CENTRAL PINE BARRENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Minutes

Meeting held on August 11, 1994 Great River

1.) Approval of Minutes

A motion was made by Connie Kepert and seconded by Ann LaWall to approve the minutes from the July 11, 1994 Central Pine Barrens Advisory Committee meeting. The motion was carried unanimously.

2.) Progress Report and Report of Commission Actions

Mr. Corwin discussed the adoption of the Draft Plan and DGEIS, and distributed copies of this plan to those members present. The cost of the Plan is \$25.00. The deadline for comments on the DGEIS is October 14, 1994. Mr. Corwin stated that comments should be as specific as possible. The combined Article 8 and Article 57 hearing is on Wednesday, September 28, 1994, at 7 p.m., at the Brookhaven Town Offices, Medford. The workshops are scheduled prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Corwin discussed the annual report, and its contents. There are a few organizations not mentioned in this report. Those mentioned are those who contribute to the primary continuing fundamental staff support who are contractors to the Commission.

Mr. Corwin stated that a statutory requirement that recently passed on August 6, 1994, was a requirement stating that within the first 12 months of the first meeting of the Commission, the Commission is to identify sufficient receiving areas to accommodate the credits being transferred from the Core. Also, it requires that the Commission consider the economic impact of the established TDR program. A report of the Economic Analysis will be distributed to the Committee. In addition, Mr. Corwin reviewed a list of all public agencies with access to the Plan.

Three public information sessions need to be held by mid October. The Core owner workshop is not a statutory requirement.

Also discussed was the Compatible Growth and Core Area Applications.

•Dries/Shoreham - The decision deadline was on 8/12/94. The new deadline is now September 14, 1994. Two issues discussed were: 1) achievement of nitrate-nitrogen

standards, 2) dedication of a section of an unbuilt paperstreet to the west of the property. The applicant has been asked to furnish additional information regarding both items.

• Centermanor Plaza - This application has been returned to the applicant. The completeness of this application is in question.

Core Preservation Area

- Tuccio Application The issues which arose were: 1) What exactly is the site? The fenced in area, or the berm area itself? 2) Effects on the ground water 3) Effects on public safety. The Commission adopted lead agency status, adopted a negative declaration, and approved this application with several conditions.
- Osleeb Application/Brookhaven This application was approved with no conditions
- Manor Pines Project Mr. Corwin discussed the status of this project. The
 Commission has indicated that this project is subject to Article 57. We have not yet
 received a reply from the applicant's attorney.

David Scro had questions regarding the Draft Plan, and asked if the Draft Plan will be changed. Mr. Corwin stated that legally there is only one Draft Plan, but can take any subject matter and have working drafts of the sections, as long as they are not called amendments or changes to the Draft Plan.

3.) Committee Reports

- a) TDR Mr. Corwin discussed the specificity of the TDR Program. Various groups will be involved. Mr. Scro added that the Long Island Builders Institute would be willing to walk each site and attend the workshops. A brief discussion ensued.
- b) Ecology John Black noted that a correction be made on the meeting minutes from the 7/11/94 Advisory Committee meeting. Under Section 3, Committee Report Ecology, the last line of the paragraph is to read "Deadline for delivering their management goals and strategies is to be in late October."
- c) Land Management Dan Morris stated that the Land Management Committee presented the Critical Resource Areas to the Commission, and discussed the Committees status with regard to future plans.

At this time, a heated discussion took place regarding the Core boundary areas. Dr. Lee Koppelman stated that the purpose of the Advisory Committee is to develop ideas, discuss those ideas, and out of this process we will be able to amend the Draft Plan until the final is proposed. Each Committee should have the freedom to complete their work. Discussions are to take place at these meetings; not controversy. Mr.

Amper stated that he did in fact agree with Dr. Koppelman's statement.

Mr. LoGrande discussed the fact that the Advisory Committee itself has two proposals for Critical Resource Areas, and that both proposals should be reviewed, a reasonable compromise be made, and that we devise one Critical Resource Area map.

Mr. LoGrande suggested that a subcommittee be designated to reach a compromise between the plan Land Management developed, and the plan that the Ecology Committee developed. A discussion ensued. John Black objected to the formation of a subcommittee. Dr. Koppelman agreed with Mr. LoGrande's recommendation.

A motion was made by Dr. Koppelman and seconded by Richard Amper that a special subcommittee be formed to review and evaluate the two Critical Resource Area maps prepared by the Ecology Committee and the Land Management Committee respectively to arrive at a compromising plan to submit to the Advisory Committee for final approval to recommend to the Commission for adoption. The motion was carried by 17 votes to 2 votes.

Mr. Corwin stated that suggestions for changes to the Plan and the DGEIS should be directed to the Commission in writing. Jamie Greene is keeping a log of all responses received.

- d) Economic Analysis Dr. Tom Sexton stated that the first part of their work has been completed. The Economic Analysis was distributed to the Committee. The economic impact in terms of the TDR program is to be evaluated. They will go about this by identifying which receiving districts will place the greatest value using Pine Barrens Credits. They have constructed a model that will estimate the market value of a parcel both with and without Pine Barrens Credits. Dr. Sexton continued his presentation by describing contents of the report. A long discussion ensued regarding the crossing of school district lines.
- e) Public Outreach Donna Plunkett discussed the four new dates of the Public Information Sessions. They are as follows:

Saturday Wednesday	8/27 9/7	10am-2pm 7pm-9pm	Brookhaven Lab Riverhead T.Hall	Core Owner Workshop Town of Riverhead
Tuesday	9/13	7pm-9pm	_	Town of Brookhaven
Wednesday	9/21	7pm-9pm	Speonk-Remsenburg	Town of Southampton
			Elem. School	

These sessions will be held prior to the public hearing. The public hearing will be held on September 28, 1994, at Brookhaven Town Offices, building 4 auditorium, at 7:00 p.m. Mr. Corwin discussed the importance of the Advisory Committee members attending the sessions. The Tuesday-Wednesday sessions are more geographically specific.

A letter is being mailed out to the landowners in the Core area regarding the Core Owner workshop on 8/27/94 at Brookhaven National Laboratory.

f) GEIS - Judy Jakobsen discussed the date of the hearing for the ECL Art. 8 and Art. 57 hearing, which is to be on Wednesday, September 28, 1994. There is an October 14, 1994 deadline for comments on the GEIS.

4.) <u>Correspondence</u>

 a) NYS Legislative Commission on Water Resource Needs of Long Island -Alternate designation - Mr. LoGrande received a letter regarding alternate designations.

5.) Long Island Builders Institute press release

Buzz Schwenk discussed his view, and his concern regarding this issue.

6.) Suggested meeting dates and places to be confirmed

Suggested dates were presented to the Committee for their review. Locations to be announced.

At this time, a discussion ensued regarding sub-divisions. Mr. Amper made a motion to have the Advisory Committee advise the Planning Commission of our engagement in a bonafide process to protect land that they are proposing for sub-divisions. There was no second to this motion.

Mr. LoGrande stated that what should be said is that under no circumstances should there be any changes zoned anywhere in the Core area, nor in the Compatible Growth Area, unless there is a comparable savings in the Core by direct purchase of the person seeking that change of zone. A brief discussion took place.