

LONG ISLAND COMMISSION FOR AQUIFER PROTECTION

MINUTES

August 13, 2014

260 Motor Parkway, Hauppauge

ATTENDEE	REPRESENTING
Dorian Dale	Suffolk County Executive Appointee/Dept. of Economic Development & Planning
Kara Hahn	Suffolk County Legislator
Brian Schneider	Nassau County Executive Appointee/DPW
Dennis Kelleher	H2M/Long Island Water Conference and Vice-Chairman of LICAP
Tony Leung	NYS DEC
Donald Irwin	Nassau County Department of Health
Michael White	Suffolk County Legislature Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory
Chris Ostuni	Nassau County Legislature Presiding Officer Norma Gonsalves
Paul A. TeNyenhuis	Suffolk County Soil and Water Conservation District
Chris Schubert	USGS
Stephen Terracciano	USGS
Jack Monti	USGS
Elizabeth Alexander	Suffolk County Legislature Hon. William Spencer
Pamela Donovan	Legislative Aide – Legislator Sarah Anker
Jared Hershkowitz	Suffolk County Legislature Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory
Henry Bokuniewicz	LIGRI
Ron Paulsen	Suffolk County Dept. of Health Services
George Proios	Suffolk County Soil & Water
Jennifer Barrios	
Carrie Gallagher	CSO – SCWA
John C. Milazzo	Counsel – SCWA
Filip Sinni	Laboratory Manager of SCWA
Tim Motz	Director of Mgmt. Efficiency & Communications - SCWA

PUBLIC COMMENT: No Comments.

The Minutes of the June 25, 2014, meeting were distributed and will be approved at the next meeting of LICAP, in order to allow sufficient time for the members to review them.

Legislator Hahn stated that she will inquire if the Legislature would approve the hiring of a Court Reporter to take the Minutes of future LICAP meetings, since the Members would like them verbatim.

Ms. Gallagher stated that three members of the USGS were in attendance and the main author of the SOTA website, who will walk us through it, is Jack Monti. Steve Terracciano runs the local USGS office and he introduced Chris Schubert, who is the Section Chief for Investigative Studies at the Long Island Program Office, which encompasses New York City and Long Island.

Mr. Monti introduced himself stating that he will be presenting the website that they have been working on. Basically, the purpose of the website is to assess Long Island's Aquifer system with a specific page devoted to Long Island's Aquifer system providing tools and resources available to give a general idea of the groundwater conditions on Long Island with the idea that this is a living document that we update over time as opposed to the publications that USGS normally distributes. A lot of the information here is based off of Foxworthy and Cohen's report which was a Long Island Atlas back in the 1960's, 70's period of time. Mr. Monti stated that he used that as a guideline in organizing and structuring what resources they had available. When you click on the tabs at top, they'll launch another section of the web page. There are

subsections within those locations, such as topography, population, land use and you can use the slider to roll down and expand on a topic if interested in looking at the topography across Long Island or the location and settings of Long Island.

Mr. Monti stated that he did not know how much time he had to devote for this presentation and Mr. Kelleher told him a half-hour would be good.

Mr. Monti then reviewed the entire website, page by page, highlighting interactive content and tools for users. Some comments that were made during the presentation were as follows:

Mr. Monti stated that information was taken from the U.S. Census Decadal Data Sets starting from the 1900's through 2010.

Mr. Kelleher noted how useful it was to have the aggregated pumpage data.

Ms. Gallagher commented how it would be helpful to have electronic pumpage reporting to more easily update on an annual basis. DEC indicated they are looking at going digital with all their reporting.

Mr. Schneider indicated that we should include pumpage from Nassau to Brooklyn through the 1960s.

Legislator Hahn commented on the difference in the Summer months between the Nassau and Suffolk charts – there seems that there was a more dramatic Suffolk Summer month usage increase compared to Nassau. She asked if that just has to do with the way the chart was set up or are we comparing the same numbers on the chart and it is more dramatic in increased usage? Mr. Monti stated that there are large population increases in Suffolk County, therefore the demand is going to be larger from 1988 to 2010. Mr. Dale stated that the trending on population is not the same steep

curve on water usage. Ms. Gallagher stated that we also have a huge influx of Summer residents in Suffolk County that have massive lawns that they want watered.

Mr. Kelleher indicated that it probably has to do with the average lot size in Suffolk County as well. The lot sizes are bigger.

Mr. Proios stated that the land usage is what needs to be looked at. The last studies done was looking at reverse commute. So even when the population had changed when New York City had down-turned, the people that were using the toilets and water in New York City were now staying in our counties and using it. Even though there wasn't a change in population so much, there was an uptake in water usage and then if you look at the large number of condominium complexes that have been built and everyone of those have automatic sprinkler systems in there. If you just look at that type of land use in the last 15 years, that has resulted in dramatic water use, especially if you putted it by hours and just look and see what was going on between 4:00 and 6:00 is huge and indicated that the Water Authority has that data.

Ms. Gallagher stated we can look into this as Commission Members, as opposed to USGS - this website is supposed to be just the technical, scientifically based information, non-partisan, peer review, published data vs. any of the analysis or recommendation that we, as the Commission, can make in our own report and findings.

Mr. Schneider asked Mr. Monti if he included the pumpage from Nassau County into Brooklyn in the early 1900's – Mr. Monti stated that he did not. Not the transfer from Nassau County through the conduits into Queens County. Mr. Schneider stated that as late as 1965, New York City was pumping approximately 60 million gallons a day.

Mr. Proios would like us to include degree days and precipitation in the pumpage/percent of recharge animation. Mr. Monti stated that it can be done. There are new tools available for animating multiple variables such as temperature and precipitation. Daily data would need the daily data of the pumpage, so he wouldn't go down to daily data, but would definitely go down to monthly data. A monthly precipitation value and a multiple temperature value can be done. It all depends on what data you have available. The data available at one time was annual, so Mr. Monti showed annual information. More recently he was able to get monthly data and showed monthly information. So as they drilled down in the temporal aspect, you could look at your variables and see how they fit together over time. Mr. Monti stated this website is made up of resources and tools for evaluating the state of the aquifer. Ms. Gallagher commented that this will hopefully help people visualize what otherwise can seem like very tedious amounts of data. In the world we live in today, people are much more used to having these interactive visualizations of data vs. having to read through reams of spreadsheets.

Mr. Terracciano stated that what is most insensitive about this is the idea that only recharges that are falling on the political boundaries are entering the wells within the political boundary. This is just not the case. Mr. Monti pointed out that the animation and comparison graphs do not include the return of the water, such as the sewer septic returns to the groundwater, the enhancements of recharge basins that are going into the system. This is just pumping compared to the potential recharge going into the ground. It helps with some measure of the inflow so from a first order perspective, it gives some sense of the intensity of pumpage from each one of the

counties. So even though Suffolk County is showing up in red on the right, it is still only pumping about 20% to 25% of the available recharge within that County. The pumpage as a percentage of recharge is 2 to 2.5 times higher than Suffolk (but the pumpage is about the same amount).

Mr. Monti mentioned that he was going over his half hour time frame, but the Members told him to keep going. Ms. Gallagher stated that we want the feedback so if there is additional content we want to add or data we want to search for, we can start on that when our contract year starts up again on October 1 with USGS. This is why we want to go through this now before going to the public and look through it and say here are some additional items that we're looking to implement in the next cycle.

Mr. Schneider raised concerns about public perception of the pumpage/percentage recharge animation, stating that it may lead the public to believe that we will run out of water some day. Mr. Monti answered by saying that the animation of pumpage over time show what is coming in compared to what is going out in one variable. Ms. Gallagher stated that this does not show what is already stored in the ground – it is looking at recharge and pumpage. If we try to look at everything that is stored it is somewhere between 70 and 120 trillion gallons that is stored underground. A comment was made that this is an appropriate question for the entire aquifer system, not particularly for Nassau. Certainly it can be sensationalized and taken out of context, but there are other areas within the website where we can discuss what really does inform this issue of sustainability or sustainable yield and there are those who will talk about the amount of water in storage, those who will talk in terms of percent of the recharge, but ultimately it is going to come back to what society determines to be the

acceptable impairments on the aquifer system. That is one of the things that the Northern Atlantic Coastal Plan study that Jack's involved with is in the final stages of defining for Long Island in the context of this Mid Atlantic region – how sustainable are our withdrawals for Long Island geography now and going forward with various climate change and population scenarios. It is a valid question as well as how quickly they could recover and that is why there needs to be a strong recommendation about the need to continuously gather data and not have these major data gaps. After the Brooklyn/Queens episode with the salt water intrusion, data stopped being collected and the question is how long it took for the salt water to be pushed out. USGS did a study with DEP looking at the leaky sewer systems that had primarily played a big role in pushing out the salt water, so even though the salt wasn't there, the nitrate content went up dramatically from the leakage of the sewerage. It would be nice to know how long it takes the aquifer to recover in regards to salt water and nitrogen concentrations for example. We have good information on the North Fork because of single lens in terms of cleansing and how long that took, but less in information about the main body and how long it takes to run through the Magothy. If we had continuous data, it would tell us, with this new issue in New York City, DEP wanting to turn on these systems in Brooklyn and Queens, so if we did that for a year, what would the damage be, what would two years of damage be – we need to know that for management tools and should we be helping New York City to close that 10,000,000 gallon a day leak or not. It is a management/political issue, but we do not have data to answer questions.

Ms. Hahn commented on the 2100 sites sampled by USGS between 1970 and 1990 and Mr. Monti indicated that this was the hey day when a lot of sampling was

going on between surface water and groundwater. There was a pulse – everyone wanted to see what this data showed. Mr. Monti stated that he believes this was largely to do with the sewerage practices that were being implemented in Nassau County and we wanted to look at nitrogen trends based on what was sampled in the stream and seeing the impacts on sewerage based on quality and flow. Also, sampling techniques started improving for volatiles. That was a period of time where there were a large percentage of samples being taken. It was asked if USGS had a copy of this data from DPW and Mr. Monti stated that if it was available online he would include it, but to transcribe a book of the data would be very difficult, not impossible though. He said he does have these studies, but is really trying to serve readily available information based on what is online, where one can go to, the Joe P. Public, the planners, the scientists, the researchers, the students, can go to a site on Long Island, specific for Long Island and find information that they can use venues and interpret on their own – that's what he is trying to achieve with this webpage tool. It was asked if those 2100 sites that were sampled between that time period, were those considered basic data sites or were those site specific, project sites for example the Roosevelt Field Study, etc. Mr. Monti stated that he did not separate it out. He gave a demonstration on the website how this has been addressed.

Mr. Kelleher stated that there is another whole set of water quality data that is not included and was discussed the last time that they got together. The public water suppliers sample their water every quarter or some that are already contaminated, every month – 1200 wells – so that's a tremendous amount of data. They are in different locations but how we analyze it and get it in useable format is another story.

Mr. Monti's suggestion is to get this into one location. Each supplier is serving a water quality report based on multiple wells – it would not be an individual sample of each well. It would be an aggregated – how many samples are taken at this particular well and then the quality – Mr. Kelleher stated that that data is available. Water suppliers have to put together an annual supply statement, which puts together, not by well, but by community – and they also have to do what is called supplemental data package which is specific to every well. Mr. Terracciano stated that a discussion was had with the DEC and the EPA, superfund folks, in terms of sharing information and President Bush asked them to make sure that information was available to everyone – so a long time ago they set out to build a web portal that allows folks to search their database and the Store-It information – data that is in the publicly available EPA Store-It database. He thinks it is called Store-it 2 or WQX, Water Quality Exchange. In any case, one of the plans forward that could make everyone's data accessible would be to bring the publicly available supply data into the EPA's Store-It database and then through the web portal you can search both databases simultaneously based upon longitude box or well number or name or some other identifiers. There is progress – there is a way forward managing EQUIS world, the endous world and the EPA water quality world. It is very tedious and challenging, but there are folks working on it. It was stated that there was never put an end-date on this stuff and the funding is up and down, then we lose it. The idea of putting all the data on one sheet was proposed many, many years ago and it kind of ironic now that the County is doing the study with IBM, twenty-five years, gave the State six super computers – one of them went to Stony Brook University and somebody said “what are we going to do with this supercomputer?” and someone

said “why don’t we put all the water data from the two counties in one place. Brookhaven Lab was asked to work on it and they put together a computer list of all of the data, after contacting all of the water companies – what do you look for from nitrates, etc. and it came out as a multiple sheet from those matrix printers that unfolded and it showed how much data existed in at least one parameter that was collected from every water district and they said that if we had one place at Stony Brook that could input it all and then everyone would send it and everyone could look at that data in one location. So they did the preliminary work, but not sure why it stopped in mid-track. The new guys that came out here knew nothing about this – that 25 years ago Stony Brook and Cornell were given these supercomputers and what did they ever do with these computers? Mr. Monti stated that he’s sure the mainframe has changed and he has computers that don’t have floppy disks anymore and that’s only 10 years ago. Mr. Monti also stated that there are ways of doing this and it is great that this committee has started. It is a new committee and the ideas that come out of the group or any other groups – it can be done. A little bit of thinking, a little bit of programming skills. He was interested in water use because that is what he was tasked with at the Northern Atlantic Coastal Plan – obviously he was heavy on the water use. Water quality, he did not have too much information, so he did not spend too much time with water quality. It was stated that in Nassau County, the Department of Health audits each of the water suppliers and he does not know how that data is taken in a more useable format, but at least moving forward, maybe the conversation should revolve around the reporting of the public water suppliers to the Department of Health in either a way that a computer database can aggregate the information in a way that is more user friendly. They

collect all that public supply data and it resides at the State level. Mr. Monti stated that our water quality data he did not include because he made a commitment at the time that this was internal only and will not be released on a public page until he gets permission. It was further stated that it is very hard – there are so many variables and methods that have to be considered when you are looking at data. Water Quality Assurance Data also has to be considered when you are looking at the database. Chemical Abstracts Service (CAS) to every chemical substance, method of analyses for constituents change – it is just not that easy to do or he thinks it would be done.

Ms. Gallagher stated that it certainly looks like there is interest from LICAP to get that supplementary data which is the raw data vs. the treated, which is what we publish in our Annual Water Quality Reports, and supplemental data and see if there is a way to consolidate it so for next year we will have that and make it live on the website and have it in the report as well. The only caveat with that is that that gives us information from the deeper levels in the aquifer. We are not going to have a lot of information from the upper Glacial which is where the immediate antigenic impacts occur. This is stuff that has been traveling for a while, it has been pulled down, as opposed to what is happening in the 0 to 10 years or the 0 to 25. Usually by the time it is down in the Magothy, where a majority of our water is pumped from, it is a legacy contaminate issue that we are dealing with. It was stated that Suffolk County has maintained a monitoring that was established in the 70's and 80's and a lot of that was in cooperation with the USGS. Mr. Monti stated that a lot of that data is included in the streams. There was also groundwater data routinely collected in the 80's into the 90's and a lot of it was for the Flow Augmentation Needs Study (FANS) and such, but there is quite a bit of

historical data from those 400 wells that weren't sampled every year. They were on a rotation and in 2010 they started to try to resurrect that and tried to reestablish 100 sites. So, we are trying to get back to that. It is one thing to reestablish them. We have the capabilities – something else to get sampling and analytical and work is being done with the USGS to try to pull resources and re-establish a monitoring network for the Glacial for a centennial kind of approach. So the effort is there. But the data, there is probably thousands of samples, maybe tens of thousands that were collected through the County for investigation, superfund sites, monitoring, salt water intrusion – it is not in one place, we do not have a database in the Health Department that collects and maintains that, so that's a big issue. Mr. Dale asked if there is an appetite for actually establishing criteria because it sounds as if it fits and starts, clearly written depositories of data that have just remained remotely unconnected to one another and just establishing what the priority destinations are in terms of what your data objectives are and then having a loading order because are sounds that there are clearly there are all sorts of data points we can be interested in and you can make a case as to why "X" is important opposed to "Y", but at the end of the day, it seems that we're only going to get through a fraction of what we have our there to choose from. There might be some sort of Board of Savants who would establish what the loading order of criteria would be so we get the priority information in place and then work our way down the various levels. We are hearing about all sorts of nifty and neat things and is there some sort of internal Savant task force that might be able to establish this so we can move down in a logical progression.

Ms. Gallagher stated to Mr. Kelleher, knowing that he was going to discuss the subcommittees later, maybe this is something that short-term risk subcommittee could look into. Mr. Kelleher stated that this is something that should be focused in on right away. Ms. Gallagher indicated that Mr. Schweitzer could not be here today, but believes that he is chairing that subcommittee and this would be a good task for this subcommittee to tackle the first year and pull in the appropriate people that have knowledge of the existing data sets.

Mr. Monti continued that this was like making pancakes – your first one doesn't come out perfect, but as you go along...the best he could do with the water quality is show and represent some case studies. A Member asked Mr. Monti where he got the flooding data from and Mr. Monti stated that he used (from 2010 and 2006) the water level information in the upper Glacial and the shallow Magothy in the Nassau/Suffolk area where the water table is in the Magothy. He used those wells to hand contour and contour up a water table potentiometric surface which would be a zero pressure head. That is the water table from that point, he made a continuous surface using the point data and the line data and represented a water table surface and subtracted the water table surface from the land surface model. In this case, it's a land surface model of LIDAR from Nassau and Suffolk Counties, not in Kings or Queens Counties because they did not have LIDAR data sets available in Kings or Queens County at the time. This question was asked to make sure Mr. Monti was using LIDAR because the last time the County did their flooding maps they were using Quadrangle Maps and that is so far off. It was further stated that in the last day or two, it's pretty certain that no government officials have been looking at the new areas that are flooding and as he

went down Rte. 111 coming here, there was a blockage where he saw some DPW guys in hip waders up to their waist at a place that he hasn't seen flooding before. So he wonders who is going out using the LIDAR mapping because the North/South corridors that are supposed to be the evacuation routes – if they're going to be flooded, you're not going to get people to move from coastal areas because these roads are also going to be impassable and he doesn't know who's collecting that data and he doesn't think he sees anyone going out there and looking at these new flooding areas. A lot of it being because of new development. We have these regulations in all 13 townships that all storm water run-off must be maintained on property, it never is, there is no penalty for not maintaining storm water run-off on your property. You can't go out and give a summons to a subdivision that generates all this run-off and it winds up going on the County and State roads and then they have this huge volume that they don't know what to do with. He's glad to see that Mr. Monti has the more accurate maps. Mr. Monti stated that when it comes to him, he will synthesize it into his interpretation of the best representation of depth water and the water table maps. So the LIDAR data sets that came to him from Suffolk County are included and in Nassau County he was able to gather as well, he stitched them together and in Kings and Queens County, they were not releasing their LIDAR data sets to him at the time. Now he believes he has them and in the 2013 map it will indicate the LIDAR portion in the Kings and Queens area. It was asked if he had marine sciences modeling that shows the effect of storm surges and may be incorporated into LIDAR to give a better view of where flooding would occur during storm surges. Mr. Monti stated that there are a lot of pieces which can still be included and the numerical modeling is one piece that is not being shown here, but we

can add that. If there is an interest, something the people would like to see, the potential is there. It's a living document in a sense where we can continually update it, as long as the interest is there and we work together. Cooperation is key.

Mr. Monti concluded by stating that all the references he used in creating this web page are listed. A logo for LICAP was discussed and Ms. Gallagher asked if anyone wanted to create one. Mr. Monti thanked Lou Bonavita and Jason Finkelstein for their help in creating this webpage. The Water Authority was also credited with funding, as well as funding from the USGS Program, in helping to assemble this in this fiscal year.

Mr. Kelleher thanked Mr. Monti for this presentation, stating it was a great job. Everyone applauded.

Mr. Kelleher stated that this is actually live online and we will send a link out to every member, we would like everyone to look at it, submit comments and asked Ms. Gallagher if she would like to be the point person on taking comments. Comments on where we need to improve it, any errors, please let us know. Ms. Gallagher stated that she is looking for volunteers today because while we developed this website, we are statutorily required to develop an actual report. One of the templates we found that seemed particularly apropos was Sound Health. It's scientific, it's nice, it talks about the transient status of the Long Island Sound. This was a model that we took a crack at putting together a very rough template for the State of the Aquifer basically pulling information from the website and adding a section on what you can do as a reader and what's on the web so you can gather more information. This is where we can have a little bit more editorial comments from the Commission's perspective. Ms. Gallagher

stated that if there are any volunteers for the SOTA Report Subcommittee, she has a few copies of this she can share with them and she'll call a meeting to get cracking because we have to produce this by March 27, 2015 – no one volunteered. Ms. Gallagher stated that she will self-select.

Mr. Kelleher stated that there are two other subcommittees, the short-term subcommittee and the long-term subcommittee. They have not had any meetings yet and he's guessing that Mr. Schweitzer and Mr. Colabufo, since very few people have volunteered for these subcommittees, they will be sending out an email and just set a date for those subcommittee meeting and ask people to attend. We would like to do that before we have our next meeting. One of the requirements of the commission is that we hold public hearings. Rather than holding a public hearing in both County Legislatures, and make a presentation, the recommendation was to try and get public input. So that's the angle we're going to take. He thinks the Suffolk County one has been scheduled for September 15, but was corrected, we are trying to do the Nassau one on September 15th and the Suffolk one on the 17th. Mr. Ostuni asked to have the form filled out and Ms. Gallagher stated that it is filled out and she will hand it to him today. Mr. Ostuni stated, "perfect". Mr. Kelleher stated that he, Ms. Gallagher and Mr. Szabo can get together to discuss it and that it would not be a long presentation. Just introducing the Commission and looking for some public input. Ms. Gallagher thought it would be a good idea to hold them the same week, so we can really get the publicity out there – come to the Nassau one on Monday, come to the Suffolk one on Wednesday. Mr. Ostuni stated that he will notice it out of his Clerk's office and Suffolk should do the same so there is maximum coverage. Ms. Gallagher agreed. The time

being 6:00 p.m. for both Nassau and Suffolk Counties. Mr. Kelleher stated that the format will be introducing the Commission and what it has accomplished so far; give the public some ideas on what type of feedback we are looking for; we will do a Public Notice, although we have not talked about details yet – that is something we need to work on in the next week or so. Ms. Gallagher stated that we have to do a Public Notice – LICAP requires that, the By-Laws require that, but we will also do a press release and the Clerk's offices will notice it as well, so hopefully it will be widely circulated.

Mr. Schneider asked if someone comes to a Suffolk meeting to make a public comment, do they also have to come to the Nassau meeting? Mr. Kelleher and Ms. Gallagher answered "no, but they would not be precluded from attending". Mr. Schneider suggested including their comments, for the record, from the Suffolk Meeting into the Nassau Meeting for the sake of not having a five hour meeting. That was agreed. Ms. Gallagher stated that the same person would submit their comments and Legislator Hahn stated this would discourage them from having to speak both times. Also, it was further stated to limit their speaking time and allowing them to submit written testimony into the record. Another question was asked by a Member was: Are we going to ask for specific people or groups? This can get overwhelming, as it has been seen before, with people with axes to grind, people with research dollars that they are chasing – it should be people that are not looking for money – like the issue of nitrogen – he would like to see an independent review of the report that DEC put out that was just a literature search that they did that was somewhat selective, he doesn't think they looked at everything, so whoever did the selective process, he would like to get the Water Resource Institute and a couple of other states that are not even related to New York,

like go out to Ohio or somewhere else and ask them under these issues of nitrogen, are you having the same issues, what is your point, is nitrogen really important for fresh water systems, and do we throw out years worth of data on phosphorous because of 5 or 10 research papers now that we are changing our direction. There has been a lot of misinformation out there and he hasn't seen any technical presentations from people who don't have vested interest in going out and telling us what the real science is. He's concerned that if we have ten people from Pine Barrens Society and Citizen's Campaign, are we going to hear a regurgitation of the same things and not have an opportunity to hear from scientists who do not have a specific axe to grind about what the real information is about contaminants and nutrients. Mr. Kelleher stated that we will not be able to prevent that and if the Pine Barrens want to send five people up, they would be allowed. It was stated that we can communicate it a little bit by the way we write the PR piece stating that it is bipartisan, bi-county and that this is something we are working on together. This mitigates it just a bit. The way we phrase, the statement that is made when introducing everybody, that we are all coming together because we all realize the problem and we are not fighting you, we all need help, we can all work together. That kind of attitude does go a long way. It was then stated that between now and then, there can be some sort of outreach to some of these groups, the usual suspects, that you want to provide information and they are not overwhelming the Public Hearing. We are not excluding the public from speaking, but maybe create another way in the process to send material to the committee. Mr. Kelleher stated that we could reach out to them to come, but can they just select one person from the organization. We are willing to listen.

Ms. Gallagher spoke about the website and will be sending the link so everyone can see what it has so far. We have a basic website for LICAP so everything can be put up everything that we can. It gives the Members, the Subcommittees, the goals, if we have news or things coming up, it will have all the Meetings, the Agendas and then the Minutes as their adopted. We have the virtual reference collection, as it exists now. Under each we try to categorize it by who had created the report or if it was a particular topic of historic interest, like Aldicarb. These are all the reports that we had available to us and could scan from the Regional Planning Board, from USGS, the State, Nassau County and Suffolk County and then we had a whole category of miscellaneous, not being sure where to put them. We also have posted any annual water quality reports from the various water providers that were available to us. Again, just another location where you can have all this information together. This just gave a little bit of a similar information from the USGS website and then Ms. Gallagher pointed out another part of the site that we want to start gathering information on all those other entities that existed that are working on the issue of water quality across Long Island right now or that relate to it, some large initiative. Eventually we will be able to have links to these as well. Ms. Gallagher stated that everyone should look at it and give back comments on what needs to be added, tweaked, etc. We will include this link in the follow up and this is just a place that we can build up so we can have it accessible to the public on what we are doing. Mr. Kelleher thanked Ms. Gallagher.

Mr. Kelleher stated that he and Mr. Szabo had a discussion, just so everyone could start putting the meetings on the calendar, we will send out a list of meetings

between now and the end of the year, just so you can pencil it in and it will not be a last minute thing.

Mr. Kelleher asked if there was anything else anyone would like to bring up at this time. Ms. Gallagher stated that one thing she wanted to make sure everyone knew about was that DEC is going to have a “Clean Sweep Long Island” the week of September 29, so we will include a link about that. That is sort of an amnesty day for farmers and commercial applicators to bring old pesticides and related agricultural related chemicals and contaminates, instead of getting dumped illegally somehow or handled improperly, they can bring them to this collection site and they will be properly collected, handled and disposed of so we know that they are not getting into the Aquifer. Mr. Dale stated that he thinks in that spirit and Sarah Lansdale won’t hold his feet to the fire if he didn’t bring up another date, he thinks September 27th, it is National Septic Day. It is an EPA program which will be held all week.

Ms. Gallagher was asked if the links she had for all of the reports (water quality reports) – is she storing that data herself? Ms. Gallagher stated that we have them actually stored as PDF’s. We have them on LICAP’s website. Mr. Kelleher asked if we took them from other’s websites and Ms. Gallagher indicated that some were found online, but a lot could not be found online, so we reached out to our friends in the consulting world who helped pull these together and got copies sent to us. It was stated that we will need a large server, but Ms. Gallagher stated that these are just the summary, we are not including the supplemental. She wouldn’t even know how to get her hands on the supplemental data packages. It was further stated that it may just be easier to have a link to their data. Mr. Kelleher stated that that is something we will look

into because if you go to the Bethpage website, they list the last ten years there.

Ms. Gallagher stated that what we wanted to do was just have the most recent year available so every year we could swap it out or as more and more become available online, but we were only able to find 10 or 15 online, but most reports we had to get other places. It was stated that these reports are really targeted towards the consumer. The supplements are not and most consumers might see the supplement and be extremely confused because the water quality can be very different because it lists both raw and treated. Ms. Gallagher stated that we have a limit – we cannot upload anything greater than 5 megabytes so on some of the virtual reference documents we had to break them up into 3 or 4 chunks. Where we could, we will link so with a lot of the Comprehensive Plan, we just have links to the existing County website. Sometime that website doesn't have everything available as all times. Mr. Dale stated that one of the efforts they are making with the Comprehensive Plan is to hyperlink internally because right now reference is made and it is so broad – efforts are being made to make it more user-friendly.

Mr. Kelleher asked if there was anything else – no one had any comments.

Mr. Kelleher thanked everyone for attending.