
APPENDIX C

SEQRA PUBLIC Hearing TRANSCRIPTS

December 12, 2023, January 23, 2024, February 15, 2024

APPENDIX C-1
SEQRA PUBLIC Hearing TRANSCRIPT
December 12, 2023

1 TOWN OF SOUTHAMPTON
 2 COUNTY OF SUFFOLK : STATE OF NEW YORK
 3 -----X
 4 TOWN BOARD PUBLIC HEARING
 5 FOR THE
 6 SITING AND CONSTRUCTION OF A
 7 COMMUNITY SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT (STP)
 8 AND
 9 ASSOCIATED COLLECTION AND CONVEYANCE SYSTEM
 10 IN THE
 11 HAMLET OF RIVERSIDE
 12 -----X

13 Southampton Town Hall
 14 116 Hampton Road
 15 Southampton, New York
 16 December 12, 2023

17 B E F O R E :

- 18 JAY SCHNEIDERMAN - SUPERVISOR
- 19 JOHN BOUVIER - COUNCILMAN
- 20 RICK MARTEL- COUNCILMAN
- 21 CYNDI MCNAMARA - COUNCILWOMAN
- 22 TOMMY JOHN SCHIAVONI - COUNCILMAN

23 *****

24 ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

- 25 JAMES M. BURKE - TOWN ATTORNEY
- SUNDY A. SCHERMEYER - TOWN CLERK

1 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. Sundry,
2 would you please read the fifth public hearing
3 notice?

4 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Public Hearing Number 50,
5 for the Siting and Construction of a Community Sewage
6 Treatment Plant (STP) and associated Collection and
7 Conveyance System in the Hamlet of Riverside.

8 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right.
9 Introducing this is Janice Scherer, our Town Planning
10 and Development Administrator.

11 MS. SCHERER: Thank you, Mr. Supervisor,
12 Members of the Board. We have with us our consulting
13 team of Tom Lembo, the Design Engineer, Carrie
14 O'Farrell, Principal at Nelson, Pope & Voorhis, and
15 Mike Brusseau, the Environmental Consultant, and
16 they're going to go through the specifics, but just
17 on a, you know, macro level.

18 This, as you know, is -- this is the SEQRA
19 hearing on the placement of the STP, sewage treatment
20 plant, in Riverside. We've aggregated the parcels
21 within the Light Industrial Zone, also known as
22 Enterprise Zone, and in aggregating those parcels,
23 we'll be able to fit the sewage treatment plant
24 there. It will require some clearing exemptions from
25 the Central Pine Barrens.

1 We reviewed three different environmental
2 alternatives in terms of how to deal with the
3 effluent from the treatment plants. We'll go over
4 that more specifically. I just wanted to give you
5 a -- you know, this is the proposed sewer district.
6 In January, we'll have a separate hearing on the map
7 and plan and report about all the financials related
8 to that district. That district boundaries about
9 507 acres, encompasses over 500 parcels.

10 And, also, in terms of Riverside as a whole,
11 there's over 35 -- there's about 35% or 466 acres of
12 preserved open space in Riverside. So we're trying
13 to balance out that open space and preservation,
14 which is great. It's on the Peconic Estuary. We're
15 dealing with the Peconic River.

16 The other side of that coin is that it's a very
17 economically distressed area, as you know, and we're
18 trying to revitalize it through the RAP. And just
19 briefly, the RAP, it started with a Brownfield
20 Opportunity Area, also known as BOA, Step 2. It was
21 a nomination process where you look at an area that
22 is needing of revitalization. So all this began with
23 this BOA. Then it moved into this Riverside Renewal,
24 the Riverside Revitalization Action Plan, and all the
25 zoning, theoretical development scenario, yields,

1 etcetera, was all done in 2015. So this hearing is
2 all about now you can't avail yourself to that code.
3 No one can utilize that RAP, or the Riverside Overlay
4 District code, unless and until there's sewage
5 treatment for that density talked about in the code.

6 So now we're finally at the point of the actual
7 plant being designed, engineered. There's about
8 43,000 linear feet of a collection and conveyance
9 system throughout the district, the force mains, the
10 pipes. Tom Lembo is here to talk all about that, so
11 I'm not going to take up too much time, because
12 everyone's here, it's been a really long day. So I'm
13 going to introduce Tom Lembo to just give you the
14 little specifics on that, and then Carrie is going to
15 talk about the three environmental options that we
16 reviewed in the SEQRA. Thank you.

17 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Just before you --
18 Janice, I also want to thank you for getting us to
19 this point. This is -- it's never easy creating
20 sewer districts. This is particularly complicated.
21 It's also been something that's been in the works for
22 me, I'd say I've been working eight years on this
23 one, too, so --

24 MS. SCHERER: Yeah, absolutely. It's a
25 long-range plan and it's --

1 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: And I -- actually,
2 even longer than that, because I started working on
3 this when I was at the County Legislature, so things
4 take time. But you've been really great in terms
5 of --

6 JANICE SCHERER: Thank you.

7 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- trying to keep us
8 focused and put all the pieces together.

9 MS. SCHERER: It's a lot of work and a lot of
10 effort by a team of people. So it's not just me,
11 it's my staff in Long Range Planning, it's all the
12 consulting work, it's also collaborating with people
13 in the audience of Riverhead who want to speak on it.
14 There's been a lot of different people talking. The
15 community of Riverside, FRNCA, you know, all the
16 people involved in the Renaissance Group. You know,
17 so we've all kind of been doing this for many years,
18 and we're finally at a point where it's crystalizing
19 into an actual plan with actual funding, grant monies
20 available.

21 We're trying to get to the point of
22 shovel-ready, and this is one of our final review
23 steps, is going through the more specific SEQRA,
24 because we didn't know at the time which parcels we
25 were going to put the STP on. And we've worked very

1 diligently with your support to buy parcels to -- so
2 we have the option. Do we put it as a constructed
3 wetland, or do they want it injected, or do -- are we
4 going to do leaching pools? And so we'll talk about
5 that today. Thank you.

6 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. Thank you.

7 MR. LEMBO: Good afternoon, Supervisor and
8 Members of the Board. My name is Tom Lembo from
9 Nelson & Pope Engineers. We have offices at 70
10 Maxess Road, Melville, New York. I wanted to just
11 speak briefly about the sewage treatment plant design
12 itself, and the alternatives analysis that we've
13 undertaken with New York State EFC and their
14 consultant, Arcadis.

15 We prepared a flow -- flow analysis of the
16 service area, and are currently finalizing both the
17 CWSRF Report and the Map and Plan Report for your
18 consideration in the very near future.

19 The treatment plant itself is designed to the
20 state of the practice. It's tertiary treatment,
21 which also means nitrogen removal, and it will meet
22 the current New York State groundwater discharge
23 standards, as promulgated by New York State DEC.

24 The treatment plant's going to be built in two
25 phases. Each phase will have 400,000 gallons of

1 capacity, for a total of 800,000 gallons. Phase I
2 of the project is considering 250,000 gallons of
3 connected existing uses, and then another 150,000
4 gallons of potential future redevelopment that would
5 be available for access.

6 Phase I of the development will also include
7 the construction of the collection and conveyance
8 system for Phase I of the sewage treatment plant.
9 For those of you that are not familiar with
10 collection and conveyance, collection just simply
11 refers to gravity flow. Conveyance refers to pump
12 flow, typically. So there is contemplated remote
13 pump stations in the service area, as well as
14 collection system in that Phase I service area.

15 The design -- excuse me. When we were working
16 through the value engineering process with Arcadis,
17 one very important point came up that we thought we
18 wanted share with you, because at one point in time
19 we had considered the construction of -- constructive
20 wetlands near the Peconic Estuary, and then Arcadis
21 also brought to our attention the idea of injection
22 wells for the site. Those were compared to
23 conventional leaching, which Health -- Suffolk County
24 Health Department is very familiar with, and also I'm
25 sure this Board is very familiar with. So when we

1 looked at the value engineering of those three items,
2 the conventional leaching facilities turned out to be
3 the best for a few reasons, and it's more of
4 elimination of the others because of either
5 construction issues or overall cost issues, and I'll
6 just briefly outline those for you as well.

7 With regards to the injection wells, we
8 eliminated them as a viable alternative due to the
9 depth of the wells, which would be over 1,000 feet
10 and connect to the Lloyd Aquifer, which is two
11 aquifers below where we get our drinking water from.
12 If they're constructed to that depth, and that's a
13 challenge in and of itself, it's about 1,000 to 1500
14 feet below grade.

15 They pose a couple of significant issues. One
16 is overall maintenance, because you have to inject or
17 pump the flow into these wells, Part 1. Part 2,
18 since they're over 1,000 feet deep, they're more
19 likely to fail than other alternative technologies
20 that we looked at, plus the selected technology of,
21 you know, conventional onsite leaching fields.

22 With regards to the constructed wetlands, we've
23 determined that, you know, they cause construction
24 challenges, because we needed to cross over a wetland
25 to get to the area that was being proposed, Part 1,

1 so we would have a construction impact for those
2 wetlands.

3 There are coastal resiliency design issues
4 where you actually have to raise the wetland up by
5 2 1/2 to 3 feet in order to meet the useful life of
6 the overall sewage treatment facility, which is
7 anywhere between 30 and 40 years. So knowing that,
8 you know, that in -- I forget what year it is, but
9 there is a point in time where they've asked us to
10 evaluate and design for an 18, 18-inch sea level rise
11 at some point.

12 And then operationally, that maintenance road
13 will remain, okay? So you can have a small swath cut
14 out of that to get up to the -- to the constructed
15 wetlands, as well as the performance of the system
16 that's going to decrease in the wintertime, because
17 of the viability of plant life during the winter
18 periods.

19 So for those reasons, we eliminated both of
20 those leaching technologies that were currently being
21 considered. It's a very high level overview of the
22 sewage treatment plant facility.

23 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Can I just ask?

24 MR. LEMBO: Sure.

25 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: So that I understand, you

CB-1
Sec. 2.3

1 eliminated the injection, injection system?

2 MR. LEMBO: Injection wells.

3 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: And?

4 MR. LEMBO: And constructed wetlands.

5 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: And constructed wetlands.

6 MR. LEMBO: And we're proposing conventional

7 teaching --

8 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Okay.

9 MR. LEMBO: -- as related to Suffolk County
10 Health Department.

11 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: I think that's actually a
12 very wise move, frankly, for a bunch of reasons, and,
13 yeah, okay. Thank you.

14 MR. LEMBO: Okay? Next, Carrie will speak to
15 the environmental issues as it relates to the
16 Supplemental GEIS.

17 MS. O'FARRELL: Good afternoon, Mr. Supervisor
18 and Members of the Board. My name is Carrie
19 O'Farrell. I am a Senior Partner with Nelson, Pope &
20 Voorhis, and we prepared the original environmental
21 review back in 2015 for the overall Riverside Overlay
22 District that was created. That Environmental Impact
23 Statement evaluated a wide variety of different
24 issues, and at that time, as mentioned, the location
25 of the sewage treatment plant had not yet been

↑
CB-1
cont.
Sec. 2.3

1 pinpointed. So after many years of effort and a --
2 and quite a bit of cooperation from the Town and
3 members of the community, we had put together an
4 engineering report and a location for the sewage
5 treatment plant, which, just to be clear, is located
6 on a total of -- it will be 11 -- sorry, 10.94 acres
7 on the west side of the Enterprise industrial area,
8 and it is a collection of several Town-owned
9 properties, plus the Five Towns College piece, which
10 is the northern piece. Requires relocation of the
11 existing Enterprise roadway, which will be realigned
12 to allow for continued access to the existing lots
13 throughout the existing subdivision.

14 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: If I could interject
15 here. Just so everybody knows, the Five Town piece
16 is ours, is the Town's.

17 MS. O'FARRELL: Oh, yes, good. It was under
18 contract last I knew.

19 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: That's right.

20 MS. O'FARRELL: So that's good that it's been
21 finalized. So that's --

22 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I don't know that
23 it's been finalized yet.

24 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: We haven't closed.

25 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay, we haven't closed.

1 COUNCILMAN MCNAMARA: Yeah.

2 MS. SCHERER: We're removing the tower, and
3 then we can close.

4 ATTORNEY BURKE: Yeah, yeah. We're in contract
5 and it's going to happen. It's just --

6 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: It will be, it will
7 be ours.

8 ATTORNEY BURKE: Yeah. We're just waiting for
9 Five Towns to --

10 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Go on. I apologize.

11 MS. O'FARRELL: Sure. The collection of those
12 parcels were -- was important in order to provide for
13 adequate setbacks for the sewage treatment plant to
14 adjoining uses. As well, that allowed us to
15 capitalize on some existing cleared areas, as Janice
16 mentioned. The proposal that includes the sewage
17 treatment plant and the onsite leaching does require
18 clearing that exceeds Pine Barrens clearing
19 regulations. Overall, though, we're looking at a net
20 benefit in terms of, you know, providing sewage
21 treatment for the existing conditions. I've gone
22 off a --

23 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: So sorry to interrupt,
24 but --

25 MS. O'FARRELL: Go ahead. Yeah, no, go ahead.

CB-2
Sec. 2.3



1 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: And I think you had
2 mentioned it. What was the standard for the
3 discharge on those leaching fields? You're adhering
4 to the State or the -- or the national standard?

5 MR. LEMBO: New York State standard.

6 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: State standard? So what's
7 that, like 10 milligrams per --

8 MR. LEMBO: Yeah.

9 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Okay.

10 MR. LEMBO: Total nitrogen effluent.

11 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Perfect. Thank you.

12 MS. O'FARRELL: So I'm -- I went a little off
13 script, so I'm going to jump back on.

14 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Sorry.

15 MS. O'FARRELL: No, that's okay. Just --

16 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: While I'm thinking,
17 you know.

18 MS. O'FARRELL: Yeah, no, no, no. Please,
19 keep, keep going, and if I repeat myself, I'll try
20 and skip ahead. And I know it's been a long day, so
21 I'm going to try and eliminate some of the discussion.

22 But the Brownfield Opportunity Area, the
23 Overlay District, and the RAP, plus the original
24 GEIS, and the adopted findings statements that Janice
25 had mentioned addressed numerous issues, created a

↑
CB-2
cont.
Sec. 2.3

1 long-range plan for the Riverside community, and
2 provided a zoning framework to achieve it, and it
3 included a number of necessary mitigation measures
4 based on that 2015 review. Central to that was in
5 order for the implementation of this revitalization,
6 we needed to identify advanced wastewater treatment
7 to be available, again, for addressing existing
8 conditions and any -- and to allow for future
9 redevelopment.

10 The STP and the GEIS, which is now a supplement
11 to that original work, looked at the STP and best
12 available technologies, location options, facility
13 design, projected phasing, relative costs, pros and
14 cons of alternatives, and available funding. All of
15 those things needed to be determined, and we walked
16 through that process, as discussed.

17 The selected alternative, as Tom went -- walked
18 through the three different options that were
19 considered, those are for the leaching discharge.
20 The sewage treatment plant in all cases remains in
21 this location in the Enterprise Zone. If you would
22 like, I can go into further detail on those
23 alternatives, but overall, due to a number of reasons
24 that are outlined in the EIS, the selection of this
25 location with onsite leaching pools was selected as

1 a -- as the preferred alternative.

2 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Does that -- maybe
3 it's a question more for Janice, but will that
4 require a hardship waiver from the Pine Barrens
5 Commission?

SS-1
Sec. 2.4

6 MS. O'FARRELL: It will, yes, based on the
7 current design, due to clearing.

8 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

9 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: And that's not an EPA
10 oversight area, not at all?

11 JANICE SCHERER: No. I mean, we have to just
12 go through that process, and so they are an involved
13 agency, and you've authorized me to make that
14 application.

CB-3
Sec. 2.10

15 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Yeah, yeah, because, you
16 know, when we're talking about discharges and
17 things --

18 (Voice On Loudspeaker)

19 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: -- this is critical. And
20 I'd hate to be at that point where we can't go any
21 farther, because --

22 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: He's in the other room.

23 MS. O'FARRELL: Gotcha.

24 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: So we have two phases
25 for this and --

CS-1
Sec. 2.2

1 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: He's like the Wizard
2 of Oz, the voice.

3 (Laughter)

4 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: This site is big enough
5 to handle both phases?

6 MS. O'FARRELL: Correct, yes.

7 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Just so that it's on the
8 record.

9 MS. O'FARRELL: So, in general, the plan I know
10 might be a little difficult to see. It is available
11 online as part of the Supplemental GEIS, but it
12 identifies the sewage treatment plant -- sorry -- the
13 sewage treatment plant itself, and then there's two
14 areas identified for future leaching. The Phase I
15 area is on the southern portion of the property, and
16 then Phase II, if the Town chooses to go in that
17 direction for expansion, would be on the north side
18 of the property.

19 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

20 MS. O'FARRELL: The southern side of the
21 property has the benefit of greater depth to
22 groundwater and a little bit of a greater travel
23 distance to surface water, because the direction for
24 surface water is to the north in this case.

25 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Okay.

↑
CS-1
cont.
Sec. 2.2

1 MS. O'FARRELL: If that's helpful. The
2 Supplemental GEIS assesses the environmental impacts
3 to the proposed treatment plant in the district, and
4 identifies mitigations and design modifications to
5 address impacts.

6 The analysis included evaluation of topography
7 and soils, water resources, wetlands, floodplains,
8 groundwater, ecological resources, critical
9 environmental resources, including essential
10 Pine Barrens. As we noted, this is in a compatible
11 growth area and is a receiving area for Pine Barren
12 credits. Land use zoning, community character and
13 construction related impacts.

14 Important to note is that central to this
15 sewage treatment plant is the idea that we are going
16 to be connecting existing homes that are located on
17 substandard lots and used -- are utilizing existing
18 onsite sanitary cesspools or septic systems. Those
19 have elevated levels of nitrogen, they don't have the
20 same kind of nitrogen removal as a sewage treatment
21 plant. The introduction of the sewage treatment
22 plant allows for that nitrogen level to be addressed,
23 both on the existing, and provides the availability
24 of new development, and still provides for a net
25 reduction of nitrogen loading to the area. So that

1 analysis was completed based on a development
2 scenario. Again, that will be part of a -- you know,
3 future actions, future applications in terms of how
4 far the Town wants to go in terms of sizing the
5 plant.

6 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Well, just the I/A
7 systems, they're standard, at least as advertised, as
8 16, 16 milligrams per liter. They're actually doing
9 less than that in practice --

10 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: It's 19.

11 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: -- but we're still at
12 this -- but it's just interesting that you're at that
13 point. I don't know how many people in this area
14 have put in I/A systems that we would connect to.
15 Any? Just four.

16 MS. SCHERER: Four.

17 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: So it's not a problem,
18 then. Okay, all right. Thanks.

19 MS. O'FARRELL: Yeah. The existing condition,
20 you know, in understanding kind of the housing, both
21 the lot sizes in many cases, when we have two large
22 mobile park communities, again, you know, just
23 historically, these -- the systems in the area are
24 more your, you know, decades-old systems, and not a
25 lot of --

CB-4
Sec. 2.3

1 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Okay.

2 MS. O'FARRELL: -- of the new nitrogen removal
3 technology yet.

4 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: All right.

5 MS. O'FARRELL: So --

6 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Thank you.

7 JANICE SCHERER: It's 11 systems.

8 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: It's 11.

9 MS. O'FARRELL: Oh, 11 systems.

10 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Eleven.

11 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Oh.

12 MS. O'FARRELL: Eleven, that's --

13 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Well, that's --

14 MS. O'FARRELL: Hey, there we go.

15 MS. SCHERER: Five hundred and three.

16 MS. O'FARRELL: In terms of selecting the
17 location for this site, it's centrally located, which
18 was important for the conveyance and collection
19 system, again, located within the -- a receiving
20 area. It has generally flat topography. There's no
21 nearby wetlands immediate to the STP and leaching
22 pool area.

23 There will be the need for some wetland permits
24 to be done for the actual conveyance system. Again,
25 the conveyance system is largely within roadways and

↑
CB-4
cont.
Sec. 2.3

1 limited clearing. We have less than an acre of
2 clearing needed for that. Connections and areas of
3 easement, where there are paper streets, are not
4 available for this.

5 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Is this gravity conveyance
6 or pump as well.

7 MR. LEMBO: Both.

8 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: It's a combination?

9 MR. LEMBO: Yeah. What she's speaking about,
10 it combines both conveyance and gravity collection
11 system.

12 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Okay. Thank you.

13 MR. LEMBO: You're welcome.

14 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Sorry, Charlie.

15 MS. O'FARRELL: No, let's keep it -- keep
16 going.

17 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: No. If you're going
18 to speak, I need you in the microphone.

19 MS. O'FARRELL: Oh.

20 MR. LEMBO: Sorry.

21 MS. O'FARRELL: Oh, sorry. Sorry.

22 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Although, you did a good
23 job on that one.

24 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Charlie is that voice
25 that you --

CB-5
Sec. 2.3

1 MS. O'FARRELL: So the answer to that question
2 was it's both. Again, this has to go through a full,
3 you know, engineer design, but it is a combination of
4 gravity and force main.

5 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Thank you.

6 MS. O'FARRELL: The STP location is outside of
7 FEMA's 100-Year Flood Zone, and is not in any special
8 flood hazard areas. It is over 1,000 feet from the
9 Peconic River. We have adequate depth to groundwater
10 to provide the onsite leaching. Good travel,
11 groundwater travel time to the Peconic River. Again,
12 on that south side, we get within the two to
13 five-year contributing -- or, sorry, travel time.

14 No rare habitats or protected species on the
15 site. However, we anticipate the need to limit
16 clearing due to Northern Long-eared Bat as a
17 continued issue.

18 And, in general, the size of the building and
19 the context of the surrounding area is -- you know,
20 this is an industrial subdivision, so the building
21 itself is set away from the roadway, not highly
22 visible in character with the industrial uses that
23 surround it.

24 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: So is one of the
25 interested parties the Peconic Estuary Partnership?

↑
CB-5
Sec. 2.3

↓
CB-6
Sec. 2.5

1 MS. SCHERER: Yes.

2 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Thank you.

3 MS. O'FARRELL: If you -- I can continue to go
4 on, like I said, on the differences between the
5 alternatives and this sited, this sited location. I
6 would like to open it for comments, and if there's
7 something specific --

8 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I'll like that, too.

9 MS. O'FARRELL: Yeah, okay. I kind of figured.

10 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: We have a number of
11 cards.

12 MS. O'FARRELL: Okay, keep -- we will keep
13 the -- the purpose of today is to get comments on the
14 document, and for the Town Board to hear those
15 comments. The comment period will be -- remain open,
16 and we can talk about that after, but for written
17 comment and additional public hearing opportunities.
18 And all comments will be reviewed and responded to
19 formally in writing, so there will be a process by
20 which every comment will be responded to.

21 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. Thank you.

22 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Okay. Thank you.

23 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. Janice,
24 okay to go to the public? We have -- I have four
25 cards, and I don't know how many people online. So I

↑
CB-6
cont.
Sec. 2.5

1 got Jeffrey Seaman. Jeffrey will be followed by
2 Dawn Thomas.

3 MR. SEAMAN: Oh, could we possibly reverse that
4 order?

5 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yes. Dawn, you want
6 to speak first?

7 MS. THOMAS: If that's okay.

8 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. Dawn will
9 be followed by Jeffrey.

10 MS. THOMAS: Good evening, I think. Thank you
11 for the opportunity to speak. I'd like to just
12 direct my comments -- I have an official copy to hand
13 to the Clerk, if that's appropriate to do that now?

14 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Sure.

15 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Thank you.

16 MS. THOMAS: Thank you for the opportunity to
17 comment on Southampton Supplemental DGEIS for the
18 siting and construction of the Riverside community
19 sewage treatment plant. My name is Dawn Thomas. I
20 am the Administrator of the Town of Riverhead's
21 Department of Economic Development, Planning and
22 Building. I make these comments at the request of
23 the Riverhead Town Board, and as such, they serve as
24 the Town of Riverhead's official comments to
25 Southampton's Supplemental DGEIS for the sewage

1 treatment plant.

2 Southampton's efforts to create a sewage
3 treatment plant for Riverside to protect the Peconic
4 Estuary are to be lauded. Protection -- I'm sorry,
5 my voice is a little shot. Protection of the estuary
6 is critical, and this STP will allow for much needed
7 and long awaited new development. Riverhead has
8 created its downtown sewer system really part of the
9 20th Century, and it has been essential to the
10 protection of the river and bay values, as well as
11 the redevelopment and revitalization of Downtown
12 Riverhead. Riverhead hopes and anticipates the
13 addition of the Riverside STP will provide long
14 awaited revitalization to the Riverside Hamlet.

15 As you know, over 10 years ago, Southampton
16 Town launched a comprehensive effort to bring
17 revitalization to Riverside, known as the RAP. This
18 plan resulted in the adoption of an Overlay Zoning
19 District, which calls for the creation of a
20 significant number of residential units, the majority
21 of which are proposed to be rental units. The
22 implementation of that plan, which contains many
23 excellent recommendations, was wholly dependent upon
24 the creation of a means through which to manage the
25 septic flow for the proposed density. Now that

DT-1
Sec. 2.5

DT-2
Sec. 2.1



1 Southhampton is making progress on its plan to create
2 the STP, the likelihood of development in Riverside
3 is greater, and the impacts created by the planned
4 density could soon be realized.

↑
DT-2
cont.
Sec. 2.1

5 Per the FGEIS for the Riverside BOA and RAP
6 Plan amendments, up to 3.2 million square feet of
7 development, including close to 2300 residential
8 units, could potentially occur within a very small
9 geographical area. The lion's share of that density
10 would be focused in the northern part of Riverside
11 toward the traffic circle, the area closest to
12 Downtown Riverhead, and within the Riverhead Central
13 School District. Although Riverside and Downtown
14 Riverhead are located in different Towns, they
15 effectively function as one community and one
16 economic ecosystem.

DT-3
Sec.
2.1

17 Both Riverside and Riverhead are areas of
18 persistent poverty, economic -- environmental justice
19 areas, and are considered historically disadvantaged.
20 Both depend upon necessary infrastructure and
21 services located in Riverhead Town. Both Hamlets
22 have struggled to be revitalized for many years.
23 Accordingly, it is critical that Southhampton and
24 Riverhead Towns work closely together to ensure the
25 best results in the redevelopment of Riverside, as it

DT-4
Sec. 2.7
↓

1 will have substantial impact on Riverhead and the
2 infrastructure it provides to Riverside. As noted,
3 in the preamble to the RAP, many people, and we often
4 get calls from Riverside residents, are unaware that
5 Riverside is not part of Riverhead Town.

↑
DT-4
cont.
Sec. 2.7

6 Over the past 10 years, since the Riverside
7 Overlay District was developed and adopted by the
8 Southampton Town Board, many of the underlying
9 assumptions and data contained in that Riverside RAP
10 Plan have changed dramatically.

DT-5
Sec. 2.7

11 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Three minutes.

12 MS. THOMAS: In particular, the marked
13 reduction of opportunities for homeownership, and
14 consequential building of wealth, the increase of
15 population due to COVID and migration, and the
16 increased need for workforce.

17 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Dawn.

18 MS. THOMAS: In addition --

19 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Dawn, just how much
20 more do you have? Just three minutes.

21 MS. THOMAS: I have another two paragraphs.

22 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

23 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: It's a neighboring
24 municipality.

25 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: No, I know.

1 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

2 MS. THOMAS: The Riverhead Town Board would be
3 grateful to have their comments heard by you.

4 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Right.

5 MS. THOMAS: In addition -- in particular, the
6 marked reduction of opportunities for homeownership
7 and consequential building of wealth, increase in
8 population -- I think I've said that.

9 In addition, Riverhead Town has supported and
10 been successful in increasing residential development
11 as part of the process of revitalization. These new
12 developments and demographics are clearly illustrated
13 in the 2020 census, as well as in the mapping tool
14 created by ERASE Racism, which I've included in my
15 document. As you will see when you use this tool,
16 Riverside is already identified as extremely high in
17 people of color segregation. Downtown Riverhead is
18 identified as moderately high in the same category.
19 These conditions require that whatever is built in
20 Riverside facilitate the growth in diversity of
21 economics, race and ethnicity. Failing to
22 acknowledge and account for these facts could result
23 in an inadvertent exacerbation of the extremely high
24 segregation that exists in the area.

25 The ERASE Racism mapping tool also provides --

DT-6
Sec.2.7

DT-7
Sec. 2.2

1 shows that Riverhead School District is within the
2 lowest category of Educational Opportunity Index.
3 The district must be considered in any development
4 plans that could significantly impact it, as it is
5 already stretched to its limits, and the \$100 million
6 expansion that they did five years ago is already
7 completely full. And I think you'll be getting
8 comments from them as well.

9 Accordingly, Riverhead Town is hereby
10 officially requesting to work with Southampton Town
11 to review and possibly revise the plans in the RAP
12 and the over -- Riverside Overlay District to
13 evaluate saturation, and to ensure that the
14 environmental, socioeconomic and economic impacts to
15 Riverside and Downtown -- and the Downtown Riverhead
16 community serve the residents of the community as
17 well. This work will also ensure that Southampton's
18 plans for its STP are right-sized for the development
19 that is appropriate for the area, and that unnecessary
20 expenditures are avoided.

21 Thank you for taking the time to receive
22 Riverhead Town's comments, and that is all I have.
23 Thank you very much.

24 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Thank you, Dawn.

25 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Thank you, Dawn.

↑
DT-7
cont.
Sec. 2.2

DT-8
Sec.2.8

1 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Can I ask some follow-up
2 questions, too?

3 MS. THOMAS: Sure.

4 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Councilman Schiavoni.

5 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: You mentioned
6 infrastructure provided to the people of Riverside.
7 Other than the Riverhead Fire District and the
8 Riverhead School -- Central School District, what
9 other infrastructure does the Town of Riverhead
10 provide to the residents of Riverside --

11 MS. THOMAS: The Riverhead --

12 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- in your opinion?

13 MS. THOMAS: The Riverhead Free Library.

14 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Oh, so there's the
15 Library District, too?

16 MS. THOMAS: Yes.

17 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

18 MS. THOMAS: And some part of the -- probably
19 Riverhead Ambulance District. We provide the sewage
20 treatment for the Riverside County Center and
21 Correctional Facility through a contract. And so the
22 communities are really definitely completely
23 intertwined.

24 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Absolutely, right.

25 MS. THOMAS: Have functioned as one economic

CS-2
Sec.
2.2

DT-7
Sec.
2.9

1 ecosystem for sometime. And whatever happens in
2 Riverside, and I know we talked about, we -- when we
3 applied for the DRI grant several years ago, which we
4 ultimately did receive in 2021, we had applied
5 together jointly for that area, and so we've been
6 looking to work together on this.

7 I think there are many predatory investors, and
8 there's a lot of funding available for affordable
9 housing, which is wonderful, but concentrating
10 affordable housing in one area is something that is
11 not wonderful necessarily.

12 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Right.

13 MS. THOMAS: It eliminates economic --

14 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: My question was on
15 infrastructure.

16 MS. THOMAS: Pardon me? Oh, I'm sorry, yeah.

17 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: My -- yeah, so --

18 MS. THOMAS: And so I'm sure I could come up
19 with some others, but I think thereby --

20 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Well, I was wondering if
21 there was anything glaring, so --

22 MS. THOMAS: As in part of the Riverhead School
23 District, the children in Southampton, the
24 Southampton part of -- or Riverside participate in
25 Riverhead PAL, our Little League, our Peewee

DT-7
cont.
Sec.
2.9

DT-8
Sec.
2.8

DT-9
Sec.
2.9

1 Football, and, you know, all those kinds of things,
2 it really does function as one community.

3 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: And also to be clear,
4 the Riverside area is part of the Riverhead School
5 District.

6 MS. THOMAS: That's correct.

7 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: They're taxpaying
8 members.

9 MS. THOMAS: That's correct, yes.

10 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: It's not like one serves
11 the other.

12 MS. THOMAS: No, no, not at all.

13 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: It is one -- okay, yeah.

14 MS. THOMAS: No, no. But I think we really --

15 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you.

16 MS. THOMAS: -- need to look at it as one
17 community, and those changes over the last 10 years
18 have been significant. And if you look at the
19 demographics and you look at the census, and any
20 other data you want to look at, those things have
21 changed dramatically in the last 10 years, since you
22 adopted RAP, so.

23 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: And I certainly can
24 appreciate the Town of Riverhead's desire to speak
25 for the Riverhead School District, but we look



DT-9
cont.
Sec.

CS-3
Sec.
2.9

DT-10
Sec.
2.7

1 forward --

2 MS. THOMAS: Well, they're going to speak for
3 themselves.

4 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Oh, I'm sure, yeah.

5 MS. THOMAS: I'm not speaking for them, I'm
6 just suggesting --

7 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Yeah.

8 MS. THOMAS: -- that it is -- it just -- it's
9 indicative of the fact that the two are intertwined.

10 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Absolutely. Thank you.

11 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: A bit of the
12 development is also commercial development, as you
13 know.

14 MS. THOMAS: Yes.

15 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Those are tax
16 ratables that will help the school district without
17 providing any children to the school district.

18 MS. THOMAS: This plan can be wonderful, but
19 it's important that it gets updated, and that we look
20 at it together, and that you understand what we've
21 done and what we're doing on our side of the river,
22 and --

23 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: I understand your
24 concerns entirely.

25 MS. THOMAS: Very good. Thank you.

SS-2
Sec.
2.9

DT-11
Sec.
2.11

1 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. Thank
2 you, Dawn.

3 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you.

4 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Thank you.

5 ATTORNEY BURKE: Thanks, Dawn.

6 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right.
7 Jeffrey Seaman.

8 MR. SEAMAN: Good afternoon, Supervisor,
9 Members of the Board. My name is Jeffrey Seaman and
10 I am Environmental Consultant to the Town Board of
11 Riverhead, speaking on their behalf this evening on
12 the Supplemental EIS prepared for the Riverside Sewer
13 District. In the essence of saving time, because I
14 do understand it's been a long day, I'll summarize my
15 comments verbally, but submit them formally this
16 evening.

17 I reviewed the Supplemental EIS and I think one
18 of the issues I recognize is that you elected not to
19 have a scoping session, which is your option when
20 preparing a supplement. And it's not the Town Board
21 as Commissioners of the Riverhead Sewer District to
22 impede, and they, in fact, encourage the Riverside
23 Sewer District to be developed and a good treatment
24 plant. What is missing from the document is no
25 discussion about the County Center and correctional

JS-1
Sec.
2.1

JS-2
Sec.2.
2

1 facilities, which have been sending their wastewater
2 to us under an agreement for at least the past
3 15 years. That was a temporary arrangement until a
4 better disposal system could be envisioned. We see
5 this as an opportunity for the County, for Riverhead,
6 and for Southampton to include that in their
7 discussions in the Final EIS.

8 Now, after discussions with our side of the
9 table, we would like to see this in a very open and
10 cooperative dialogue, even prior to preparing the
11 Final EIS. My comments are rather detailed in --
12 from an engineering and environmental standpoint. I
13 believe they are substantive, but we would encourage
14 you to have that dialogue established long before you
15 finalize the Final EIS. And we would like to keep
16 that open so that we are not just viewed with these
17 comments as a typical EIS comment and response
18 option.

19 We have a pump station, we have infrastructure,
20 and all of that is in part, we believe an opportunity
21 to include that system in this district, either as an
22 outside district contributor, which is what we're
23 experiencing now by receiving the waste from the
24 County. It could be an opportunity as a funding
25 source to kick-start this project. And I'm sure your

JS-2
Sec.
2.2

JS-3
Sec.
2.11

JS-4
Sec.2.2

1 engineers are going to have to do a little bit of
2 homework with us. We're open to provide all the
3 information necessary to have them understand the
4 flow volumes, the frequency, the peak, etcetera, to
5 see how that might fit into your long-term plan.
6 I think collectively that would be a very wise way
7 to go.

8 Currently, this wastewater is set nearly three
9 miles to our treatment facility, and I think
10 cooperatively we could do a better job working
11 together to protect the estuary, and to facilitate
12 development on both sides of the river. Thank you.

13 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you.

14 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Just a quick question. I
15 understand that Riverhead invested a lot in upgrading
16 its sewage treatment plant several years ago. The
17 question --

18 MR. SEAMAN: Yes.

19 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: -- when we originally many
20 years ago, you know, talked with you guys, that there
21 were issues with the costs of upgrading your system,
22 but since then you've invested that. But has that
23 increased the flow rate, or is it still the same?

24 MR. SEAMAN: Well, the flow rate has increased
25 because of existing development. Also, Riverhead is

JS-4
cont.
Sec.
2.2

CB-7
Sec.
2.2

1 in the process of updating its comprehensive plan.
2 Part of that plan is to exam the potential for moving
3 development rights off of the farmland that is
4 currently zoned for residential, but transferring it
5 to the receiving area, and those receiving areas that
6 we have selected are the ones that are going to be
7 served by municipal sewer and municipal water. So
8 having the burden of the flow from the County Center,
9 the courts and the correctional facility actually
10 impede that opportunity for us.

11 Since you're constructing a new plant and it's
12 in the earlier stages, I think some intelligent
13 planning would dictate that we work together to see
14 if we can't work collectively to resolve that issue
15 both for Riverhead and for Riverside.

16 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Okay. Thank you.

17 ATTORNEY BURKE: Were there concerns about the
18 reimbursement rates that the County was paying the
19 Town, too? I recall being in a meeting on the shared
20 services with the former Supervisor.

21 MR. SEAMAN: I have no comment on that.

22 (Laughter)

23 ATTORNEY BURKE: Okay.

24 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: I didn't even ask the
25 question.

CB-7
cont.
Sec.
2.2

AB-1
Sec.
2.2

1 (Laughter)

2 ATTORNEY BURKE: With the former Supervisor I
3 had a meeting with the County. I know that was an
4 issue expressed by the Town for the County.

5 MR. SEAMAN: It's been always an issue, so I
6 think it's one that can be resolved. We've been in
7 the process of resolving that with the County. But
8 since the facilities are in Southampton --

9 ATTORNEY BURKE: Yeah.

10 MR. SEAMAN: -- and really are in Riverside --

11 ATTORNEY BURKE: In Riverside, it certainly
12 makes sense.

13 MR. SEAMAN: -- I think working together this
14 could be a benefit for everybody. Thank you.

15 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Thank you.

16 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you.

17 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. Ken Coenen,
18 followed by Angela Huneault.

19 MR. COENEN: Good evening. My name is Ken
20 Coenen. I have a -- I've got an interest in this
21 area in that many years ago, during the short-lived
22 life of the Village of Pine Valley, I was the
23 Planning Consultant to Pine Valley.

24 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Yeah.

25 MR. COENEN: And I have a fairly good knowledge



AB-1
cont.
Sec.
2.2

KC-1
Sec.
2.14

1 of the area, and I think this is a very positive step
2 to helping the area. However, some of the decisions
3 made in this impact statement have missed the mark.
4 And I think you guys can do a lot better by changing
5 the design of the plant from an SBR to an MBR. It
6 gives you better quality effluent at less cost and a
7 smaller footprint. There was one paragraph
8 discussing that in the -- in the document.

9 The document also has a discussion about
10 injection wells that are 100 feet deep to the Lloyd
11 Aquifer.

12 MS. SCHERER: A thousand.

13 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: A thousand.

14 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: A thousand.

15 MS. SCHERER: A thousand.

16 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: It's over a thousand.

17 MR. COENEN: It's written there many times
18 100 feet.

19 MS. SCHERER: It's wrong.

20 MR. COENEN: It's wrong, but that's aside from
21 the point.

22 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: We're not doing it.

23 Go on.

24 MR. COENEN: Say again, Tom.

25 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: I said we're not doing it.

KC-1
cont.
Sec.
2.14

KC-2
Sec.
2.2

KC-3
Sec.
2.3

1 MR. COENEN: But the --

2 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: But go on.

3 MR. COENEN: I understand, but there's problems
4 with the document itself. A hundred foot wells are
5 not a deal-breaker. A thousand foot wells are
6 certainly a deal-breaker. The economic discussion in
7 the thing is way off the mark, as far as I'm concerned.

8 As far as the economics of -- they say the SBR
9 is cheaper, never has been, never will be. An MBR is
10 much less expensive to do, and it can be built faster
11 and installed quicker. If you're looking to get a
12 big bang for the buck, that's the way to go for that
13 particular thing.

14 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Is there a difference in
15 energy consumption between the two systems that you
16 cite?

17 MR. COENEN: The MBRs are less energy intensive.

18 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

19 MR. COENEN: So you have that.

20 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: At what topology? That's
21 a loaded question.

22 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

23 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: We'll go on, we'll move on.

24 MR. COENEN: You'll get written comments from
25 me on this whole thing. But I think the overall



KC-3
cont.
Sec.
2.3

KC-4
Sec.
2.2

CS-4
Sec.
2.14

KC-5
Sec.
2.2

KC-6
Sec.
2.5

1 concept is fantastic for Riverside, I think it's
2 necessary. It will improve the overall Peconic
3 Estuary, the river, the water quality. It's a really
4 good project. It can be a lot better.

5 One of the other things that I was struck with
6 was the discussion on the created wetland, and from
7 the discussions I've heard now --

8 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Thirty seconds.

9 MR. COENEN: Thank you. The discussions I've
10 heard, it's going to be at the top of a hill. It's
11 more like a recharge basin, the way it's described,
12 than a constructed wetland. Yeah, you'll put plants
13 in it and everything else and call it a wetland, but
14 it's really not a wetland, it's a recharge basin.
15 Little things like that, but the document is full of
16 contradictions and problems, as far as I'm concerned.
17 Thank you.

18 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you.

19 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Thank you.

20 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Thank you. All
21 right. Angela?

22 ANGELA HUNEULT: Hi again. Angela Huneault, this
23 time representing FRNCA, Flanders-Riverside-Northampton
24 Community Association. I am the president. And
25 since I normally do not take my three minutes,

KC-6
cont.
Sec.
2.6

KC-7
Sec.
2.5

1 because I always talk fast, I want to take the moment
2 to say thank you, Jay. Thank you for what we are now
3 seeing come forth.

4 I drove Flanders Road and noticed that where
5 you always talked about that pier, I call it a pier,
6 there was always a building and then like a barn,
7 seeing activity happening, good activity. The park,
8 beautiful activity happening there, the Maritime
9 Trail Park, which will eventually get a name, and
10 then tonight, the sewer. We're excited, we are
11 excited. We don't want to see anymore delays. We
12 can't wait to get shovels in the ground and for
13 things to move forward.

14 I said years ago, about 2014, end of that,
15 beginning 2015, that Riverside-Northampton-Flanders
16 is a diamond in the rough and that we're going to
17 shine, and it's -- I see it happening. I see us
18 being -- and it's all of you guys, what you -- you
19 did listen. It took time. We had a pandemic, we
20 know that. But I just want to thank you.

21 Thank you, John. Thank you, Rick. And I know
22 this is not the last of us seeing you guys. I'm sure
23 in some way, some form we will continue to see you,
24 but we want to thank you. And then the torch that is
25 going forward with the two of you and the rest of the

AH-1
Sec.
2.14

AH-2
Sec.
2.14

1 new Board that's coming, we're excited for 2024.
2 We're excited to see what we've envisioned for all
3 this time to actually come to -- come forth. And
4 we're looking forward to the development and whatever
5 else comes our way. So thank you.

6 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Thank you.

7 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Thank you. It's a nice
8 sentiment, I appreciate it.

9 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Appreciate it, yeah.

10 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you, Angela.

11 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. That's
12 all the cards I have.

13 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: It should be noted that,
14 you know, Angela as the president of FRNCA, the
15 meetings, the membership of the meetings, they're
16 incredibly positive on this, on this project, so, you
17 know -- and we've been at many of them and they're
18 consistent with their support.

19 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Is there anyone else
20 who didn't fill out a card, or maybe they did and I
21 missed it, but who wanted to speak at this public
22 hearing?

23 (No Response)

24 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Good.

25 (Laughter)

AH-3
Sec.
2.14

CS-4
Sec.
2.14

1 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Oh, do you want to
2 speak? No, I just saw you move your hand.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, no.

4 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, no.

6 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Never mind.

7 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I didn't know that's what
9 I did.

10 (Laughter)

11 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. So we'll
12 go to our online audience, if you wish to be heard on
13 the Supplemental EIS for the Riverside Sewer District.

14 MR. CERTAIN: I see no hands.

15 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. Janice,
16 do I need to leave this open?

17 MS. SCHERER: Yes, actually. So, as I
18 mentioned earlier, there will be a different hearing
19 noticed pursuant to Town Law Article 12(A)? Is
20 that -- I got that right?

21 ATTORNEY BURKE: Yes.

22 MS. SCHERER: For the sewer district formation,
23 and that all has to be very specific in how it goes,
24 and Kathleen is in charge of that. So we anticipate
25 a public hearing to be on January 23rd, you know,

1 assuming the organizational, nothing will change,
2 still the second and fourth of the month. So I would
3 ask that you adjourn it until that day, and then we
4 can hold the hearings together, because that's where
5 all the costs and everything will be discussed.

6 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

7 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: What's the date?

8 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: I'd like to make that
9 motion.

10 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Twenty-third.

11 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: January 23rd, '24.

12 MS. SCHERER: Correct.

13 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. January 23rd.

14 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: 1/23/24.

15 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right.

16 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Twenty-three, '24.

17 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. So, if
18 you don't mind, I'll make the motion, you second?
19 It's typically -- so I'll make a motion to adjourn
20 this hearing to January 23rd of 2024, seconded by
21 Councilman Schiavoni.

22 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

23 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: And on the motion,
24 anyone?

25 (No Response)

1 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: All right. All in
2 favor?

3 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: Aye.

4 COUNCILMAN MARTEL: Aye.

5 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Aye.

6 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Aye.

7 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Aye.

8 MS. SCHERER: Thank you.

9 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Okay.

10 MS. O'FARRELL: And the comment period is 10 days
11 following that hearing.

12 MS. SCHERER: But it's just adjourned to a date
13 certain. Oh, there --

14 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: It's adjourned. That
15 day it could be closed or it could be held open --

16 MS. SCHERER: Yeah.

17 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: -- for another 10 days.

18 MS. O'FARRELL: You're required under SEQRA to
19 hold it open for another 10 days following that
20 hearing.

21 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Right.

22 MS. SCHERER: Yeah, so they're not going to
23 close it.

24 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Well, the new Board
25 will take care of that.

1 MS. SCHERER: Yeah.

2 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: And we could do that at
3 that time.

4 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: At that time, yeah.

5 CLERK SCHERMEYER: The comment period is open
6 this whole time.

7 MS. SCHERER: Yeah, the comment period is open
8 this whole time.

9 CLERK SCHERMEYER: It's an open legislative file.

10 MS. SCHERER: So if anyone's hearing this --

11 SUPERVISOR SCHNEIDERMAN: Yes.

12 MS. SCHERER: -- and wants to submit comments
13 to the record, it's --

14 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: They've got until the
15 23rd, and then 10 days after that.

16 MS. O'FARRELL: That's Correct. Okay.

17 MS. SCHERER: Thank you.

18 COUNCILMAN BOUVIER: For another Board.

19 (End)

20

21

22

23

24

25

