

November 20, 2011

Suffolk County Department of Health – Board of Review:

I am aware that Housing Help has requested a variance from the Suffolk County Department of Health Services (SCDHS) for their sewage treatment plant (STP) at Matinecock Court in Greenlawn, NY. I strongly oppose their request.

It is my understanding that the **minimum** setback requirement between the STP and the LIPA substation should be 150 feet and the **minimum** setback from the STP and other structures should be 200 feet. Housing Help is requesting a variance of 124.6 feet, making the setback from the LIPA substation only 25.4 feet. They have also requested a variance making the setback from Building #6 only 91.4 feet and Building #9 only 123.3 feet.

SCDHS has **minimum** setback and separation requirements for a reason. I'm sure this isn't something that someone guesses at when writing these regulations. I am sure that many factors are taken into consideration when these requirements are developed and that is why they should be strictly adhered to.

SCDHS-Board of Review, should in good conscience deny this variance request. In doing so, know that you did your job by enforcing the **minimum** setback requirements developed by your very organization to ensure a safe environment for the residents of Matinecock Court, the students and staff at Northport High School, Pulaski Road Elementary School, and Boces, as well as the residents in the neighboring area and our entire community.

I feel that a STP of this size and capacity with its proximity to the LIPA substation, LIRR, schools, and residential community should require setbacks that are actually greater than the minimum requirement. So much can happen here with or without the STP, but the STP adds additional risk with chemicals and toxins. Accidents aren't planned, but they are a reality. A malfunction at the STP, the LIPA substation, or the LIRR, etc, can be exacerbated by having the STP closer than the **minimum** setback. Who would be culpable? Would it be SCDHS for being negligent in granting such an outrageous request? By adhering to **at least the minimum** setback requirement, the STP would be isolated, creating a safety zone that will hopefully prevent unnecessary harm. This request is reasonable and prudent.

Lastly, SCDHS should be very concerned about a precedent being set if this variance is granted. Know that without doubt, further requests for the same concessions will come back to haunt you.

I implore you to enforce the **minimum** setback requirements to ensure this STP is as safe as possible for EVERYONE in our community.

Sincerely,