

Victor Triolo

From: Chris Triolo [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 30, 2010 3:31 PM
To: Victor Triolo; [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: Sewage Treatment Plant Proposal for Matinecock Court
 [REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Anderson, Gilbert <Gilbert.Anderson@suffolkcountyny.gov>
Date: Aug 30, 2010 4:25 PM
Subject: RE: Sewage Treatment Plant Proposal for Matinecock Court
To: Chris Triolo <[REDACTED]>
Cc: "Cooper, Jon" <Jon.Cooper@suffolkcountyny.gov>, "Wright, Ben" <wrightb@suffolkcountyny.gov>, "Donovan, John" <donovanj@suffolkcountyny.gov>, "Hilbert, Walter" <Walter.Hilbert@suffolkcountyny.gov>, "Dumas, Ed" <ed.dumas@suffolkcountyny.gov>, "Greco, Lenny" <lenny.greco@suffolkcountyny.gov>

Mr. Triolo :

Your July 29, 2010 email to Legislator Cooper has been forwarded to this office for review and comment. We have communicated before on this project and the points that you raise are best responded to by various agencies in both the County and the Town of Huntington. However, I will attempt to provide the detail requested as follows:

1. Storage of Hazardous Material: The Suffolk County Sewer Agency received an application from the developer and, based on meeting the Agency's requirements and the Town of Huntington environmental approvals, has granted formal approval for the construction of a wastewater treatment facility at a location on the site. The distance of the proposed facility to the schools and residential community is different than you note. It surpasses the clearance distances that are required by the Suffolk County Department of Health Services that has jurisdiction in that matter.

Both the Department of Public Works and Suffolk County Department of Health Services review the engineering report as well as the plans and specifications prior to the construction being initiated on the project. As this time, the engineering report is under review and the plans and specifications are not anticipated until early 2011. Assuming a normal sequence of approval, construction would be initiated in June 2011.

The design criteria for the facility is contained in those documents. We note that the potential use of sodium hydroxide for supplemental alkalinity control, which may be required to enhance the treatment process, is not anticipated to be used. However, there will be two 55 gallon drums that remain empty on site, enclosed within a containment area. They will have a pump that can be utilized if supplemental alkalinity is required. There are no other chemicals being utilized on the site, with the exception of possible housekeeping chemicals. These would be similar to those used by the nearby school and community.

9/30/2010

2. Emergency Planning: Suffolk County follows and maintains all industry and regulatory protocols and standards. Public health and safety are tantamount concerns we deal with on a daily basis. As noted previously with the exception of Sodium Hydroxide, which we do not expect to need, only housekeeping chemicals will be stored on site. As such, a hazardous material emergency response plan and/or team associated with this facility is unnecessary.

3. Groundwater Impacts: The impact on the groundwater quality as indicated above would be insignificant as compared to the onsite systems and their inadequately treated sewage. Consistently, the nitrogen in the effluent from the BESST process is less than 10 mg/l and approaches single digits, while the onsite systems are a minimum 4 times that concentration, if not greater.

You note Suffolk County's sole source aquifer. The discharge from the proposed system will eventually reach the Upper Glacial Aquifer. However, rather than moving vertically through the upper layers of groundwater to the lower Magothy Aquifer, which is used for drinking sources, the effluent will move horizontally continuing down gradient towards the outer limits of fresh water. Suffolk County has modeled and studied the groundwater for some time now. The Departments of Health Services, Public Works, and the Suffolk County Water Authority have reviewed the conditions with respect to drought or wet weather and determined that this will not cause an acceleration that would interfere with the disposal of the effluent to the Upper Glacial Aquifer.

The environmental impact statement that was prepared is sufficient to define the recharge situation. However, as the planning continues and develops, we will continue to review these matters.

4. STP - Variance Review: This matter was responded to in an email to you from Walter Hilbert, P.E., of the Suffolk County Department of Health Services, dated July 29, 2010. Any further questions on this matter should be directed to that office.

In conclusion, over 180 wastewater treatment plants exist in Suffolk County. They improve the environment and have not resulted in the conditions that have been your concern. The process that will remove pollutants and reduce nitrogen to the effluent limitations required by New York State and Suffolk County far exceeds the quality of the onsite systems.

We realize the sensitivity of this project within your community, as you have voiced in various communications. Your comments are unfounded and inaccurate. We suggest that you deal directly with other agencies such as the Town of Huntington that has jurisdiction in these matters. Our coordinated review will result in a facility that meets all regulations and we are confident that the issues that you raise will not put the residents of the community at risk for hazardous materials or impact the well field that serves your community.

Sincerely,

Gilbert A. Anderson, P.E.,

9/30/2010

Commissioner

Suffolk County Department of Public Works

335 Yaphank Avenue

Yaphank, NY 11980

phone 631-852-4011

fax 631-852-4165

gilbert.anderson@suffolkcountyny.gov

From: [redacted] On Behalf Of Chris Triolo

Sent: Thursday, July 01, 2010 11:19 AM

To: Cooper, Jon; Anderson, Gilbert

Cc: flanagan@senate.state.ny.us; marcelli@senate.state.ny.us; fetrone@town.huntington.ny.us; Mark Cuthbertson; sberland@town.huntington.ny.us; gjackson@town.huntington.ny.us; mmayoka@town.huntington.ny.us; planning@town.huntington.ny.us; Chris K; Mallgraf, Greg; [redacted]

Sandy Shannon; County Executive

Subject: Re: Sewage Treatment Plant Proposal for Matinecock Court

Dear Mr Cooper,

First, please confirm receipt of the below e-mail. Second, since the below e-mail was sent to you nearly a week ago, when should we expect an official response?

Thank you,

Chris Triolo

SMC Committee

www.stopmc.com

On Fri, Jun 25, 2010 at 8:07 AM, Chris Triolo <chris@gilstoneinc.com> wrote:

Suffolk County Legislator Jon Cooper
50 Gerard Street, Suite 100

Huntington, NY 11743

June 25, 2010

9/30/2010

Dear Mr. Cooper,

We are in receipt of your letter dated June 16, 2010, regarding the process of permitting for a Sewage Treatment Plant (STP), which is in the planning stages for Housing Help Inc.(HHI), at the proposed Matinecock Court affordable housing development in East Northport, NY.

We would like to take this opportunity to address some issues that we as a community, feel have not been given enough exposure, discussion and/or evaluation. These issues may potentially have a direct adverse effect on our community, and due to the STP's proximity, may potentially pose harm to thousands of children and educational staff in the two (2) adjacent schools[1].

While the letter of the law may have been satisfied with regards to notifying the public about the STP permitting process, in as much as this issue is very controversial, we believe that as our elected representative to the county, you might have done more to make the process as transparent and as informative as possible. It is our hope that you will consider the following pressing issues and give them your strictest evaluation possible.

Our issues include the following:

1. STORAGE OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS WITHIN THE STP:

- a. In your June 16, 2010 letter you stated: *"It does not use any outside chemicals to treat the wastewater."*
- b. In 2006, Susan Lagville of HHI, made a similar response contained within the public comments portion to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)[2] attached hereto as Attachment A. Her response to a question asked directly about hazardous chemicals being stored or used in the STP was that, *"no hazardous chemical will be shipped, handled, stored or used in the STP"*.

We would now direct your attention to pages 19-21 of the FEIS Part #4, prepared in 2004, and submitted to the Town of Huntington[3] (Attachment B). There you will see the description of Sodium Hydroxide 25% (also known as lye), including the quantities, storage, and usage and safety equipment for the maintenance personnel to be utilized at the STP.

Sodium Hydroxide 25%, according to its Material Data Safety Sheet[4] (Attachment C) is "Very hazardous in case of skin contact (corrosive, irritant), of eye contact (irritant), of ingestion. Hazardous in case of inhalation. Liquid or spray mist may produce tissue damage particularly on mucous membranes of eyes, mouth and respiratory tract. Skin contact may produce burns. Inhalation of the spray mist may produce severe irritation of respiratory tract, characterized by coughing, choking, or shortness of breath. Inflammation of the eye is characterized by redness, watering, and itching. Skin inflammation is characterized by itching, scaling, reddening, or, occasionally, blistering."

9/30/2010

It is our opinion, as well as the opinion of the hazardous material community that this constitutes a hazardous material, which will be in very close proximity to the two (2) aforementioned schools. Of course, no one has mentioned the fact that raw sewage, treated effluent and sludge are hazardous on their own. No one has discussed or illustrated the sludge being removed or any of the other day to day issues that the STP will bring.

We ask for your assistance with holding HHI accountable to their claims of “no hazardous substances” being present at the proposed STP. We feel as though HHI is ill-equipped to handle the requirements of such a large scale development especially the management of highly specialized structures (the STP). Specifically we would like to see and/or request the drafting of standard operating procedures for the STP, storage and handling procedures for treatment chemicals and a contingency plan for leaks, spills and major events. We would also like confirmation that no other buffering and/or sewage treatment chemicals will be used at the proposed facility.

2. EMERGENCY PLANNING:

- a. The Northport, East Northport, Greenlawn, and Kings Park Fire Departments do not have hazardous materials response teams. The Suffolk County Police Department (SCPD) has no local resources either. No hazardous materials handling plans or emergency response planning has been completed that we are aware of. Additionally, no Fire District or School District has been consulted to the potential hazard coming into their community.

We ask for your assistance with determining the status of such plans and notifications.

3. GROUNDWATER IMPACTS:

- a. The Suffolk County Water Authority (SCWA) has a well field, known as the Laurel Hill Road Well Field, which according to HHI's documents, lies fifteen hundred (1500') feet north of the proposed STP. As is most of HHI's documentation due to the longevity of the fight against this development, most of the reports are very old, some using data from twenty years ago or beyond. The biggest issue lies within the hydrology report (dated 2003 and authored by CDM), FEIS, Part 4, Appendix C[5] (Attachment D), which discusses the impact on the SCWA wells and the groundwater in the area of the STP. The modeling was run by CDM using 1994 pumping and recharge conditions for Suffolk County.

- b. The Suffolk County Multi-Jurisdictional Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan dated October 2008[6] (See Attachment E) details historical droughts on Long Island. the report states that in 2002, Long Island, Suffolk County in particular, showed a drought level lower than eight (8) other droughts on Long Island over nearly 100 years. It was considered to be the second worst level of drought in their measurements, and during this time New York State had the worst drought in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association's (NOAA) 108 year history of recording such incidents. This would be the same time that this study was performed. The question that we pose is how the fluctuation of the water table in drought conditions (i.e. maximum pump capacity) will affect the direction and speed of travel of the minimum thirty six thousand (36,000) gallons per day of treated sewage being discharged into the ground. It is not inconceivable that the local drinking water supply (currently pulled from the magothy aquifer[7]) could potentially be affected as the CDM model showed that the well field's contributing area included the southeast corner of the proposed development.

We ask for your assistance in requiring this modeling study to be re-conducted using current usage data and estimates by HHI that 37,500 gallons per day (gpd) of treated effluent will be discharged from the STP (previous model was based on 36,000 gpd).

4. STP – VARIANCE REVIEW

- a. As stated in Appendix G of the FEIS (Sewage Treatment Plant Engineering Report), pages 21-22 of the document (pages attached as attachment F), the Suffolk County Department of Health Services (SCDHS) has minimum separation and setback requirements for STP's. The current layout of this development does not meet those requirements of 150 feet between the STP and property lines, and 200 feet from structures or setbacks therefore requiring the SCDHS to issue a variance to allow the development of this structure in its current location and capacity. Mr. John Sohngen, SCDHS case manager, is currently reviewing the status of this request and as of the date of submittal of this letter, has not notified us of the variance hearing date.

We ask for your assistance with the SCDHS in regards to the hearing process for such variances. We feel as though a STP of this size and capacity should not receive such variances from the requirements. It is to be located near two (2) public schools, multiple residences (especially within the development), Long Island Railroad service lines, and a LIPA substation. In the event of an equipment failure or chemical spill this could cause catastrophic failure of services to our children (evacuation of the schools), service disruptions to the LIRR, and most importantly poses a health risk to those who live in the community.

The entire STP issue continues to be an issue that reminds us that much of HHI's research is based on old and potentially incorrect or hazardous information. We would argue that few Suffolk residents could use such old reference material to obtain building permits, but of course, most residents do not have the litigating successes of HHI. In any case, we feel that our representatives need to be vigilant to protect all of their residents.

The aforementioned references are of utmost interest to us, to the extent that this appears to be at the very least an omission and at worst a deception by HHI. Few issues in any major building plan are as important as the potential environmental damage that a project of this magnitude can inflict. It is the very essence of why environmental impact statements are so comprehensive. We can only imagine what else we have not been told about, what other missteps exist in these thousands of pages of documents, and what other not-discussed issues put this community at risk, while HHI is rubber stamped every step of the way.

We hope that we can count on you to give these matters strict examination in an effort to protect your constituency. We look forward to your response.

Thank you,

Chris Triolo

SMC Committee

9/30/2010

www.stopmc.com

- [1] Northport High School and Pulaski Road Elementary School.
- [2] http://town.huntington.ny.us/permit_pics/707.pdf (page 195 of the PDF).
- [3] http://town.huntington.ny.us/permit_pics/710.pdf (Pages 113-115 of the PDF).
- [4] http://www.sciencelab.com/xMSDS-Sodium_Hydroxide_25_-9926878.
- [5] http://town.huntington.ny.us/permit_pics/710.pdf (Page 127 of the PDF).
- [6] <http://www.co.suffolk.ny.us/RESPOND/> (Section 5.4.12).
- [7] The magothy aquifer is the 2nd deepest on Long Island and is overlain by the upper glacial.