

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MEETING OF THE LONG ISLAND COMMISSION ON  
AQUIFER PROTECTION

MARCH 23, 2016

10:08 a.m.

260 Motor Parkway  
Hauppauge, New York

Kristi Cruz  
Court Reporter

1

2       A P P E A R A N C E S:

3

4       Stan Carey,  
5       Nassau-Suffolk Water Commissioners Assoc.

6

7       Frank Koch  
8       Chairman, Long Island Water Conference9       Carrie Meeker Gallagher  
10       New York State DEC

11

12       Peter Scully  
13       Long Island Water Conference14       Walter Dawydiak  
15       Suffolk County Commissioner of Health

16

17       Chris Ostuni  
18       Nassau County Legislature Presiding Officer19       Michael White  
20       Nassau County Legislature Presiding Officer

21

22       Sarah Meyland  
23       Nassau County Legislature Minority Leader24       Jared Hershkowitz  
25       Suffolk County Presiding Officer

26

27       Brian Schneider  
28       Nassau County Commissioner of Public Works29       Steve Colabufo  
30       Suffolk County Water Authority

31

32       Walter Dawydiak  
33       Suffolk County Department of Health

34       Michael Schneider

35       Stephen Terracciano

36       Paul Granger

37       John C. Milazzo

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MR. KOCH: First things  
3 first, let's do the pledge of  
4 allegiance. Please all stand.

5 (Whereupon, the Pledge of  
6 Allegiance is performed.)

7 MR. KOCH: It looks like  
8 we're still waiting for some members.  
9 I'll do a little introduction and  
10 then we'll have everybody introduce  
11 themselves, then hopefully we can do  
12 a quick photo op and then get to the  
13 serious part of the meeting.

14 I don't know if everybody  
15 knows me here. I'm Frank Koch, I'm  
16 the Long Island Water Conference  
17 representative and Chairperson for  
18 2016, Special Engineer, Certified  
19 Water Plan Operator, and  
20 Superintendent of South Farmingdale  
21 Water District.

22 Can everybody hear me?  
23 Great, great.

24 In case you're wondering  
25 what the Water Conference is -- most

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 people do -- it consists of 49 water  
3 utilities, as well as engineering  
4 firms, scientists, environmentalists,  
5 and contractors. So it's a great  
6 organization that already has a  
7 cohesive unit.

8 I wish Jeff Szabo was  
9 here. I'd like to thank him for  
10 getting this ship up and running.  
11 Hopefully I can continue his great  
12 effort. Carrie, also, who did a lot  
13 of yeomen work here. She did a lot,  
14 as well.

15 I'd like to thank Suffolk  
16 County Water Authority overall.  
17 Steve Colabufo, Ty Fuller, the rest  
18 of the talent. Maria Truppia  
19 wherever she is -- there she is. All  
20 you guys really are the backbone of  
21 this right now and hopefully a lot  
22 more people will start to join in.

23 LICAP for 2016, the big  
24 thing is really the standing  
25 subcommittees, okay? We have reports

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

to do, okay, and two subcommittees that you know are, there's the long-term subcommittee, figuring out the long-term risks of the aquifer, and we have the short-term. That's the gist of it. It's a lot more complicated than that, obviously, 15 to 16 reports. Steve Colabufo and Bill Merkman coordinating that.

So the big thing right now is, we're also going to have a demonstration by Ty, okay, showing what we did coordination-wise between all the districts and between the regulators and the county legislators and the executives. So we'll go through that, as well.

At this time, before we get a photo op, let's go around the table and introduce ourselves.

As you know, I'm Frank Koch, Superintendent of South Farmingdale Water District, and also Chairman of the Long Island Water

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

Conference.

MR. CAREY: Stan Carey, I represent the Nassau/Suffolk Water Commissions Association, and I'm also the Superintendent at Massapequa Water District.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Walter Dawydiak, Director of Environmental Quality, Suffolk County Health Department.

MR. WHITE: Michael White, representing the Suffolk County Legislature Presiding Officer.

MR. SCULLY: Peter Scully, Deputy Suffolk County Executive for Administration. I'm standing in for Dorian Dale. It seems he had a work-related thing at Rhode Island today.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's difficult to hear those of you who are facing that way.

MR. IRWIN: Donald Irwin, I'm the Director of Environmental

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

Programs, Nassau County Department of Health.

MR. B. SCHNEIDER: Brian Schneider, representing Nassau County Executive, Ed Mangano, as well as the Department of Public Works.

MR. OSTUNI: Chris Ostuni, I'm representing the Nassau County Legislature.

MR. TERRACCIANO: Stephen Terracciano, with the United States Geological Survey here on Long Island.

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Jared Hershkowitz, Suffolk County Presiding Officer Representative.

MS. MEYLAND: Sarah Meyland, representing Nassau County Minority Leader.

MR. MILAZZO: John Milazzo, Suffolk County Water Authority. I'm sitting in for Jeff Szabo. He's in Washington today on NEWWA legislative committee meetings.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 He sends his regrets.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Excuse  
4 me, if you don't mind. Carrie  
5 Gallagher, she will be here shortly.  
6 She's going to be running late. Just  
7 so you guys know.

8 MR. KOCH: Okay, great.  
9 And if you see a card from Paul  
10 Granger, he's in the audience, as  
11 well. I actually have a seat for  
12 you, Paul, here. We'll wait for  
13 Carrie, okay, because she's  
14 [indecipherable] so far. So if we  
15 can wait for the photo op a little  
16 longer.

17 Does anybody have any  
18 objections to adopting the minutes of  
19 the December 9th meeting, 2015?  
20 Anybody reviewed it?

21 I make a motion to approve  
22 the minutes.

23 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Second.

24 MR. MILAZZO: There should  
25 be a voting number.



1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. CAREY: I'll second  
3 it.

4 MR. KOCH: Seconded by  
5 Stan. All right. We'll go right  
6 into it.

7 MR. MILAZZO: All in  
8 favor?

9 (Aye.)

10 MR. KOCH: Thank you,  
11 guys. Appreciate that.

12 Let's go right into  
13 subcommittees. Subcommittee update  
14 by Steve.

15 MR. COLABUFO: Steve  
16 Colabufo, Suffolk County Water  
17 Authority, and I'm the Chairman of  
18 the Water Resources and  
19 Infrastructure Subcommittee. And  
20 Bill Merkman, who isn't here, is  
21 Chairman of the Water Resources  
22 Opportunities Subcommittee. Those  
23 are the two standing subcommittees of  
24 LICAP.

25 We had our latest meeting

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

on March 1st. The main purpose of that meeting was to receive drafts of the 16 individual reports that are going to comprise the bulk of the Groundwater Management Plan that's due in about a year. Of 16 reports, we did receive drafts for six of them on or before that meeting, and another partial draft was submitted at that meeting, but that report has a couple of pieces still remaining.

There are nine outstanding, so to speak, reports. Drafts of seven of them are expected by mid-April, and the authors have actually promised in writing they would will have those drafts by sometime between now and mid-April. One is expected shortly after that, that's Paul Fontoro's report on regulatory requirements going forward. He got in kind of late into the game, really after the March 1st meeting we reached out to him. So he

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 really hasn't had a chance to begin  
3 working on them, although he did  
4 submit an outline.

5 And there's one report  
6 that still has no author. Bill and  
7 myself have been busy trying to  
8 get an author for Water Supply  
9 Alternatives, which could include  
10 desalination, [inaudible] aquifer  
11 storage and recovery, other  
12 technologies that are used throughout  
13 the country we believe should be  
14 included in this type of report. And  
15 there are several people who work in  
16 this kind of technology a lot, but  
17 have not been really able to devote  
18 the time or effort into doing it. So  
19 we're still looking for a report on  
20 that subject from local personnel.  
21 So we're still working on it.

22 We hope to get all the  
23 outstanding reports drafted and  
24 submitted by mid to late April and  
25 have them then turned around and

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

finalized by, let's say, mid summer.

3

Once that's done, we can bring

4

drafting the full advisory plan and

5

have a good couple of months to get

6

it out and around.

7

So it all depends on the

8

level of participation and

9

cooperation of authors and

10

contributors of these reports. The

11

faster we get them in, the faster we

12

can turn them around, get comments

13

and corrections, and the sooner we

14

can begin working on the management

15

plan. So I'd say we're a tiny bit

16

behind schedule, not too bad, as long

17

as we can keep the latest updated

18

deadline of mid to late April for

19

submitting of the actual reports. So

20

that's up to the authors and

21

contributor to get them in.

22

MR. KOCH: Yes, Jared?

23

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Mr. Chairman,

24

I understand that there's been some

25

members who have requested an

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

additional discussion about possible new subcommittees. Is it possible that we could have that discussion now, since it's appropriate because we are talking about subcommittees?

MR. KOCH: Absolutely. I believe Karen Bloom, I believe, had a request regarding an additional subcommittee?

MS. BLOOM: Yeah. A number of us are -- think that we should speed up -- we agree 1,000 percent with the IBM report for Suffolk County. We have an octopus without a head, little coordination, and we need an RME, a responsible management entity.

In discussions, some of us have been talking informally with legislators from both Suffolk and Nassau, and there is a concern that the mandate for LICAP on the 17th Resolve is very clear. It states that we must consider -- LICAP has to

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

consider management opportunities and implementing them. So actionable plans.

If any of you were at Ken LaValle's roundtable recently, one of the Suffolk County legislators there said, right in public, we are in a state of emergency in terms of our water. So when I mentioned this in our March 1st subcommittee meeting, there were comments from some of the people in the group that that would be premature. Again, some of us feel it is about 40 years, possibly, late, and we should be jumping on this now.

We're not asking for a lot. We're just asking for subcommittee, to look at the options. There are many more options, probably, than we've even imagined for what an entity would be. A number of us have been discussing. We've already come up with four great ones.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

We have Plan A. Sarah Meyland was presented one option, which would be the compact. We have Plan B, which is a compact with variations. We have Plan C, that believe it or not is coming from DEC. And another just came in, Plan D. So we've sort of started this.

But we'd like a committee within LICAP. And Brian Schneider may report later because he is the delegate to LINAP from LICAP, and we suggested to him that could you explore maybe having a similar committee platform or whatever to explore what an entity would be within LINAP, possibly combining it with LICAP.

So this is not asking a lot, and that's the concept for the subcommittee, just devoted to exploring what that entity would be. And I think we have a great model of, Jeff Szabo and Paul Granger are

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

heading the Water Conservation Working Group. We've only had one meeting, but it's great. It's very informal. We actually brainstorm. We have people who disagree, and therefore we get really good ideas with pros and cons. So something like the structure of that committee, which I think is a good one.

And actually, I would really like a vote taken because, you know, we'd like to continue discussions with the legislators who do have concerns, who actually voted for the mandate to set up LICAP, that we should be moving this along, not later, but sooner.

MR. CAREY: I have a question. Who stated that there was a state of emergency?

MS. BLOOM: It was -- actually, the legislator at that meeting was -- she's the head of the Environment and Planning Committee,



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

Kara Hahn.

MR. CAREY: Did she that with respect to drinking water or to nitrate release in the bays?

MS. BLOOM: Water, all water, drinking water and in the bays, we're in a state of emergency.

MR. KOCH: Yes, Jared?

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: I just want to read to you, this comes from our website, okay, very specifically in terms of tasks and goals section. And I think it actually adds to what she's saying. It's just something that I think we need to keep in mind. Every once in a while we need to look back at the resolution, look back at what our stated goals are so that we can just kind of reorient ourselves. We've talked about, and Jeff's talked about with the commissioner, that all of these subcommittee reports should have recommendations at the end of it, very specific actionable plans.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 Carrie Gallagher jumped on that and  
3 agreed, also.

4 Just let me read from our  
5 tasks and goals section of LICAP,  
6 just so we're all on the same page.

7 "The Groundwater Resources  
8 Management Plan will also include  
9 management opportunities, development  
10 of and methods for implementing  
11 recommendations, and proposed  
12 regulatory amendments, as well as an  
13 implementation program, including  
14 stakeholders roles and  
15 responsibilities, prioritization of  
16 action, schedule, and costs."

17 I don't think we're doing  
18 that, not in the detail that this  
19 seems to imply, okay?

20 So I think it's just  
21 something that we all need to look at  
22 when we look at submitting our plans.  
23 I know that when I went back to the  
24 draft at my last meeting, I know that  
25 you were there and Jeff was there

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

and, you know, you corrected some of the things, the mistakes that I had made, and we all looked at things, and we disagreed on some and we agreed on a few others, and I acknowledged those in my latest draft.

But I also looked at this, and I was remiss in not including some of these items in my report, and when I do my final draft, I'm going to be addressing this. I think that all chairs of the subcommittees and the heads of the subcommittees need to be focused on, you know, what are the -- and we didn't say we'd write it in resolution terms; Jeff and I discussed that. But we need to include it in this format of recommendations that the legislators can look at and then might want to implement. We're going to try to give them a menu, and I think that's what Karen's asking. Not that we

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

tell them what to do, but if we give

3

them a scientifically-based menu of

4

things that can be a choice down the

5

road, and that's all it is. There's

6

no harm, no foul here in establishing

7

another subcommittee.

8

MR. KOCH: I still believe

9

that's premature at this point, I'll

10

be honest with you. Yes, during the

11

reports these recommendations are

12

going to be excellent, and as part of

13

the groundwater -- as part of the

14

resource plan, that may be included,

15

obviously.

16

I think at this time, not

17

really -- as we're doing detective

18

work, I know Karen thinks there's a

19

dead body already, but I think what

20

we've got to do is let's really see

21

what we need. She says we have four

22

choices, okay? We're not even sure

23

what the problems are. I hear

24

crisis, I hear octopus. These are

25

great buzz words, but there's no

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

definition until we actually get a report. And I think that's a matter of, what it sounds like according to Steve, it's a matter of a couple of months, of four or five months, and then we get to the actual plan, and part of that management plan. Yes, like I said, the menu option of having different -- having an entity or having a compact or having something like that is definitely --

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: So why wouldn't we want to do that work ahead of time?

MR. KOCH: Because we don't know what that's going to form.

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: But there's no harm in at least studying it so that when four months down the road from now, we have things that we can at least look at, a subcommittee has done the work ahead of time. Look, a subcommittee is presenting, it doesn't mean that LICAP accepts

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 it, okay? It can deny the entire  
3 thing. We're going to vote on all  
4 these things anyway, right?

5 MR. KOCH: Right, right,  
6 right.

7 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: But why  
8 not do the work now, and we can add  
9 to it if we find we need, subtract  
10 from it. At least we're starting to  
11 do the work. If you're saying we  
12 need a subcommittee in four or five  
13 months, which is what you just said,  
14 right?

15 MR. KOCH: Possibly, yes.

16 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: That's  
17 fine. Why not do it now and get it  
18 started? These things take time. We  
19 need to do the research, we need to  
20 do the exploring. We have people who  
21 are interested in working on it.  
22 There's no harm, no foul in forming  
23 it now. It's not premature --

24 MR. CAREY: What  
25 specifically is this subcommittee

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

going to be tasked with doing?

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Trying to research what choices LICAP might have, and we may present all of them in our report or we may present two of them or we may present none of them. But we have a responsibility -- it's clear in the resolution, it's clear in the way the tasks are written -- to present management choices to the both legislators. That's what they voted for, that's what they want.

When I speak to legislators, and I've spoken to many of them, they say -- you know what one guy told me? This is really interesting. He said, you put it down in paper what you want me to vote on and I'll examine it. I don't want to have to do the research and work, that's why I hired you guys, to do the research and the work. And the research and the work means,

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

also, how are we going to be implementing all of these actionable plans that are coming out of the subcommittees, and that means they say a later entity, they say a management opportunity. It's pretty clear. So why are we waiting? Why are we waiting four or five months?

MR. CAREY: Well, that's a matter of one's interpretation. I don't read the language that way myself.

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: I don't understand how you could not see, it says in our tasks --

MR. CAREY: I haven't heard from any one professional that has been on this committee or voting board member that there's a state of emergency with the drinking water.

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: I didn't say there was a state of emergency.

MR. CAREY: Well, a reference was made to a state --



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: But I didn't say that. Don't put words in my mouth.

MR. CAREY: You had your choice.

Also, we have an entity that's already in place that's charged with doing what you're suggesting, and that's the DEC. We're going through great efforts to try and get them the proper funding to do a better job because they've been short-staffed.

But when I do read the legislation, it says that, in one of the resolves, "LICAP shall focus its efforts solely on quality and quantity of groundwater in the state of the aquifer in methods for preventing further degradation of such waters." And I don't see -- at the end, the last resolve that was referenced said that LICAP is a temporary commission; temporary.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 So again, we haven't heard  
3 through any of these reports that  
4 there's a state of emergency, and my  
5 interpretation and my opinion, you  
6 could agree or disagree, is that's  
7 not what we're charged with, to  
8 outline a new entity when one  
9 already exists that's doing the job.  
10 We could debate all day whether or  
11 not they're doing it effectively, but  
12 they already are tasked with doing  
13 what you're suggesting.

14 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Stan, I  
15 never mentioned an emergency; I never  
16 mentioned whether the DEC was doing  
17 its job or not doing its job. All I  
18 said was this, very simple: It's  
19 very clear in the resolution, it's  
20 very clear in our tasks, that we are  
21 responsible for presenting management  
22 opportunities. I don't understand  
23 how that could be interpreted in any  
24 other way than saying, well, you know  
25 what? The DEC and additional funding

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

is one choice, okay? That's one

3

choice; that's fine. But there are

4

other choices that we should be

5

looking at, and we have a -- look,

6

I'm a citizen appointed here, right?

7

I have an ethical responsibility to

8

the citizens of Long Island. That's

9

my responsibility. Others here may

10

have responsibility both to the

11

citizens of Long Island and to their

12

individual agencies. I get that,

13

okay?

14

But when we look at it,

15

and I would hope that everyone here

16

can divorce themselves and close the

17

door to their offices and look at it

18

as if they're fathers, mothers, sons

19

daughters, whatever, and say, look,

20

we need to do everything we possibly

21

can do to make water right on Long

22

Island. We're talking about a very

23

serious thing. Whether it's an

24

emergency or not we can debate all

25

day. I never said that.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 But we do know there's a  
3 problem, otherwise LICAP would not  
4 have been formed. So why not try and  
5 do some additional research so that  
6 down the road, if it's four or five  
7 months, we are there already and we  
8 can start talking about these things.  
9 There's no harm in -- you want to put  
10 DEC additional funding as number one,  
11 no one's going to argue with that.  
12 But there are other choices here, and  
13 I think it's something we need to  
14 look into. There's no harm  
15 in forming a subcommittee.

16 MR. CAREY: I'm not saying  
17 there's a harm, but I think that it's  
18 outside of our mission.

19 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Then  
20 what are management opportunities,  
21 Stan? Explain to me that.

22 MR. CAREY: Part of the  
23 partnerships that we're identifying  
24 with the irrigation people, with  
25 fertilizers, and those --

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: That's  
3 not management.

4 MR. CAREY: That's not a  
5 tool to manage the aquifer?

6 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: That's a  
7 tool, and there are many, many  
8 others.

9 MR. CAREY: You know, I  
10 disagree. You know, everybody will  
11 have their say if we decide to go  
12 forward, but I'm not in agreement.

13 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Karen, I  
14 think, asked for a vote.

15 MS. BLOOM: Since I raised  
16 this, I'm wondering if anybody there  
17 at the table would disagree with the  
18 fact that we know what the problem  
19 is. All of these committee reports  
20 are showing -- are exploring  
21 different aspects of, let's say, the  
22 elephant. The problem is no one is  
23 managing the aquifer. Can any of you  
24 name one entity that's managing it?  
25 Everybody has a little bit of

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 power --

3 MR. MILAZZO: I think  
4 she's sitting right next to you.

5 MR. KOCH: New York State  
6 DEC.

7 MS. BLOOM: DEC is not --  
8 they're not managing the aquifer.  
9 They give out permits. It's power  
10 without any responsibility.

11 MR. CAREY: That's not  
12 accurate, and I don't think it's fair  
13 to say that.

14 AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's  
15 very accurate.

16 MR. CAREY: No, it's not,  
17 because I'll tell you why. If you  
18 were a public water supplier and  
19 you've dealt with the DEC, okay, to  
20 put in for a new well permit, it's  
21 not just file a piece of paper and  
22 you get your well permit. We've been  
23 working on one for two years, and  
24 there's so many things connected to  
25 it. There's a water conservation

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

plan that we have to prove that's

3

affected. We have to show

4

contamination areas that may

5

influence. It's not a form that you

6

fill out and they freely give you a

7

permit. So that's not accurate to

8

say that they're not doing it.

9

MS. BLOOM: So then, Stan,

10

let me ask you, when that entity,

11

which happens to be DEC here, stamps

12

the permit, what basis are they doing

13

it on? Do they have any idea what

14

the aquifer looks like or, you know,

15

how much can be apportioned to you or

16

to others?

17

MR. MILAZZO: I think that

18

is in the criteria for granting a

19

public water supply well permit. So

20

they have to make those findings when

21

they grant a permit. That's their

22

charge. You correctly identified

23

that the waters are in the trust to

24

the people of the state, and the

25

state has a responsibility for

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 managing it, and the state has  
3 delegated those requirements and  
4 obligations to its Department of  
5 Environmental Conservation, and  
6 that's what they do. That's what  
7 they do.

8 MS. BLOOM: John, each one  
9 of us owns this water and --

10 MR. MILAZZO: The state  
11 owns the water.

12 MS. BLOOM: -- all these  
13 agencies, they're administering it as  
14 trustees for us, and it's not a great  
15 job. It's 40 years down the line and  
16 we have a Bethpage plume and we have  
17 saltwater intrusion and yada yada  
18 yada, so many things. We need to  
19 change the way we're doing things.  
20 This is just a continuation of what  
21 we haven't been able to do. That's  
22 what we need --

23 MR. MILAZZO: Karen, and  
24 that statement is different than no  
25 one is doing it. If you want to say



1 PROCEEDINGS

2 it needs to be changed, you --

3 MS. BLOOM: Tell me, who  
4 has the responsibility?

5 MR. MILAZZO: I told you,  
6 the DEC. That's clear. That's its  
7 statutory obligation.

8 MS. BLOOM: What about the  
9 health department? The health  
10 department --

11 MR. MILAZZO: If you have  
12 criticisms of it, that's something  
13 different. May or may not be valid.  
14 I'm not going to weigh in on that.

15 MS. BLOOM: But the health  
16 department probably has more of a  
17 jurisdiction in the sense of they're  
18 permitting everything that's going  
19 into the aquifer. You know, DEC has  
20 stuff that's coming out, but, and  
21 also --

22 MR. KOCH: The local  
23 health departments are branches of  
24 the DEC.

25 MR. DAWYDIAK: Our

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 authority is substantially entirely  
3 delegated from the state.

4 MR. STONE: From the state  
5 health department.

6 MS. BLOOM: I mean, I'm  
7 not going to argue. Look, you know,  
8 we have the testimony of where our  
9 water is.

10 MR. KOCH: No, we don't.

11 MS. BLOOM: Yes, we do.

12 MR. KOCH: I think that's  
13 what we're trying to find out right  
14 now.

15 MS. BLOOM: Well, you  
16 know, we have a 2015 final report  
17 from Suffolk County, at least in  
18 comprehensive water, that left off  
19 around 2005 and added some data in  
20 2013, and hopefully the report that  
21 Steve is working on, Steve Colabufo,  
22 is going to bring us up to date with  
23 the state of the aquifer with maybe  
24 new data.

25 MR. KOCH: Don't you think

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 that's important before we put  
3 action, before we go into action?  
4 Don't you think that's important that  
5 we find the findings first? And what  
6 it sounds like is, it sounds like  
7 we'll be working on the plan near the  
8 end of the year.

9 MS. BLOOM: I mean, as the  
10 expert. Ask Walter.

11 Do we have trends on where  
12 the water is going, Walter.

13 MR. DAWYDIAK: We have a  
14 very clear vision based on Suffolk  
15 County public water supplies in  
16 private wells where our key  
17 contaminants are concerned. But  
18 those are not necessarily the same  
19 issues of concern into Nassau. In  
20 many cases, they're not.

21 To me, this is a form  
22 function problem. We haven't really  
23 clearly defined what our goals and  
24 objectives are on a bi-county basis  
25 to know exactly what the forms and

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

functionalities are, and I think that's what a lot of this conversation gravitates around.

In Suffolk County, Peter Scully and Dorian Dale are leading the charge on evaluating options for wastewater management upgrades, as recommended in the comp plan, which may be not an issue for Nassau, which is already sewerred. So we have different challenges and needs that we're systematically working through.

MS. BLOOM: Do you understand in this discussion --

MR. MILAZZO: And the work that Dorian and Peter are doing, wouldn't that be helped by some of the data LICAP's providing?

MR. DAWYDIAK: Absolutely, definitely it's a district effort.

MR. MILAZZO: And that can be a scientific underpinning.

MS. BLOOM: Well, I guess it's confusing. Like, what would be

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

the fear of having a subcommittee explore this now, you know? It's something that if it doesn't look good, you know, again, we have Plan A. Does that serve the water providers? Does that serve DEC? How would they be involved in this entity? What will serve clean water best?

Frank, you know, you said you were going to maybe ask Brian if he was going to have a little report. He had said that he was going to talk with LINAP, with the folks in Albany, the DEC folks.

MR. KOCH: I believe that Brian has every right to speak whenever he'd like to.

MR. B. SCHNEIDER: As far as LINAP is concerned, we have conference calls every couple of weeks with the LINAP Executive Committee. The LINAP is a very, you know, new entity right now. Your

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 concerns were brought up, Karen, as  
3 well as at the last LINAP conference  
4 call about dovetailing the work that  
5 both LICAP and LINAP is doing so  
6 we're not having two parallel tracks  
7 of study and plans that are going  
8 forward without any intermingling of  
9 ideas. So those thoughts were  
10 brought out at the last call.

11 It's my understanding, and  
12 Mike, you can jump in, a lot people  
13 that are sitting on LINAP are at this  
14 table, as well. So I believe going  
15 forward, there will be a lot of  
16 interaction between both groups.  
17 It's not going to be separate  
18 entities that are just going on their  
19 merry paths without any kind of  
20 interaction between the tasks and  
21 functions of both.

22 So I think from an  
23 overarching view, since surface water  
24 and groundwater are all  
25 interconnected on Long Island, there

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

is going to be a lot of interaction

3

between both of those groups.

4

MS. BLOOM: So were they

5

open to having specific committee

6

platform group, working group, to

7

look at what an entity options might

8

be?

9

MR. B. SCHNEIDER: I think

10

from the LINAP perspective, a lot of

11

working groups are still being formed

12

right now. I don't see any reason

13

why, you know, there wouldn't be that

14

discussion of some sort of, you know,

15

an army, as you say.

16

But again, Mike, if you

17

want to jump in on anything here.

18

But I think it is, you

19

know, a distinct possibility that a

20

working group could examine the

21

recommendation that you're making

22

about forming a subcommittee.

23

MR. WHITE: I will jump in

24

on that because I'm also part of the

25

LINAP, being a member of the Long

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 Island Planning Council, and that's  
3 an effort that's coordinated between  
4 DEC --

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: A little  
6 louder.

7 MR. WHITE: I'm also  
8 involved with LINAP, as I'm a member  
9 of the Long Island Planning Council,  
10 and that effort is a piece of work  
11 that's being coordinated for the  
12 state, with state funding, with the  
13 counties, and of course will be  
14 already a growing group of  
15 stakeholders.

16 I don't necessarily  
17 disagree with your premise that  
18 there's a governance issue to be  
19 resolved in terms of where we need to  
20 be in terms of aquifer management and  
21 protection. I don't think I am in  
22 favor at this point of forming the  
23 subcommittee because I see it in two  
24 parts.

25 The first part is, and



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

this is a discussion we had at the  
LINAP call the other day, is part of  
the problem, the threshold problem,  
is that even amongst the effort with  
LINAP, LICAP, I mean, this week I see  
in the paper the Nature Conservancy  
produced another report that nobody  
even knew about, okay? One of the  
problems we have to begin with as a  
baseline is, and this could be part  
of a subcommittee effort, is the  
coordination of all the work that  
everyone's doing. Otherwise, we have  
the same fragmentation of governance  
in terms of implementing and managing  
the action items as we do even  
studying what the problem is, okay?

So that seems to be, to  
me, the most immediate effort. And  
I'm not being critical of anybody.  
And with all due respect to the DEC,  
they're the first to admit, the last  
time they did an aquifer management  
plan was in 1986, which is why we're

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 sitting here, unfortunately, in 2016  
3 recognizing that there are  
4 significant issues.

5 However, again, I want to  
6 go back to, I don't want to have a  
7 subcommittee at this point that would  
8 appear to presume we needed another  
9 entity, because one of the things we  
10 all know about Long Island is that we  
11 are over-governed, we are over-taxed,  
12 and new entities mean more spending.

13 If, in fact, we get to a  
14 point where we see gaps in terms of  
15 action items and implementation, and  
16 there's nobody there to do that, and  
17 another entity of coordination or  
18 oversight is necessary, I think that  
19 could be one of the items that comes  
20 out of our work product, okay? But I  
21 don't want to start out with the  
22 point now of saying we need to do  
23 that, okay, or we're even  
24 entertaining that option.

25 So I think two things, in

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

summary, because I've talked a little

3

while here, and I appreciate the

4

opportunity to talk about this.

5

First of all, I think I want to

6

attack that issue of the coordination

7

of the work efforts that are going

8

on. That's something that we should

9

work on right now. So whether we

10

want to have sort of a working group,

11

and I'll even spearhead a little bit

12

of that for this group because I'm on

13

LINAP, I'm on the Regional Planning

14

Council, certainly I've worked with

15

the counties, we should form a group

16

where we're all talking to each

17

other. I think, for the first time

18

ever, there's more of that than ever,

19

but it's clearly that that needs to

20

have and that needs to continue to

21

happen.

22

With respect to the next

23

issue of the governance issue, a

24

working group might go forward when

25

we see some of the action items and

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

identify the gaps. Is DEC not there

3

to do that? Do they not have the

4

funding to do that? Is the county

5

health department not doing something

6

and something needs to be done?

7

Well, then maybe there needs to be

8

some other glue that provides that.

9

So I think we should

10

approach it in two fashions. At

11

least for the first piece, I'm

12

willing to work with anyone,

13

including Brian, because we have the

14

connector, and of course Walt and

15

Peter are on those LINAP calls, as

16

well. At least you're on it most of

17

the time, I think. I think that's

18

where we should start, that

19

coordination effort, and then see if

20

we're going to have that governance

21

issue without saying we need more

22

governance.

23

MR. MILAZZO: I think that

24

makes sense. I mean, speaking for

25

Jeff, who I have a letter delegating

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

his vote to me -- is the Water

3

Authority on these calls? I know

4

that some people from the Pine

5

Barrens Commission have been. If

6

they're not, we will make someplace

7

available.

8

MR. WHITE: Not yet. But

9

just so know, as Brian pointed out,

10

it's in the early efforts. It's

11

still in scoping. There will be,

12

actually, let's call them, I guess

13

working groups we're going to call

14

them, or some sort of task force

15

entities on various disciplines

16

within that work. It's sort of

17

taking the old 2008 model, skimming

18

it down a little bit because, you

19

know, there's \$5 million -- 2008 cost

20

\$5 dollars. In 1978 that was

21

probably more like \$25 million, so

22

what do you do now? So you really

23

have to get right formation for that,

24

and that's what's in formation.

25

MS. BLOOM: Well, Mike, in

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

those discussions of a working group,  
I'd really like to sort of push you,  
at LINAP, to take more of the LICAP  
model, because this is really  
democratic; it's open. What you're  
doing at LINAP is, like, people at  
the top are talking to each other.  
There's no representation from, like  
we have a Jared Hershkowitz for the  
people. There's a lot of talk in  
LINAP --

MR. MILAZZO: That is a  
great bumper sticker.

MS. BLOOM: There are 92  
people in LINAP's working group, and  
more are added. But we really need  
somebody on the inside who is not in  
THE bureaucracy, because you know,  
all you guys, you've got bosses and  
bosses and bosses. Your hands are  
tied to a certain degree. So we need  
somebody to bring some new ideas.  
Like in our conservation  
subcommittee, John Turner has brought

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 the most advanced idea that I've  
3 heard come out of LINAP so far, and I  
4 know there are going to be others,  
5 but I just happened to be in that  
6 committee, the whole concept of  
7 water reuse. Not just as a word, but  
8 as a real action plan that the county  
9 is in the process of.

10 So I think we need some,  
11 you know, upstarts, like me or  
12 others. Not that I have time. But  
13 seriously, to move things along and  
14 get them out of thinking -- we're  
15 just thinking in the patterns of what  
16 we're doing and pouring more money  
17 into it, we're going to get the same  
18 response. Ask Lee Complimin what he  
19 thinks about 2008.

20 MR. WHITE: I just want to  
21 say, I'm not disagreeing. And with  
22 respect to LINAP, everybody at the  
23 table who's been involved --

24 I think you raised exactly  
25 the right point. And with respect to

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 LINAP, not to be defensive, that  
3 still is in formation. It definitely  
4 anticipates exactly what you're  
5 saying.

6 And, I don't know, Brian,  
7 how many -- was there a hundred or so  
8 groups that are presently --

9 MR. B. SCHNEIDER: There's  
10 at least a hundred stakeholder groups  
11 that are involved in LINAP. Don't  
12 get the impression that this  
13 executive committee is doing all the  
14 heavy -- there's no heavy lifting  
15 being done, really.

16 MR. WHITE: Not just yet.

17 MR. B. SCHNEIDER: So  
18 LINAP is still really early in  
19 formation, and there will be plenty  
20 of representation from groups large  
21 and small, stakeholders large and  
22 small who have a voice to be heard.

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: If I may  
24 just jump in very quickly there. We  
25 brought along some documents on



1 PROCEEDINGS

2 LINAP. You might want to take a look  
3 at that, Karen. It actually outlines  
4 some of the working groups. So take  
5 a look at that.

6 MS. BLOOM: I've read that  
7 in detail.

8 MR. KOCH: In light of  
9 Michael White's comments, we're going  
10 to start moving on. I know Jared had  
11 his hand up one more time.

12 Jared, can you make it  
13 quick?

14 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Yes.  
15 Michael, I'm thrilled to hear you  
16 acknowledge that there needs to be  
17 coordination between all these  
18 groups. That's really what it's all  
19 about. I volunteer to be on any  
20 working group that you need.

21 But I do want to correct  
22 one thing that you said, and that's  
23 in our resolution. We are  
24 responsible for establishing the  
25 scientific underpinnings of a new

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

entity. That's pretty clear in the resolution, down the road, down the road.

MR. KOCH: Right.

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: That's one of the reasons why we're pushing the subcommittee. However, if you can establish a working group between LICAP and LINAP and start bringing in some of these ancillary outside groups, you know, I think that would be extraordinarily smart, Michael.

So I think your point of bringing in maybe the Nature Conservancy and the other three groups and members of the community, like me, or environmentalists, like Karen, and the Departments of Health and the DEC into one table, trying to just talk about all of these things, it really does supplant the need for subcommittee in LICAP, because essentially what we'd be doing is identifying an approach, identifying

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 where the gaps are, and trying to  
3 figure out how we can fill those  
4 gaps. So yes, I volunteer for that.

5 MS. BLOOM: And, Michael,  
6 we'd really like to make that larger.  
7 We have three major umbrella groups  
8 for the environment. We have the  
9 Long Island Clean Water  
10 Partnership --

11 We'd like to make this  
12 forum for coordination larger because  
13 we have three umbrella environmental  
14 groups: The Long Island Clean Water  
15 Partnership; Water For Long Island,  
16 which is focused on groundwater; and  
17 then we have a third, very neutral  
18 group, it's called the Long Island  
19 Water Forum. There's six of us in  
20 the leadership there, but we have  
21 about 80 groups that belong. No  
22 government. Government only upon  
23 invitation, and industry and finance.  
24 But we have a neutral forum and it's  
25 already very well organized. It's a

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

place that we if we need a

3

facilitator, we can hire one.

4

And because we're going to

5

come down to some very hairy

6

struggles and we'd like them to be

7

more in the open and to discuss, you

8

know, what are your needs as water

9

providers? What is your needs, DEC?

10

How can we shift some of this?

11

So we really want to offer

12

the Long Island Water Forum. It's a

13

neutral place, we have big meetings,

14

and to bring the different entities.

15

And it's not government-run, it's not

16

agency-run, it's really a forum of

17

the people. And Nature Conservancy,

18

it started with their initial funds,

19

so --

20

MR. WHITE: Yeah, and I

21

fully agree with that. I think

22

that's a great vehicle, it's great

23

opportunity. And, quite frankly, the

24

only reason I mentioned the Nature

25

Conservancy is because there was

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 evidence this week --

3 Anybody here from the  
4 Nature Conservancy?

5 It has to be a two-way  
6 street. I mean, for people on LINAP  
7 and LICAP to read in the newspaper  
8 that they've released a new nitrogen  
9 model study of the North Shore, okay,  
10 when they're on the phone, as we want  
11 them to be, with respect to scoping  
12 LINAP and involved in this project,  
13 as well, I think it's important to  
14 make sure that it is a two-way  
15 street.

16 I had the opportunity to  
17 get a copy of that. I think it's  
18 useful. I think there's some  
19 questions that are raised. But  
20 that's the kind of thing that goes to  
21 that coordination issue, as well.

22 MS. BLOOM: Thank you. I  
23 will mention that to Carl Robow  
24 because he's the one who did the  
25 study and he is the one at our Long

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

Island Water Forum that has expressed

3

that exact thought. You know, we

4

don't want to see in the newspaper

5

something that we didn't know about,

6

and here, I'm going to mention, thank

7

you for that comment.

8

MR. WHITE: Again, I'm not

9

being disparaging of them. I'm just

10

saying that's an example of where it

11

needs to be a two-way street. Thank

12

you. I'm sorry.

13

MR. KOCH: Thank you,

14

Michael. That was great. Let's end

15

that conversation right there so we

16

can move forward a little bit.

17

Another mission of this

18

LICAP is State of the Aquifer Report.

19

Steve Colabufo is also working on

20

that. He wears many hats. A draft

21

is in, it's roughly 40 pages.

22

AUDIENCE MEMBER: A little

23

louder.

24

MR. KOCH: Okay, I'm

25

sorry.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 We're talking about the  
3 State of the Aquifer Report. A draft  
4 is in to the nine members, we'll go  
5 look at it, and I guess we'll make  
6 some comments, and then we'll have a  
7 final draft --

8 What do we got, about a  
9 couple of month to go on that, Steve?

10 MR. COLABUFO: Yeah. I  
11 mean, as soon as people can get  
12 comments in an all, we can begin the  
13 final draft.

14 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Why is  
15 it only the nine voting members? Why  
16 isn't it also to the ex officio  
17 members?

18 MR. KOCH: I think the  
19 only people that can actually vote on  
20 it to actually get the report  
21 completed is the nine members.

22 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: I  
23 understand, but we would like our  
24 input. That's why we were voted into  
25 the committee.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. KOCH: I don't see any  
3 harm.

4 MR. MILAZZO: I think it  
5 went to the -- where is it going?

6 MR. COLABUFO: Well, it's  
7 electronically. I submitted it to  
8 the Tim yesterday and I believe he  
9 submit today to Jeff, although I  
10 can't speak --

11 MR. MILAZZO: It's in  
12 final review.

13 MR. KOCH: So maybe Jeff  
14 will, you know -- we don't want to  
15 hold anyone out.

16 MR. CAREY: So the goal  
17 for the State of the Aquifer will be  
18 everybody to provide input and  
19 comments so that we can get a draft  
20 that can be released to the public,  
21 and then we could have our public  
22 hearings this year, receive public  
23 comment on it, and then by the fourth  
24 quarter meeting, we can adopt it as  
25 the State of the Aquifer Report. So



1 PROCEEDINGS

2 that's the goal.

3 So it's important, when  
4 everybody gets, it to try and get the  
5 comments back within 30 days or so so  
6 that we could move forward and  
7 schedule the rest of the hearings and  
8 meetings.

9 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Last  
10 meeting, we talked about scheduling  
11 the hearings for, like, late fall or  
12 early winter.

13 MR. MILAZZO: That's  
14 right. With the report out there.

15 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Correct.  
16 With a little publicity.

17 MR. KOCH: I think that's  
18 all we have for that Item 4.

19 Item 5 is a discussion,  
20 this is for everyone, Island-Wide  
21 Conservation Plan. I don't know if  
22 we got anywhere with that.

23 Does anybody have any  
24 input at all when it comes to the  
25 Conservation Plan?

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. GRANGER: There was a  
3 meeting maybe month ago.

4 MR. CAREY: We met once  
5 about a month ago. There were a  
6 bunch of us there.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: There's  
8 another meeting April 8th.

9 MR. CAREY: April 8th,  
10 right. On Friday, April 8th, there's  
11 another meeting scheduled. There  
12 were some really good ideas that were  
13 discussed at the meeting for  
14 Conservation Plan. I know the DEC  
15 has some new ideas that they've  
16 proposed recently. So we're going to  
17 meet and try to put these together  
18 and move forward with an Island-Wide  
19 Conservation Plan through LICAP.

20 MR. KOCH: Really, now  
21 we're going to get up to Ty Fuller.

22 Ty, if you can do your GIS  
23 Water Supply -- if you can do your  
24 thing, that would be great.

25 While Ty's getting set up,

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

we'll do a little photo op with

3

everybody at the table.

4

MR. MILAZZO: So this one

5

is going to be the on the State of

6

the Aquifer, so it's just a photo of

7

the members.

8

(Recess was taken.)

9

MR. KOCH: When

10

regulators, scientists and engineers

11

get together, this is one tool that

12

will help in this management plan

13

that we're going to eventually get

14

to.

15

So, Ty, if you could take

16

it away.

17

MR. FULLER: I was looking

18

at Newsday today, just a couple of

19

things. We think we already touched

20

on it. "DEC orders action on

21

Bethpage groundwater plume."

22

"Investigators questioned

23

in doctoring trial work on a dumping

24

case." "West Islip site cadmium

25

likely contaminated creek." I'll be

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

there tonight. "North Shore nitrogen

3

pollution blamed on septic systems,"

4

Michael White spoke about that.

5

"Algae blooms in the Peconic River,"

6

all these different issues, right?

7

So back in February,

8

everything becomes so pronounced.

9

Governor Cuomo comes down to Stony

10

Brook, pledges support, Steve

11

Terracciano is here, \$6 million for

12

an effort to help with the study on

13

Long Island. So, I mean, we're aware

14

of the issues that we have. I mean,

15

it's pronounced.

16

For water suppliers, the

17

three dozen districts or more, we're

18

dealing with various issues. If

19

you're looking at any specific water

20

supplier, whether you're talking

21

about local issues, let's say water a

22

supplier in a developed area dealing

23

with the legacy of industrial

24

contamination, or water suppliers

25

rural areas dealing with agricultural

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 contamination. We know what those  
3 problems are. But as we start  
4 working together, we find that these  
5 problems are not just in the one  
6 district, they can be found  
7 throughout the Island.

8 So anyway, we have worked  
9 together. We've come together under  
10 LICAP, which we're all aware, right?  
11 Our mandate is to address the quality  
12 and quantity issues affecting  
13 drinking water.

14 One of the subcommittees  
15 that I was a part of, Carrie started  
16 and a few of you were here for, was  
17 the Water Quality Working Group. We  
18 were tasked with creating a water  
19 quality map of the aquifer. We  
20 surveyed various water suppliers,  
21 asking them what their contaminants  
22 of concern were, we compiled that  
23 list, we debated about what was  
24 important, going back and forth.

25 But through that debate, a

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 new idea emerged. We said what if  
3 instead of focusing on certain  
4 contaminants, we could have a system  
5 in place where we could have all of  
6 the contaminants from our laboratory  
7 imported into a system so that we  
8 could search for any particular  
9 contaminant concern. You know, that  
10 was a novel idea.

11 But then I raised two more  
12 questions. One is, how would you  
13 display this? And two, how would you  
14 get the laboratory information in  
15 there?

16 Now, in terms of the  
17 display, GIS seemed like the most  
18 straightforward solution. Jim, our  
19 GIS manager, he likes to say to  
20 people who are not familiar with GIS  
21 that it's Google Earth on steroids.  
22 You can take any type of spacial  
23 information, whether it's wells,  
24 compost facilities, dumpsites,  
25 whatever you want, you can put it

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

into this system, have real-world

3

coordinate to it. In this case we

4

surveyed water suppliers. We asked

5

them for their well locations. A lot

6

complied with us. We put it into the

7

system.

8

Now, getting the

9

laboratory data, that was another

10

challenge. We spoke about different

11

databases that we could use: EQUIS,

12

Water Quality Exchange, nothing wrong

13

with any of those. But this is an

14

unfunded mandate.

15

So we kind of got together

16

in a small meeting, and ultimately we

17

decided that the easiest way to

18

import that data was through Excel.

19

The reason being, it's very

20

straightforward, we're all familiar

21

with it. More importantly, it

22

integrates easily into the GIS

23

software.

24

What I'm showing you here

25

is an overview of all the wells that

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 we have imported into the system in  
3 both Nassau and Suffolk. I just  
4 color-coded the Suffolk water wells  
5 in red, and what I consider LICAP is  
6 Nassau, you know, Greenlawn,  
7 Riverhead, Hampton Bays, a great  
8 majority of the wells.

9 I want to be clear about  
10 something. This is not a map. What  
11 you're looking at is a living  
12 document. Every one of these points,  
13 which represents a well, contains  
14 information such as the district  
15 location, well depth, the aquifer  
16 it's located in, mean sea level  
17 elevation. Not only that, it also  
18 has an entire calendar year's worth  
19 of water quality data. Not in a  
20 select group; all the samples that  
21 were taken. What that means is you  
22 can search through this system for  
23 any particular contaminant of concern  
24 in any parameter.

25 So, you're interested in



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

chlorides. I want to look for chlorides above 80, it will only display those wells that have chlorides above 80. You're interested in chlorides above 80 in the Magothy, it will show that. You're interested in chlorides above 80 in the Magothy at a depth between 400 and 500 feet, it will show that.

What is the limitation that we find? Jim? It's the user, and that's what it comes down to.

Anyway, we wanted to ask some basic questions. Let me just say as a disclaimer, this is not a scientific dissertation; just showing you an overview.

One of the discussions that was brought up in early water quality working group meetings was nitrates. You know, there was a concern. On the Nassau side, it's not really a concern for us. On Suffolk, it is a concern because the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

majority of Suffolk is unsewered.  
I'm showing you a map showing sewerred  
areas on Long Island.

Sarah, can you tell me  
what's wrong with this?

MS. MEYLAND: It doesn't  
show the North Shore Sewer District.

MR. FULLER: It doesn't  
show the North Shore Sewer District,  
wonderful. Well, doesn't that? See,  
this is when you talk about living  
documents; things change real time.  
Thank you, Brian Schneider, thank  
you, Shawn Saley, thank you Michael  
Flaherty for providing that  
information. Because we're working  
in that GIS environment, you can  
share data amongst everybody.

Anyway, this is the  
sewerred areas in Nassau. Great  
majority is sewerred. There are some  
unsewerred areas; Port Washington,  
Muttonhead, some of the larger  
communities. Suffolk remains largely

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 unsewered. You have the Southwest  
3 Sewer District that is sewerred. You  
4 also have protected areas in the Pine  
5 Barrens. This is the Central Pine  
6 Barrens Region, also the growth area  
7 shown in the light green.

8 What I did was, I just did  
9 a query, nitrates greater than 5,  
10 and these are the results. So these  
11 are all the public supply wells that  
12 shows nitrates greater than 5. If  
13 you notice, I have it color-coded.  
14 This range and display I've set.  
15 Anybody that uses GIS, you can adjust  
16 it any way. So if it's in yellow,  
17 it's about 5. It works it's way up  
18 to where it's red, it's above  
19 drinking water standards, 10 parts  
20 per million.

21 So in all the areas that  
22 we know that we should have nitrate  
23 problems, mainly on the North Fork  
24 where you have a lot of agriculture,  
25 you do see that you have high

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

nitrites. In Orient, this well field does exceed drinking water standards. People here have RO systems. As we go to the south, this is in Quogue, this is one of our well fields that's blended with nitrites. All along Brookhaven you do see that there are wells impacted by that. Huntington, you do see that. As you go to the south, you do not see that. But let's keep in mind that these are deep wells that you probably wouldn't find nitrites in anyway.

But I was surprised to see what I saw in Nassau. Even in the sewerred areas, you do see that there are wells that are in red, that do exceed drinking water standards, that probably do have treatment. Unsewerred areas in Port Washington show that.

I would point out that these are Magothy wells, they're deep, so this is probably legacy --

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

Steve Terracciano could probably  
provide more discussion on that.

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Ty,  
this is treated data?

MR. FULLER: This is well  
water. Just to be clear, this is all  
well water data. I mean, we can go  
into treated, but our mandate was  
focused on --

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Well,  
hopefully it wouldn't be treated if  
it was --

MR. FULLER: Yeah, it's  
just a focus if you wanted to see the  
state of the aquifer as it is.  
That's all we're looking at at this  
point, is well water data.

But this is something I've  
always been interested in. You know,  
as far as what we deal with on Long  
Island, with chlorides, you know,  
there's two things: There's seawater  
contamination, and also things I  
focus on is road salting. So we know

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

about the seawater issues that we've seen on the North Shore, parts of the South Shore, Montauk. What I've searched for was chloride greater than 80 parts per million. The MCL was 250 parts, so I figured 80 would give you a nice assessment of what the aquifer looks like.

Anyway, as far as road salting goes, one of the first areas that we saw it at was on the North Fork. We noticed that well fields that were next to recharge basins or salt storage facilities, they were showing impacts to road salting. There is a way to tell the difference between the two. We can have a separate discussion about that.

But anyway, one thing you can tell is, when you look at the middle of the Island, I mean, you're in areas far away from seawater bodies, there should be no impact by seawater. What these all have in

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

common, these well fields, like College Road well field, the Morris Avenue well field in Brookhaven, they're next to either a salt storage facility or they're next to a recharge basin. As a matter of fact, this well field right here, our Fisher Avenue well field, some are you are familiar with, this well was constructed five years ago, had chlorides approaching 200 parts per million. Makes absolutely no sense. It's right by the Southern State.

We did a suburban investigation using the Source Water Assessment Program, saw the area of contribution was to the northwest. We looked at some aerials, we find the Town of Islip salt storage yard.

I went out there; I drove out there. Not only was it a salt pile, uncovered, it was a two-story salt mountain out in the open, right next to a stream. We did approach

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

the town about it, you know, showed

3

them the research we did. We

4

did some work with the USGS on that.

5

They eventually dealt with that.

6

Walt, I'm not sure if

7

you're familiar, this is a Suffolk

8

County Department of Health salt

9

storage facility that they have it

10

covered in now. So that's been

11

addressed.

12

Now, as far as Nassau

13

goes, let me be clear. Nassau is

14

experiencing problems with seawater

15

contamination. There's been a lot of

16

work with USGS on that. But I did

17

get some additional information from

18

Great Neck. They do, and let me be

19

clear, they do have wells impacted by

20

seawater. They do have a shallow

21

well out here that I did do some

22

further analysis, and it does show

23

what appears to be some impacts from

24

road salting, similar to what we find

25

on the North Fork.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

In addition, western Nassau, this is a glacial well right here in an area where you have an abundant water supply. It appears to be next to a recharge basin. Road salt seems to be the issue. So road salt is an island-wide problem.

Superfund plumes. This map that I'm showing here just shows various superfund plumes in Nassau County. I did not find a coverage for Suffolk. As a side note, this was actually created by a student of Sarah Meyland. Thank you. I found this online, actually, and I thought this would be an interesting thing to look at. The contaminant of concern we always hear about, one of the industrial spills, is TCE, trichloroethylene. That's normally associated with the Northrop Grumman plume.

So what I did was a search for all the wells that had TCE

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 greater than 1. The MCL was 5 parts  
3 per billion. So this gives, like, a  
4 nice overview.

5 Again, let me be clear  
6 that this plume map, it doesn't point  
7 out every single well that's impacted  
8 by plumes. Like, for instance, this  
9 is the Northrop Grumman, I think  
10 that's the best assessment. And you  
11 can see the ranges. I mean, you go  
12 from levels as low as 1 all the way  
13 up to 1,500.

14 So let's zoom in on this  
15 one right here. So we're looking at  
16 the Northrop Grumman plume here.  
17 That's where you see some of the  
18 highest levels of TCE, and these are  
19 the wells that are in Bethpage. This  
20 here is all along Huntington.  
21 Various fills. I mean, there's a lot  
22 of industry out there. You know,  
23 back in the '60s, '50s maybe, dry  
24 cleaning used to use TCE before they  
25 switched over to Perk. I could do

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 research on that, as well.

3 Even all along right at  
4 the Nassau/Suffolk border, I'm not  
5 going to associate this with any  
6 plumes, but this is our East  
7 Farmingdale well field, the TCE  
8 levels approaching 25 parts per  
9 million, we have an air stripper out  
10 there, and you can see that it's  
11 widely spread throughout Nassau.  
12 This is the Hempstead well that's  
13 being impacted, Garden City, we see  
14 some impacts of that. So it is  
15 pretty widespread in areas where you  
16 do have industry or development.

17 Iron. Iron is something  
18 that there's been a lot of studies  
19 done on. And iron, what you find is  
20 that it's mainly along the South  
21 Shore. Essentially, what happens is,  
22 you know, as groundwater moves from  
23 recharge areas to the north and it  
24 kind of works its way down south and  
25 gets deeper, it goes into more acidic

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

environments, reducing environments,  
and what that results in is metals  
dissolving out this is why you have  
iron problems. A million dollars  
later you have iron treatment  
facilities. So you do see that all  
along the South Shore.

But there are some areas  
on the North Fork that we do see high  
iron. Lower lake well field, it is  
right next to a lake. I point out  
that it is next to some composting  
facilities, other things. I would  
love to see more studies about this  
one. I'm not saying that's the case,  
but anyway --

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: There  
should be more studies, Ty.

MR. FULLER: There should  
be. Lower lake and [inaudible] those  
are the two well fields on our North  
Fork that are impacted by it.

But again, I was just  
curious about pH and what role does

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

pH play into that. What I did was a

3

search for pH in all wells less than

4

5. I thought this was interesting.

5

Right along Nassau/Suffolk border,

6

this is where you see it.

7

Now, again, this

8

complements previous studies that

9

have been done. Craig Brown,

10

somebody I know from USGS, he's done

11

studies, and basically what he's

12

saying is, you know -- let me just

13

say something else.

14

On the South Shore, these

15

wells, they have pH less than 5, very

16

specific high iron. Right when you

17

get to Huntington, the pH is still

18

low, but you have low iron. Why is

19

that?

20

This is from Craig Brown.

21

He actually did a study where he

22

shows in this area where you see,

23

this is where recharge would occur

24

at, you have more oxygen groundwater.

25

It's coming from rainwaters, it's

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

more oxygenated, it's reacting with

3

matter, it's not causing iron. As

4

you start going further to the south

5

and you're getting down to deeper

6

flow paths, older water, it's more

7

acidic, more reducing environment,

8

that's where you get the metals from.

9

Anyway, this is an

10

overview; a small snapshot. Let me

11

be clear about something: We have a

12

working copy with us right now. So

13

if you had specific questions about

14

the well depths and everything else,

15

we can answer that right now. You

16

know, these are all Magothy wells

17

right here. But anyway, this is just

18

a small overview of what we can do

19

with this.

20

Where do we go from here?

21

One is incorporating the remaining

22

water districts. I would say right

23

now we have 97 percent of the water

24

districts with us. There's one or

25

two holdouts. I'd like to get them

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

on board. As a matter of fact, just last within the past week we got two more districts; Freeport, Rockville Centre. So we're building this.

Next step, incorporating the monitor wells. We've already gotten great cooperation from Nassau County. Mike Flaherty, I've been working closely with him, we've incorporated those monitor wells. Brian Schneider, thank you, as well.

So we're bringing that in there. You know, we've had discussions with Suffolk Department of Health Services incorporating their monitor wells. It would be great just to have one system in place where you can search through and have larger discussions about this. Okay?

Finally, having a web version. Right now, the way this system is, anyone that uses GIS could access this, could search through it

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

to find things. But you want to make this more accessible, user friendly, right? So what I'm envisioning is having a system in place where you just have drop downs. You know, you select your district, select your wells, contaminants, time frames, anything, and then the results will pop up. And I think that warrants further discussion, but, you know, we're pretty excited at where we've gotten to. I think this has been something that's been attempted for decades. As I was talking to Steven Terracciano yesterday, he said he recalls in 1983 that there was initiative to kind of unify this data. Well, here we are. We did it a simple way, effective way, and we're pretty excited at the results.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Have there been discussion about having a



1 PROCEEDINGS

2 web-based version that was also  
3 publicly --

4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could  
5 you speak up?

6 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: I  
7 was wondering if there had been  
8 discussions about having a web-based  
9 version that would be publicly  
10 accessible, as well, because that's  
11 something that could -- you know, you  
12 could request public funding, then,  
13 for something. Usually the end  
14 result would have to be publicly  
15 available, though, if you're going to  
16 get public funds. I didn't know if  
17 there would be a different level of  
18 information that could be provided.

19 MR. CAREY: We have talked  
20 about it and we are likely going  
21 to -- I've been a part of it with Ty  
22 trying to get cooperation from the  
23 districts to get everybody's places.  
24 But we have to be cautious that the  
25 information's protected. So we're

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

working out what level of detail we want to make public. For engineers and health department and USGS, that's one thing. But for the public, we just need to be cautious because we really, you know, sold the releases from the districts on that it would be fully protected. So we want to make it public; we just haven't, you know, figured out to what level idea.

If I could just add to this a little bit, I think this is really a great tool for everyone that really -- I don't know that anyone has put something together like this in the past, but the potential going forward is tremendous. Ty mentioned the monitoring wells. Nassau and Suffolk is probably three times the amount of monitoring wells than we saw here today. If you include all that data in here, I mean, you could get a picture of the quality of the

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

groundwater from Queens to Montauk  
very easily.

Another piece that we  
would add some of the monitoring  
wells for the plumes is probably --  
the Bethpage plume alone is probably  
two or three hundred monitoring wells  
alone that we could add. We have all  
the information, it's just a matter  
of doing the legwork and entering in  
there.

So we do plan on  
presenting this to DEC at the state  
level on April 4th. I'm going to go  
up and present it to the DEC  
commissioner who expressed an  
interest in it for the new uniformed  
Task Force Response Team that the  
governor mentioned at his press  
conference in Stony Brook last month.  
So we're really excited about it, and  
I can't thank Ty and Jim enough for  
the hard work they put into this and  
as it continues to grow.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Stan,  
3 who else will be participating in  
4 person? I'll be dialling in for  
5 that.

6 MR. CAREY: I believe the  
7 chair of this committee that the  
8 governor formed is Commissioner  
9 Sagos --

10 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: No,  
11 is anyone coming up with you, though?

12 MR. CAREY: Frank is going  
13 to attend, Ty, and Jeff Szabo.

14 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Okay.

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi. I  
16 was wondering, is there opportunity  
17 to also incorporate private well  
18 testing? For instance, the reason  
19 I'm asking this is that the Peconic  
20 Estuary is going to be doing a plan,  
21 and if they can get verification of  
22 more localized water quality, it will  
23 help with their action plan. So is  
24 that a possibility?

25 MR. CAREY: I think the

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 question would be, you know, how  
3 would we get that data. I believe  
4 only the health department has  
5 private well data, both health  
6 departments, more so in Suffolk. I  
7 think we just need to be cautious  
8 because the private wells, aside from  
9 agricultural wells, tend to be very  
10 shallow, and it may not be a true  
11 representation of what's in the  
12 deeper aquifers.

13 But it's a good point and  
14 we could certainly look into it. I  
15 just don't know what effort it would  
16 take to get the information out where  
17 we'd use it.

18 MR. DAWYDIAK: The other  
19 problem is private well data is  
20 protected by privacy. We're not  
21 allowed to give out exact geo-spatial  
22 locations. But it's a point well  
23 taken, and we have to wrestle with  
24 how to better present that space and  
25 time to people to use in a more

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 meaningful way.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there  
4 a possibility of actually getting  
5 permission from private owners to  
6 share that for that purpose or  
7 something like that? Because I think  
8 a lot of people do care about their  
9 waters, both the aquifer and the  
10 surface water.

11 So if there's some way of  
12 sort of building upon information  
13 that's already available and then  
14 filling in the gaps, it might go a  
15 long way.

16 MR. DAWYDIAK: You know,  
17 that's an excellent suggestion. I'll  
18 take it up with our water folks and  
19 county attorney to see if we could  
20 institute disclosure forms that could  
21 allow that.

22 I'm sorry, were you  
23 finished with your question?

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes.

25 MS. BLOOM: Is there a way

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

of coding where they are? Like for

3

endangered species, we don't put

4

exactly where they are, but there's a

5

way of using that information in a

6

map type thing.

7

MR. DAWYDIAK: Broad

8

brush. You know, we talked about

9

streets, but some streets are bigger

10

than others. We talked about

11

radiuses, but that gets a little

12

fuzzy and difficult. We never really

13

come up with a streamlined way to do

14

this. In the health department,

15

we're actually upgrading our computer

16

systems over the next year, we have a

17

big capital project, and better

18

integrated GIS functionality is one

19

of the big goals moving forward.

20

Question for Ty. What is

21

your go-live date for making this

22

available to the water suppliers,

23

health departments, everyone?

24

MR. FULLER: You're on the

25

board. What's your go-live date? To

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

be honest with you, it's whenever you

3

guys want. You know, the issue that

4

I would say in creating this is not

5

setting up the framework; it's just

6

waiting for district cooperation.

7

That's taking the longest time. I've

8

been coordinating that with Stan,

9

Jim, and everybody else, and we're

10

getting it on a piecemeal basis. If

11

we got everything all at once, we'd

12

be set up and ready to go right now.

13

You know, for instance, we

14

are still waiting to get some of your

15

monitoring well data. And I know you

16

guys have a vast network and there's

17

things you have to figure out.

18

Again, once we can kind of figure

19

that, then we can all sit down and

20

say how do you want to present this.

21

MR. DAWYDIAK: The

22

groundwater data is going to be a

23

little tough, but our guys are

24

working through the mechanics. The

25

public supply well data, as it



1 PROCEEDINGS

2 stands, the most important tools I've  
3 ever seen --

4 MR. FULLER: I would say  
5 as far as the public supply wells,  
6 just getting those last couple of  
7 districts on board. That's really  
8 what it comes down to. We're talking  
9 about probably five or less to get  
10 them on board. As soon as we can do  
11 that, then we can prepare a complete  
12 data set.

13 And I'll also point out  
14 something. We're focusing on  
15 essentially the calendar year 2015.  
16 The framework is in place. So if you  
17 wanted to look at historical, you can  
18 do that immediately. That's up to if  
19 that's something we want to do, but  
20 you'll have the ability to do that,  
21 going forwards and backwards.

22 There's going to be a  
23 larger discussion as to whether Excel  
24 is the proper database to hold this  
25 in, and I'm sure, Steve, you can

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

comment on that more, Terracciano.  
But for us, this is the most  
straightforward way to get the data,  
and we have the system in place.  
Pace Labs and Suffolk Water Labs,  
they already have a system where they  
export it; it's very simple, very  
straightforward.

So that's it. We get  
those last districts on board, if we  
got them today, then we can go live  
tomorrow.

MR. B. SCHNEIDER: By the  
way, would it be necessary to wait  
for those?

MR. FULLER: Would it be  
necessary? I only say that because  
we're working together as a group.  
Isn't that the whole point of LICAP?

MR. B. SCHNEIDER: If it's  
a living database already, you can  
always just add those at some point.

MR. FULLER: And that's  
what we've been doing. We just added

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

two more districts this week.

MR. CAREY: Our intention is, you know, presented to the full board today, which is the first time many of you have seen it, and then go from there. We would like to get the remaining districts on board, but there are a couple of questions, too. We're still trying to figure out, you know, what level the public -- we plan a posting on the LICAP website, but at what level do we want to make the information publicly available. You know, we don't want to be able to drill down into specific locations.

And also the discussion has been do we only want to put up raw water quality data. I mean, that could create the public to raise a lot of questions as to what am I drinking. You know, we all understand it's raw and that's not --

MR. IRWIN: It's a serious issue. Any public version has to

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 clearly express that it's raw water  
3 quality and not drinking water.

4 MR. CAREY: Your phones  
5 would be ringing, our phones would be  
6 ringing. A couple of questions, but  
7 we're very close, we're very close.  
8 I don't see why, by the end of the  
9 year, we wouldn't have this  
10 available.

11 MR. WHITE: It has to be  
12 on the front part of your -- your  
13 water conveyer has responsibility for  
14 what the distribution system looks  
15 like, but --

16 MR. B. SCHNEIDER: It  
17 still is going to be misconstrued.

18 MR. DAWYDIAK: Are you set  
19 up to show the treated water quality,  
20 as well?

21 MR. FULLER: We can be.  
22 This is discussions that we've been  
23 having as of about a week ago. Our  
24 lab director, Kevin Dirk, he's been  
25 working with us on that. So we can

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 have a system that shows the treated  
3 data at distribution points. But I  
4 think that's something that warrants  
5 further discussion on how we set it  
6 up and --

7 MR. DAWYDIAK: Have to  
8 give each other public water  
9 quality --

10 MR. CAREY: I completely  
11 agree. Part of the problem is when  
12 we did the releases from the  
13 districts, it was specific to raw  
14 water quality data. So we'd have to  
15 go back to them and get another  
16 release to say we want to do finish  
17 water. I think it would be an easy  
18 sell.

19 MR. WHITE: It would be a  
20 benefit.

21 MR. CAREY: Yes. But as  
22 this unfolded, a lot of these things  
23 came up as a working map.

24 MS. MEYLAND: I think it's  
25 publicly available information.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. WHITE: It should be.

3 MR. CAREY: It is.

4 MS. MEYLAND: The well

5 water might be.

6 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: I

7 mean, legally the water districts are

8 supposed to provide that as a

9 supplemental data, too.

10 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: They do.

11 MR. WHITE: They report

12 it.

13 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: So

14 you have the treated water comes out,

15 and next, if it's requested, you have

16 to provide the well water.

17 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: They

18 don't provide the raw map. They only

19 provide the treated map.

20 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: But

21 you have to provide that in the

22 supplemental. You have to provide it

23 if it's requested, or make it

24 available. We always have it on the

25 website.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

MR. CAREY: That's accurate. If I don't have to go back to all of them, that makes me happy, but maybe we can do it at a meeting where they're all in attendance and just mention it, and then we can go from there.

MR. DAWYDIAK: Just one last question for Ty. Are you planning on doing a static update once a year and reloading this, or are you're all automated and the data feeds in --

MR. FULLER: That's a great question. I think we talked about once a year.

Now, as far as Karen Bloomer, I think you had a question of how quickly can the data be uploaded in there. As quickly as it can be exported from the labs.

I would say the way we discuss would probably be on a yearly date that we would do it. If the

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 group decided they wanted it sooner,  
3 then that's something that ultimately  
4 you guys would decide.

5 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Ty, can  
6 you extract from that some sort of  
7 graph which shows how contaminants  
8 are increasing from year to year  
9 or decreasing?

10 MR. FULLER: Yeah, you  
11 can. I mean, you've got to remember  
12 that you're looking at this in four  
13 dimensions, because not only do we  
14 have the samples that were taken, the  
15 dates that were taken, and the  
16 depths, and the mean sea elevations.  
17 So you know exactly where the wells  
18 are located, what the concentrations  
19 are over time. Jack Monte from the  
20 USGS, he's done some three-dimensional  
21 work with that. That's going to  
22 another step. Steve, I don't know if  
23 you want to talk on that some. But  
24 you can show that.

25 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: I would



1 PROCEEDINGS

2 love to see it. In my district,  
3 that's what I've been trying to do,  
4 going back to treated.

5 MR. FULLER: You can,  
6 essentially, with this framework.

7 MR. B. SCHNEIDER: Basically,  
8 if it's in Excel, it's not something  
9 you would do, but the information  
10 would be there. If you know how to  
11 use Excel, you'd be able to populate  
12 a chart to show trends.

13 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: From  
14 year to year for a particular  
15 pollutant.

16 MS. MEYLAND: GIS does  
17 that anyway.

18 MR. FULLER: It does it  
19 anyway, and this is why I'm excited  
20 about GIS. I think most of you here  
21 have worked with GIS, or your  
22 department's worked with GIS. It's  
23 available to everybody. I've reached  
24 out to some of you personally to get  
25 data sets. Sarah, I found your data

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

set online, that display here.

3

That's the great part of it, it

4

brings the larger community into

5

this. So that's what we spoke about,

6

coordinating our efforts.

7

MR. KOCH: Excuse me. The

8

gentleman.

9

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are we

10

obtaining data points, if you wish,

11

closer to the surface to give us some

12

prediction of what to expect at the

13

well sites?

14

MR. FULLER: Can you say

15

that again?

16

MR. MILAZZO: It's only

17

existing wells, so it's not a

18

concern.

19

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Again, I

20

don't know if there are, if you wish,

21

data points out there that could be

22

integrated into this that would allow

23

us to look at -- if the Grumman plume

24

is coming down.

25

MR. FULLER: Monitor

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 wells.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I can  
4 take that. I can speak for Nassau  
5 County. There were 500 wells,  
6 approximately, that are in all  
7 different portions of the aquifer.

8 MR. FULLER: I did a  
9 disservice not showing it. I  
10 apologize.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The  
12 thing is those are still available,  
13 they're maintained, and they can  
14 sampled for different projects. So  
15 work that's being done in Bethpage,  
16 there are county wells that are being  
17 examined and can be used for  
18 additional studies. So as you find a  
19 problem, the network is permanent,  
20 it's there and it can be used. So it  
21 can always be a source of  
22 information.

23 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Just  
24 to add onto that, Brian and I were  
25 going to bring this subject of other

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

business, but that \$6 million effort

3

that was announced last month is

4

going to be able, hopefully, with

5

creating a new updated, essentially,

6

hydrologic framework for the Island,

7

we'll be taking all that information

8

in from existing wells, we'll be

9

putting into new wells, and you'll be

10

able to model. So you can use it,

11

then, to model predictably what may

12

happen looking at that information.

13

So that's, I think, how

14

this and that will tie together and

15

able to do some of that modelling and

16

see what might hypothetically

17

happen under different circumstances.

18

What can we anticipate happening with

19

plumes, with saltwater intrusion,

20

with other -- with clumpage, out into

21

the future. So we can collectively

22

make better water resource management

23

decisions.

24

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there

25

a possibility that that's going to

1

PROCEEDINGS

2

include live updates with remote

3

sensors? I know that --

4

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Steve?

5

I'm not sure about that. I don't

6

think there were plans to have a

7

remote --

8

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there

9

even any estimate of how much that

10

would cost?

11

MR. TERRACCIANO: Remote

12

sensor for quality?

13

AUDIENCE MEMBER: For

14

quality, all around.

15

MR. KOCH: Not quite there

16

yet.

17

AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's

18

one of the things an entity would be

19

good for.

20

MR. B. SCHNEIDER: I don't

21

even think technology-wise --

22

MR. KOCH: We're not quite

23

there yet.

24

MR. B. SCHNEIDER: You've

25

got to be able to analyze the water.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 There are certain water quality  
3 parameters that you can, you know,  
4 basically take from the well sample,  
5 which are just very, very basic  
6 things, like dissolve oxygen and pH  
7 and temperature. Any of those types  
8 of things really are not going to  
9 answer long-range water quality  
10 issues like tracking TCE plume.

11 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Maybe  
12 I'm beyond -- I'm just hearing about  
13 this concept.

14 MS. BLOOM: Steve, they've  
15 already planned it.

16 MR. B. SCHNEIDER: It's  
17 part of the 6 million, right?

18 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Maybe  
19 if you got a 60 million.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well,  
21 that's I wanted to know, is there  
22 even any discussion of that  
23 possibility and how much that would  
24 cost.

25 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Not

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 yet, to my knowledge. Certainly not  
3 within DEC.

4 MR. WHITE: That's where  
5 this stuff is being used for surface  
6 water, for some of the basic  
7 oceanographic parameters. We're  
8 hoping to apply it to wastewater for  
9 things like DOD and TSS. Groundwater  
10 is a whole other level of  
11 sophistication.

12 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So, but  
13 he was talking about once a year, but  
14 how often -- do you check this stuff  
15 quarterly? You check it monthly?

16 MR. B. SCHNEIDER: Well,  
17 it's as often as you take a sample  
18 from the well.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right,  
20 okay. So how often is that normally?

21 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: It  
22 depends on the contaminant, it  
23 depends on the location.

24 AUDIENCE MEMBER: And then  
25 there was some point in time when

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 they cut the funding off for the USGS  
3 and didn't do any more testing or  
4 something?

5 MR. B. SCHNEIDER: If  
6 you're talking about water supply  
7 versus monitoring well data, that's  
8 two completely different things. The  
9 water suppliers are required to  
10 analyze their water on a much, much  
11 more frequent basis than a monitoring  
12 well.

13 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that  
14 monthly that they do that?

15 MR. SCULLY: Depends on  
16 the well, the frequency of sampling.  
17 A contaminated well would require  
18 monthly sampling. Some wells are  
19 actually weekly.

20 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I  
21 gotcha. So it's how bad it is or has  
22 been in the past?

23 MR. SCULLY: Correct.

24 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Or  
25 the -- I mean, bacteriologicals



1 PROCEEDINGS

2 you're sampling much more frequently  
3 for than you are for, say, TCE.

4 MR. IRWIN: That's  
5 generally in the distribution system.

6 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Right,  
7 in the distribution system, not  
8 the --

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well,  
10 all of this is -- makes it a whole  
11 other level of information that you  
12 might need to be dealing with.

13 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: It's  
14 information overload, right?

15 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well,  
16 not necessarily, if you really want  
17 to get to the bottom of things.

18 MR. KOCH: Our next item  
19 is Other Business. I think Carrie  
20 alluded to something in other  
21 business.

22 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Yes.  
23 So we just -- Brian and I just wanted  
24 to mention, we've been talking about,  
25 and with the USGS, we're currently

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 working on refining an expanded scope  
3 for that study.

4 So initially, USGS had put  
5 out a scope for western Long Island.  
6 This is going back to, you know,  
7 Senator Martins and Assemblyman  
8 Schimel had requested a study mostly  
9 focused on out of concern that New  
10 York City was going to reopen their  
11 Jamaica wells. So there was a scope  
12 that existed for that.

13 In conversations about  
14 water quality concerns across the  
15 state, we were able to convince the  
16 governor that it would be ideal to  
17 expand that scope to all of Long  
18 Island. He announced that last  
19 month. And so that's what we're  
20 working on now, that there's an  
21 expanded scope, it's undergoing  
22 vetting and technical review. We  
23 hope to have that out.

24 I may be speaking to the  
25 Western Aquifer Committee -- what's

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

the -- in mid-April. We won't have a final scope by then, but we'll hopefully have more detailed information then. We'll be starting to talk to all the different groups and stakeholders about what's actually going to be in that scope. Ideally, we will be able to identify some short-term activities that we can amend an existing work plan agreement that we, DEC, have with USGS so they can get started more quickly rather than waiting for the new contract to go into place, because we all know that the contracting process can be painful.

So that's what -- so it's kind of we're working on two tracks right now. One is -- really kind of three tracks. One is, we're finding that overall expanded scope of work that will address the Nassau concerns, as well as the concerns in Suffolk. Two is, what's that kind of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

sub-proposal, the first one year worth of work that we can get done and started on that we can get -- amended the existing work plan.

MR. TERRACCIANO: Five-year scope right now.

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Yes. So the project will take five years total. It was going to be two and a half years, roughly, for western Long Island. So now that we're adding in Suffolk, it will be another two and a half years.

But the concept being that we're not going to wait. It's not like you're not going to see anything in those five years. As products are available, you want to get a project website up and running within that first year. We want to have the plan detail for where all the new outpost monitoring wells will need to be located. We're going to be putting in approximately another 24 outpost

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

monitoring wells in the Lloyd and Magothy aquifer. We'll be working with Nassau County DPW and either Suffolk County Department of Health Services or Suffolk County Water Authority to get those wells actually drilled because they could be more efficient at getting that done than the USGS itself.

Those would be done, the wells will essentially be drilled within those first two and a half years. We want to make sure they're installed within those first two and a half years, and then the latter two and a half years will essentially be finalizing the work on the interactive maps, the modeling. Every interested public agency will have a chance to be trained on Mod Flow and have access to it and have the chance to try different applications. So there's a technical support component actually built into

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 it. We're hoping to actually have  
3 the training right back here in this  
4 room.

5 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Question  
6 for that is, Mod Flow has already  
7 been chosen?

8 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Yes.

9 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I heard  
10 that CDM actually made theirs open to  
11 the public.

12 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Well,  
13 so Mod Flow is what USGS uses, it's  
14 open source, and they continue to  
15 support it. So it seemed to be a  
16 more logical choice since it's  
17 something that USGS will be  
18 constantly supported. When they  
19 update their models, it will be  
20 available for the agencies, too, to  
21 download and use those updates.

22 MR. TERRACCIANO: Most of  
23 the consulting folks use Mod Flow or  
24 are able to take the archived files,  
25 the Mod Flow files, and create them

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 or run the models themselves.

3 AUDIENCE MEMBER: In their  
4 own system.

5 MR. TERRACCIANO: In their  
6 own systems, yes.

7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So it's  
8 kind of like the Excel of modelling.

9 MR. TERRACCIANO: Yeah,  
10 it's one of the first modeling  
11 software that's out there the  
12 longest. It probably has the most,  
13 they call them packages written for  
14 them to handle special hydrologic  
15 situations. How do you model rivers,  
16 streams, dams, pumping wells, surface  
17 water/groundwater interactions, and  
18 on and on.

19 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there  
20 any downsides to that? I mean,  
21 because it's been so long, maybe  
22 it's not updated?

23 MR. TERRACCIANO: I think  
24 it's constantly vetted and tested,  
25 and I think that it's proven.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

MR. WHITE: Carrie,  
specifically on the connector, and  
this is on the Nassau County side.

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER:  
Yes.

MR. WHITE: So with  
respect to the New York City going  
forward on their application to renew  
their well permits for the 34 wells,  
that was the concern of Nassau County  
if they turn those Queens wells on.  
So we've been working with the city  
to track their scoping process and  
their environmental preparation,  
what's going to be environmental.

The reason I raise that is  
now that there's this other effort,  
we have always been concerned and  
we're not sure there's a break point  
between what the city is going to  
actually agree to do in their  
environmental assessment versus what  
other information Nassau County and  
the Island would want out of that



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

information. So I'd like to see a tie-in with this effort. And, of course, it's sort of a DEC issue, as well, because they're preparing the environmental impact statement to support their application for a renewal of those well permits. So if there's, again, a gap, I think we should probably follow that up with the county in this effort.

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: And we've reached out.

MR. TERRACCIANO: We need permission.

MR. WHITE: You need permission?

MR. TERRACCIANO: To drill wells in the city.

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Right, so that will be part of it. But we've also reached out to Region 2, DEC, our counterparts in water, to make sure that we are coordinating our efforts and sharing information.

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 MR. WHITE: And, to be  
3 fair, we've established, I think, a  
4 very cooperative relationship with  
5 DEP on this now. We've had several  
6 meetings with them, we're in  
7 communication with them. So I think  
8 it's something that can definitely be  
9 coordinated.

10 MR. TERRACCIANO: The  
11 model will also address city  
12 concerns. City has plans to install  
13 a lot of green infrastructure to help  
14 manage CSO outflow. There's a  
15 shallow depth of water in many places  
16 of the city. So proper understanding  
17 of future groundwater levels will  
18 impact the viability of green  
19 infrastructure moving forward.

20 There's also concerns  
21 there of existing saltwater  
22 intrusion. Previous Jamaica water  
23 supply wells experienced saltwater  
24 intrusions. So, moving forward, they  
25 would benefit from understanding

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 effects of pumping.

3 MR. WHITE: Absolutely.

4 MR. B. SCHNEIDER: Just to  
5 jump on what Carrie said, we're  
6 working very closely with Carrie and  
7 Steve. We're independently, knowing  
8 that this was going to be coming down  
9 the pipe and the Nassau County DPW is  
10 going to be managing some sort of  
11 drilling component, we have Mike  
12 Flaherty is from DPW, also, and he's  
13 had a tremendous amount of experience  
14 in the well drilling contracts that  
15 we've put out over the years.

16 So we are in the midst of  
17 formulating a new drilling contract  
18 specifically for the deep well  
19 investigation in the parts of Nassau  
20 and actually going into Queens. So  
21 that will be a contract, that we're  
22 going to look into that as soon as we  
23 have -- the real technical specs need  
24 to be ironed out, because just the  
25 technology of the actual drilling

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

techniques that are used and especially the geophysical probes that need to get installed and actually monitor the thickness of the salt layer, that's an evolving science, also. We need to make sure that the USGS can have complete access to those wells once they're installed. And we also have to make sure that the wells are installed so that we're not going to be cross-contaminating the aquifer, introducing salt to one area where it is not already. So we have to be very careful that we have a very skilled well driller who is going to be able to get these wells in properly.

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: And so, Steve, the first year task is to make sure that those technical specs and everything are identified, the locations of, ideally, where the new wells are to go are mapped out and

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

that that's all signed off on so we

3

can get started on the drilling by

4

spring of 2017.

5

MR. KOCH: Any other new

6

business?

7

Jared?

8

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: One of

9

the biggest issues that we actually

10

faced early on was public information

11

and education. We have -- I was

12

mistakenly listed as the subcommittee

13

chair and writer for that, and I was

14

reached out to by Dennis Keller, who

15

used to be the vice chair of this

16

commission, who expressed to me

17

interest in jumping back in, and we

18

had that kind of discussion. He and

19

a lot of his partners are interested

20

in forming that subcommittee and

21

reaching out to their PR and ad firm

22

and seeing if we can get some pro

23

bono work for it. Of course, this

24

speaks to Ty's wonderful presentation

25

and explanation between well water

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

and actual drinking water, getting

3

that information out to the public.

4

So we're going to -- I'll pursue that

5

with Steve in terms of establishing

6

that, because I think that that

7

communication to the public is just

8

so important.

9

MR. KOCH: Great. Thank

10

you, Jared.

11

Other business?

12

MR. DAWYDIAK: Just one

13

quick update. The Suffolk County

14

Health Department has issued a

15

request for proposals for a sump

16

watershed wastewater plan. We've

17

been working closely with the region

18

and with the Division of Water up in

19

Albany under the umbrella of the

20

Nitrogen Action Plan. We've had some

21

capital money sitting around for a

22

while, it was a quarter percent of

23

our creation. To do this plan, we

24

worked with DEC to coordinate our

25

efforts with their efforts, and DEC

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 is supplementing it, most likely,  
3 with some monies under a state grant.

4 This is going to produce a  
5 wastewater plan or a one-year period.  
6 We actually want a map in six months  
7 to show what the priority areas are  
8 for upgrades to protect surface  
9 waters, as well as public supply  
10 wells. So there's a dimension of  
11 early groundwater modelling using  
12 existing tools to identify what areas  
13 are presently or in the future going  
14 to be impacted and what sorts of  
15 upgrades are going to be needed.

16 Right now, in Suffolk  
17 County we have a number of 360,000  
18 cesspools and septic tanks. We can't  
19 tell you today whether 50,000 or  
20 100,000 are the highest priority. We  
21 can't tell you what the benefits are  
22 going to be or what the costs are,  
23 and in six months we'll be much  
24 better situated to do that.

25 I bring it up here because

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 there's a clear overlap in connection  
3 with the public water supply issues.  
4 This was discussed at the Nitrogen  
5 Action Plan hearings that the state  
6 DEC's had. Carrie's got extras of  
7 the scoping document that was the  
8 subject of that.

9 In the next month, we're  
10 also going to have a rollout meeting,  
11 sort of probably a small one with key  
12 stakeholders, and a bigger, more  
13 public one to present the proposed  
14 work plan, get comments, and kick  
15 this off on an accelerated time  
16 frame.

17 So this is going to be a  
18 big jump start both for the Suffolk  
19 County portion of the Nitrogen Action  
20 Plan, and hopefully it will continue  
21 to leverage with LICAP.

22 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Those  
23 test well systems, septic systems  
24 that we put in were real positive on  
25 the initial results. I know we have



1 PROCEEDINGS

2 another lot we coming up.

3 MR. DAWYDIAK: Yes. 18  
4 are in the ground, 19th is going in.  
5 We expected that least three,  
6 possibly more of the technologies  
7 will be fully validated, having  
8 reached steady state in six months,  
9 performance data by the summer. So  
10 our goal is to make them approvable  
11 on the street for anybody who wants  
12 them, and round two is going to have  
13 additional --

14 MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Which is  
15 great. I understand some of the  
16 preliminary tests were really good.

17 MR. DAWYDIAK: Yes.

18 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: Walter,  
19 any update on when they might be  
20 approved?

21 MR. DAWYDIAK: This  
22 summer. Our goal is to create a  
23 sanitary code framework, to make them  
24 approvable, and to give the health  
25 department the power that it needs to

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

have a responsible management entity  
for operation, maintenance,  
enforcement, data tracking. And then  
one by one, as each technology is  
tested under our whatever our  
standard specification is, it will be  
dropped in as an approvable  
technology. So there might be two or  
three in July, two or three in  
August. And over time, people don't  
need to go to board of review, they  
can come into our testing protocols.  
Once a day, there's Q/A, they can be  
used as of right. So it's going to  
open up the marketplace, see  
alternatives and competition.

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Did you  
guys look at Professor Glotis' work  
on this, from Stony Brook? He's got  
some really phenomenal work on  
converting the nitrates from  
homeowners into gas, into air.  
There's some really interesting stuff  
going on in research.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

MR. DAWYDIAK: The Clean Water Technology Center is Walker and Goldberg, and they're looking at alternative leaching. The layer cake system with the sawdust underneath the leach field is potentially very promising to reduce nitrogen very cost-effectively. They're also looking at another option, but I'm not familiar with --

MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: It's Goldblatt.

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Goldblatt. I'm sorry, I misspoke.

MS. BLOOM: So, Walter, does the code upgrade include just the pilots that you're doing or --

MR. DAWYDIAK: No, it's going to be a global upgrade that establishes a pilot provisional general use system for alternatives. So the ones that are already in the septic program might be on the street for use immediately. Any new systems

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

don't need this review and board of review. They come in, they're piloted, we test them, we make sure that they're built and performing as promised, and then they become provisionally and general use approved.

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: This is no cost to the county? This is coming from the manufacturer?

MR. DAWYDIAK: Correct, the pilots are.

MS. BLOOM: Does this include urea capture and compost tools?

MR. DAWYDIAK: Urea and compost are not currently in the septic demo program, but they're alternatives that are on the table.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is there any plan to incorporate some of the manufacturers that didn't want to just give it to you for free? Because that was the criteria, and so

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

it skewed it towards people who were

3

sort of new and -- the old ones were

4

just like what do we need to do that

5

for.

6

MR. DAWYDIAK: Anybody can

7

team up with an applicant moving

8

forward to test a system in our area,

9

and once we see the six months of

10

data, they can move to the next stage

11

of approval and put more of them in.

12

It's just the people that donated it

13

got the benefit of the early

14

coordination and training and

15

testing, so that we get the

16

on-the-ground experience locally, as

17

well.

18

AUDIENCE MEMBER: But that

19

ended up living out some of the

20

better ones.

21

MR. DAWYDIAK: So far. I

22

men, we'll see how it goes over the

23

next couple of months.

24

AUDIENCE MEMBER: What

25

would be the process? Somebody, some

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 company, I'm going jump throw out  
3 one, I don't know the name, but  
4 there's one that Macalister talks  
5 about.

6 MR. DAWYDIAK: The  
7 nitrates, yeah.

8 AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay,  
9 the nitrates. I didn't know the  
10 name. They didn't go in the test.

11 MR. DAWYDIAK: He's  
12 approved the nitrates for medium  
13 sized system, 1,000 to 15,000. There  
14 are a couple of proposals that are on  
15 the drawing boards right now for  
16 those, but not for individual  
17 residences yet. He could choose  
18 to enter the next phase of septic  
19 demo, which would streamline it. If  
20 not, at any time he can partner with  
21 an applicant to show us a few  
22 systems --

23 AUDIENCE MEMBER: So if  
24 Joe Schmoie wants to build one, then  
25 it could be tested and you could all

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

be involved in that.

3

MR. DAWYDIAK: Yes.

4

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Even

5

though it's just a private enterprise

6

that's taking place, you would then

7

be involved in testing that for your

8

purposes.

9

MR. DAWYDIAK: Right.

10

AUDIENCE MEMBER: How

11

about urea catcher, that's just sort

12

of something that's on the back

13

burner? Because it seems like that's

14

the first thing you should be looking

15

at.

16

MR. KOCH: You know what?

17

I think this is a great conversation.

18

Jared, if you have something else to

19

add, make it quick. We have this to

20

12. This is great --

21

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Maybe

22

this a question for Carrie. I know

23

that in my report I have a reference

24

to this, and some sort of mechanism

25

whereby we can help homeowners

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 actually pay for this, whether it's a  
3 rebate from the state or tax  
4 incentive or whatever, making up the  
5 difference between the installation  
6 for the whole system and one of those  
7 new systems.

8 Have you guys started to  
9 explore that at all, how we can make  
10 it easier for a homeowner?  
11 Representing the citizens.

12 MS. MEEKER GALLAGHER: No.  
13 That's going to be part of the  
14 scoping document in here (indicating)  
15 and it's going to be part of the  
16 plan, so it's kind of like once all  
17 this up-front -- it's a long-term  
18 action under the Nitrogen Action  
19 Plan. So once we do these early  
20 action items, then -- so if everyone  
21 thinks it's a great idea to figure  
22 out how we come up with a rebate  
23 program or incentive, we will look  
24 into it, you know, but that will be  
25 part of that price tag at the end.



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

MR. HERSHKOWITZ: Just trying to encourage it happening earlier since these things are going to be approved sooner. Rather than waiting for the end of this, which could take a year or two, maybe we could find some way to find some funds to help homeowners install these things earlier and get the process going. That's all I'm asking.

MR. KOCH: Any other new business?

Any of the public like to make a comment.

Yes, sir? Please state your name.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm Jerry Attovino, and I live down on Long Beach Barrier Island. I've been doing this on and off for probably 12 years, and I put two feet into it when we got readings of 110 parts per million of chlorides in the wells

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

down there. Subsequently to that, in 2014, at the Long Island Symposium For Water Quality, the USGS announced that the freshwater/saltwater interface had migrated a lot further landward than originally anticipated. I understand the interface is now underneath the shoreline down in Long Beach. Other things have happened, alarming things and announcements are made.

Fast-forwarding to here, when I see the head of the table disagree with Jared's interpretation of the mission statement and I see the head of the table giving Karen some pushback on some type of proactive committee, the question I have for the head of the table and the other members of the board is: How does this differ from preserving what's happened for 40 years, 45 years, where you have science and recommendations and they don't get

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

PROCEEDINGS

converted into proactive  
implementation? How is this  
different than the do nothing  
solution? And that's my question for  
LICAP.

MR. KOCH: Okay. I don't  
think we're doing nothing. I think  
we're trying to put our ducks in a  
row, okay? I hear this 40-year  
number. Obviously every urban area,  
okay, has the same issues. It's not  
like Grumman did anything wrong when  
they won the war in World War II. It  
just wasn't -- you know, this is  
things from the past. We're not  
going to correct them overnight. How  
we agree or disagree on how to do  
that, that's another story, but I  
think we're all on board.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well,  
I'm looking for an action plan, all  
right? I don't care -- personally I  
don't care if it's an entity, a  
mechanism. But I want to see

1

## PROCEEDINGS

2

correction, proactive correction, and

3

I'm not seeing that and I'm not

4

hearing that, and that's my point.

5

MR. KOCH: Thank you.

6

Any other comment from the

7

public?

8

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Just

9

here. There seems to be a lot of

10

things going on where we need

11

coordination, everybody's agreeing on

12

that, and the fact that there are all

13

these agencies and everything else,

14

and also the fact that we don't want

15

to get to a state of emergency. This

16

has been going on for a long time,

17

and I think the 40 years goes back to

18

the 2008, which was this great study

19

done then.

20

But I think at this point

21

let's not get to a state of emergency

22

and let's look into -- I think

23

somebody should be looking into what

24

kind of entity would help coordinate

25

things. Is there some kind of

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 solution out there? There's nothing  
3 that's doing on the island. Maybe  
4 it's something that's been done in  
5 Texas.

6 But at any rate, I think  
7 we do want to look into what are the  
8 possibilities for getting everybody  
9 together? What are the possibilities  
10 for actually moving ahead? And I  
11 think looking into these  
12 possibilities, while we're seeing  
13 exactly where our problems are, is  
14 useful because then we'll have --  
15 when your report comes out, then  
16 we'll have some ideas about, okay,  
17 now we know these problems, and we  
18 have general ideas of why our  
19 problems are, now how do we get our  
20 solutions implemented? And I think  
21 that's really an important thing, so  
22 that having a subcommittee looking  
23 into, hey, what are the things out  
24 there? What are some ways other  
25 areas have dealt with getting all the

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 pieces together? It would really be  
3 a great idea so that that kind of  
4 thing is ready when we know precisely  
5 what we want to do. How do we  
6 coordinate? How do we do it? How do  
7 we get it implemented?

8 MR. KOCH: Thank you. Any  
9 other comments?

10 Just one more thing.  
11 Everybody at the table, you're going  
12 to get an e-mail regarding the State  
13 of the Aquifer Report. Just make  
14 sure you respond to that in a timely  
15 manner. We're going to give it about  
16 30 days.

17 I make a motion to close  
18 the meeting.

19 MR. WHITE: Second.

20 MR. KOCH: Vote? All in  
21 favor, say aye.

22 (Aye.)

23 MR. KOCH: Thank you.

24 (Time noted: 12:00 p.m.)

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T I O N

I, KRISTI CRUZ, a Notary Public in  
and for the State of New York, do hereby  
certify:

THAT the foregoing is a true and  
accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto  
set my hand this 6th day of April 2016.

---

KRISTI CRUZ