Middle Road, Calverton; "I just moved here from Hampton Bays. I lived there for thirty-two years. I got into animals and horses and they didn't offer me nothing over there and Riverhead had something to offer me as far as bringing up my children around animals. You take this away and you don't have anything to offer anybody."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. Yes Sir."

Garrison Brown, Aquebogue; "I think I'd like to voice my opposition to this amendment on several grounds. Number one, I don't think the need is here. Usually when we pass a bit of legislation as to solve a problem, to alleviate some kind of distressful situation in the Town, I'm a veterinarian. I see hundreds of people every week. Animal owners, small animals and also large animal owners, agriculture district residents and village residents. I think I've seen in the past fifteen years any increase in the number of animal complaints. It's the usual neighborly disputes that we see, but there's no increase. Doc Menendez has been involved in animal control and I think he would varify that and I don't speak for him. I'm not aware of it and I think I would be if there was a serious animal problem in Riverhead. Two years ago, we had a meeting down here, a hearing and it was soundly defeated and I really don't understand why we're down here this evening. I think the showing that we had two years ago, should have convinced anyone that this kind of an ordinance is just not needed. One of the other reasons I would oppose this is because I think the ordinance is poorly written.

For example, the number of animals per one acre having one chicken per acre. It's already been said, but I'll just repeat it. One hamster per acre. I think it's arbitrary. Who picked the one acre size. Why can a person having four acres, have four hamsters and a person having three quarters of an acre

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedGarrison Brown continues:

have no hamsters. It gets to be ridiculous and as Mr. Nohejl said, it is restrictive. I'm against that.

Also in part E it says, no animal, corral or stable shall be kept or maintained, excuse me F. No manure, fecal matter, odor or dust producing substance shall be stored within fifty feet ----- . Well I'm wondering what dust producing substances are? I read that a few times and I still don't know. To me dust is dry top soil. Now if you have to pave your area, so it doesn't produce dust, I think that's ridiculous. I'm not trying to be cute or facetious, but that's the way this thing is written. How do you stop dust from accumulating on your property.

The other last remark that I'd like to make is that Riverhead has as it's main drawing car why anybody would want to move out here, the rural nature, the serenity of outlining areas. And I think we should do everything we can do to maintain it. The previous hearing that was held I think there's an advancement in the right direction and the redefining of agriculture. We depend a lot on animal related industry in this area. It's an increase to our economy and it looks like it's going to be more an important part as time goes on. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. Yes Sir."

Dr. Wilson, M.D., Aquebogue; "I have nothing to do with horses. Some people I know think I'm a horse doctor, which isn't so. But anyway, I have some acquaintance with these animals because my daughter loves them and I think that if somebody is going to object to the projects of horses near them, I think they're living in the wrong place. Let's face it, this is the country and horses are definitely part of the scene. And the other thing is this. The recreational horse business is really an expanding thing and if ever a community needed some small industries and small business, I think that this area is it. Any restrictive legislation that we have, that would hinder the expansion, the growth of a business like this out here which after all generates income into the area I think is wrong. And if the concern for the concentration of the horse manure, I think that other areas give us much more danger from that source than from a few horses on an acre of land. That's all I have to say."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you Dr. Wilson. Paul?"

Paul Podlas, construction; "I'm a life-long resident of Riverhead for fifty years and I'm sure I'm going to say

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedPaul Podlas continues:

things that are hostile tonight. But I'm on the code revision committee who helped write this ordinance, proposed ordinance, excuse me. It was never our intention to apply to agriculture. We're talking about residential. I live in the Town of Riverhead. I like horses. I don't own a horse. I live on a half acre of land. In theory right now, I could have ten horses. This is what we're talking about. We're not talking about the person who lives out in the country. Riverhead is country, but I'm talking about, like I hear Aquebogue, Church Lane, stuff like that. It was never our intention for that restriction. We're talking about residential areas. A home site. I get the feeling tonight that a lot of people are concerned about their farms if they have ten acres, they have to have only ten chickens. That's not true. We're talking about residential areas. If you're in an agricultural area, it's different.

Now we attempted to correct that with the third hearing tonight to make it permissive. That's why Kevin wrote up the ordinance to change the definition of agriculture and that was our sole intention to bring this up about residential area and I'm not the one who sponsored it at the meeting. I won't take credit for that. I sure shouldn't take credit tonight from all the hostile remarks we heard tonight. But it was mainly our intention for residential, like I say I have a half-acre I can put a horse there.

I have a house and a two-car garage. I have a back yard say 60 by 100 feet. I would find it very difficult to keep a horse there. I don't know where I would ride it. My neighbors would shoot me if I started riding across the land, like I heard tonight the remarks. That's very true. This is the only reason we brought this up. We didn't bring it up for the man that has fifteen acres and living on a farm. This is an entirely different situation. This is --- what Kevin stressed in the beginning and this is my interpretation when we discussed it and I'm sure this is what our committee was trying to get across. We're talking about residential area. I see Mr. Nohejl disagrees. All right, my name is Podlas. My number's in the phone book. If you would like to call me up, I'm sure we'll listen. I'll listen. Bring your ideas, I mean if . . ."

Supervisor Janoski: "Paul, address your remarks up here. "

Paul Podlas: "Okay. Oh I guess that's all I have to say. I just want to repeat we intent it for residential area and not to restrict to farming. I married into a farm family,

PUBLIC HEARING " continued

Paul Podlas continues;

incidentally, so I'm not against them. Don't get me wrong. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Something is missing. Miss Harris, you've already spoken so I can't recognize you until everyone has spoken. Miss Wilson, let's not turn this into a debate."

Marge Wilson, Aquebogue; "I'm very much opposed to this acre per animal law and I would like to know why someone in the construction business is helping to write animal laws. Why can't people that are keeping animals now and that are in touch with what's going on and what the problems are, why aren't they writing the laws to be proposed?"

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. I saw . . ."

Carol Ackerly, Wading River; "The gentleman before me said that this pertains only to a residential district. I live in a residential district. It's residential B. The first permitted use is agriculture. I have a forty acre farm across the street from me. Now would this affect me? Would I be considered agricultural or wouldn't I? I am a resident in a residential district, but it's also agricultural permitted."

Supervisor Janoski: "Miss Ackerly the purpose of a public hearing is to hear your views."

Carol Ackerly: "Well I have called the Town on this matter various times and it seems no one can answer this question for me. If you're going to write laws like this, I think you should have it clarified so the people know what their rights are. I also have a petition here signed by people under eighteen, future voters, that are gainst this provision as it stands."

Supervisor Janoski: "Is there anyone else that wishes to address the Town Board? Yes Sir."

David Ruud, I'm the farm manager of the Timothy Hill Children's Ranch. I've read this amendment on the page. I didn't see anything about residential stated in the amendment.

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedDavid Ruud continues:

We build a ranch out here in Riverhead for the exact reason that this is a rural area. Our average is to young people with legal social and emotional problems and our program wants to meet their needs by having them work in a rural setting, children will be living on the property, children from the community will be coming out to the property to work with animals. We have goats, we have horses, we have ducks, we have cattle. If we have to have an acre for every goat that we have, when all four of our goats have kids in the next month or so, we're going to be in trouble. Because right now we've got them in a quarter acre pen. I think that as has been mentioned, it's healthy for children to be around animals to work in a rural type setting with animals if they're on one hundred acres, or if this is on an acre or a half an acre. I think then, we talk a lot about horses and the inconvenience of people riding horses, people don't ride goats usually and they don't ride ducks and they don't ride a number of animals that can be kept in an acre, a half acre or even in a small residential piece of property. They can be kept clean. They can be cared for without being an inconvenience or odor to anybody neighboring.

I think that, first of all, I'd like to see residential be put into the amendment because I haven't seen that yet. As far as I know until that is, that effects our ranch, and I would like to see something in the amendment about the size and shape of an animal as to how many acres are going to be required to house such an animal argument for a horse are different than arguments for goats or arguments for a duck. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. I'm going to recess this hearing for ten minutes."

Supervisor Janoski recessed the meeting for ten minutes after which the meeting resumed at 9:11 P.M.

Supervisor Janoski: "I see a hand. Yes ma'am."

Betty Brown, Peconic Bay Blvd., Aquebogue; "And I would just like to say that I understand what Mr. Podlas is trying to say and I respect his opinion. But you can't penalize all the people that have a home and family on a residential lot. I happen to have a family and I have a bunch of children. They have a lovely family cow and a lovely little pet sheep. I cannot afford any more acreage along the Blvd. to buy so that my children can keep these two animals. I'm paying several thousand dollars worth of taxes as it is now. I can't get any more. I feel badly for the folks that live in Riverhead. I feel badly for the ones that live along Roanoke Avenue. I can't say that they

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedBetty Brown continues:

didn't have the foresight in past years when they were buying too big, a larger piece of property because this does happen. That's why I tried to get out in the country. I don't have neighbors. I'm very very lucky. But don't take the animals away from me and my children because of other folks that are not in as good a position as I am. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you."

Shirley Densieski, Middle Road: "Well we've had the privilege for about five years to live in a rural area where we have two acres and I have a few geese and believe me I pay taxes to keep those geese there. I guess they won't be allowed to reproduce this year, though. But for about fifteen years I lived in an area which had neighbors wall to wall. I had a neighbor that had fifty cats and there's no provision in there anywhere that she still can't have fifty cats. And believe me they were messier than my four geese. All right now, this also sounds like we're going to have to hire to make sure that this law is — who is going to check this. This looks like there's going to be salaries and my taxes are going to go up again. And I won't even be able to feed my four geese. So it's a lucky thing they don't reproduce. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski; "Thank you. Mike Velys."

Mike Velys, Peconic Bay Blvd., Aquebogue; "I used to live in Brooklyn where I raised rabbits and I realized that's not a place to raise rabbits, it should be out in the country here. We've been here for about twenty-five years now.

I think this law is arbitrary. It's capricious as they say in legal terms and I think it's too restrictive. I think that apparently some people have been affected and as the young lady said, you can't penalize everybody for some violations that some others are causing. You don't have hunters hunt on the property behind me and they come onto my property and I make them aware of the fact of trespassing and they shouldn't be doing what they're doing. You can't stop everybody from hunting because you got a couple of trespassers. I call the game warden. I call the police and they do their job. And if somebody is violating someone's property in the same manner, we have the bodies, the police to take care of it. I don't think everybody should be penalized because we have some people violating the laws.

My property happens to be 3.97 acres. I have had as many as seven acres. I've never had one complaint in all the

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Mike Velys continues:

years we've had the horses. The kids grew up with them. They learned to take care of them and take care of the stables. Some of the neighborhood kids kept their horses up there, it was a wonderful environment. I think it's a wonderful way to raise children. Right now if this law goes through, I'd have to take a hoof off of a horse in order to have four of them down there. My front yard is — my house is set back considerably. If I were to have horses again, the most ideal place to have them would be the front yard, but I wouldn't be able to do that if this ordinance went through. My taxes were just raised about one thousand bucks and it seems to me, as we get further and further with taxes, the use of our properties keeps diminishing and I think that's out of order.

I wasn't born here. I chose to live here. I moved out from the city because this is where I thought I want to raise my children. It's a rural area. I'd like to see it stay that way. Thank you."

Herbert Rogers, Calverton: "Mr. Janoski, members of the Board, Mrs. Pendzick, ladies and gentlemen, I lived on less than an acre of land for many, many years, but had horses for many many years. I've never had a neighbor dispute. I think as a person lives, he'll find his neighbors or whatever he is — practically everybody in this room, I don't see any Indians, I think everybody else came from another country some time or another, at some point in history. Everyone of our forefathers came over here for freedom. They came over for freedom of religion, freedom, one of many things. Today we have a government that wants to take away more and more of our freedom. I think money that we're paying on our taxes and so forth, we're entitled to use our property in a manner that we see fit and I think that if we need anything, it's less government, and less restrictions. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. Yes Sir."

Robert Barrett, President of the Long Island Dairy Goat Association; "We've heard a lot about horses tonight. We've heard a little bit about hamsters and various other kinds of animals pointing at the inadequacy of this bill that is before this group of men. It is true that horses are very large animals and hamsters are very small animals. One cannot lump them together in such a bill as this one is. I represent about ninety families of goat keepers. About four of us are large breeders. The others are people who have one or two goats in their backyards on half acre plots. I might point out that people have people who have a goat or two are saving on their grocery bill by having a milk supply, by having a partial meat supply and I would not like to see these things

PUBLIC HEARING - continuedRobert Barrett continues;

taken away from these people who are trying in a small way to be self-sufficient. I might point out that a goat is usually kept confined. A goat is about the size of a police dog, but you can be certain, my goat is not going to run over and defecate in your yard."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. I've been waiting to get you up here."

Unidentified Speaker from the audience: "You have."

Supervisor Janoski: "Vic wanted to see you. It's dark back there. And Vic wanted to see you in the light."

Victoria Wanat: "My parents own the J.N. Ranch in Riverhead on West Main Street. In 1880, a little bit of history here, my great, great, great grandfather left my great, great grandfather the land which has been known since 1938 as J.N. Ranch. Now this establishment has been known to run horse shows for Central Suffolk Hospital and Camp Pa-Qua-Tuck for crippled children in East Moriches. As our property stands, it is zoned as commercial. We are surrounded by a trailer, excuse me, mobile home park on two sides. I know that and residential in our front yard. If the Board decides to change the zoning, we're up a creek without a paddle. Isn't that not right? Yes? I hope.

I'm not only speaking for horse owners, but also animal lovers. And if a Vanderbilt or Rockefeller, a Whitney decide to ride a cow or an ox down the middle of Main Street or keep it on less than an acre of land, I doubt if you'd stop them. Would you? Thank you very much."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. Do I have anyone else who wishes to address the Town Board?"

Bill Nohejl: "Is there anybody else?"

Supervisor Janoski: "I don't see anyone. I guess you're next, Bill."

Bill Nohejl, Wading River; "I suggest that you gentlemen put a lot of people's mind at ease and take your vote right now. You've got your mind's pretty well set up."

(Standing Ovation at this time)

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Janoski: "Really it is out of order to have a vote. My position, I think has been stated and I believe some of the other Councilmen stated their position. I want to tell you something, though, I suggested this afternoon at the work session that we do exactly that, that we pool the Board early in the hearing so that we could demonstrate that there was no support for this particular proposal (tape ends) (tape began) we do have a better looking crowd here tonight, not that I mind you Bill. But I certainly enjoyed having some of the attractive people here tonight and I know Vic has. He has been making comments all night over her. But I know I have no objection if the members of the Council would like to and I will put that quick, can we poll the Town Board, not a formal vote, but a polling?"

At this time, there was an inaudible discussion between the members of the Board and the Town Attorney.

Supervisor Janoski: "There seems to be legal advice that we should not proceed in the manner. I am sure that when this hearing is closed if anybody wanted to ask any member of the Town Board what their position was, that they'd have no objection to telling it."

Bill Nohejl: "Suppose you close this tonight and you don't deliberate tonight. will a conclusion be brought forth to the public."

Supervisor Janoski: "I have a feeling, Bill, that there's a conclusion already existing here."

Bill Nohejl: "Is this hearing over?"

Supervisor Janoski: "No."

Bill Nohejl: "Are you closing this hearing."

Supervisor Janoski: "The hearing has not been closed yet."

Bill Nohejl: "Because I'd like to make a statement after."

PUBLIC HEARING - continued

Supervisor Janoski: "I know you like to have the last word. As a matter of fact we are really departing from what is the normal procedure of a public hearing. Before I get to you Mary Beth, is there anyone else who has not spoken, who wishes to address the Town Board? Then Mary Beth, the floor is yours."

Mary Beth Andresen, Aqueboque; "During the break and I don't know if there is protocol or if this is Roberts Rules or whatever. I spoke to Mr. Podlas and he led me to believe that when this committee was formed to re-evaluate this public hearing which was brought up a couple years ago, in almost the exact wordage, if I do recall except for possibly the last entity which was entered at this time. He was under the impression that this dealt with the residence district. According to what I have read, according to what I have interpreted as the meaning, this is still a very very nebulous type of listing. I also think that people here are very, very concerned that this might be shelved again, to be brought up in another three years hence, or another two years hence. I worked very hard three years ago. Every time I turn around I would like to sit down for at least two weeks and have something not to worry about. It seems like . . ."

Supervisor Janoski: (Inaudible).

Mary Beth Andresen: "It seems — but you're getting paid for it. I have to go through stomach aches, nervous dinners, lots of cups of coffee, lots of abuse to my children, lots of phone calls, lots of red tape, lots of mimeographs, lots of writing, lots of time, lots of counting the pavement and driving around on weekends when I should be home taking care of my animals. Passing out little slips of papers and making people aware. I think the people who would like to know once and for all, I don't know how long that's going to last. Obviously, you don't want to do it this evening. I think they would like to know in the very near future a finalization on this. We realize it's an election year. We don't want to see it shelved again. We don't want to see it shelved again to be brought up in a non-election year. It's very important to a lot of people here. That's all. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Okay Mary Beth. Is there anyone that wishes to be heard at this time?"

No one else wishing to be heard and no communications having been received thereto, Supervisor Janoski declared the hearing closed at 9:30 P.M.

PERSONAL APPEARANCES

Supervisor Janoski: "And I would like to say that certainly the Town Board will take a public position on this proposed ordinance. However, there is no way this sitting Town Board can restrict a future Town Board from taking into consideration any matter. So that yes, some future Town Board may resurrect an idea similar to this and there's no way that we can stop that. But as far as this Town Board, we will make one decision and I think it's already been made.

Now is there anyone who wishes to address the Town Board on any other issue? Yes Sir."

William Drower, RR #2, Plainview Drive, Wading River; "Last Thursday, approximately one hundred citizens of Wading River community journeyed over to Hauppauge to voice their objections to a ferry terminal being located in Wading River. Excuse me?"

Supervisor Janoski: "Back up a little."

William Drower: "Thursday night, I didn't speak loud enough, that's why. I'll start again. Last Thursday, approximately one hundred citizens of Wading River journeyed off to Hauppauge to voice their objections to a ferry terminal being located in Wading River. At the hearing, I presented as President of the Wading River Civic Association, approximately one thousand signatures. It was 1,015, I believe of which about 80% of these signatures were Wading River residents. Some of the objections that we have for this site, I'd like to read to you if I could find it. Economically, this is not cost effective.

It is the largest operating cost of all those selected about eight sites that they proposed. It is the longest waterway connecting from Long Island to Connecticut. It's approximately eighteen miles. Considering that Long Island is one of the highest paid taxed areas in the country and considering how much fuel, the fuel shortage in this country, I don't think it's appropriate for the taxpayers of Wading River or taxpayers of Long Island to support or subsidize a ferry terminal at Shoreham-Wading River.

In addition to this objection in order to get to the Long Island Sound, the DOT, that's Department of Transportation, would have to build a road approximately one mile long from William Floyd Parkway to the sound. One of the routes the road would — which is west of the power plant would require evacuations or excavation, excuse me, of the bluffs creating unknown hazards to the already fragile environment of Long Islands north shore. The possible loss of houses located on these bluffs due to disturbed sand flow is a great — exists a road east of the Shoreham Plant would ruin the wetlands owned by

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continuedWilliam Drower continues:

the nature conservancy. It would require the removal of historic private homes, interrupts the flow of spring fed ponds into the marsh and dessimate the entire creek road area which consists of the Wading River Town beach, the Wading River boat ramp and many private homes and private beach clubs.

The noise level from the trucks, from the cars, from the ferry boats and the power plant that's already there would just be intolerable to the residents that live in the Wading River basin.

In addition to this ferry terminal, the study proposed a 2,500 foot tressel extending out into the Long Island Sound. That's a half a mile long. This tressel located in Wading River is just not compatible without community.

In addition, exposing the ferry site or ferry terminal to the widest part of Long Island Sound. In the time of the north east if anybody's been down there, you can see, the height of the waves that come crashing in on our beach. It just doesn't make sense to have a ferry terminal located in these open waters, when there are existing harbors that can accommodate ferries. Then in addition, they propose locating this ferry next to a nuclear plant.

Considering what happened at Three Mile Island, it doesn't make sense to have nuclear plant subject to possible contamination and also negate the possible use of it as an evacuation route.

In lieu of all these objections, I, as President of the Wading River Civic and a resident of Wading River, we welcome your support in our determination to keep a ferry terminal out of Wading River. Thank you very much. I have some extra copies of the study in case you folks would like to read it."

Councilman Prusinowski: "Could I have another copy of your statement too, so I could read it along . . ."

Supervisor Janoski: "Bill, I don't know three times in a night, really. Bill Nohejl."

Bill Nohejl, Wading River; "First of all the farm production, there was one thing left that was brought to my attention. And that as aquaculture. Aquaculture should be included into the farm production because clamming and fin fishing is part of Riverhead."

Councilman Prusinowski: "Is that in the state code Bill?"

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continued

Bill Nohejl: "No, but — as farming, we recognize aquaculture as fine farming of the sea, clamming, shell fishing whatever, mariculture.

Also I want to concur with Mr. Drower. I happened to be at that meeting at Hauppauge last Thursday. Yes, Joe you should have been there. You should have heard the people of Wading River give their comments. It was very interesting. And none of the Town Board members were there. But I concur with what he said and I feel as though that tressel going out 2,500 foot into the water is going to act somewhat like up on the Levon property there building that jetty out. So far, Wading River has been a little fortunate yet that we haven't had that beach wiped out. But I think it's more and more is put into it. I think we will be eroded out. Like they have on the east side of the mining operation on the Levon Property. And also as Bill stated about the power plant, God forbid if there's an accident there that would be one of the supposedly escape routes."

Supervisor Janoski: "Bill do you know who owns the property that the ferry is being proposed."

Bill Nohejl: "Lilco."

Supervisor Janoski: "Lilco?"

Bill Nohejl: "Who else?"

Supervisor Janoski: "I'm almost tempted to ask a rhetorical question and I have never — but I'm going to do it anyhow. As politically unwise as it may be, we just got finished with a public hearing and which people who owned horses said that they should be able to do with their property what they see fit. How does it settle — how do you rectify in your mind that perhaps Lilco should be able to do with their property what they see fit. That's just a . . ."

Bill Nohejl: "I didn't say — you asked me who owned the property. I didn't say that Lilco should do it or shouldn't do it. But I don't believe they should have their power plant there, regardless that they do own it."

Supervisor Janoski: "I'm just saying that we have two conflicting ideas coming and I just wondered how you rectified them. That's all."

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continued

Bill Nohejl: "Don't forget now you got one property owner telling all of the area what to do. That's only one property owner. Now one property owner next to me has horses and that horse is not right, I go to that property owner and I say, clean up your act. I can't do that to Lilco. I'm one. But horse manure I suggest that they do be very careful of how they store the horse manure or dispose of it. And as I said at the last public hearing, bring it to the farms. The farms would be glad to have it."

Supervisor Janoski: "It's just a thought Bill."

Bill Nohejl: "All right. That's to set you straight."

Supervisor Janoski: "You always do. Yes you had your hand up before, but you never . . ."

Unidentified speaker from the audience: "I chickened out. I'm against that proposition. But I was thinking maybe a way of preventing this."

Irene J. Pendzick: "Excuse me, could you give your name and address for the record."

Mildred Tooker, 251 Hubbard Avenue; "If you would give the people who have a legitimate gripe, recourse, then they would be picking on all of us by trying to pass an ordinance that effects too many of us. In other words, public stables seem to be mentioned quite often. Public stables they should have to get a permit. They should have to prove that they have trails to use before they're allowed to be in, I think. Maybe this would help. They need recourse. So they don't pick on us who takes care of our animals. That's all I wanted to say."

Supervisor Janoski: "Eileen."

Eileen Drower, Wading River; "I want to ask the members of the Board and the Supervisor to seriously consider supporting the residents of Wading River in their fight against locating the ferry in that location. I realize, I'm sure you do that one of the sites is to the west of the power

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continuedEileen Drower continues:

plant which is in Brookhaven Town. Even though it is there, it will jeopardize not only Riverhead Town, the town beach, and the boat ramp. The creek if you go up there now and look at it, there is a sand bar. Every May, I think Lilco dredges it out, deposits the sand along the beach, tries to fill in that cut, that's there the step that mother nature leaves us every winter and well, ask the fishermen.

In a month and a half, the mouth of the creek is silted over again. There's a jetty out there that Lilco has put out and just helps the flow of sand to accumulate where it shouldn't. This great big long thing that they propose putting out into the water for a half a mile is going to increase that flow of sand. When they cut into the bus, should they, and again, it is Brookhaven Town that -- it will affect Riverhead Town. Now Joe, you had asked who owns the property? Lilco owns the property to the left, to the west. But on the east of the creek, Wading River Creek, Lilco owns the first house just east of the creek just after that it's all privately owned either homes or beach clubs, right? That will be jeopardized.

Right behind it is all the wetlands. Again it's nature conservancy. There was a gentleman at the hearing, he's on the commission from Garden City and he made a comment when Denis Hurley, who spoke in our favor at the commission hearing was saying his business, the gentleman from Garden City commented that we had driven up Sound Road and thought it was a lovely area, but why not have it open to traffic something like 3,000 cars a day. Have you gentlemen driven up Sound Road? See how winding it is. It's bad enough during the winter without the additional traffic that we get in the summer. But try driving it in the summer, a lot of children ride along there, a lot of children walk along there. And there's a terrible increase in traffic. You know cars with trailers and boats to the ramp. People going up to the beach it cannot hold increased traffic like that.

Another thing that crosses my mind now, Al Prodell at the public hearing he spoke as the President of the Shoreham-Wading River School Board. He commented that something like 800 vehicles or school buses, it couldn't have been a day it must have been a week passed along Route 25A in the intersection of William Floyd. William Floyd ends at 25A. Now all of the children in the Shoreham-Wading River School District in grade six through eight have to cross that intersection twice a day to get to the middle school. It's in Shoreham. The Shoreham residents-students have to cross the intersection to get to the high school. That's grades nine through twelve. They have to cross it twice a day.

In reference to the Wading River students, I think you're putting their lives in jeopardy if you don't support them cause again you're exposing them to the hazard of potential

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continuedEileen Drower continues:

accidents and if you've driven along William Floyd, 25A and William Floyd Parkway and seeing some of the close calls, playing children along there, it says yield, but it should say chicken, it gets a little rough.

So I would urge you strongly to consider supporting the residents of the Wading River Area of the township of Riverhead in their opposition to the ferry being located there. There are areas, I'm not saying don't put it in our back yard, put it in theirs, but I strongly personally believe that they should expand existing ferry services, the two that they have. We would like to see Wading River removed permanently, a site for consideration by this ferry commission. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "A councilman has asked for the floor."

Councilman Menendez: "Eileen, Eileen Drower, are we — the two of us, Councilman Regula and myself went to Hauppauge that night to hear this so — called a debate we thought it was going to be, but it was very one-sided. And the people who were there, were desperately against this thing. And it was quite an impression on us."

Eileen Drower: "Yeah, the public did."

Councilman Menendez: "Yes the public and the public was asking for help."

Eileen Drower: "The businessmen, though, were all saying Shoreham-Wading River, or Wading River-Shoreham, however you want to put it, the businessmen are in favor of having it put there."

Councilman Menendez: "Most of the ones who are in favor of putting it there were somebody who lived somewhere else."

Eileen Drower: "True, we had asked them to come out to the area. Are they familiar with it and they're not."

Councilman Menendez: "And they were counting the dollars in their pocket when they were doing it."

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continued

Eileen Drower: "Sure were. We're a quiet little residential area."

Councilman Menendez: "As I understand it, they have until March 15th . . ."

Eileen Drower: "That's true."

Councilman Menendez: "To get the — all your correspondence in."

Eileen Drower: "To the commissioner of . . ."

Councilman Menendez: "To the commissioner, that's right."

Eileen Drower: "Of the Department of Transportation."

Councilman Menendez: "This afternoon, we did have a resolution prepared and expecting there would be something like motherhood and fly right through. But that wasn't the case and the Board wanted to hold it up for various reasons and it's a good possibility they might reconsider it a little bit possibly if we could hold a special meeting if we could get this thing through and into the proper hands before the deadline."

Eileen Drower: "I trust you will."

Councilman Menendez: "Because I think you people there are definitely desperate for help."

Eileen Drower: "We are."

Councilman Menendez: "From what we can hear."

Eileen Drower: "That's why I ask for your favorable consideration."

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continued

William Kasperovich, Wading River; "My topic is human waste. You've heard a lot about animal waste. I wish I could generate as much interest in human waste which is with us every day. Everybody who reaches for the handle to flush his toilet is a sanitary engineer as far as I'm concerned. Nobody gives it a second thought until the water backs up. Then they call a plumber. Occasionally, the plumber says your system's all filled up. You got to empty it out. You look in the red book, you find a honey dipper, you call him in, he gives you a price, pumps it into his tank truck, you give him his money, he fills the hole he made in the ground and he drives away. And thank God you wish you never see him again or never have this happen again. Now what is in the truck headed west towards the garbage dump is septage. And let's keep the definition in mind because it is being bandied about improperly by many responsible people.

Now since I run out of five minutes all the time getting to my last topic, I'm going to put this topic first. What we have in our back yard, as far as our sewage system is concerned, when it's filled up, we're concerned with it. When it isn't, usually we're not. But a lot of us are drinking our neighbors laundry water, not realizing. Now the point that I want to make is that when I get in touch with the Health Department in any and all the agencies I could get a hold of I find them tell me the same thing. They have no jurisdiction, existing cesspools, septic tanks or water wells. And we have nothing on the books to have any control so that a home owner is open to any whim, any landowner in the residential area in his own back yard can do pretty much what he pleases. Also that the new proposal with the Scavenger Waste does not encompass this area properly, and certainly not adequately.

All right now, I'll go to the contents of what's in the tank truck. When I spoke to you people at the last meeting, you wanted a number of questions of what I was driving at. We gave an engineering firm about over \$50,000 and I'd like to know what has happened, what we have gotten for that money? I'd like to know — questions. Where is the answers to the questions that were raised at the public hearing. This information was not afforded the public, was not answered during the meeting and the public wasn't informed afterwards. Pertinent important questions, where was the compiled data collected by the Town to verify the basis of this produce? Next one, Why is septage, now God mind you, human waste and water which is being objected to and being dumped in the Town dump? Why is this next separated from commercial and industrial use? Another question? Why do we not ask commercial houses and Grumman who has their own truck and delivers regularly to fix their system, alter or augment it? We permit them to haul it down to the dump because it's cheaper for them to do this.

The figures avail that I have been able to compile I feel that the public is not informed. We should know before

PERSONAL APPEARANCES -continuedWilliam Kasperovich continues:

not afterwards like the southwest sewer district. I see here irregularities and when I read in the engineer report that they say if our numbers aren't right, well you people just raise the taxes. The hell with it."

Supervisor Janoski: "Three seconds under five minutes. Is there anyone else that wishes, Jessie?"

Irene J. Pendzick: "Mr. Kasperovich, do you have a copy of your talk?"

William Kasperovich: "No, I only say words like that when I get all mad and wound up."

Jessie Tomlinson, Wading River: "Mr. Janoski, Members of the Board, I would like to give you a little historical background on the Policy Advisory Commission Meeting that was held last week. As you may or may not know, I was fortunate enough to be appointed to that Commission approximately one year ago. That commission was an outgrowth of the Commission that was appointed by Governor Carey to study the possibility of a bridge across Long Island Sound. When the Commission at that time decided that a bridge was not feasible for many reasons, it was decided that we would study the possibility of including ferry services across Long Island Sound.

Originally, it was intended basically to study the existing sites, which are two. One from Port Jefferson, and one from Orient Point and see what could be done to help them improve business. They are not bankrupt by any means, and they are making probably a fair profit, but obviously there's a need for an improvement of transportation across the Sound. They were sites — there are some sites that we were studying as the feasibility of creating a third site. Unfortunately, Shoreham and Wading River, there are two sides that are still being considered. There are members of the Commission who felt all along, that those two particular sites were not the best choice, but the Long Island Association and the Long Island Men's Business Association, commonly known as LIMBER and several other groups, basically business oriented groups are very much in favor of those two sites for many reason.

I will try to be objective as possible, but next week I will be voting on this issue. I want you to understand that you have basically until March the 12th to make a decision. That is the day that we all meet for the final time. There are approximately thirty members on the Commission and we will each present our views to Commissioner Hennessey. Commissioner Hennessey

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continuedJessie Tomlinson continues:

is the head of the Department of Transportation and I know you've spoken to him concerning your street lights. I, myself took it upon myself to talk to him about it. I see nothing much has been done. He's a lot more reasonable than Austin Emery, to say the least. But anyway, we will present our views to him (the tape ended) (the tape began) and has really tried to publicize the meeting. They've tried to publicize the issue and I would hope that those books that Mr. Drower gave you would help you come to a decision. Your decision really would be — the people of Wading River demonstrated the night of the hearing how concerned they were. The speakers were remarkable. They were sincere. They were truthful and they touched on every aspect.

It's not just a question of not in my back yard, they brought out many technical, ecological, environmental points as well as the economical points of view and made it very clear to the commission members of how concerned they were. I felt on talking to some of the members afterwards that they did have an impact. They felt that the group was a very intelligent group of people, very well organized, very disciplined and certainly very much aware of what they were talking about.

Unfortunately, Newsday covered that session and I say unfortunately because it seems certainly from reading the papers that we did not attend the same meeting. Now Newsday has always seemed to have an interest in getting over to Connecticut, I guess for very good business reasons. But they have an obligation to report the truth and the article that appeared in the paper the next day was a total distortion. It never mentioned any of the speakers in Wading River, so actually the public is not given a fair shake as to whether or not they should agree with the attitude of the residents of Shoreham-Wading River. I think the local papers will cover it a lot more accurately. So I just would like to tell you that if you can find it within your heart to discuss this and come to some sort of a conclusion. I would be very happy to hand deliver your statement to Commissioner Hennessey next Thursday."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you Jessie. Yes Sir."

George Chester, Sound Road, Wading River; "I'm sorry that you fellows didn't have time to get there. We felt it was kind of an important thing for Wading River. I know we came here to attend your meetings and we had quite a turn out there. And truthfully, from a business stand point, you say these two ferries are operating profitably. These two ferries with the original evaluation. So all of a sudden you get a government agency making a survey and looking for a third site which is another say agency. Any my fear is that they're going

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continuedGeorge Chester continues:

to build another agency, be it in Wading River or some place else. But Wading River theoretically is the most expensive, so there'd be more bucks involved. They'll be a lot of hands in the pots. I feel that we should avoid the pot. I feel that as far as Wading River goes, I think you people owe it to us, the voters that voted you people in to vote no for this issue."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you George. Yes Sir."

Bart Morrison, Wading River; "Mr. Janoski, Members of the Board, I represent citizens for a unified Wading River. I also attended that meeting Thursday night and I was most disturbed and I must agree that Mrs. Tomlinson — when I'm finding attending these Board Meetings or hearings or whatever the news is not being reported. It's not being reported in the Towns, it's not being reported in the County. There were easy, 100 people from Wading River and thank you two councilmen from the Township of Riverhead and the people in Wading River showed a great concern about the Commissioner studying whether they should use Shoreham-Wading River as a possible site. But what impressed me was the people were not being selfish. We understand the need for transportation out here and industry in a desperate situation out there, but what we can't understand is why business and the politicians are not striving in the way we see it striving to improve the present situation,

These two ferries we have, they say they're operating profitably. You can make blue look red, and red look blue. It doesn't make sense to me. I've gone out to both these ferries numerable times and they operate sporadically. The one in Port Jefferson cuts off in October and starts up again in May. The one out east if you get a twelve foot swell cancels a trip. I would hope that people would push for improvements in both of these services and as I said in the address in Hauppauge, improve the present transportation system on Long Island period. Now what we're coming to the Board for right now, we're asking the Board to support us. I understand and I'm sure everyone in this room understands that you represent the people in the Township of Riverhead all of those interests, business, private or whatever. But you do represent us too even in Wading River, Shoreham, it might be a small part of Shoreham — Valentine Drivers. All we're really asking for is that you go on record that you recognize our problem and that you recognize something first has got to be done about the transportation problem on Long Island and the present two ferries crossing the Island. Before they jump into something over here, it was very well put by this gentleman overhere. You know are they really interested in moving the situation, business wise on Long Island or is someone looking for big

PERSONAL APPEARANCES - continuedBart Morrison continues:

bucks. We're going to build something else.

As I said in the address, it's just another transportation boondoggle. I said in the address in Hauppauge, we can't move the transportation up and down this Island. On the Long Island Expressway we can't move across this Island and put a ferry service out here to destroy that area over there and that's what you're doing, destroying that area over there. Wading River, I'm a native of Long Island. I've been out on the east end here for maybe fifteen years. Wading River is literally being destroyed with that nuclear plant over there and haphazard building and putting this thing, it absolutely makes no sense. And we would ask you to support us in this particular issue.

It's very important to us and I don't — we get up here at times and when we threaten and we say you don't support us we'll remember you election day. That's so much donkey dust at times. We really want your support in this issue with no threats involved. It's something that's very important to us, but it's very important to you also. Because you're going to live hopefully on this Island for another twenty or thirty years and we all want to see the Island go in the right direction. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Thank you. Frances."

Fran Vitollo, Wading River; "I wish you people would support this from Wading River. We need your support for the simple reason if you ride along 25A, it's bad now. I'm thinking of Sound Avenue, Hulse Landing Road and North Wading River Road and being always here complaining about the road conditions, I hope that you support us in this. Thank you."

Supervisor Janoski: "Is there anyone else that wishes to address the Town Board?"

No one else wished to be heard at this time.

There being no further business on motion and vote, the meeting adjourned at 10:05 P.M.

Irene J. Pendzick

IJP/vlv

Irene J. Pendzick, Town Clerk