



## **APPENDIX 3**

---

Annotated Transcript of  
Hearing Held July 6, 2006

**THIS PAGE WAS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK**

## COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

### Minutes

A Public Hearing of the Suffolk County Council on Environmental Quality was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on July 6, 2006.

#### **MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Dr. Larry Swanson, Chairman  
Michael Kaufman, Vice-Chairman  
Dr. John Potente

#### **ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

Terrence Pearsall, Chief of Staff of the Suffolk County Legislature  
James Bagg, Chief Environmental Analyst/Department of Planning

#### **MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

#### **MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:**

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

**(The Public Hearing was called to order at 10:11 AM)**

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to call this public hearing together. This is the hearing on the Suffolk County Vector Control in Wetlands Management Long-term Plan and Environmental Impact Statement. Welcome to the second of the two public hearings on this topic. My name is Larry Swanson and I'm the Chairman of the Suffolk County CEQ. CEQ is the lead agency for preparing and reviewing this document. I'd like now for my colleagues to introduce themselves. We'll start here with Dr. Potente.

**DR. POTENTE:**

My name is Dr. Potente. I'm a member of the CEQ. I have been on the committee for one year and I have been on the subcommittee for the vector control long-term plan.

**MR. KAUFMAN:**

My name is Michael Kaufman. I'm Vice Chairman of the CEQ. I have been 12, 13 years on the CEQ, I'm not sure any longer. I've also participated in the subcommittee reviewing this plan.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Larry Swanson. I am the Chair and I guess -- I think I started on the CEQ in 1988. Jim.

**MR. BAGG:**

My name is James Bagg. I'm staff to the Council on Environmental Quality.

**MR. PEARSALL:**

Terrence Pearsall. I am the Chief of Staff to the Legislature and I'm representing Presiding Officer Bill Lindsay.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you. For the people that are coming in the door now, if you desire to speak please fill out one of these green cards so that we know that you want to speak. Several ground rules. We're here to listen to your concerns. We will not be answering questions about the plan, however. We won't be interacting with you in any way other than to perhaps to clarify some points that might not be clear in your statement. Your comments will become part of the public record and they will be addressed in the environment impact statement.

As you can see, we have a stenographer with us to take down your presentation. If you have a written statement, please leave it with the stenographer so that she can use it and it will also become part of the record. We will limit the time for each of the speakers to five minutes. And when you come forward, please identify yourself and the name of the organization that you represent, if you, in fact, represent an organization. So with that we will begin. First speaker is Bob McAlevy.

**MR. McALEVY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee to the study and I'm also a member of the Citizen Advisory Committee to the Peconic Estuary Study. And as I pointed out the last time, this summary document, which the County has pledged by Robert Gaffney to uphold, in essence says, although one can interpret it, in the estuary stop the spraying and stop the ditching. I'll point out that it was a negotiated document. The County people were involved as well as the EPA and the DEC, and it would have been stronger if the County people weren't involved in it.

In volume seven of seven of this document that you have all had, the draft environmental impact statement, I disagree with page 1293 statement methoprene poses no threat to human health

and little or no ecological impact. There is no basis for saying that. On page 1310, pregnant woman and fetuses were not addressed specifically in the analysis. That's page 1310 in this document. That's volume seven of seven.

At the beginning of the present study, there was a scoping document produced. I have a copy of it here but I'm not going to give it to you. I have referred to it in my December offering. And it says in here in essence that at parts per billion, one part per billion, the shellfish and finfish eggs and larvae are killed off by pesticide exposure. I'll just point that out.

This information, which was the scoping document of this program, was not referred to in this study. You might want to ask somebody why not. Why did they allow pesticide spraying in the estuary where there was some evidence you get five parts per million, which, according to this document, would kill off the next generation in that study in the estuary. Okay.

The rest of my comments, the rest of my comments deal with the volume three of the seven volumes that were produced in the GEIS. And I point out at first, and I have this written down and I am going to leave it with you, is that they ignore the scoping document comments about the lethality of the pesticides used.

There's also -- I know there is a man here from the Audubon Society. I'll refer you to figure 310 and it shows the bird populations over the last I'll say 40 years going like this, and the County tries to make an issue of the last little down. There has been much more -- much higher percent decreases in the past before there was any West Nile Virus. And, in fact, when they do the studies, the autopsies of the birds, in almost every case they contain pesticides, especially the raptors. And there is an implication that this last down in the birds was caused by West Nile Virus. Yes, they had West Nile Virus in them, but they also have pesticides. You might want to look into that one.

And on page 393 of the 904, this section acknowledges that children are particularly vulnerable to pesticide exposure because, and I'm quoting, "children eat and drink higher quantities for body size than adults," and quote, "biological development in children is rapid and makes them susceptible to chemical insult." That's -- I'm going to give you this. That's right from this report. But it omits -- this is not what they say, this is what I say now, but it omits any discussion of developing human embryos and fetuses being far more susceptible than children because of their far greater growth rate.

Further, there is no mention of the fact that pesticides to which pregnant woman are exposed are passed through the placenta. It was assumed by this program that there was no pass through from the mother's blood to the developing embryo, but I gave you the reference in March. Passed through the placenta into the developing babies.

So I conclude that section three and four of volume three fails in estimating the adverse affect of pesticide spraying on the next generation of County residents, ecology and estuarine finfish and shellfish and is therefor incomplete for not dealing with these issues. I'm going to give you this one.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Could you please summarize?

**MR. McALEVY:**

Yes. I'm summarizing that the study fails short in the impact of their spraying of pesticides on the next generation of Suffolk County residents and the wild productivity and the ecology. And I have some other documents that I'm going to leave here which tend to support what I'm saying. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you. Mr. Merryman.

**MR. MERRYMAN:**

Good morning and thank you for allowing me to present my remarks again before this Council. My name is Larry Merryman and I'm the Conservation Chair and the Past President of the Great South Bay Audubon Society. In this matter I also represent the Long Island Audubon Council, consisting of all seven Long Island Chapters comprising approximately 7,000 members. These chapters are the South Shore, Four Harbors, North Shore, Huntington, Eastern Long Island, North Fork and Great South Bay Audubon Societies. These chapters have unanimously approved their opposition to Suffolk County's Mosquito Control and Wetlands Management Long-term Plan for the following reasons.

Concerning that part of the plan that includes the Open Marsh Water Management, or OMWM aspect of digging ponds and creeks in the high marsh of our saltwater wetlands, we cannot accept this OMWM ponding procedure as there exists no scientific evidence or support that it restores wetlands and controls salt marsh mosquito populations.

On June 22nd I was given a tour of the two areas of the Worthheim National Wildlife Refuge that had been the subject of the experimental OMWM ponding. There was no significant amount of mosquitos present in the salt marsh that day. However, this may have been because it was a windy day. In addition, it was pointed out to me that some areas that we traversed were not subject to OMWM techniques, but were normal, non-treated high marsh areas and there was also no significant mosquitos present in these non-OMWM treated areas.

My point at this juncture is that all of the evidence of mosquito reduction presented appeared to be anecdotal, not scientific. In the opinion of the Long Island Audubon Council, the OMWM ponding procedures do not promote restoration, but further disturbance to the marsh.

One of the points made by the proponents of OMWM ponds is that the ponds encourage avian species diversity. However, in order to prevent waiting birds from feeding on the pond's killifish, these ponds are dug deeply enough to discourage use by waiting birds. The advocates of OMWM ponding also indicate that the spoil from the ponds that were recently dug has been used to fill the existing grid ditches that were created many years ago in a futile attempt to drain the marshes and reduce mosquito populations.

It was further indicated that by filling these old grid ditches, the total amount of high marsh taken by digging the ponds and creeks has been replaced. I doubt if that can be substantiated, as the new ponds, enlarged creeks and the connector channels to the ponds appear to be a substantial area.

We have been assured that before any OMWM work will be done in the Suffolk County wetlands a screening committee will undertake a review of the project and vote on its feasibility. However, the content of the screening committee appears to be heavily weighted toward governmental rather than conservationists participation. In addition, the screening committee will only have to pass on OMWM designs over 15 acres. This loophole can allow for many abuses.

I would also like to point out to the Council that Audubon New York, representing approximately 50,000 members, passed the following resolution. "Whereas, controversial, alternative methods of vector control that are under consideration in Suffolk County Vector Control Plan, such as open marsh management which advocates the digging of ponds and salt marshes, have not been proven effective. Resolved, that Audubon New York supports the exploration of alternative means of establishing disease vector control and response practices that are proven effective based on the best available science and that will not negatively affect habitat or vulnerable bird populations."

At a time of our heightened concern about the possibility of rising sea levels, high tides and

storm surges that could occur from anticipated hurricane activity, it seems foolhardy to be experimenting with and reducing our saltwater wetlands. This experimental project will dig up areas of salt marsh peat that have taken centuries to develop and therefore, the collective Audubon Societies of Long Island believe that the OMWM techniques proposed in the long-term plan are unproven at best and damaging at worst. Thank you for your time and patience.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you. Kasey Jacobs.

**MS. JACOBS:**

Hi. My name is Kasey Jacobs. I am representing Citizens Campaign for the Environment. My statement will be brief since we testified last week and will also be submitting our written comments by the end of the public comment period.

Our largest concern with the long-term plan is the continuing inability to properly distinguish between nuisance control and health base control. The two terms should not be considered interchangeable; it's very hazardous to do so. Spraying of adulticides should only be conducted for disease control and even then in a limited, targeted fashion.

Also, the thresholds for spraying adulticides are ambiguous. The plan states that the criteria for spray include approximately 25 mosquitos caught in the New Jersey light trap, approximately 100 in the CDC light trap, and five or more mosquito landings per minute. But the plan does not state if this refers to all mosquitos or mosquitos of concern and often uses vague language to state the criteria.

The risk assessment and the DGEIS cites the use of a caged fish study. This study appears to be adequate for larvicides, however, in regards to adulticides it's seriously lacking and shouldn't be considered when discussing and evaluating the potential impacts of adulticides on marsh ecology. Only one site, John's Neck, was used for the evaluation along with the control site and was confounded by low dissolved oxygen. This small sample does not hold up to rigorous scientific scrutiny and could not be used to support any specific conclusions. In addition, long-term lethal or sub-lethal effects cannot be detected over a short period of time, which was the case in this study since only four days were used.

Along the same lines, when discussing the risks involved with ditches and other marsh modifications, the 2005 SCERP research should be included since it used numerous Long Island marshes to analyze nutrient runoff, particularly nitrogen, and also fecal coliform for open ditches and closed ditches. It affirms, "Mosquito ditches contained high levels of nitrogen and fecal coliform bacteria. The draining of mosquito ditches in Flanders Bay likely accounts for the flux of 1,200 moles of nitrogen per day and thus represents approximately 25% percent of the nitrogen load to the southern portion of the bay and nearly 10% of the nitrogen load to the entire bay. Mosquitos ditches are a source of nitrogen and fecal coliform bacteria which can degrade water quality in estuaries such as Flanders Bay. Since the plugging of mosquito ditches can effectively eliminate ditch flow, such a practice seems warranted in ecosystems such as the western Peconic Estuary where the primary goal of the estuary's comprehensive management plan is to minimize nitrogen loads to this region."

The Open Marsh Water Management may have equivalent problems and others. Since it's experimental at this time, it's unclear and thus should not be used as marsh, quote unquote, restoration. Using OMWM techniques and the term restoration is inaccurate and misleading. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you. Are you going to leave your written statement?

**MS. JACOBS:**

No, we're submitting ours.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Joseph Barone.

**MR. BARONE:**

Good morning. I come here as a concerned citizen and as a member of the Smith Point Property Owners Association. And I would be in favor of spraying and I would be in favor of finding a middle ground, a middle way, a reasonable compromise. I'm also interested in protecting the environment, but as a human being I feel that I am a part of the environment and I would like to be protected from some of the dangers of not spraying.

For example, my contractor, who is working on my home, sent his child to Shirley Beach and was bitten by ticks. When they went to the hospital they were found to have Rocky Mountain Spotted Fever, a very rare occurrence. I tried to bring a doctor's note saying that this had occurred, but I was not able to do that in time. Then, of course, the famous West Nile Virus. We need to be protected from that.

And it was pointed out to me by a neighbor that many immigrants coming to this country bring with them contaminants in their blood, such as malaria, that when the local mosquitos bite these people, that they absorb within them the ability to transmit these -- this malaria and perhaps other diseases, and this is a consideration.

Furthermore, I think all homeowners deserve the right to have the peaceful enjoyment and healthful enjoyment of their own property, their own home, and with the presence of masses of mosquitos this becomes almost impossible.

And lastly, when the government -- if the government were not to spray and not to try to protect the people, the people would take measures of their own. They would spray the grounds themselves and they would do whatever they think is necessary to protect them. They would bring from their basements whatever chemicals they think are effective. In the past -- I don't think that all of the DDT that exists in this world is gone and I would bet that many homeowners use it. I would bet that there are chemicals such as \\_chloradrine\\_ , which was prevalent in the past, not allowed today, but I would bet that it used by individual homeowners trying to protect themselves. And \\_melathyon\\_ . Other restricted chemicals probably are going to be used by individuals.

So when or if the government is absent in this process, homeowners will take it into their own hands and therefore you will get the runoffs and you'll get the damage and dangers to the fish and to the birds and to the wildlife perhaps in excess of what you would have if the government were to take what I would recommend as the middle path. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you very much. Mary Lee.

**MS. LEE:**

Good morning. My name is Mary Lee and I live in Smith Point. I'm a member of the Smith Point Beach Property Owners Association along with being a Council member also.

My problem is mosquitos -- a lot of them. Last year we were in a drought. We had the Vector Unit in our yard. They come three times a week to pick up the mosquitos and count them to see how bad they are accumulating. Last year in the drought they collected 3,800 mosquitos within a week's time. It took Mr. \\_Katz\\_ , that collects the mosquitos, three weeks in order for them to come and spray our yard. We live by the Smith Point Beach Marina. They had to get permission from the County to get back there to spray because it's horrible.



And I have been there for 15 years and once in a while -- you can't go out there and watch the sunrise. You can't go out and watch the sunset. You're cooped up inside your home constantly. When you cut the grass you have to wear long sleeved shirts. My husband sometimes has to wear boots, high boots, because he gets bit through his pants to cut a 2,400 square foot piece of land.

I have asthma and I have COPD. I would take the spraying any time in having to spray my clothing because I feel as if it's more dangerous for me. When the vectors come and spray, when Suffolk County comes and sprays I can always shut my windows and reopen them after they start spraying. As far as I'm concerned, there is no damage to any of the wildlife that we have. We have deer, we have all different kinds of birds, rabbits, and there are more coming. It's not like -- because it's so beautiful back there. To see any damage or any -- any of them dying is not happening, and I am for it. And that's all I got to say.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you. Could you for the record state at what COPD is?

**MS. LEE:**

I'm so used to saying COPD. Construction of my lungs. It's -- I am so used to saying COPD.

**MR. KAUFMAN:**

Are you trying to say chronic obstructive pulmonary disease?

**MS. LEE:**

Thank you. Yes. I'm just so used to saying COPD. I'm sorry.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you. Dominick Licata.

**MR. LICATA:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Good morning.

**MR. LICATA:**

My name is Dominick Licata. I'm the Chairman of the Board for the Smith Point Beach Property Owners Association. I'm also the Chairman of the Board for the Smith Point Community Development Corporation. We are a lot of good things going down at Smith Point.

I do want to address something that Mary said with her 3,800 mosquitos. Mary, I have one of those traps in my backyard, too, and I bet you a dollar a mosquito that I have more than you.

The mission statement for the Property Owners of Smith Point reads as this. "Our mission is to empower each property owner through a shared decision making process with the knowledge and information necessary to plan a progressive quality life-style in our community. As the gateway to the Fire Island National Seashore, we strive to preserve and protect the aesthetic, environment and its inhabitants by participating in coastal planning and being a watchdog for this community. We will embrace quality recreation programs without compromising the quality of life and public safety."

Recently, and I think it was 2003, the Department of the Interior gave gateway communities more -- more power and input regarding anything that takes place on their Fire Island National Seashore or any other government recreation, federal recreation areas. The Property Owners at Smith Point were recently asked by the Department of Public Works, Charles Bartha and Leslie Mitchel, to adopt the highway from the bridge and we did such a successful job that we

have many real estates that are looking to hang us because of the illegal signs that they salt and pepper the parkway with along with the garage sale signs. Now the parkway looks absolutely beautiful and we adopted another mile of it. So we have got two miles of the highway going all the way up to Kate Browning's office and we do the best we can.

The biggest problem we have is not the human element, the trash that they leave. It's the mosquito. We have difficulty when it comes to cleaning that area. With the 50,000 visitors we have every year to the Fire Island National Seashore, it's quite often that many of us who live along the parkway carry extra bottles of all these chemicals that you pick up in the local drugstore. We see mothers with children and baby carriages hurrying, running, trying to get away from the marina area, going as far north as they possibly can. People on bicycles who are trying to manipulate through traffic who are slapping themselves constantly.

My daughter came and visited me last summer. She's a runner. She loves to jog, and she was looking forward to running over the bridge and going to the beach and running along the shore. My house is the first driveway off the bridge. She made it to the bridge and turned around and ran back as quick as she possibly could. Her legs were covered, covered with welts from mosquito bites.

I have a 30 foot \\_penion\\_ . We have issues with dredging with the County. It's been ongoing issues. The \\_Uncachunk\\_ Creek, which is a creek that is located just between John's Neck on the peninsula of Smith Point and the Carman's River. We had hoped that the dredging would give us some relief, but we don't see that happening any time soon.

Now, John's Neck we know is right across the \\_Uncachunk\\_ Creek. It parallels it. I cannot get from my house to my boat in the backyard without being inundated with mosquitos. I have to wear a sweat suit, a sweat suit that I would wear in the winter is what I wear to get from my house to my boat. And then when I'm out of the canal and far enough away, I'll strip down and feel much more comfortable, but I need that type of protection.

How much time do I have left? I want all my minutes.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

You've got about a minute and a half.

**MR. LICATA:**

I'm going to submit this mission statement from the Property Owners Association. In the back of it is an application for you to join us. It's only \$48 a year. It would help us tremendously.

To wrap it up, and I want to say one thing. I really appreciate the help that we get from Charlie Bartha's office and Leslie Mitchel and Dominick Ninivaggi. Apparently something is taking place, though. The response time when we have emergencies, such as mosquitos, the response time for what I call the super sized mosquitos who are looking for our super sized, super sized meal eating human beings that go to that beach -- the mosquitos know this. They are hungry. They are looking for those super sized human beings. The response time is poor. We need more help for vector control. We need more drivers. They have got to get out there when we need them, not three weeks later. I want to thank you very much and please join our association. We need your money.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you.

**MR. LICATA:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Ronald McKenna.

**MR. McKENNA:**

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. My name is Ronald McKenna. I'm Vice President of Fire Island Pines Property Owners Association. I'm in charge of the entire operation of Fire Island Pines. I'm also liaison to the County Vector Control in the County of Suffolk County.

In a survey conducted by the Property Owners Association two years ago, 95% of our property owners participated. Ninety-one percent were in favor of continuing the mosquito spraying here in the Pines by Suffolk County. Ninety percent was also agreeable to the performance of Vector Control.

I live there for -- lived on Fire Island for the past 50 years and I lived there when there was no mosquito spraying whatsoever, which was terrible. I also lived there when the only spray -- Vector Control only sprayed once month, which was also terrible. We now continue it on a basis of one spray per week, which we enjoy. We are satisfied with the performance of Vector Control. We are not satisfied with the happenings, what has happened over the past several years, especially the ditches.

There were three ditches built or dug in 1969, 36 years ago. We came around thinking that the Vector Control will clean them out, which they did every year up until this year. What has happened now with the National Seashore that the Vector Control has to submit to the National Seashore a survey which they have to find out in what's in that ditch, send specimens back of the water as well as what's -- as well as the measuring of the ditch. We are opposed to this, mainly for the factors this is the first year over the past 36 years those three ditches were not cleaned out and Vector Control has cleaned them out every year, even though we opposed it.

We also have a large population of HIV people living in the community. We want this continued -- the Vector Control to continue their performance as well as we would like some pressure put on the National Seashore to have those three ditches cleaned out. Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you. Kevin McAllister.

**MR. McALLISTER:**

Good morning, everyone. My name is Kevin McAllister. I'm with the Peconic Baykeeper. I want to talk to you about the wetlands issue again.

Last hearing I shared with you that we lost approximately 38% of our tidal wetlands in the South Shore Estuary since the 1930's, an additional 6.6% since the Wetlands Protection Act in 1974, mainly due to dredging and filling.

I have been speaking about the dredging, wetland ditching, since 2001, and I'm pleased to hear, and certainly with the report from SCERP, Professor \\_Gobler\\_ substantiating what I have been saying all along. These ditches act as conveyances, both for nitrogen levels as well as certainly fecal coliform bacteria. And that has, in fact, been substantiated through this independent study.

Now we are transforming from wetland ditching into ambitious OMWA plans under the guise of wetland restoration. OMWA comes in a lot of shapes and sizes. Many of the techniques are warranted on a case by case basis. But certainly going in and really transforming from digging ditches to digging holes is not the answer. We can't loose any more wetlands to dredging, diminishment of the retention time and thus conveyance. So whether it be a pond and \\_a \\_ sinuated\\_ channel, nevertheless it will certainly export. And again, with concern about flood attenuation. We need every inch of peat out there to protect our adjacent coastal areas. |

The next item on methoprene, and you've heard me speak to this as well. Obviously unlike the application of the adulticides and although we have documented that they are entering the surface waters or compounds associated with them, the intent of methoprene is to place this material in the water, sprayed directly by helicopter over salt marshes. And I shared with you, I guess, my discontent early in the process about what I felt was some select representations on methoprene as it relates to impacts in the environment. And one particular researcher, Dr. Michael \\_Horst\\_ , I felt was diminished or, you know, was not adequately represented and Dr. \\_Horst\\_ will be submitting comments to you on the product.

One particular concern, it's high affinity to organic matter, to particular matter or detritus for that matter. And that poses another pathway entering through the food chain from worm communities up through crabs and obviously into crustacea. And, again, I share with you and will repeat the manufacturer's labeling may cause long-term adverse impacts in the aquatic environmental.

So while we have an alternative product, BTI, and I know Vector Control will say that they need both products to effectively deal with mosquito breeding, really I think this material has to be removed from the pesticides that are being used. And certainly Westchester as well as New York City came to this recognition and have prohibited and greatly restricted it's use in and around estuarine waters.

The last item, and I want to expand on the comment I made, you know, the comment I made about the firewall, and I really do feel this EIS is building a firewall around current vector control practices. With that, you know, I shared with you the fact that the long-term plan was way out in front of the EIS. This wasn't even vetted with respect to the findings, whether or not the findings were, in fact, factual and supported. And yet we already had plans for OMWA and, you know, as matter of fact, here's the program.

I want to point out to you that, you know, there is inherent conflict with this EIS process and Vector Control for the sheer fact that the completion between nuisance control and disease prevention, that is tied into state funding. So Vector Control cannot acknowledge and justify nuisance control activities and spraying activities and receive state funding. So again, I strongly suggest to you there is inherent conflict in this process that needs to be scrutinized by this Council.

Within my mission and the organization's mission to protect and sustain our base, I mean, obviously I'm very focused on this issue, have been for a number of years because I view it as significant. And when you look at, again, all the elements of the plan, whether it be ditching, OMWA, the larviciding activities, the adulticiding activities, you know, that's significant impacts, potential impacts, to the aquatic environment. And with the number of insults that are affecting our waters today, I mean, again, we can't continue to turn a blind eye to this program. So I ask you to take a hard look, do your job, due diligence on review of this EIS and its long-term plan, and come to the right decision. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you. John Lund.

**MR. LUND:**

Good morning. My name is John Lund, you had that right. I am from Davis Park, Fire Island, representing that community. It is a community of about 284 houses on Fire Island, 154 homeowners owning, 170 houses living between Great River and the Hamlet of Brookhaven.

It's different from most of the other communities on Fire Island in that it is local. Homeowners are more local than perceived in many articles that you read about Fire Island. Renting, also, to local people, Sayville, Bayport, Medford, Patchogue, etcetera. It's not a June, July, August community. The ferries run between Marsh and December and we're trying to get them to run

longer. So it's a nine to ten month community, people are out there working on their homes, enjoying their second homes. It is close by to where we work and live for the rest of the year.

We are at the western end of the wilderness area on Fire Island which does not allow any fogging or aerial spraying. I don't think there is any place on Fire Island that is aerial sprayed unless the CDC confirms that West Nile is there and that is needed and then it still takes Vector and Suffolk County and everybody else to get involved.

We are fogging. We are sending small fire trucks or garden carts or whatever via boardwalks and fogging under the boardwalk. So when you see that Davis Park, Water Island, Fire Island Pines, Cherry Grove, whatever it was, was sprayed, it is not aerial spraying as we see along the south shore via helicopters. I want to make that very clear. So, where we are fogging it is very specific. It is usually near the walkways throughout the communities.

Currently we're fighting ticks as well as mosquitos to use our second homes. The instances of West Nile are usually found late in the year in September when it is determined that it is so cool at that point that mosquitos will probably be dying off naturally anyway and why bother aerial spraying. There are a number of cases of West Nile on Fire Island, have been reported there. The problem with Fire Island, if you have been there, the vegetation is about two feet high consisting of mainly poison ivy, dune grass, Virginia creeper, etcetera, so that any bird that did die and fall on the ground would not be discovered.

The communities still allow some aerial lines, telephone, electric, but the rest of Fire Island, all power lines, phone lines, whatever, have to be underground. So the natural perch for most of those infected large birds doesn't exist.

It seems as though we're trying to impose one set of standards on all of Suffolk County. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that Suffolk County is composed of the highlands on the north shore, the lower lands on the -- and we have been referred to as the low landers on the south shore and the bays and whatever. It's a very, very different place depending on where you are. And the North and South Forks are also different.

We derive a lot of revenue from tourism on Fire Island -- on all of Long Island, I'm sorry. The Suffolk County Legislature a couple of years ago completed a study pointing out how much the Atlantic beaches brought to the County in terms of revenue. People love the ocean. We're unique in that we face south so if you go to the beaches on the south shore you have the sun in your face all day from east to west. Whereas some of the other coastal areas you actually have to turn around, not watch the ocean, you have to look at the houses on the shore to enjoy the view out over the ocean.

I would say that we probably need a varied plan within Suffolk County to deal with the different areas. Obviously next to the estuaries we have to be extremely careful not to destroy the fish, the crabs, the clams, the whatever. But I think it's -- we need a varied approach. I think that Suffolk County Vector has done a great job on Fire Island, they have been responsive to problems. I noticed that within the draft EIS they were talking about mosquito magnets. Our community has --

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Could you please summarize?

**MR. LUND:**

Right. Our community is offering homeowners that buy mosquito magnets this year a \$50 rebate. So we are trying to do something within the community that is species specific, not harmful to anything else within the community.

**CHAIRMAN SWANSON:**

Thank you. I notice that there are several people that came in after we began. Is there anybody that desires to speak that hasn't had the opportunity? No more speakers? Okay.

I want to thank you all for coming. I can assure you that we will look very closely at your statements and consider them in our deliberations with the County on the development of this plan. And I thank you all for coming and participating in the process. Have a good morning.

**(THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED AT 10:56 AM)**  
**\\_ \\_ DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**