

---

**APPENDIX C-2**  
**SEQRA PUBLIC Hearing TRANSCRIPT**  
January 23, 2024

---

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

9 Southampton Town Hall  
 10 116 Hampton Road  
 11 Southampton, New York  
 12 January 23, 2024

13 B E F O R E:

- 14
- 15 MARIA Z. MOORE- SUPERVISOR
- 16 MICHAEL A. IASILLI - COUNCILMAN
- 17 CYNTHIA MCNAMARA - COUNCILWOMAN
- 18 BILL PELL - COUNCILMAN
- 19 TOMMY JOHN SCHIAVONI - COUNCILMAN

20 \*\*\*\*\*

21 ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

- 22 CHRISTINE SCALERA - DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY
- 23 SUNDY A. SCHERMEYER - TOWN CLERK

24  
 25

1 SUPERVISOR MOORE: All right. So ready to move  
2 on to our second public hearing of the morning -- of  
3 the afternoon.

4 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Public Hearing No. 2, for the  
5 Siting and Construction of a Community Sewage Treatment  
6 Plant and associated Collection and Conveyance System  
7 in the Hamlet of Riverside.

8 MS. SCHERER: Good afternoon, Supervisor Moore,  
9 Members of the Board. Janice Scherer, Town Planning  
10 and Development Administrator. This is a continuation  
11 from the public hearing we had in late December, which  
12 many of the new members did not have the benefit of  
13 attending, so we brought back our consultants to just  
14 give you a brief overview.

15 I'm just here to tell you that this sewage  
16 treatment plant, as we discussed at the work session,  
17 this is being done in support of the Riverside  
18 Revitalization Action Plan. This area that you see  
19 here is the Riverside Sewer District area, which will  
20 be put into two-phase, it will be a phased effort. So  
21 that you see, Phase I is the yellow portion of the map  
22 adjacent to the aerial, and that bluer looking portion  
23 is Phase II.

24 This area also was once designated as an  
25 Urban Renewal Area, a portion of it, a Brownfield

1 Opportunity Area, and it is a designated Disadvantaged  
2 Community, meaning that 40% of the households are below  
3 the Federal Poverty Level, 55% of the community has a  
4 disability.

5 And there are just multiple reasons why the  
6 community has been so supportive of a revitalization  
7 plan in this area, because they're really looking to  
8 bring themselves out of being economically disadvantaged,  
9 and allowing for environmental restoration with the  
10 sewage treatment, and offsetting that with some additional  
11 growth and progress, so that there could be opportunities  
12 for first-time homebuyers, like we were just talking in  
13 the first -- in the first public hearing.

14 So with that, I have Carrie O'Farrell and  
15 Tom Lembo from Nelson & Pope. Carrie is going to be up  
16 first to just give you some overview for the SEQRA  
17 portion.

18 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thank you, Janice.

19 MS. SCHERER: Thank you.

20 MS. O'FARRELL: Good afternoon. Carrie O'Farrell  
21 with the firm of Nelson, Pope & Voorhis, with offices  
22 at 70 Maxess Road in Melville. We were retained by the  
23 Town of Southampton in 2015, when the original  
24 Riverside Overlay District was contemplated, and  
25 performed the Environmental Impact Statement at that

1 time. That plan was finalized with a findings  
2 statement, which was very extensive, if you've had a  
3 chance to look at that. But it also, as part of that  
4 effort, identified the sewage treatment as a key necess --  
5 a key necessity to advancing any of the revitalization  
6 efforts that were envisioned by the Overlay District.

7 So as an effort to continue the revitalization  
8 efforts, the Town has advanced the sewage treatment  
9 options by, first, seeking funding; second, preparing a  
10 preliminary engineering report; and third, preparing a  
11 Supplemental EIS to review the sewage treatment plant  
12 and the various alternatives that are being considered  
13 as part of that design effort.

14 The Supplemental GEIS that we -- sorry, GEIS,  
15 Generic Environmental Impact Statement. If I say too  
16 many acronyms, please stop me. Assesses the potential  
17 environmental impacts and available mitigation,  
18 specifically to this wastewater treatment option,  
19 because, again, the sewage treatment is required in  
20 order to advance any of the other revitalization  
21 efforts, so it is an essential step to be taken at this  
22 time. It looks at the flows from -- the wastewater  
23 flows from existing septic systems, which are somewhat  
24 aged throughout the community. And due to density  
25 limits, the density of housing within much of the study

1 area exceeds Suffolk County design flow, and are shown  
2 to have nitrogen loading impacts to the Peconic River.

3 SUPERVISOR MOORE: How many gallons per day did  
4 you determine is the existing flow?

5 MS. O'FARRELL: It depends on how you look at it.  
6 Based on Suffolk County design flow factors, it's in  
7 the range of 200,000. And I'll have Tom Lembo come up.  
8 They also looked at actual flow rates within the  
9 district. So, you know, there's a little bit of a --

10 SUPERVISOR MOORE: There's a difference.

11 MS. O'FARRELL: -- differential between those two  
12 things, but --

13 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: And that's gallons.

14 MS. O'FARRELL: What's that?

15 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: That's gallons, not  
16 square feet.

17 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Gallons per day.

18 MS. O'FARRELL: Yeah, sorry, gallons per day,  
19 correct.

20 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Yeah, not square feet.

21 MS. O'FARRELL: Sorry.

22 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Okay.

23 MS. O'FARRELL: So one of the first steps in  
24 evaluating the sewage treatment plant was siting, you  
25 know, where are there options to place a sewage

SM-1  
Sec.  
2.2

1 treatment plant within the Overlay District. It is a  
2 fairly environmentally sensitive area. There's limited  
3 land area available that has -- you know, that's either  
4 not developed already within proximity to existing  
5 wetlands. There's tidal wetlands associated with the  
6 Peconic River to the north. There's freshwater  
7 wetlands both to the north, the south, southwest,  
8 southeast, surrounding the limits of the -- of the  
9 overlay zone. There -- it is located within the  
10 compatible growth area of the Central Pine Barrens.  
11 There's a lot of land that has been publicly purchased  
12 and set aside for preservation.

13 So identifying a parcel of adequate size,  
14 adequate depth to groundwater, trying to keep those  
15 separation distances from freshwater wetlands, and, you  
16 know, those other constraints was a difficult task,  
17 honestly. So the -- ultimately, the parcels that were  
18 most advantageous were Town-owned parcels that are  
19 within the Enterprise Zone. There -- the Town owns  
20 7.31 acres. The Enterprise Zone is an existing  
21 industrial zone area and it's the western side of the  
22 Enterprise Zone. Do we have that new map,  
23 the STP?

24 MS. SCHERER: It's on the yellow map.

25 MS. O'FARRELL: Oh, yeah, we could do it this

1 way, that's true. So the Town owned three parcels  
2 within -- or four parcels within the Enterprise Zone,  
3 and then proceeded to --

4 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Hang on a second, Carrie.  
5 Charles, can you shift over, please? Okay. Now go  
6 ahead.

7 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Yeah.

8 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thanks.

9 MS. O'FARRELL: Sorry. And then Five Towns  
10 College owned a parcel adjoining the Town lots, that  
11 was an additional 3.6 acres. So all together,  
12 including the existing road right-of-way, which is also  
13 Town-owned, the cumulative parcel was 11.45 acres  
14 within that industrial zone.

15 This site has the benefit of a number of those  
16 things that we were talking about. It's within an  
17 industrially zoned area, so, from a land use  
18 perspective, the sewage treatment plant makes a lot of  
19 sense within that zone. It's located on Enterprise  
20 Drive, which is a no-outlet loop roadway that is  
21 outside of the view set of CR 24. There's going to be  
22 a wooded buffer perimeter that would be retained around  
23 the sewage treatment plant. Again, over  
24 1,000 feet from the Peconic River, located outside of  
25 the floodplains, suitable well drained soils, adequate

1 depth to groundwater. So there were a number -- and,  
2 sorry, groundwater travel time was something that was  
3 also important to this analysis. So the parcels  
4 themselves kind of came together, and, given the  
5 different constraints within the area, really were an  
6 optimal location for the sewage treatment plant itself.

7 So the sewage treatment plant would be centrally  
8 located within those parcels. It is a building that is  
9 fully enclosed, all wastewater treatment is contained  
10 within the building itself. It's concrete, made to  
11 last. All of the effluent that is treated in the plant  
12 would be discharged below -- we'll go through some  
13 alternatives, but below grade, so it is never --  
14 there's no outdoor interactions in terms of odors and  
15 things like that, the process is fully enclosed.

16 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Where are the -- why don't you  
17 point to the leaching fields on the map?

18 MS. O'FARRELL: Sure. So that the way the --  
19 there's a plan that has a little bit of a closer  
20 zoom-in that we can share at the end of the meeting.  
21 But there's two -- it's envisioned to be a two-phased  
22 process, 400,000 gallons for the first phase, 400,000  
23 for an expansion in the future. The southern portion  
24 of the property, which is the area of the deeper  
25 recharge -- or deeper depth to groundwater, and

SM-2  
Sec.  
2.2

1 additional travel, groundwater travel time would be  
2 Phase I leaching pool. So it's the lower half, it's  
3 about 2.3 acres, I believe. And then the second phase  
4 of the project would go on the northern side, the  
5 leaching pool would be in this area, again, all  
6 underground. It would be revegetated with, you know, a  
7 native grass species, and regularly mowed, so you don't  
8 see any of the subsurface leaching.

9 Part of the construction also involves -- it's  
10 just the -- trying to make sure that we're meeting all  
11 the Health Department separation distances to adjoining  
12 properties. A portion of Enterprise Drive is included  
13 within the future STP parcel, sewage treatment plant  
14 parcel. So there is a reconfiguration of Enterprise  
15 Drive that is shown on the maps that would still allow  
16 for access for all the existing lots in that area, but,  
17 again, provides adequate room for that -- the sewage  
18 treatment plant with appropriate setbacks.

19 The -- in addition to the sewage treatment plant,  
20 there's a collection system that would be routed  
21 throughout the overlay zone study area that is a  
22 combination of force mains, gravity sewers. It's  
23 approximately 12 miles in total of different mains for  
24 both Phase I and Phase II. That main installation is,  
25 for the most part, within the paved roadway or within

1 the right-of-way. There's a few sections where it's --  
2 it is proposed at this time within paper streets, but  
3 pretty limited disturbance from an environmental  
4 standpoint, you know, again, really working within the  
5 existing paved areas.

6 There is a requirement for a clearing on the  
7 sewage treatment plant parcel that does exceed the  
8 Central Pine Barrens regulations associated with  
9 clearing. So there is an application necessary to the  
10 Central Pine Barrens for a hardship to address the  
11 clearing that's required on the parcel, if we were to  
12 proceed with the leaching pool discharge option.

13 SUPERVISOR MOORE: I believe a public hearing has  
14 been scheduled by the Planning -- I'm sorry, by the  
15 Pine Barrens Commission for that.

16 MS. O'FARRELL: Correct, yes. An application was  
17 submitted, and that will be -- I think that's coming up  
18 next month.

19 One of the biggest environmental benefits, as  
20 we -- as I started to talk about before, is the  
21 nitrogen loading associated with the installation of  
22 the sewage treatment plant. So the existing condition,  
23 you have a number of antiquated systems, small lots,  
24 typical cesspool, onsite cesspool, and wastewater  
25 systems have a nitrogen loading between 40 and

SM-3  
Sec.  
2.4

1 50 milligrams per liter. A sewage treatment plant  
2 treats wastewater to a minimum of 10 milligrams per  
3 liter, so there's a net benefit in that treatment  
4 process.

5 We did a nitrogen loading model as part of the  
6 original Generic Environmental Impact Statement, which  
7 showed that under the existing condition, the expected  
8 nitrogen loading is 4.58 milligrams per liter under the  
9 existing condition, and then with the sewage treatment  
10 plant and the development that was -- it was called a  
11 theoretical development scenario. So we evaluated what  
12 would happen with the revitalization efforts being  
13 treated by the sewage treatment plant, and you end up  
14 with a net reduction of nitrogen loading to 4.3  
15 milligrams per liter, which is a 10% reduction within  
16 the study area. And that can even be improved  
17 depending on how much of the existing condition is  
18 connected to the system, which is the Town's intention  
19 at this time.

20 We went through a number of alternatives.  
21 There's a section in the Generic EIS that goes through  
22 alternatives. I'm going to have Tom work through most  
23 of those. But just in general, we have -- just to  
24 point it out on the map, we have -- the treatment plant  
25 itself is -- remains in the same STP site location. We

1 don't have a better spot to put the plant. The  
2 alternatives are looking at how do we deal with the  
3 discharge -- sorry, the effluent, and how is it  
4 handled. So, at this time, it's proposed to be  
5 discharged subsurface at the STP parcel.

6 We did look at an alternative that looked at a  
7 constructed wetland, which would pump the effluent to  
8 an area of dredge spoil, which is elevated, but still  
9 close to surface water, and we -- and we determined  
10 that there's some feasibility issues with that, both in  
11 a construction standpoint, sea level rise, flooding  
12 inundation. There's a number of things that were  
13 setbacks associated with that. And there's a lot of  
14 wetland areas on that north side, so it's a pretty  
15 limited envelope that we had to work with.

16 We also looked at an onsite -- several injection  
17 wells, so Tom will go through that in a moment. But  
18 that allows for less clearing on the site, but is a  
19 well that would inject the effluent deep into groundwater,  
20 so there's some limitations in that as well.

21 We also looked at some options of other connections  
22 through connecting to Riverhead, and a no-action, which  
23 means the area stays as is. So that has a lot of  
24 limitations on any future redevelopment. So the  
25 emphasis in this case was provide a sewage treatment

1 option that would encourage and incentivize  
2 redevelopment in this area.

3 Any questions? Otherwise, I'll --

4 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Yes, I have a question  
5 before you go to your colleague.

6 MS. O'FARRELL: Sure.

7 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: This system that we are  
8 putting in, aside from the moving parts, how long do we  
9 estimate a system like this to last?

10 MS. O'FARRELL: I'm going to give that to Tom.

11 (Laughter)

12 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay. All right, so okay.  
13 As far as the Phase I coverage area or service area,  
14 I'm very happy that there are three mobile home parks  
15 in there. Those are a highly dense area and those are  
16 currently just on septic systems.

17 MS. O'FARRELL: Correct. Just we didn't -- I  
18 didn't explain this map, I'm sorry.

19 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: No, that's all right.

20 MS. O'FARRELL: So the -- just for the benefit of  
21 the public, the yellow portion is considered Phase I.  
22 That was identified, again, as those higher density  
23 areas, areas close to environmentally sensitive zones,  
24 and kind of the quarter downtown area for a  
25 revitalization that was contemplated in the Overlay

CS1-1  
Sec.  
2.2

CS1-2  
Sec.  
2.14

1 District. And Phase II is the blue sections. And, you  
2 know, again, there's some future planning and movement  
3 that could take place as we get through -- get into the  
4 design phase next.

5 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: And one other aside. With  
6 the constructed wetlands that you pointed out, aside  
7 from this project that we're talking about here today,  
8 the Peconic Estuary Program has granted -- has given  
9 the Town a grant to reconstruct wetlands on that area.  
10 So that, that is happening, but that's -- that's not  
11 your thing.

12 MS. O'FARRELL: Yeah. No, that's wonderful.

13 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: So thanks to the Peconic  
14 Estuary Program.

15 MS. O'FARRELL: Go ahead.

16 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: I do have a question. Have  
17 you looked at any potential alternatives in the case  
18 that the Pine Barrens Commission does, you know, not  
19 approve the clearing?

20 MS. O'FARRELL: Yeah. Out of the alternatives  
21 that we mentioned, there's a couple of different things  
22 that the Pine Barrens will be looking at, clearing is  
23 one of them.

24 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Right.

25 MS. O'FARRELL: The placement of a sewage

CS1-3  
Sec.  
2.2

MI-1  
Sec.  
2.3

1 treatment plant in the Central Pine Barrens is also,  
2 you know, a pivotal piece of this. And the nitrogen  
3 loading that you can expect from that sewage treatment  
4 plant will be something else that is evaluated by them.  
5 So that was a lot of the reason for the offsite  
6 constructed wetlands idea.

7 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Okay.

8 MS. O'FARRELL: Like I said, it has some downfalls.  
9 It's --

10 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Right.

11 MS. O'FARRELL: It is an option.

12 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Right.

13 MS. O'FARRELL: The injection well option is a  
14 much smaller footprint in terms of the effluent  
15 discharge. So we can reduce the amount of clearing  
16 significantly with that, but there's some water quality  
17 downsides to that.

18 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Right.

19 MS. O'FARRELL: And the purpose of the Pine Barrens,  
20 you know, really is about protection of groundwater --

21 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Right.

22 MS. O'FARRELL: -- and drinking water. So Tom  
23 will get into a few of those, you know, kind of the  
24 positives and negatives of the different alternatives,  
25 but there are options.

1 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Okay.

2 MS. O'FARRELL: Good?

3 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you.

4 COUNCILMAN PELL: Thank you very much.

5 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thanks.

6 MR. LEMBO: Good afternoon, Supervisor and  
7 Members of the Board. My name is Tom Lembo from  
8 Nelson & Pope Engineers. We have offices at 70 Maxess  
9 Road, Melville, New York 11747. Would you like me to  
10 address the two questions first, or would you prefer me  
11 to go through my presentation, and, hopefully, they may  
12 be answered as part of that?

13 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Will you address it in  
14 your presentation?

15 (Laughter)

16 MR. LEMBO: With regards to the longevity or the  
17 life cycle of the sewage treatment plant, no.

18 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

19 MR. LEMBO: So I can answer that for you right  
20 now. Typically, those plants are designed for anywhere  
21 between 30 and 40 years. The concrete in the system,  
22 all right, that's designed as part of it would normally  
23 last 50 years.

24 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Uh-huh.

25 MR. LEMBO: So you can stay within the same

1 footprint, but, at the same time, replace mechanical  
2 components, if necessary, prior to having to think of  
3 other alternatives for sewage disposal in this area.  
4 Is that adequately answered?

5 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Right. You know, I think  
6 in the Village of Sag Harbor their system is currently  
7 in for 50 years now and it's going strong. I mean, I'm  
8 thinking once we put this infrastructure in, it's going  
9 to be there for a long time.

10 MR. LEMBO: It will be there a long time, yeah.

11 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

12 MR. LEMBO: So thank you very much. So, as I had  
13 said, we were hired by the Town to prepare the flow  
14 analysis of the service area, to prepare the Clean  
15 Water State Revolving Fund report, and to prepare a  
16 map and plan for the formation of the sewer district  
17 for the Town. The map and plan is not the subject of  
18 this hearing, this is specifically related to the SEQRA  
19 and the Clean Water State Revolving Fund report that  
20 was added to that EIS.

21 The plant is currently designed or contemplated  
22 to be tertiary treatment, which is third, third stage  
23 removal, specifically for nitrogen and other organic  
24 pollutants in the -- in the -- in the treatment system,  
25 and will also meet current New York State groundwater

CS1-4  
Sec.  
2.2

1 drinking standards.

2 The treatment plant is designed in two phases,  
3 for a total capacity of 800,000; right now, 8,000 --  
4 800,000 gallons per day. At this point in time, we are  
5 only looking to construct 400,000 gallons a day based  
6 on our flow analysis.

7 The flow analysis was prepared in two levels,  
8 one, pulling Suffolk County Water Authority data for  
9 each and every parcel that's within the subject area,  
10 and then also looking at it from a Health Department  
11 density standpoint. The results of the Suffolk County  
12 Water Authority analysis indicate approximately 90,000  
13 gallons a day currently used in the service area.

14 If you look at the Suffolk County Department of  
15 Health Services density, which is what is allowable on  
16 the parcel pursuant to the density of the acreage  
17 that's there, you're more looking at between 225 and  
18 250,000 gallons a day, which is what we wrote as the  
19 existing density, which only leaves 150,000 gallons a  
20 day available for additional development in the area as  
21 part of Phase I.

22 We -- we evaluated as part of the CWSRF three  
23 different technologies for use, BEST, or biologically  
24 engineered single-sludge treatment systems, SBR  
25 systems, which are sequencing batch reactor systems,

1 and MBR systems, which are membrane bioreactor systems.  
2 We eliminated BEST from contention, for lack of a  
3 better way to describe it, because of footprint  
4 concerns, and the overall size of the lots that are  
5 there.

6 We looked at more deeply both SBR and MBR  
7 requirements. I'm going to outline a couple of  
8 advantages and disadvantages of each for you at this  
9 point. In an SBR system, or a sequencing batch reactor  
10 system, you're only looking at a single tank process  
11 which exhibits mechanical reliability, because you only  
12 have one blower and one pump installed in each of the  
13 tanks, okay? It's easily upgradable in modular  
14 fashion, which was conducive to an expansion by another  
15 400,000 gallons a day.

16 The equipment is optimized, or the usage of the  
17 equipment is optimized in a -- in an SBR system,  
18 specifically because you can use the same piece of  
19 equipment for every two tanks, as opposed to having to  
20 have a dedicated air pump and other pumping systems for  
21 a one-tank or -- for one tank, excuse me. It's  
22 demonstrated a very high quality effluent in the  
23 35 years that it's been approved in Suffolk County.

24 Its disadvantages are pretty simple. It has a  
25 greater overall footprint, and once you choose an SBR

1 system, in order to add to it, you do need to increase  
2 your capital cost for new tankage, whereas the  
3 conversion to an MBR system can be done in situ if you  
4 chose SBR first, okay? So I just wanted to bring that  
5 up as part -- as a possible alternative, if we choose  
6 that the footprint needs to remain as is.

7 There is a little bit of a capacity change. You  
8 could typically get approximately 25% more capacity in  
9 an SBR that's converted to an MBR system. So that if  
10 the Town feels that 800,000 is too much of a expansion,  
11 we could make that conversion to an MBR system at a  
12 future time.

13 With regards to the MBR system, the advantages,  
14 again, as I had just discussed, they have a smaller  
15 overall footprint. They have -- they run at a higher  
16 biomass concentration, which allows them to treat  
17 effectively further down within the spectrum for  
18 nitrogen removal. They have a higher quality effluent,  
19 and in some cases can treat emergent contaminants,  
20 although that's been the subject of some white papers  
21 recently that say depending on how large the pore size  
22 is -- and I know I'm getting very detailed with it.  
23 There's a filtration portion of an MBR system. How  
24 large the pore size is, some of those emergent  
25 contaminants will still break through and pass through

1 the MBR system as well.

2 As far as disadvantages go, there's a somewhat, a  
3 slight increase in upfront costs. It is less flexible  
4 as it relates to what you have to operate that system  
5 at and then what your sludge production may or may not  
6 be. It has a higher O&M cost, because what I had just  
7 discussed with relationship to the SBR, that for every  
8 two tanks in an SBR and the equipment associated with  
9 that, I would only be able to run one tank of an MBR  
10 system.

11 The other only concern that we have is sometimes  
12 there's fouling phenomena, where the filters get  
13 clogged or bound, which, you know, necessitate  
14 additional operational strategies that the O&M, or, you  
15 know, the contract operator may or may not need to  
16 address at any given time.

17 During the next phases of design, the Health  
18 Department-approved technologies will be considered,  
19 and vendors will be vetted at that point in time. All  
20 right? We have, you know, working knowledge. I've  
21 been designing for 27 years. We have working knowledge  
22 of the cost of each of these, so we were able to  
23 best-guess it at this point for what was required. And  
24 then as the design progresses, it's typical for any  
25 engineer to contact the vendors and get price opinion

1 from them for the technologies that are being  
2 considered. All technologies are still on the table,  
3 BEST, MBR and SBR.

4 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: I have a question about  
5 SBR and MBR. As far as energy consumption, is there a  
6 significant difference in energy consumption between  
7 the two systems?

8 MR. LEMBO: Typically, an MBR consumes more  
9 energy --

10 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Uh-huh.

11 MR. LEMBO: -- because of the -- not being able  
12 to optimize the use of an aeration blower for two  
13 tanks, as opposed to one tank. Other than that,  
14 they're equivalent. So it's just blower operation to  
15 aerate the tanks.

16 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. LEMBO: You're welcome.

18 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Would you say that the MBRs  
19 are more expensive to maintain in the future because of  
20 the replacement of the filters more periodically?

21 MR. LEMBO: Yes, that is also correct. My  
22 only -- again, we -- I want to take cost, and I also  
23 want to take treatment level and point that out to you,  
24 because the MBR is going to potentially give you a  
25 higher degree of treatment as it relates to emergent

CS1-5  
Sec.  
2.2

SM-4  
Sec.  
2.3

1 contaminants, okay? And, you know, it's -- we're  
2 talking about some pharmaceuticals, PFOS and PFOA,  
3 which are both what are called forever chemicals, I  
4 think it's the best way to describe it. They do  
5 demonstrate removal. SBR has not been studied to that,  
6 so I can't offer or really opine on that issue.

7 I think I had said this already, but design  
8 alternatives were investigated as part of the CWSRF  
9 report preparation and value engineering process in  
10 conjunction with the New York State Environmental  
11 Facilities Corporation. They are the entity that  
12 provides some of the funding grants that are being  
13 considered by the Town at this time. That CWSRF  
14 included comparison of the STP process, technologies  
15 employed and effluent leaching alternatives.

16 So I'd like to dive into the leaching  
17 alternatives at this point in time, if you don't mind.  
18 There were three alternatives that we looked at,  
19 constructed wetlands, injection wells, and a  
20 conventional subsurface discharge, which is very  
21 similar to the leaching pool on the back end of a  
22 septic tank, all right, but at a much larger scale,  
23 obviously, because you're putting 400,000 gallons of  
24 treated effluent into the -- into the system.

25 So injection wells, we considered them, and were

1 eliminated due to the top of the -- due to the depth of  
2 the wells required based on the value engineering  
3 process at over 1,000 feet deep. There was a  
4 discussion of injecting into the Lloyd Aquifer, which,  
5 you know -- and during my first testimony I hadn't been  
6 able to address that, but from what I've read, in 2008,  
7 the New York State Legislature banned recharge to that  
8 aquifer for protection purposes, if ever the two other  
9 aquifers were fouled to the point where it wouldn't be  
10 available for drinking water anymore.

11 Construction wetland -- constructed wetlands were  
12 determined to cause construction challenges, including  
13 additional wetlands permits for construction, coastal  
14 resiliency design issues, and additional cost to convey  
15 this treated effluent from the STP, which, again, would  
16 be remote.

17 Let me just outline for you real quick here. I  
18 just want to point out that in this area here, there  
19 are freshwater wetlands that we would need permits for  
20 construction, and then we would need to also maintain  
21 an access road if we ever had to service those  
22 constructed wetlands. So we obviated that as a viable  
23 option due to those challenges.

24 Conventional subsurface leaching is the preferred  
25 alternative based on a few factors, one, ease of

1 construction, ease -- and second, ease of maintenance,  
2 okay? This system is going to -- essentially, you're  
3 going to dig to about three feet above groundwater and  
4 start to install precast concrete rings that will --  
5 they're perforated, by the way, that will leach the  
6 clean effluent into the soils, the surrounding soils.

7 And just so -- so we're clear on it, the three  
8 feet of separation is pursuant to Health Department and  
9 provides additional treatment, because it takes  
10 approximately 90 days total travel time for that water  
11 to eventually seep into the groundwater that's there.  
12 The soil acts as a media or a substrate that bacteria  
13 can grow on and provide additional treatment of that.

14 I just want to make sure I didn't miss anything  
15 for you as part of this. No. I think I've covered  
16 everything that would be required in order for you guys  
17 to have a better understanding of what the treatment  
18 options were, what we looked at as part of the Clean  
19 Water State Revolving Fund report, and for you guys to  
20 become much more -- better versed in sewage treatment.  
21 And I thank you for your time.

22 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thank you.

23 COUNCILMAN PELL: Thank you.

24 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: I do have a question, sorry.

25 So you mentioned MBR is the strongest in dealing with

MI-2  
Sec.  
2.6

1 PFOS and PFOA, different ones that you mentioned.

2 MR. LEMBO: Uh-huh.

3 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: But you also mentioned that  
4 PFOS and PFOA may still enter into, into the system.  
5 Do you have an approximate rate of which that would be  
6 entering into it?

7 MR. LEMBO: I only read two articles on it --

8 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Okay.

9 MR. LEMBO: -- and they were approximately the  
10 same, but it depends on the pore size.

11 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Right.

12 MR. LEMBO: Okay? The opening of the holes  
13 through the filters, whether you're able to treat  
14 long-change versus short-chain PFOS compounds.

15 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Okay.

16 MR. LEMBO: Okay? So until we select the  
17 technology --

18 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Right.

19 MR. LEMBO: -- I could only offer you that,  
20 you know, I've seen as low as 30% removal, I've seen as  
21 high as 80% removal in the two studies that -- that I  
22 read through.

23 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Yeah. And the only reason  
24 why I ask that question was because the State is, you  
25 know, always looking at this, and it could change down

MI-2  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.6

MI-3  
Sec.  
2.6

1 the road. It's good to hear that Phase II looks like  
2 we're going to assess the technology, correct --

3 MR. LEMBO: Right.

4 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: -- contingent on what the  
5 law is, so that's good to hear, and, yeah, appreciate it.

6 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Did the options include  
7 polishing filters, and if it did, would that address  
8 the PFOS?

9 MR. LEMBO: So the polishing filters that were  
10 considered only considered removal of solids to protect  
11 the downstream leaching fields, not further than that.  
12 You can add MBR as a polishing filter to the end of an  
13 SBR, or you can just perform the same function by  
14 constructing an MBR. I think in this case you're  
15 better off just constructing an MBR if the cost is  
16 viable related to an SBR construction. Again, you know,  
17 the pressed nature of this district, the operational  
18 costs will increase with an MBR.

19 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Yeah.

20 MR. LEMBO: So I --

21 SUPERVISOR MOORE: And there's probably a big  
22 enough footprint that you don't have to go with the  
23 more expensive treatment system.

24 MR. LEMBO: I'm sorry, could you repeat that  
25 question?

MI-3  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.6

SM-5  
Sec.  
2.6

SM-6  
Sec.  
2.2

1 SUPERVISOR MOORE: You said that the SBR needs a  
2 bigger footprint, but that's probably not an issue here  
3 with all the land that's been acquired.

4 MR. LEMBO: Correct. Yeah, we were able to site  
5 the sewage treatment plant for the 800,000 gallons  
6 a day.

7 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Uh-huh.

8 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: And the constructed  
9 wetlands was an option when this was undertaken, but  
10 it's off the table, correct?

11 MR. LEMBO: Well, I'm not -- that is correct.  
12 I'm not recommending it at this point because of the  
13 operational issues, because of the resiliency issues,  
14 and a few other concerns that that -- you know, one of  
15 them being the State of New York is going to treat the  
16 permit discharge differently than they would with a  
17 conventional subsurface discharge.

18 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Okay.

19 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: The effluent that comes  
20 out of the facility that goes into the leaching fields,  
21 how is that tested? I know that the State or the  
22 County Health Department requires that it's tested on a  
23 daily basis. Is that --

24 MR. LEMBO: Right at the end of the pipe. So  
25 before it gets into the leaching field, there is a flow

SM-6  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.2

CM-1  
Sec.  
2.2

CS1-6  
Sec.  
2.6

1 metering chamber typically designed --

2 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Uh-huh.

3 MR. LEMBO: -- and that flow metering chamber is  
4 where they pull their grab sample from for testing.

5 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: So this is a human taking  
6 something and --

7 MR. LEMBO: (Nodded yes).

8 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay. And then testing a  
9 sample.

10 MR. LEMBO: It's part of the operations and  
11 maintenance standard operating procedures on a daily  
12 basis.

13 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Uh-huh. Are we required  
14 to keep the tops of the leaching fields -- are we  
15 required to keep the tops of the leaching fields clear?

16 MR. LEMBO: We are.

17 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: And -- okay. So if we  
18 wanted to put a future solar array or something on  
19 that, we probably may not --

20 MR. LEMBO: It would be --

21 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: -- be able to do that.

22 MR. LEMBO: I would not recommend it.

23 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

24 MR. LEMBO: I'll -- let me say it to you that  
25 way. It hasn't been done that I'm aware of in Suffolk

CS1-7  
Sec.  
2.6

CS1-8  
Sec.  
2.4

1 County. And because there is the potential for fouling  
2 at the leaching fields, you don't want to be -- have to  
3 remove the solar array and then replace it afterwards,  
4 after maintenance is complete.

5 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. LEMBO: Thank you. Thank you very much.

7 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thank you.

8 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Thank you.

9 COUNCILMAN PELL: Thank you.

10 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Oh, there's some cards here.

11 Jeff Seaman.

12 MR. SEAMAN: Madam supervisor, may I defer my  
13 time to Supervisor Hubbard, please, for the moment, and  
14 according to order.

15 SUPERVISOR MOORE: I don't -- you know, I don't  
16 think that we do that, but --

17 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: He just wants to change  
18 the order.

19 MR. SEAMAN: Just the order.

20 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Oh, just to change the order?

21 MR. SEAMAN: Yeah. Thank you.

22 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Does the Supervisor want  
23 to speak?

24 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Supervisor Tim Hubbard.

25 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Yeah, welcome.

1 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Congratulations and welcome.  
2 You want to go first, right?

3 (Laughter)

4 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

5 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Oh, Dawn Thomas is here, too.

6 SUPERVISOR HUBBARD: Madam Supervisor, Town Board  
7 Members, thank you for the opportunity to talk. I  
8 appreciate your time. I'm Tim Hubbard, the Supervisor  
9 for the Town of Riverhead.

10 Previously, we've sent Community Development  
11 Director Dawn Thomas over here to address comments  
12 regarding -- on behalf of the Town of Riverhead. I  
13 felt it important for myself to come here and address  
14 you personally.

15 Riverside and the Town of Riverhead are deeply  
16 connected. We provide education to the Riverhead  
17 School District, we provide library services, fire  
18 protection services, public transportation, post office  
19 services, shopping and commerce, hospital and medical  
20 services, children's recreation, including parks,  
21 Little League, PAL, we even share a common zip code.  
22 The communities effectively rule and function, or  
23 effectively function as one unit.

24 We also share important demographics, as both  
25 areas are designated as Areas of Persistent Poverty,

TH-1  
Sec.  
2.9

TH-2  
Sec.  
2.9

1 and Historically Disadvantaged and Environmental  
 2 Justice Areas. Riverside is considered very highly  
 3 segregated based on color. Downtown Riverhead is  
 4 designated as highly segregated based on color.  
 5 Redevelopment of Riverside cannot exacerbate the  
 6 situation and cannot be allowed to overwhelm  
 7 Riverhead's resources.

↑  
 TH-2  
 cont.  
 Sec.  
 2.9

8 Riverhead is in full support of Southampton  
 9 building a new sewage treatment plant. It will help  
 10 protect the Peconic Estuary, which goes without saying,  
 11 the benefits -- it benefits the entire East End region.  
 12 It will jump-start needed revitalization on the south  
 13 side of the river. The problem we have is with the  
 14 proposed makeup of the housing stock under  
 15 consideration for that revitalization.

TH-3  
 Sec.  
 2.14

16 Rather than 2300 or so units of all affordable,  
 17 we strongly urge the Town Board to consider a mix of  
 18 senior housing, which won't impact our schools and  
 19 parks as much, ownership units and single-family homes,  
 20 market rate rentals, workforce rentals, and affordable  
 21 rentals. Riverhead addressed this problem by providing  
 22 housing of all types for people of all types.

TH-4  
 Sec.  
 2.8

23 Riverhead's on a firm path to revitalization in  
 24 Downtown -- in Downtown Riverhead that will provide  
 25 economic development, diversity on all levels, and

TH-5  
 Sec.  
 2.8

TH-6  
 Sec.  
 2.8  
 ↓

1 removal of barriers for all. We believe that Riverside  
 2 should be redeveloped using the same methodology.  
 3 Along those lines, we have three requests. Number one,  
 4 that we put our respective planning teams together to  
 5 ensure that any Riverside development does not result  
 6 in inverse redlining, i.e. putting all affordable  
 7 housing on already highly segregated location. And our  
 8 mutual efforts will ensure that all of the services  
 9 provided by Riverhead to Riverside are not overwhelmed  
 10 by the redevelopment.

11 Next, I would like to propose an intermunicipal  
 12 effort to relook at the Riverside Revitalization  
 13 Activation Plan, and I am willing to commit the Town of  
 14 Riverhead financially by partnering to fund the study  
 15 whose purpose would be to review the current market and  
 16 demographics for incorporation into the plan. If we  
 17 work together, we can ensure that Riverside and  
 18 Riverhead Hamlets get what they deserve, a vibrant,  
 19 diverse and economically robust community.

20 The final request is that the new Riverside Sewer  
 21 District be designated or designed to include the  
 22 Suffolk County Jail and the Suffolk County -- the  
 23 County Center. As Jeff Seaman will speak on and fully  
 24 address, moving these properties from service by  
 25 Riverhead sewage treatment plant, which they currently

TH-6  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.8

TH-7  
Sec.  
2.9

TH-8  
Sec.  
2.7

TH-9  
Sec.  
2.2

1 are, or served by contract, will allow Riverhead to  
2 expand its sewer down West Main Street, so that we can  
3 move existing homes and businesses located on the river  
4 from private systems and connect to -- up to our system  
5 at the west end of town. We do not have any CPF  
6 funding to expand our district, so getting back that  
7 capacity is crucial for us.

8 I thank you for your time and attention, and look  
9 forward to working together with you in the next couple  
10 of years. And I'm always available for anybody. If  
11 you ever have any questions or anything, please feel  
12 free to contact me. Thank you for your time.

13 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thank you.

14 COUNCILMAN PELL: Thank you.

15 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you, Supervisor.

16 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Do you have a copy of your  
17 comments to leave with the Clerk?

18 SUPERVISOR HUBBARD: I have my notes written on  
19 it. We are going to mail them to you.

20 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Oh, good.

21 COUNCILMAN PELL: Okay.

22 SUPERVISOR HUBBARD: Okay?

23 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thanks.

24 SUPERVISOR HUBBARD: Thank you.

25 COUNCILMAN PELL: Thank you.

↑  
TH-9  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.2

1 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Dawn Thomas, would you like to  
2 come up and speak now, or, you know, whatever order you  
3 want. Jeff Seaman?

4 DAWN THOMAS: I could defer to Jeff. I think  
5 Supervisor Hubbard just said everything. Thank you.

6 MR. SEAMAN: Supervisor, Members of the Board, my  
7 name is Jeff Seaman. For the SEQRA record, I'm here  
8 representing the Town Board of Riverhead, as they are  
9 the Commissioners of the Riverhead Sewer District, and  
10 I am an environmental consultant retained to address  
11 the Supplemental Draft Generic Environmental Impact  
12 Statement, and perhaps more specifically the idea of  
13 adding the County Center and correctional facilities as  
14 part of the existing conditions analysis, and the  
15 benefits that would be realized by both Southampton and  
16 Riverhead.

17 As the Supervisor has expressed, I think there  
18 was -- well, initially, a misunderstanding that the  
19 desire to do this was to increase more density in  
20 Riverhead. That's not the case. Riverhead is in the  
21 process of developing and finalizing its comprehensive  
22 plan update, which is scheduled to be finished by the  
23 spring of this year.

24 Riverhead does not have the CPF monies that other  
25 East End Towns have amassed, so we're limited in how we

JS1-1  
Sec.  
2.2

1 can use our resources for both water quality issues and  
2 land preservation.

3 North of Sound Avenue, in the Historic District,  
4 is part of a 7,000 block of farmland that's under  
5 pressure because it's currently zoned two-acre  
6 residential. It's unsewered and we don't have the  
7 available funds to just purchase that. But we have  
8 come up with a creative transfer development program  
9 which would identify that area as a sending area, and  
10 take that two-acre zoning with incentives to move that  
11 to sewered and watered areas that we can provide  
12 municipal service to. Part of that target area is the  
13 receiving area, which is located along the western end  
14 of our Main Street area, because we can easily connect  
15 it to the sewer and to our water district, but we don't  
16 have the full capacity to realize that.

17 The County Center is approximately 300 feet from  
18 the boundary line that you've drawn here. There's an  
19 existing pump station at Nugent Drive, which is about  
20 1,000 feet from your proposed district boundary, and  
21 about 1,000 feet from Phase I. That pump station,  
22 while it's owned by the County, discharges to a manhole  
23 near the library, and then that wastewater is sent all  
24 the way to our Riverside plant more than 2 1/2 miles  
25 away. Your treatment plant would be much closer

1 than that.

2 In your own studies, and I've reviewed about  
3 1,000 pages of all of the work that you've done here  
4 for the treatment facility, the design, the capacity  
5 that you've engineered it for, it would seem reasonable  
6 to have included that connection in the EIS. We're  
7 only at the Draft EIS stage for comment, but I think  
8 that whether that was overlooked, that 100,000 gallons  
9 discharge from the County, or a misunderstanding of how  
10 that treatment system was connected to Riverhead,  
11 because they're outside our district, it really should  
12 be inside your district.

13 So what we're proposing, that you relook at not  
14 only the capacity that you could receive from the  
15 County, but also its revenue stream, because they're  
16 outside our district. They're subject to a 1.75  
17 multiplier over a standard sewer fee that we have to  
18 surcharge them because they're outside the district.  
19 If you looked at the financial aspects of that, that  
20 additional 100,000 gallons coming from those  
21 institutions might help offset your residential user  
22 fee, because it's an immediate funding stream.

23 It's very inexpensive to make that connection.  
24 That force main is -- you know, wouldn't even show up  
25 in your estimated 35 million for this project. So it's

JS1-1  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.2

1 a very minor cost addition. It would capture that  
2 area. There is really no other development west of  
3 that in Riverside for perhaps three or four miles, so  
4 it's not like you're on a fringe of an additional  
5 development to add into that. So since your plant  
6 appears and your system appears --

7 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Thirty seconds.

8 MR. SEAMAN: -- significantly larger than even  
9 the Phase I would warrant just to treat the existing  
10 conditions, and by omission, by oversight, or purpose  
11 of studying maybe only the area within your  
12 revitalization area. I think that under SEQRA you  
13 really do need to take this option very serious,  
14 because as I often tell all the Board Members I  
15 represent, when it comes to SEQRA, you want to put on  
16 belts and suspenders. But if you're looking for the  
17 use of SEQRA in support of funding requests, you have  
18 to add duct tape and super glue to make sure that this  
19 goes through, because you do not receive your funding  
20 until your SEQRA record is solid. We know that from  
21 100 years of experience of dealing with municipal  
22 sewers in Riverhead. And as the Supervisor offered,  
23 we're available to assist you to complete this project,  
24 which we fully support. Thank you.

25 COUNCILMAN PELL: Thank you.

JS1-1  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.2

1           COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: I have a couple of  
2 questions. First of all, I appreciate the fact that  
3 the Supervisor and you came in to address us. Thank  
4 you very much. We have a number of overlapping,  
5 overlapping districts in Southampton Town and  
6 East Hampton Town, mentioned by the Supervisor, the  
7 Library District, the Fire District, and, of course,  
8 Riverhead Central School District, which significantly,  
9 significantly goes into Southampton Town, and these  
10 things need to be taken into consideration.

11           You mentioned farmland along Sound Avenue. Would  
12 you kind of dive deeper into that? I'm very interested  
13 in that. Are you talking about transfer of flow credits  
14 or development rights?

15           MR. SEAMAN: So we have a total of 7,000 acres of  
16 farmland that is existing that we've preserved, I think  
17 7,000. I think Dawn could probably speak to that.

18           COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: And just to stop you here,  
19 that's with the Town of Riverhead, your Community  
20 Preservation Fund, and Suffolk County?

21           MR. SEAMAN: Yeah, yes that's total.

22           COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

23           MR. SEAMAN: We want to focus on the Historic  
24 District north of Sound Avenue as the next goal. So if  
25 you were to -- that's currently two-acre zoning, and

JS1-2  
Sec.  
2.2

1       although it's farmland, it's two-acre zoning  
2       residential that can be development, there are no  
3       restrictions on that, and the Community Preservation  
4       Fund doesn't have the resources to purchase that.

5               COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Is it part of your  
6       Farmland Protection District, is that what you call it?

7               MR. SEAMAN: It is within the APC.

8               COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

9               MR. SEAMAN: But farmers have the right to  
10       development land as well --

11              COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Right.

12              MR. SEAMAN: -- unless they sell development  
13       rights. So as an incentive to preserve that farmland,  
14       if we transfer that development to another area through  
15       a TDR program --

16              COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Uh-huh.

17              MR. SEAMAN: -- that type of a creative and novel  
18       system, even at an increased density, if it is going  
19       into a sewer district, would be able to preserve that  
20       farmland.

21              COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you.

22              COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: And my question was just  
23       you had mentioned revenue for the County Center. How  
24       much revenue would Riverhead lose if we were to take  
25       the County Center?

↑  
JS1-2  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.2

CS1-9  
Sec.  
2.2

CM-2  
Sec.  
2.2

1 MR. SEAMAN: Actually, we would only -- if you  
2 wanted to discount the .75 multiplier -- the 1.75  
3 multiplier, we really wouldn't be losing any revenue on  
4 that, because we would still be charging a sewer fee  
5 for the 100,000 gallons per day that we picked up. We  
6 would also have that within our district.

7 When you're outside a district, you sign an  
8 agreement. That agreement is subject to negotiation on  
9 a periodic basis, and even, honestly, wrestling about  
10 getting paid and the money. If it is included in your  
11 district, it is mandatory that they pay that fee and  
12 there's no way around it, just as there would be no way  
13 around it for any other institution located within your  
14 sewer district, so it's a guaranteed income.

15 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Thank you.

16 SUPERVISOR MOORE: The only thing that struck me  
17 was with the numbers. I think, Tom, you had said it  
18 was between 200 and 250,000 gallons per day for the  
19 existing flow under the Suffolk County standards,  
20 design standards.

21 MR. LEMBO: To Suffolk County density standards.

22 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Yeah.

23 MR. LEMBO: Yes, that's correct.

24 SUPERVISOR MOORE: And then the County Center is  
25 160,000. So that's the whole 400,000, if you --

JS1-3  
Sec.  
2.2

SM-7  
Sec.  
2.2

1           MR. SEAMAN: But no, there are -- but -- and I  
2           have the -- some detailed reviews of the numbers  
3           projected from existing conditions. I think, as  
4           Tom can explain, there are design standards, there's  
5           actually as-built flow. If your as-built flow under  
6           your existing conditions under typical SEQRA, that's  
7           your flow. If it's 94,000 gallons per day from your  
8           existing built condition, that's your condition, and I  
9           think that's what was projected from the use of Suffolk  
10          County Water Authority numbers. So that's -- that's  
11          your true flow. Anything beyond that, what your  
12          standard would predict, undeveloped sites could be, or  
13          subdivision of existing land could be, that's more  
14          speculative. That's good for a design factor, but  
15          that's not an existing condition.

16          My -- my feeling is that an existing condition is  
17          your current status quo, and it's missing 100,000  
18          gallons from the County because it's in Riverside, and,  
19          really, I think supports the -- not only the income  
20          stream, but the whole theory that you're not building  
21          this system for future development as its primary  
22          purpose, you're building this system in order to  
23          attenuate nitrogen load to the Peconic, so I think it's  
24          a benefit to your argument for that purpose.

25          But I'll let the engineers recalculate the way I

JS1-4  
Sec.  
2.2

1       figured out what your total flow is, because there are  
2       conflicting numbers, not because they're in conflict,  
3       but it's their interpretation as to whether it's a  
4       design flow using a County standard, or an existing  
5       flow from a measured outflow, or input through water  
6       meter calculations with a discount for the time of  
7       year, discount of irrigation, other uses of water that  
8       would enhance the flow.

9                SUPERVISOR MOORE: Uh-huh.

10              COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: And to be clear, you're  
11       here because the Town of Riverhead wants to preserve  
12       farmland up on Sound Avenue, that gorgeous -- the  
13       vistas and farm production for farming? That's --

14              MR. SEAMAN: That is part of it.

15              COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

16              MR. SEAMAN: But I'm also here to, you know,  
17       really recommend that because the County Center is  
18       going to -- it's in Southampton and it should be  
19       connected to the nearest treatment plant. That's  
20       actually identified by Nelson & Pope in a response that  
21       they gave to Arcadis, who reviewed the value  
22       engineering. An alternative was presented in the EIS  
23       that this flow all go to the Riverhead sewage plant and  
24       that you not build a treatment plant. Well, that  
25       wasn't feasible for a lot of reasons, because that was

JS1-4  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.2

CS1-10  
Sec.  
2.2

JS1-5  
Sec.  
2.2

1 discounted some 10 years ago. But the County flow will  
2 be nearest to the treatment plant that you built, and  
3 even in their argument, that's where it should be  
4 connected.

5 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thank you.

6 MR. SEAMAN: Thank you.

7 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you for coming in.

8 COUNCILMAN PELL: Thank you.

9 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Charles, is there anyone  
10 online that would like to speak?

11 MR. CERTAIN: I see no hands.

12 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Does that mean -- I  
13 signed a card, is that what you're talking about?

14 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: We're on a public  
15 hearing, not -- you signed up for public portion?

16 AUDIENCE MEMBER: For public portion.

17 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: We're not in public  
18 portion yet.

19 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: That's next.

20 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Almost there.

21 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: This is specific to the  
22 Riverside Sewer District.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay, got it.

24 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Janice, yes.

25 MS. SCHERER: So, as you know, the map and plan

↑  
JS1-5  
cont.  
Sec.  
2.2

1 report hearing is scheduled for February 13th, so we're  
2 recommending leaving this hearing open so that they  
3 align, so any comments on the financial side get  
4 encapsulated into the FEIS. So we would ask that the  
5 Board adjourn this to February 13th to continue the  
6 public hearing at that date.

7 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Okay. And if we did want to  
8 have meetings with Riverhead and talk about, you know,  
9 the County Center, how does that impact the report that  
10 we have now, would that need to be amended to  
11 incorporate that information?

12 MS. SCHERER: No. I mean, in the end, we're  
13 talking about almost having this entirely funded  
14 through public grants, so it could only get better if  
15 we have more revenue toward it. So I guess --

16 SUPERVISOR MOORE: But, I mean, we wouldn't have  
17 to designate, you know, that that would be included in  
18 the collection conveyance or the design at this point?

19 MS. SCHERER: I don't think so, because, I mean,  
20 first, the response to comment in the Final Environmental  
21 Impact Statement would most likely produce a map of  
22 another color --

23 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Uh-huh.

24 MS. SCHERER: -- unless you wanted to do part of  
25 Phase II showing the County Center and what that would

SM-8  
Sec.  
2.2

SM-9  
Sec.  
2.2

1 look like incorporated into your map and plan. You  
2 could always amend the map and plan report.

3 COUNCILMAN PELL: I think I would like to see  
4 Phase II, the map, about alignment.

5 MS. SCHERER: Showing that?

6 COUNCILMAN PELL: Yes.

7 MS. SCHERER: Sure, we'll add that into the Final  
8 EIS. The Final Environmental -- after you close this  
9 whole thing, Nelson, Pope & Voorhis will produce what's  
10 known as a Final Environmental Impact Statement, and  
11 all these comments that have been made to you will be  
12 addressed, and then you'll determine whether they're  
13 addressed to your satisfaction, and at that point  
14 you'll say that's complete. And when we address that,  
15 we can have further meetings so that you can have a  
16 more robust response and say, well, we also met with  
17 Town of Riverhead on these days, we talked to the  
18 Suffolk County Executive, maybe even, you know, and we  
19 can add all that into the record as to how --

20 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Janice.

21 MS. SCHERER: -- you took a hard look at all this.

22 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Okay.

23 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Phase II is the blue area?

24 MS. SCHERER: The bluish purple color.

25 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

1 MS. SCHERER: Yes.

2 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: So we could possibly amend  
3 that or add a Phase III if we --

4 MS. SCHERER: Correct.

5 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: -- do want to do what -- okay.

6 MS. SCHERER: And I believe that they said their  
7 contract with the County Center, and correct me if I'm  
8 wrong, Jeff, that it ends in 2027? Oh, you don't have  
9 to get up, you can just tell me. Does it?

10 MR. SEAMAN: I believe, yes, they had three years  
11 to come up with an alternative.

12 MS. SCHERER: So the County has until 2027 to  
13 come up with an alternative --

14 COUNCILMAN PELL: So --

15 MS. SCHERER: -- to being contracted into  
16 Riverhead.

17 COUNCILMAN PELL: Okay.

18 MS. SCHERER: So they'll be interested in  
19 discussing this with you.

20 COUNCILMAN PELL: Yeah.

21 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY SCALERA: But this is for  
22 the Phase I. The map and plan before the Board today  
23 is the -- or the SGEIS is for the Phase I aspect of the  
24 plan for the --

25 MS. SCHERER: It's actually the whole thing.

CS1-11  
Sec.  
2.2

1 because we have to --

2 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY SCALERA: Phase I and II?

3 MS. SCHERER: -- in SEQRA look at the whole  
4 action, but we're talking about implementing Phase I  
5 now. But we must disclose the full action, so that  
6 would include it, but that doesn't mean that it can't  
7 change.

8 COUNCILMAN PELL: So if Phase -- for the County  
9 Center would be Phase II or Phase III?

10 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Well, it could be Phase I.

11 MS. SCHERER: That is at your discretion.

12 COUNCILMAN PELL: It could be Phase I.

13 MS. SCHERER: It could be I, II, or III.

14 COUNCILMAN PELL: I think it should all be at one  
15 time, myself.

16 MS. SCHERER: You can determine that. I would  
17 recommend that you do it at least at Phase II, because  
18 that way we have all that worked out. But we really  
19 need to take a look at it.

20 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Okay.

21 MS. SCHERER: I think it's better for us just to  
22 talk to Riverhead and talk to the County.

23 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Absolutely.

24 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY SCALERA: I don't want you  
25 to do anything that's going to change the map and plan,

1 that's now being a separate hearing.

2 MS. SCHERER: We are not changing the map and  
3 plan at this point. So what has to be is that the map  
4 and plan report shows the costs, and the costs are  
5 affiliated with every single parcel in this district,  
6 and then in every parcel for Phase II. So if you said,  
7 well, now we have a Phase III, that would factor into a  
8 revised map and plan report, which would have revised  
9 numbers --

10 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: And would that --

11 MS. SCHERER: -- and we're not at that point.

12 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: And would that require  
13 another public hearing?

14 MS. SCHERER: Yeah.

15 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Okay.

16 MS. SCHERER: Everything always requires --

17 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Yeah.

18 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Okay.

19 MS. SCHERER: -- a public hearing and contract.  
20 And Kathleen would be the better person to speak to  
21 this. I don't know if she's here right now, but --

22 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY SCALERA: As long as it's  
23 not changing. It's I and II right now.

24 MS. SCHERER: It's not changing anything at this  
25 point, although it's a good suggestion. And I also

1 agree that we should look at that.

2 SUPERVISOR MOORE: So whether we do it in Phase I  
3 or II, it can -- we don't have to amend or revise the  
4 map and plan or this SEQRA evaluation?

5 MS. SCHERER: Right. You're considering it right  
6 now in your SEQRA record.

7 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Yeah.

8 MS. SCHERER: So it's all being put on the record  
9 now.

10 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Okay.

11 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY SCALERA: But in the map and  
12 plan that we just set out, is the boundary inclusive of  
13 the --

14 MS. SCHERER: It is not.

15 DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY SCALERA: Right. That would  
16 need a revision.

17 MS. SCHERER: It would need a revision to the map  
18 and plan report if you decide to include it. At such  
19 time you decide to include it, the map and plan --  
20 because now they're in the district. So they, as  
21 district users, would have to have the opportunity --  
22 oh, good -- to be incorporated. And, Kathleen, would  
23 you like to respond to that any further? Thank you.

24 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thank you, Janice.

25 COUNCILMAN PELL: Thank you, Janice.

SM-10  
Sec.  
2.2

1           DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY SCALERA: Kathleen, the  
2 Board was talking about potentially including the  
3 County, at Riverhead's suggestion, the County facility  
4 into the map and plan at some point. What would that  
5 do at this stage, and what would be the process for  
6 that?

7           DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MURRAY: Sure. So, as you  
8 know, on February 13th we'll have our first public  
9 hearing on the map and plan. And if at that time the  
10 Board decides that they want to see different  
11 boundaries, then we would have to amend the map and  
12 plan and have a new, new notice of public hearing on  
13 that new boundary description. And, really, it's not  
14 limited to the boundaries, anything in that map and  
15 plan that you want to see changed at that time can be  
16 amended.

17           COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: How does extending the  
18 process work towards our grant and --

19           DEPUTY TOWN ATTORNEY MURRAY: It's difficult. As  
20 you know, EFC gave us an award letter that says we have  
21 to have district formation by June, so we have to be  
22 very cognizant of those time frames. Every time I  
23 notice a new map and plan, it has to be within --  
24 published within 10 and 20 days in our local paper, so  
25 just things we have to keep in mind.

CM-3  
Sec.  
2.2

1 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Okay. That's interesting.

2 COUNCILMAN PELL: Thank you.

3 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Thanks.

4 MS. SCHERER: Do you have any other questions  
5 for me?

6 SUPERVISOR MOORE: I don't think so. I don't know.

7 MS. SCHERER: Or the consultants?

8 COUNCILMAN PELL: No.

9 SUPERVISOR MOORE: We're just going to hold this  
10 open.

11 MS. SCHERER: Yes. The record would stay open  
12 until February 13th?

13 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Adjourn it to --

14 MS. SCHERER: February 13th.

15 SUPERVISOR MOORE: All right. Thank you.

16 MS. SCHERER: Thank you.

17 COUNCILMAN PELL: You have to make a motion.

18 SUPERVISOR MOORE: I don't know. Do we need a  
19 motion to take --

20 COUNCILMAN PELL: Uh-huh.

21 SUPERVISOR MOORE: All right.

22 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: To adjourn.

23 SUPERVISOR MOORE: I make a motion to adjourn --

24 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Who's making the motion?

25 SUPERVISOR MOORE: I'll make the motion for

1 adjournment.

2 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: I'll second it.

3 COUNCILMAN PELL: And I'll say aye.

4 SUPERVISOR MOORE: All right. That brings us to --

5 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Thank you.

6 SUPERVISOR MOORE: -- the public portion comment

7 of the meeting.

8 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Did we call the vote? I'm

9 sorry, I didn't hear anything.

10 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Yeah, we have to vote.

11 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Oh, I'm sorry.

12 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: That's okay

13 SUPERVISOR MOORE: All in favor?

14 COUNCILMAN PELL: Aye.

15 COUNCILMAN SCHIAVONI: Aye.

16 COUNCILWOMAN MCNAMARA: Aye.

17 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: I'm going to abstain, please.

18 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Thank you. What did you say?

19 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Abstain.

20 SUPERVISOR MOORE: For the hold -- for the vote

21 to hold it over.

22 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: For the vote, yeah.

23 SUPERVISOR MOORE: Okay. Now we're in the public

24 comment portion.

25 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: You got that, correct?

1 CLERK SCHERMEYER: I can't hear.

2 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Abstain.

3 CLERK SCHERMEYER: You're abstaining.

4 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Yeah.

5 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Okay, I'm sorry. It's just  
6 difficult to hear down there.

7 COUNCILMAN IASILLI: Yep, sorry. Sorry, I'll be  
8 a little louder.

9 CLERK SCHERMEYER: Abstaining, got it.

10 (End)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

