



**Suffolk County Department of Public Works  
CP 8192 – Flanders Riverside Corridor Sewering Feasibility Study  
Summary of December 5, 2011 Stakeholder Meeting**

*To: Boris Rukovets, P.E., Special Projects Supervisor, Suffolk County Department of Public Works  
Honorable Jay Schneiderman, Suffolk County Legislator  
Distribution List*

*From: Mary Anne Taylor, P.E.*

*Date: December 7, 2011*

*Subject: CP 8192, Flanders Riverside Corridor Sewering Feasibility Study  
Summary of December 5, 2011 Stakeholder Meeting*

Boris Rukovets, Suffolk County Department of Public Works (SCDPW) Special Projects Supervisor and Frank Russo and Mary Anne Taylor, members of the team working with SCDPW on the County's Flanders Riverside Corridor Sewering Feasibility Study, attended the stakeholder meeting convened by Legislator Schneiderman at the David W. Crohan Community Center in Flanders on December 5, 2011. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the Flanders Riverside Corridor Sewering Feasibility Study to the community and obtain stakeholder feedback. The sign-in sheet and a copy of the PowerPoint presentation are attached to this meeting summary.

Legislator Schneiderman opened the meeting by welcoming the attendees, and explaining why he had sought and successfully obtained funding for the study. He explained that the area needed sanitary sewers to implement Southampton Town's proposed development plans for the River Catwalk Project and the "LI 40" project (Riverside Hamlet Center). Furthermore, provision of sanitary sewers would help to address the existing discharges of residential septic systems to groundwater that ultimately discharges to the Peconic Estuary which would help to improve water quality. The County has a \$48 million fund that can be used for sewer construction, and the Legislator would like to access these funds for the Flanders Riverside Corridor. Legislator Schneiderman observed that there was less stakeholder participation than he had expected, and identified the need for another meeting so that the input of additional area stakeholders could be considered.

The Legislator introduced SCDPW Special Projects Supervisor Boris Rukovets, who described the goals of the Study. Mr. Rukovets introduced Mary Anne Taylor and Frank Russo from the consultant team that is working with the County to complete the study.

Mary Anne Taylor identified Bowne Management Services as the third member of the team working with the County, and reviewed the project background and objectives, which included identifying the sanitary sewerage infrastructure required to support the commercial development necessary for economic revitalization of the area, and to provide water quality improvements by addressing septic systems in areas of residential density greater than currently permitted by Article 6 of the County's Sanitary Code.

She emphasized that the project is a study and that the objective of the study is to develop the information necessary for the County/Town /stakeholders to make informed decisions regarding sewerage. The study is just the first step in the process. She introduced the main study area (650 acre commercial corridor along Route 24) and the three optional residential areas (approximately 1048 parcels) that would also be considered. She reviewed the project scope, comprised of:

Task 1- Public Education

Task 2 – Feasibility Study, the main part of the project, which includes preliminary design of a collection system, potential siting and preliminary design of a treatment plant and recharge/discharge facilities, and development of project costs and schedule

Task 3 – Environmental Tasks, including a long form Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) and templates in anticipation of a public scoping meeting, draft and final Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) and Findings Statement.

Task 4 – GIS – development of a Geographic Information System

Tasks 5 and 6 – Project Management and Deliverables

She explained that the team was carefully considering the project's location in a very environmentally sensitive area adjacent to the Pine Barrens Core Preservation area, and within the area contributing groundwater baseflow to the Peconic Estuary. Siting a sewage treatment plant, and the discharge (or recharge) of treated effluent will be challenging. Based on the location, the treatment plant will be required to remove more nitrogen than conventional treatment systems; the team's preliminary design will assume that effluent nitrogen levels do not exceed 3 to 5 mg/L.

Potential locations of the treatment plant were discussed. M. Taylor noted that the potential to expand an existing sewage treatment plant would be the preferred option, both because it avoids the controversy of siting a new facility and because it can significantly reduce the project cost. Frank Russo underscored the NIMBY (not in my backyard) attitude that could be avoided if an existing

facility could be used. Legislator Schneiderman observed that the proposal submitted to the County had identified the potential to expand the existing Suffolk County Community College sewage treatment plant as one option. Boris Rukovets said that while the plant remained one of the options to be considered, the plant permit flow was only 12,500 gallons per day (gpd). M. Taylor explained that there were constraints that would be further explored -- first, it was not clear that it could be expanded to treat the flow from the entire study area, although it may be able to accommodate flow from part of the area. Secondly, the college is located within the core preservation area of the Pine Barrens. Legislator Schneiderman and Frank Russo agreed that the College's location would provide the required buffers and was located sufficiently distant from residences. Another potential location is the Sand & Gravel Pit property that was identified in the County's Request for Proposal (RFP). Frank Russo observed that the Sand & Gravel Pit property would not be large enough to site a facility large enough to treat the flow from the entire study area. Removal of County Center wastewater from the Riverhead STP was also identified as a consideration; Frank Russo explained that only 200,000 gpd flow was generated (Note: SCDPW has measured the flow at 135,000 gpd). He described how H2M was upgrading the Riverhead plant so that effluent nitrogen would be reduced to 3 mg/L in accordance with the Peconic Estuary Program's requirements. Mary Anne Taylor indicated that any alternative would have to consider the discharge within the larger context of removing a load of nitrogen currently entering the groundwater/surface water system via septic system discharge.

Discussions focused primarily on the appropriate extent of the study area to be considered. It was agreed that the study area provided to the consultant team was selected very broadly. Given that the increased cost of providing the infrastructure to the larger area, and the constraints this could mean in terms of siting a treatment facility and treated effluent disposal, this could reduce the chances that adequate funding could be identified.

The benefits of sewerage just the commercial areas west of 105, in terms of providing economic benefits to the depressed area were discussed. Ms. Janice Young and others noted they were concerned that this would further discourage development on Route 24 east of 105. Ms. Young also noted that groundwater in the optional residential area to the northeast was within six inches of the ground surface and replacement/upgrade of the septic systems was likely to be required (perhaps as a requirement of future sale) in the future.

Councilwoman Bridget Fleming requested that the team develop the costs associated with provision of sewerage infrastructure for the variety of study area alternatives that had been identified during the meeting. M. Taylor replied that because consideration of the different study areas would likely yield different sizes/locations for the wastewater treatment plants, it would not be possible to design/site multiple plants as part of this study; more focus was required. Councilwoman Fleming repeated her concern that stakeholders be provided with adequate information to select the study area.

Jefferson Murphree inquired about use of the newly approved technologies (Nitrex or BESST) in lieu of the centralized treatment facility. M. Taylor replied that SCDHS had only approved the facilities for

flow rates between 1,000 and 15,000 gallons per day and because the projected flow from the study area exceeded 1,000,000 gallons per day, this could require on the order of 100 small facilities. Frank Russo noted that very preliminary calculations indicated that flow generated by the area would range from 1.9 to 2.6 million gallons per day (MGD), and that implementation of the BESST or nitrex technologies was also expensive. He noted that incorporation of the McLeod's Trailer Park into the area contributed approximately 200,000 gpd.

Legislator Schneiderman acknowledged the environmental importance of providing sewers to the optional residential areas, but expressed his preference to focus on the area west of Route 24 where the proposed developments were located. The potential to implement the project in Phases, with the core commercial area to be sewered first was considered. Boris Rukovets and Legislator Schneiderman agreed that additional stakeholder meetings would be required, and that additional flow information was required in order to establish the study area boundary. It was agreed that the project team would estimate the wastewater flows expected to be generated from the sub-areas within the study area and three optional areas, and that this information would be presented to the stakeholders.

*Please advise M. Taylor of any oversights or errors to this summary.*

cc: Legislator J. Schneiderman  
C. Bartha  
J. Donovan  
K. Kelly  
C. Kobos  
J. McGovern  
B. Rukovets  
F. Russo  
J. Schneiderman  
B. Wright