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ANGELA LICATA:
My name is Angela Licata. I am deputy commissioner of New York City's Department of Environmental Protection.

We're co-hosting this meeting tonight on our Jamaica Bay Watershed Protection Plan and I thank you very much for coming. We notice that it is a little light in the crowd tonight but we will enjoy this intimate setting, where we can discuss our issues freely and get your feedback.

The purpose of tonight's meeting is to give you an update of where we are with our Jamaica Bay Watershed Protection Plan, to share with you some of the goals and objectives that we've highlighted for ourselves and to really get your feedback on that.

I will just be brief with my introductory remarks. To my right is
John McLaughlin, who has been our project director for the DEP and there are a few folks here from DEP tonight, those who are helping out in the lobby and a few of my staff who are around, just to show you that everybody has been working really hard on this Jamaica Bay Plan.

I'm glad to announce tonight that we will have a time extension. I shouldn't say for certain but the City Council has introduced a bill, Local Law 71, that will allow us to take some additional time to prepare this Watershed Protection Plan so we, jointly with the Advisory Committee here tonight, we are hosting this meeting and we have all jointly agreed that it would be advisable to take some additional time to deal with these very complex issues.

I would also like to introduce Manny Kaufman, who most of you know, and Doug
Adamo, he is from the National Park Service. They will both make some statements tonight and so with no further comments from me, I will turn it over to John to do a brief presentation.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
Thank you for coming. I will just give you a quick summary of what we have been doing since we last met, in the last four months, and this is just an overview of the presentation.

We've done some outreach to the community, developing some goals and what plans to address based on the input that you gave us and what we already know and there are some issues that need attention. We've done some modeling which reflects if we did some BMP's in the Watershed. We note that due to the overall quality of the bay we did come up with some potential strategies that we're thinking about at the moment that
we can implement.

The next steps are of what we have done to date. We've had meetings with the advisory committee and the DEP and just to summarize, we are discussing, planning, and other activities -- the airport issue and its’ impact on the bay and some community outreach.

In outreach, I'll just summarize that we had two meetings, one was in January and one was in February of '06 and that as far as the local law and what it's intent is to do, as well as some priority problems in the bay. Sometimes there are solutions that you have given us at those two meetings. They also describe current protection restoration that's going on in the bay now and the Advisory Committee, their members’ rules and responsibilities in the plan and we've also asked you to get involved either through letters, e-mail, or phone
calls, to attend these meetings.

What we've done in the last couple of months is met with several City agencies one-on-one and this includes City Planning Parks, the DEC, and OEC. There was a larger meeting that was posted by OEC that had the other agencies also involved attend and it was to discuss their involvement in the Watershed and how we could work together to formulate some plan.

As far as we're thinking now in development plans, there are six goals that we are looking at. They include water quality, wetlands and buffers, improved fish and wildlife habitat, public use and enjoyment of the bay, sound land use and development, and education and outreach.

Goal 1. Water Quality:
This is to improve and maintain water
quality in the bay and a self-sustaining ecosystem and to improve recreational uses.

Goal 2. Wetland and Buffers: Protect and restore and create additional wetlands, which is just as important.

Goal 3. Improve fish and wildlife habitat:

Removal of invasive species, which include many indigenous population of vertebrates and invertebrate’s and many other non-plants, good plants.

Goal 4. To Improve Access to the bay and Public Recreational Activities:

We need to promote green behavior and sensible land using planning and development and clearly this picture shows an extra large urban airport; public outreach and education, it's to
foster local Watershed stewardship by
the bay and the importance of the bay,
logically and culturally for good
reason.

There was a couple of modeling efforts
that we are looking at. There are a
couple of parallel plans, there’s the
DEP Comprehensive Water Quality Plan and
long term water control plan. Each of
those has a modeling component that
we're looking at.

With respect to the Watershed Protection
Plan, it has its own set of models that
we have developed. Modeling efforts are
showing that some BMP's made by some
important stone water quality benefits
warrant further evaluations. Some of
those that show promise is porous
pavement, infiltration trenches, bio-
filtration swales and street tree
planting.
The one thing that is missing from the Watershed, in addition to water, are street trees, there is only about 21 percent. According to the Park's survey there is only 21 percent that has tree cover and we would like to maximize that.

Things that we're looking at are draft management strategies. First is the water quality. Again, it's looking at the comprehensive quality water plan and the long-term control plan. There are agencies that are incorporating those using appropriate and targeting BMP's in the Watershed. If the groundwater table is very high, infiltration is probably not a good idea. Some BMP's are better removed, so it's a targeted effort to determine which one is most effective and improve tributaries and improving storm water quality and reducing floatables in the system.
Wetlands and Buffers:
This is restoring and creating additional wetlands and it's very important to also put the associated health habitats with that. Creating ponds, freshwater ponds, and brackish wetland ponds, restoring submerging aquatic vegetation, and that's not something you do initially.

SAV, referring to very quiet, still waters, so that's something we envisioned a little later on, but it's an important piece of the bay, it's an important fact.

Implementing and monitoring and maintenance programs, long term, to make any changes that lead you a long way.

Fish and Wildlife:
This is mainly protecting existing habitats and trying to protect those that are being created someplace else;
restoring head waters of Jamaica Bay, shallow water and flat water habitats that will improve integrity of the Bay; dune habitats, coastal and woodland habitats.

Did anyone pass by the landfills today on the Belt Parkway? We planted our first tree, so we are on our way to putting back about 400 acres of another coastal woodland, which is a great start. Also, we're restoring extirpated plant species. It is critical to find the right plants and find the right habitat and put them back.

As I've mentioned before, increasing awareness of the value of the bay. If you went north on the Belt Parkway the bay becomes less and less known, because once you get that far out deep into the watershed, what happens in the watershed does affect the bay eventually and we're increasing access to the diverse
landscapes types throughout the watershed and the bay.

We would like to use on-site BMP's to control runoff, so whatever sites we develop on government property, to install some BMP on that site so it doesn't leave; encouraging green development and promoting sustainable development practices in private and public sectors; public outreach and education. If you drive anywhere outside New York City, you know in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed, or any other watershed, there are signs indicating that we are doing that. Certain regulations do apply, certain mind-sets apply, but it's important to raise that awareness and some of the material outside will help to promote that.

There are a lot of different groups that are working to protect the bay. We just need to coordinate those efforts a
little better, I think, and work well with them and work together, it's important.

Raising awareness in young children:
This could be through some educational changes in the school system and that's something we have been working at. It's just a mind-set of reducing damaging behavior, polluting damaging behavior, and also increasing the number of volunteers and events. That will help raise the awareness for the bay or about the bay.

Some next steps, as Angela Licata had mentioned, City Council did draft some legislation to amend Local Law 71. We've been looking to revising the findings from the preliminary modeling work that is done to date where we're continuing to meet with City agencies and discuss their role within the Watershed and how they can help be
involved with finding some of those management strategies that I mentioned. We're looking at all strategies, the quality of plans and find the most appropriate recommendations and apply it to Watershed.

We will hold additional meetings with you once we have a more formulating document that you can review and comments on and just provide additional input.

That's it. Thank you.

JOHN FAZIO:
We have some priority problems here. To me, and I have been working on this bay since all of my life, but officially I've been working on the bay since 1972.

There are rules within the park that allow people to walk on the beach but wouldn't let them in the originals
rules. With the help of Don Marrow, we have changed those rules to where you could float a boat and not go into the channels.

I have been working on this bay for a long time but there were other things that I had help with.

Now, I've been to a multitude of meetings, I know millions of dollars have been spent and I don't see results. I really don't see results. I see results on the closure of the landfill, they had plenty of money and they're using it, they're doing it and on that I see some results. On the rest of this bay I don't see results, I still see deterioration. I see one model after another defined and I never see results of the modeling. Millions of dollars have been spent there and I don't see millions of dollars being spent on an actual product.
Now, I see problems with the bay and you know the problems with the bay. DEP is throwing 320 million gallons of polychlorinated water into Jamaica Bay every day, 54,000 pounds of nutrients every day. That's detrimental to the bay. Can we correct that? Yes, we can correct it. They did it in Seaford. They put a pipeline to the ocean, I've been spouting this over and over, and this is not new to you, John. It may be new to some people here, but after they did that in Seaford, they opened up clamming again and it's not hurting the ocean because most of that water is treated and they could handle 54,000 pounds of nutrients, and they can handle chlorinated water. Jamaica Bay is having trouble handling it.

Do you want to know why the marshes are disappearing? That's a good reason. We can spend one million dollars and put
marshes back there but it's not going to
cure the problem. The problem is being
-- we’re killing the stuff instead of
growing the stuff. There's other
problems in the bay too that -- the
airport, there's floatables that still
come from Bergen Basin. After the storm
they open up the sewers. I see it, I
live on the water and when I see that
water change, I know what’s floating in
that water. When it's floating in the
water, that means they opened up the
sewers. I know what I'm talking about,
the sanitary napkins, the condoms, stuff
like that. That's not in our water.
That's from our sewers and that comes
every time you get a hard rain and the
bay can't handle it and it's full.

Now, if we had the pipeline out in the
ocean that could handle more water it
would go out to the ocean instead of
running out through Jamaica Bay. We
will never get Jamaica Bay to the effect
that I would like to see it, where you can plant and swim freely because every time we get a terrible rainstorm, even if we worked on it, we would be re-polluting it.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
There have been measures to reduce floatables considerably, such as building CSO tanks --

JOHN FAZIO:
I'm picking up greasy bottles that came from the sewer and putting them in my garbage.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
I'm not saying it does not happen, but that's not entirely due to --

JOHN FAZIO:
I'm saying that you're not doing a good enough job. They put big nets to catch the stuff. It's like a big bag that
goes under the water and holds the water. There was never any intent to implement that at Bergen Basin.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN: I know and again, that's where it goes to public outreach so --

JOHN FAZIO: We're the public and I have been speaking as the public for many years, John, and you know that. I mean, I'll be dead before the bay is better because I'm getting too old.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN: Oh, I hope not, John.

JOHN FAZIO: Here, here is another thing. We have a beautiful place, we have a meeting, there is a few people in this group. Is there a dozen people that does not belong to an organization that's being
paid to be here? In other words, is there a dozen people from the public? This guy's from the press, over here is from the DEP, over here is from DEP. How many people are here -- we should have this meeting closer to the water. You got places to put it in, you got Ryan Center, you got places closer.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
This is a Watershed Protection Plan, it's to go to the Watershed.

JOHN FAZIO:
Yeah, this is still part of the Watershed, I realize that --

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
The next meeting will perhaps will be at the Ryan Center. We'll alternate back and forth.

JOHN FAZIO:
Who is from here that knows about the
bay, that's involved with the bay?

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
Again, that's the outreach. That's just our point. You need to raise awareness that, you know, that what they do affects the bay. You just proved a point.

JOHN FAZIO:
Again, we'll go to the next thing, public access. I have been fighting for public access for this bay. I even had one agency, the Department of Buildings, say they would pay to have ramps built at Jamaica Bay, boat ramps. There's no boat ramps at Jamaica Bay. There's not one legal boat ramp at Jamaica Bay. There's the one boat ramp that's illegally used off the school. Gateway Park has beautiful ramps over there that they use for seaplanes, but they don't want boats in Jamaica Bay.
You're talking about Gateway Park, I like Gateway Park, but it's a national park in an urban setting and they don't want people in their park. You can say they want people all you want to, but they refuse to allow access for the people to go into Jamaica Bay.

You got Cross Bay Bridge, you got all that property and every time there's a commercial project, they give it to the commercial projects. They're building now -- they're using that land for the marshes. They built it for the bridges -- when they did the cement on the bridges. Department of Buildings was going to build a boat ramp there and maintain it with money for maintenance and the Parks Department turned it down. They don't want people in their bay, so if you're looking for usage --

**JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:**

It's not only --
JOHN FAZIO:
I'm looking for usage.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
Usage is not only boat ramps, its canoes, kayaks.

JOHN FAZIO:
You could take a canoe and carry it down there. You don't need a launching ramp there.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
You still need access to do that.

JOHN FAZIO:
There's a lot of people here that can't afford to have a boat. It's expensive, it's very expensive, but if they had a launching ramp -- the Port Authority lied to us. The Port Authority came to our community board and said we need that parking lot. We can give you
something for it and we can do something for you. Yeah, put a launching ramp there as part of the parking lot and you could even let the people pay to park there for the day and they said okay. They got their parking permit and they come back and said can you strike that from the record. That’s a fact, so these are the agencies that we are dealing with and the DEP has been no better in coming out and doing what they're supposed to do in the bay.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
John, we're trying --

JOHN FAZIO:
You've been trying to spend money -- look, John Mealey was my friend. He was commissioner of DEP and he still didn't do the right thing here for Jamaica Bay in my eyes. There should have been more access; they should have been more forceful --
JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
That's what we're doing now.

JOHN FAZIO:
John, you're not that because nobody
pressures anybody with -- all the City
is doing is giving more property to the
Parks Department who don't want people
in their bay. Now, you want outcry from
the public? Well, here I am, I'm
outcrying and --

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
I know, that's fine --

JOHN FAZIO:
I know that you're not always happy to
see me --

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
I'm always happy to see you, John.

JOHN FAZIO:
-- but I am on the bay for 70 years and
I know the bay inside and out and I know
that it has been screwed over and it's
come back and they're about to do it
again. I know they want to put fill in
the bay. The agencies got together and
they wanted to fill in our holes to give
us better water flow. You know what
they want to do? They want to save
money because they have to dredge the
toxic fill out of our ports and they
gotta find a place to do it because the
Feds' -- the federal powers won't let
them dump it out in the ocean, so the
State and the Port Authority and now the
engineers, they all got the same colors
on, they're all in bed together, and now
it's gonna be good for the bay, like
it's gonna make the floatables any
better by lessening the holes.

Give me a break, I was a dredge captain.
I was a tugboat captain that handled
dredge fill. I know what the hell I'm
talking about and I know my bay. There is not too much being done for the bay. Millions of dollars have been spent and not in the right direction. There's survey after survey after survey, and no accomplishment, not much accomplishment.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
I don't think you're giving enough credit for the work that is being done.

JOHN FAZIO:
There's billions of dollars being spent.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
It doesn't appear overnight.

ANGELA LICATA:
I appreciate your input, but I would like to move this along.

Just to respond to something that you said --
JOHN FAZIO:
They want the best thing to happen for this bay -- I know what I want for the bay. I want a pipeline out to the ocean to get rid of our excess fresh water that's highly chlorinated and highly nitrogenated and access overflows that the ocean could take and this bay can't.

ANGELA LICATA:
You just said so much, and we are listening. I just -- we're not agreeing with it --

JOHN FAZIO:
I have been saying this for years and all I hear is that it's gonna cost a lot of money and I says how much money and they didn't even spend any money to find out what it would cost.

ANGELA LICATA:
Let me just respond to some of what you said so far.
In order to determine how much money has been spent and what good it has done, those are details that are difficult to relate. Certainly off the cuff I can't even pretend to relate to all of the money that has been spent and to all the benefits that have been received. I'm not saying that we have arrived or that what we've done is sufficient work here, that's why we're continuing to study a lot of issues, but certainly we can provide you with a listing of all the projects. The trenches that we have seen, which are somewhat beneficial with respect to water quality is part of the survey every year and there's a lot of proof, with respect to water quality improvements, that have occurred. We certainly have additional problems and that's why we want to continue to assess them.

One of the ways that we're continuing to
assess solutions is, as you mentioned, is the long out goal. We don't think that we have arrived at this conclusion. At this point in time the long out goal will have certain benefits, that there are certainly some adverse effects, that by putting waste water into a pipe and sending it to the ocean could cause damage to New Jersey. I think there would be a lot of political hurdles associated with that.

JOHN FAZIO:
It's working fine in Seaford.

ANGELA LICATA:
It may be. It's certainly something that we're continuing to study and we will share that data with you, we're just not there yet.

JOHN FAZIO:
You haven't even gone into the idea of what it would cost for a project like
that. Nobody has spent $100,000 to find out what it would cost to dig a tunnel.

ANGELA LICATA:
We have, actually. We have. In fact, I just don't have those numbers, but we have researched the cost.

JOHN FAZIO:
I've been told -- John said that they were finally thinking about it, just thinking about it. I don't see any actual notation on it. I don't see an actual mention of it in a public forum.

ANGELA LICATA:
It's an alternative right now. It's subject to analysis --

JOHN FAZIO:
No, it's the answer.

ANGELA LICATA:
Well, that's certainly an opinion. I
have not formulated my own opinion and
while I appreciate that you're sharing
yours, at this point in time we need a
lot more analysis before we can get
behind something like that. Once again,
there are a lot of permits that would be
required, some State and Federal
agencies. There would be a lot of
intergovernmental --

**JOHN FAZIO:**
Again, you mentioned permits, some
State, Federal or whatever. When you
people want the permits to do the right
thing here, you'll get it. The Port
Authority has got permits to dump their
antifreeze in the bay and the DEC says
it's okay because it's in the
wintertime. Now that's baloney, because
whatever I put on the floor in the
wintertime, it's still there in the
springtime in my house, if I spill
antifreeze if I put it in my car.
You know our agencies are not giving us a fair shake here. Our agencies are spending money and giving us a lot of lip shit and, by the way, I'm not meaning to frighten anybody here but I'm giving up. I just told Pete that I've been giving up six nights a month for the last 35 years and I don't get paid for that, I don't get gas money for that. I get aggravation because I know what's good for our bay. I live on the bay and I lived from the bay. When we were poor we ate from the bay and I love the bay, otherwise I would not be here so when I speak, I speak with knowledge and I speak with longevity.

ANGELA LICATA:
I appreciate that your dedication is apparent and I don't want to debate you on these issues. I don't think this is the proper forum to do that, so why don't we let everybody have a turn and speak on other issues. I'm sorry that
you feel that we're not giving these
issues due consideration because, in
cfact, we are. I can attest to that.

We will provide you with a lot of data
associated with analyses that we're
undertaking. I think you see we're
giving these issues, all of them, very
serious consideration. If you need
contact information, we can give you
information that we feel is in, at least
a reasonable -- we cannot share
information that we don't feel that we
have reached a conclusion on. Again,
sir, I don't want to debate you.

JOHN FAZIO:
I'm not gonna debate you. I want more
projects for the bay that will repair
the bay, to have it come back to where
it was.

ANGELA LICATA:
We share the same goals. Please, let us
continue our meeting and --

JOHN FAZIO:
If you want to address the agenda that you put up on the board, I'm trying to do that. I'm not trying to argue with you. If you want to put better water quality in Jamaica Bay, I'll try to do that. You should be telling that damn airport, the runway that they put across a working channel, when they did that there was a buoy right there when they closed it off. I was on a dredge job then and --

ANGELA LICATA:
John, would you mind if we take this outside after the meeting is done and you and I can have a conversation to continue what you --

JOHN FAZIO:
No, this is the place to do it, right here.
ANGELA LICATA:
We need to continue with the meeting now.

JOHN FAZIO:
I'll sit with anybody, anytime. Thank you.

ANGELA LICATA:
We do need to move on. Thank you. We would like for the Advisory Committee to make a presentation as well and then we can move forward and we can take some of these issues, goals back on the board and you could speak directly on those goals. I just want to keep some framework moving forward so that we keep our meeting productive.

Doug, would you like to do that?

MR. ADAMO:
Most of you know me, I'm Doug Adamo and
I am on the Advisory Committee for the National Park Service. Today I'm representing the Jamaica Bay Watershed Protection Plan and I want to thank everyone for coming out, we really appreciate your input. I just have a very brief update on our recommendations.

The Advisory Committee plans to release a graph of Jamaica Bay Watershed recommendations by July 1st that they called for and this meeting also supports the time that we have set, post legislation, and our hopes to use the extra time to get the amendment and what it will provide, to see additional public feedback, and on the final reports, any public outreach it makes, which we have in September given the extra time that we expect to get from post legislation and that would eliminate having public meetings in July and August, when a lot of people take
The committee is deeply appreciative of all your comments that we have received so far and we look forward to releasing a draft and working to improve it in the coming months. Thank you.

ANGELA LICATA:
Does anybody have any questions for Doug specifically? No? Okay, then what I'm going to suggest is that we put on Goal 1 so that we can just focus on -- I think this covers everything that you'll want to be speaking about. Maybe not with DEC directly, but there does not seem to have a place in our plan at this point. I don't think that we're opposing them and I know you want to speak to them --

IDA SANOFF:
I think they're very much in the DEC's plan. They might not be in your plan,
but they are very much in the DEC's plan. I beg to differ and I think that we do need to discuss this.

ANGELA LICATA:
We should. I'm just suggesting that they're not part of our plan so I wanted to focus on that first tonight and then certainly we could talk a little bit more about that.

IDA SANOFF:
Well, don't you work in conjunction with DEC? I mean you're the Watershed Advisory Committee which means -- don't you need to be aware of what the other agencies are doing as well?

ANGELA LICATA:
Yes, we do need to be aware. So in focusing on Goal 1, which is to improve and maintain water quality in Jamaica Bay and you should be focusing on the strategies for doing so. For those of
you that haven't come to the previous
meetings, what this means when we say
that we're evaluating recommendations
from comprehensive water quality plan
and the long-term control plan, that's
what you hear some of the more seasoned
veterans that have been following some
of the DEP projects and programs talking
about tonight, what they're talking
about is that as far as the
comprehensive water quality plan, we are
focusing on what it would take to
achieve compliance within Jamaica Bay of
all of the water quality standards,
knowing that DEP has responsibility
stewardship for achieving water quality
standards within the bay, knowing that
New York City DEP runs wastewater
treatment plants whose effluent may find
its way into Jamaica Bay. There are four
wastewater treatment plants that are
discharging to the bay and those are
issues that are being studied under the
comprehensive water quality plan. In
October or so a draft plan will be submitted to DEC recommending and outlining certain strategies for achieving compliance with water quality standards. That's what's being discussed there.

The long-term control plan has to do with combined sewer overflow control. That would be water that doesn't find its way to our wastewater treatment plants and overflows or discharges during certain storm events. This is another plan to deal with the strategy for controlling and minimizing that sort of problem.

In a combined sewer system it is inevitable that water will not find its way to a treatment plant and the system is designed to overflow to relieve itself. We do take two times dry weather flow to the plants, so wet weather is treated but again, once
again, once the overflow, the quantity or volume of water that can't make its way to the treatment plant, it overflows at various discharge points into the bay. Those lead to problems for some of the tributary areas, so we are also looking and evaluating the recommendations being made under the long-term control plan and are working with the Advisory Committee to make some recommendations as we study some more non-engineering and non-structural techniques to deal with these types of issues. Those techniques mainly are what are loosely called best management practices.

What are the sort of things that we could do as citizens of the Watershed that would control flow before it overwhelmed these types of systems? Is there a way that we could control some of this flow at the source? That is one of the strategies that we have been
evaluating very closely and that will hopefully not be an effect of what we've proven to know in the tributaries that were discussed here tonight and improving salt water quality overall.

Therefore, with respect to Goal 1 related to water quality and some of its objectives, does anybody have any comments on that?

**MARGARET WAGNER:**

This is all very new to me but I've lived on Jamaica Bay and I agree with John. I did not see anything in the local newspaper. Where do you get the word out to the public?

**ANGELA LICATA:**

To have the meeting advertised?

**MARGARET WAGNER:**

Yes.
ANGELA LICATA:
I don't know where we advertised this meeting.

JULIE STEIN:
We did use about ten local papers. They are all weekly papers, so they get published once. We used everything from --

MARGARET WAGNER:
The big paper in our community is The Wave. Was it in The Wave?

JULIE STEIN:
I'd have to check on that. I think The Wave might have been one but we definitely looked to local papers and --

MARGARET WAGNER:
It's a very poor turnout.

ANGELA LICATA:
It's a very poor turnout. In fact,
we're a little surprised because in January and February when the weather was awful we had a tremendous turnout at this location.

MARGARET WAGNER:
I said to John earlier, and I agree with John, we are a little out of the area here.

ANGELA LICATA:
No, we had a meeting here once before. It was very well attended.

JOHN FAZIO:
But was it attended by people who lived around the Bay?

ANGELA LICATA:
Yes.

JULIE STEIN:
One reason for this venue is because it is centrally located for people and
public transit.

**ANGELA LICATA:**
Well, the next meeting we could have back down at the previous local. We did that at the National Park Service. Yes, we can certainly do that.

**MARGARET WAGNER:**
I think we owe that to the people in the public surrounding Jamaica Bay and I don't think --

**ANGELA LICATA:**
If you could suggest any place, because that's certainly our goal. We've come out here tonight, we make a presentation, we're very interested in sharing our information, we're very interested in hearing from the State Holders and we certainly don't want to waste anybody's time and, once again, we did use this venue once before and it was very well attended, it has really
great space so I thought we'd try it again tonight.

MARGARET WAGNER:
I just have one more question. This is going to the public, all these studies that you're doing and you're looking to have this turned into a law?

ANGELA LICATA:
What we need to do is to offer this as a plan for Jamaica Bay and what we would hope to have is that you folks working together with us, working together with the advisory committee, we will be issuing a draft plan and then we're hoping that you'll give recommendations and comments and that we will be able to together work and issue a final plan. That's all it will be. It will not have the effect of law, it will be a series of recommendations, it will be a series of analyses that have been brought to bear, to show and demonstrate issues
that we believe and conclusions that may have been scientifically demonstrated or some calculations and/or analyses, things of that nature, and then what we hope to do is to drive policy to something like this.

MARGARET WAGNER:
Just for the study, what is the mention of this local law, Law 71?

ANGELA LICATA:
Local Law 71 was a law that was a test that received counsel to require that New York City DEP prepare this plan. It requires the local law, and we also have it on the website and we have copies probably here tonight, Local Law 71 has many requirements. It requires that we look at policy issues, it requires that we try to figure out a way where if a project is being proposed anywhere within the bay and its tributary area that all of the key agencies and
stewards of the bay will be aware of that project. We'll be able to compare notes and sort of be able to weigh in on that proposal so we don't catch people by surprise, so that there's no synergy with respect to some of these issues and that there is no -- to avoid what is now maybe perhaps what is not always a comprehensive assessment.

MARGARET WAGNER:
So Local Law 71 is a law already?

ANGELA LICATA:
It's a law already. What is happening is that law is being proposed to be amended. There's been a bill introduced to allow us any additional used time to work on this plan. What we have been learning is that other plans of this type, there's Chesapeake Bay, those sorts of things will take years and it really is a very elaborate process and those plans tend to be much more in
detail and that the goals that are asserted, there are really plans for implementation along with that and take some time to develop.

MARGARET WAGNER:
So some of these goals we're looking to amend into the law?

ANGELA LICATA:
No. These are the goals that are coming out of the efforts. These are really the elements and the making of what is a watershed protection plan. These are the sorts of issues that need to be considered. First and foremost, we need to consider water quality as a goal. We need to improve water quality.

MARGARET WAGNER:
What is the connection between the plan and the local law, I'm still confused?

ANGELA LICATA:
The local law requires a plan, that's all. The local law requires that a plan be produced.

MARGARET WAGNER:
Because you're looking to have it amended? The local law is already written, it is a law?

ANGELA LICATA:
The local law requires that a plan be produced. What is proposed to be amended is the schedule for completing the plan, the schedule for completing the plan that is proposed at this point. Whereas the first law required one year, the proposed law legislation would allow two years limitation on the plan and that's really essentially the difference.

MARGARET WAGNER:
I'm still confused.
ANGELA LICATA:
I'm sorry. I don't know what else to say to clarify that. It's important that we have it signed so we really have a chance to study and develop orientation strategies.

GLORIA WITTELS:
What's the goal for the extension, the two months extension?

ANGELA LICATA:
In September we're planning to give another update on what we have been able to develop and the advisory committee will have its input to us on its goals and objectives. The advisory committee will work with these folks at State Holders and develop input.

GLORIA WITTELS:
When does the input that we're giving tonight get to the advisory committee to consider?
ANGELA LICATA:
Right now, it will be recorded.

IDA SANOFF:
My name is Ida Sanoff and I'm vice president of Natural Resources Protective Association, which is based in Staten Island and covers the five boroughs. NRPA is an environmental and civic and educational group that stretches from Cape May, New Jersey down to Montauk Point. Tonight I also represent the New York and New Jersey Bait Keeper.

You want to protect habitat, land marshes, we're behind you 1000 percent and we'll certainly lobby for that.

Regarding the panel, part of our major complaints is that there is no outside peer review or no outside scientists with the exception of Dr. Swanson, who
we feel has too many connections to the agencies and for the right other reasons not to be impartial in this. He is also not a life scientist, as I understand. One of his focuses has been on these areas and sedimentations regarding dissolved oxygen and the select areas of the bay, one of these of course is the a/k/a Borough Pits. John alluded to a nitrogen problem which also affects dissolved oxygen. We have repeatedly heard that these deeper areas of the bay have lower oxygen concentrations than other areas. One of the proposed solutions put forth by New York State and a recently spent $1.4 million is the study of improving dissolved oxygen by filling these deeper areas.

One of my comments is: How could you even consider filling these areas to improve dissolved oxygen without first addressing the nitrogen problem, which we know impacts dissolved oxygen?
ANGELA LICATA:
As I understand it, the D.O. problem in the tributaries does not have as its main cause nitrogen. The D.O. problem in the tributaries is separated and dealt with differently from the D.O. problem that occurs in grassy bays or in some of the other areas where those areas are more routinely affected by continuous nitrogen releases on a daily basis from the treatment plants.

Again, those connections associated with the low D.O., whether it has to do with the depth of sediments and all that, it's our best, very educated guesses or educated signs at our fingertips that those are related to the depth of the water.

IDA SANOFF:
Has there been outside peer review?
ANGELA LICATA:
Well, I would say --

IDA SANOFF:
Can we see the data? If there has indeed been independent outside peer review we would like to see the data.

ANGELA LICATA:
We're not hiding any data and I don't know that the review sheet, the conclusional review has reached that before we released that report to the DEC, but certainly you can see that.

IDA SANOFF:
Will it be independent peer reviews?

ANGELA LICATA:
I don't know that I can promise that because I don't know that we feel as though we don't have enough credentials behind us, rather we have a host of people and scientists.
I think what you should do, personally, is I think you should look at the data when it's released, I think you should look at the analyses that were done and that support that and that demonstrate those conclusions and then you should comment and let us know whether you think that there are problems --

**IDA SANOFF:**

We've already commented and we have already spoken to scientists with 45 years of experience and they tell us that NPS has 25 years of pertinent data on dissolved oxygen conditions in Jamaica Bay and that Grassy Bay is not as bad as it has been, so right away just looking at Grassy Bay we have a conflict and -- let's not sit here and discuss that.

Let me cut to the chase, because you have a lot to do and I have a lot to do.
The 600 pound gorilla sitting in the middle of the room is Dan Borowitz. They affect not just Jamaica Bay but they affect the entire coastline, Coney Island and Staten Island as well.

We've all seen the plan put to test in Jamaica Bay. If you fill those test pits and prove it to be successful, and they will prove that it is successful because they're judge, jury and executioner, and then they could fill every pit in Jamaica Bay and every pit in Staten Island, and every pit on Coney Island. We have been arguing this, you talk about public input, here's your public input: At the last Jamaica Bay task force meeting you tried to put a vote on the floor --

ANGELA LICATA:
I don't want to cut you off but I must cut you off for one reason. You're not talking to the right people on the right
issue. I don't want you to waste your time --

**IDA SANOFF:**
You're the assistant commissioner of the DEP and you're talking about this plan.

**ANGELA LICATA:**
I'm the deputy commissioner of the DEP and it doesn't contain any of those elements.

**IDA SANOFF:**
But DEP does and if you are overseeing the DEP, that is the part that is the lead agency, my issue is --

**ANGELA LICATA:**
I just don't want you to misdirect your time.

**IDA SANOFF:**
I don't want DEP to wiggle out of saying that they're not -- they are the lead
agency as far as mediating Jamaica Bay. DEC. states as put forth its plans to begin dumping into Jamaica Bay materials of questionable value that they refused in New Jersey because it was inappropriate.

**ANGELA LICATA:** I actually don't know that.

**IDA SANOFF:** It does. I spoke to the City and Clean Ocean Action and they refused the clay as part of remediation and the dredge materials management clearly states that clean material will be used as a test case, then toxic material will be used. If you really want to remediate Jamaica Bay, what was taken out of Jamaica Bay was clean sand. No one has proposed to put clean sand back and meanwhile New York State and New Jersey are stealing sand, the sand master comes out and
wants sand, he is stealing off of New Jersey, off of Coney Island, New York State is paying. If you need and want to remediate Jamaica Bay, restore the past. Take the sand from the sand master that he is taking from us and use it in Jamaica Bay.

ANGELA LICATA:
Should we move on to Goal 2, because I can't have this discussion with you. Please let me finish for the record.

For all you people, I am not here and not responsible for the dredge material management plan. I don't know anything about the dredge material management plan --

IDA SANOFF:
Will you sign off on it?

ANGELA LICATA:
I'm here to discuss the Watershed
Protection Plan and I appreciate the comments and I am taking them all in, but I'm just a casual observer on this, so I don't want to -- again, I want to come here, I want to discuss category 2, Restoration, because I want to find some common ground.

IDA SANOFF:
But you spoke about floatables and that was on the previous line. People do not know what storm drains are for. They think it is the sewer and we could discuss this a million times.

There was a young girl in Ericsson Beach who started to focus extensive experiments on this and was told that she could not do this. I see dog walkers sweep the poop in plastic bags and throw it in the storm drain and if you want to know what causes the elevated nitrogen problems, go out on the beach after a heavy rain and see all
these half filled poop bags all over the place. You have a lot of fecal material that is going into your storm drain that is completely bypassing the water treatment plants and this goes on in every borough in the City and I have yet to see, and I have put this in the comments too, and it would be very simple to fix the storm drains, let's have some public service announcements and we have seen nothing.

ANGELA LICATA:
We read you comments, we picked up on that and it's a very good suggestion.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
I don't think it mentioned placing waste baskets on the beach.

IDA SANOFF:
The agencies do not talk to each other. The New York City Parks Department proposes to meet on Labor Day. Beaches
are mobbed with people, there's tons of
garbage, including their dirty baby
diapers, which just wash right back in.
We've asked the City Parks Department
and I even spoke to the commissioner, I
said can't we keep garbage pails on the
beach for another couple of weeks and he
said no, because you need someone to
empty the pails and then you have to pay
the person, so this is our whole thing.
These agencies do not work together.

ANGELA LICATA:
We did take a long time, and my staff
will tell you, it is highlighted and
we've retained that and we're going to
see that to the end, to hopefully retain
that as part of the plan. I think it's
an excellent comment and hopefully
something can be done to implement that.

GLORIA WITTELS:
So you think we'll have garbage pails?
ANGELA LICATA:
I can't guarantee that, but I can guarantee that it will make its way into the plan.

IDA SANOFF:
By the way, and then I'm going to sit down, we have been battling this for over 30 years. That's how long this has been going on for.

Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak.

ANGELA LICATA:
Let's move on, but first does anyone have any comments on water quality?

Okay, Ida made another good point with respect to category 2, Restoring and Creating Additional Wetlands. Some of those sites which are adjacent to the bay, the opportunity to do what they're natural predisposed to do, which is to
filter storm waters, to filter basically rainwater as it's entering the bay and to provide a buffer for the bay and those might seem like simple concepts but they really do work and there are so many examples of that sort of thing and where we do our restoration sites, where we truly do in and take an area that we think is suitable to serve a higher purpose of natural resources protection, we will go in and we will remediate that area by, first and foremost, by providing a very clean, suitable substrate, so if you don't really get your planting medium right, you won't be able to grow the plant that you're seeking to and you will not create a habitat that you were looking to regenerate, which is something that John can speak on, certainly more than I can.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
If you saw the piece on Channel 4 last week, they indicated what the shoreline
was back in 1899. The ecosystem is dramatically altered by less than 100 years. If you look at the map there is a series of little streams and fingers that came down to the bay carrying sediments, carrying water. Those processes are no longer there, so to the extent that it's possible, we're trying to put some of those back, right on the shoreline and within the Watershed itself.

There's a couple of things that are missing, but one that stands out is water. It's to put back, to the greatest extent possible, the water. It's not going back to 1899 because we have too many people to pack up and move, we're a little limited in that, but we are looking at ways to maximize that, to put back, with regard to value of some of the functions that they serve.
JOHN FAZIO:
I'd like to comment on that. I think that in 1899 they didn't have ten million automobiles dropping grease and oil off the road and if you put back waterways directly to the bay, I believe you're giving a direct route for the floatable off the roads to go right back into the bay.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
You're right. That's a great suggestion but that's not going to get rid of ten million cars.

JOHN FAZIO:
What I'm saying is what worked in 1899 -- unless it was filtered -- in other words, the streams were filter through wooded areas.

ANGELA LICATA:
That's what you are doing -- when you re-create these kinds of channels or
introduce fresh water into this type of system, it would have to be done in such a way that its handled by either an area where the water can be detained and floatables detained. These things, these best management practices, for lack of a better term, these strategies for developing storm water or freshwater input into the bay we designed several of these types of systems that really could tell you about these in great detail in Staten Island. They're not only functional, they're really beautiful and we don't see as many opportunities of that sort of thing in Jamaica Bay but we have been looking really hard because it would certainly be in these situations.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:

In other words, a direct route to the buffer?

ANGELA LICATA:
There's no such thing as a direct route, there wouldn't be a direct route. There would have to be a channel that would have to find its way to a detention base.

**JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:**

I wasn't trying to say to go back to 1899 --

**JOHN FAZIO:**

John, I just wanted to clarify the statement. The statement is that in 1899 there wasn't all this grease and oil on the roads.

**JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:**

The point I was trying to make was that they had these buffers. It did rain in 1899 as well, they had big storms in 1899 as well. Those streams, those woodland buffers and grasslands intercepted that water before it got to the bay, that's the point I was trying
to make. The only point I was trying to make. I'm trying to say is to put back some of this, to the extent that we can do this given the conditions that we have. Looking at that, it does not work in all areas of the Watershed. The substrates, in some areas the groundwater is barely channeled and infiltration would probably not be a good idea in those areas.

Again, it takes time to evaluate those occasions. Some are better left being treated and certainly we're going to target and measure those areas that have those. It's a difficult process to look at. You have to evaluate what you have and then for the appropriate measure and place.

**ANGELA LICATA:**

In summary for Wetland and Buffers, there are primary reasons and objectives for doing this and one reason is that
you would get storm water out of the pipe system, you re-introduce it naturally into a freshwater system that then will interface it with the title system and therefore it enables you to re-introduce this material and therefore also providing habitat potential for the bay.

In this category we have a special place for looking at opportunities to do salt marsh restoration. We heard previously about how much salt marsh is being lost in Jamaica Bay, so we see that as one of the key elements of this Watershed Protection strategy, to be able to re-engineer, re-create salt marsh habitat.

**JOHN FAZIO:**

Now on the salt marsh, the darn airport, they finally stopped reconstructing the water surface at the bay's edge. You got -- we were growing marshes over there again up against the rocks. When
they finally got stopped from expanding and contracting, we are now growing marshes over there. The marshes were coming over there, where in other parts of the bay are the freshwater and that's Grassy Bay, that's where the marshes are supposed to do very well, so I could take you in my boat and show you all new growth in the last five years of marsh up against the airport, which is really phenomenal for me because at Bergen Basin they're dispersing terrible stuff out of there. It's a great picture to see that marsh growing back there and nobody is planting it, it is growing on its own.

ANGELA LICATA:

Category 3, Recognizing the unique qualities of Jamaica Bay: The uniqueness of it being an urban setting and providing a tremendous habitat for fish and wildlife, so certainly the Watershed Protection Plan would not be
complete without making every effort to retain what it is that we have, the quality that we have, preserving it for the future and make certain improvements where we're capable of doing that.

Public use and enjoyment: This is very important because, as John was suggesting earlier, it's very important that we learned that people are aware of these surroundings, people that are passionate for this resource. They will protect it, will be guardian, will come here, they will argue or debate, will certainly be a watchdog. They will be respectful of the bay as well as sticking up for it and being certain that people are doing the right thing to protect it, government agencies or whomever or whoever that entity might be. This is why we are pulling this out as a specific objective under this category and we also want to increase access to the landscape.
Once again, if we could bring more people to enjoy the resource, then we will build upon those senses of protection.

**ELLEN HYRTIG:**

My comment refers to the recreation. I think to move forward with the plan you need to make sure that everyone is aware that there could be recreational conflicts and there have been in the past and will be in the future and that they should be very carefully reviewed. In some areas it is appropriate for active recreation and in other areas are more suitable for passive recreation.

In fact, the National Park Service Recreational Management Plan of 1979, we recognized those different areas labeled for the purpose of wildlife refuge and we should not throw out anything from the old to come up with a new plan,
something old that was there before and
it really worked well to look to
preserve the bay. We should be very
aware of the different uses of
recreation, some active and some
passive.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
That includes the habitats in the bay.
They work with habitats so, right, to
look at very carefully as to what use,
what impact would bring back the
integrity of the bay, and we will look
at that very closely.

PETER GRANICKAS:
I'm Peter Granickas. I live in Howard
Beach. I'm on the bay, I have a boat and
I agree with what she just said. There
are parts of Jamaica Bay that you know,
you want to leave the plants alone, you
want to leave the animals alone, the
bird sanctuaries, I agree with that 100
percent. We literally have been
shortchanged throughout. We have absolutely — first of all, there's no boat ramps. If you wanna put a boat in the water you gotta go on the dead-end street, do something illegal most of the time, because there is no way to actually launch -- there's no public place to launch a boat.

The other thing is that because there is no access to the bay, people make their own access. What I'm talking about is when they built that first bridge, they cut through the gates and they go down there and they made their own beach. They have barbecues down there and everything and this is day after day after day in the summer. There is no public facilities there so they poop, they this, they that, they everything on the beach and when they're done, they leave everything on the beach. Nobody ever cleans that except the tide that comes in and a good storm will wash away
a lot of what they do into the water. It's hideous and part of the reason is that there is no place for these people to do these things, so they created their own place, but there is no oversight of it.

If you go on the first bridge, and I love it, you're allowed to fish out there. They give you somewhat access to fish. The people, they go up there with their fishing rods, they have garbage cans that are not emptied. Now Parks Department says they're not our garbage cans so we don't empty. Sanitation doesn't empty them because they're on the bridge, it's not theirs, there's no actual route for it. If there was something built, some kind of facility, and there are parking lots on either side of the bridge, we could park and do all these things. There are no facilities whatsoever.
Now, if they built something there, I don't know what, a restaurant, something where somebody had some kind of oversight, in other words, they'll be making a little money on the business but they had to keep this clean. In other words, it would be part of their contract or whatever with the City, to maintain a place for people to have their picnic area or even build a public park or something, I don't know. I'm just throwing this up here, but it is an absolute pigsty.

Under the bridge, the side of it, and I don't care what you say, it's a habitat and it's better this way because if you make it public there will be more people down there. Even if there is more people, people should have access to the water. Even if there's more people there would be less dirt. If people don't have to walk two miles to throw out their garbage, they'll maybe walk to
the garbage can and put their garbage in. If the garbage can -- I see garbage cans on the beach and they're like this here (indicating) with garbage and if they don't get emptied the wind blows it out.

ANGELA LICATA:
Where is this first bridge?

PETER GRANICKAS:
It's called the North Channel Bridge.

JOHN FAZIO:
Next to Gateway Park -- not Gateway Park, because we fought like hell to get the garbage cans on there and then DOT was told to pick it up. DOT doesn't pick it up and Gateway says it's in Gateway Park but they say they have no facility to pick it up. So Sanitation doesn't have a route there and it's a catch-22. The cans are there, it took four or five years or ten years to get
those garbage cans and now we have no
one to empty them.

PETER GRANICKAS:
If they had a real public access --
people set up tents down there, and you
know, cops aren't gonna go down there to
throw them out, the Parks Department
isn't gonna do it. In the summertime
it's like little shanty villages almost.
It's not right, it's definitely not
right.

This area here, I agreed with you 100
percent about having habitat or whatever
you wanna call it, growing grasslands or
something, but what I've learned is that
having some type of commercial interest
involved will keep a lot of this down,
which in actuality will improve the
total outlook of the bay. You need a
little bit of commercialism to pay
whoever -- there not gonna do it for
nothing. The Parks Department, you
know, I mean -- they'll set up a park or whatever and when they run out of money, they just run out of money and that's it.

Gateway -- let me tell you something, the Federal Government does not know how to run a park because they do absolutely nothing or less, and no offense, I think one of you over there is from Gateway. Sorry, I don't mean to hurt your feelings but --

**ANGELA LICATA:**
How could he not take offense to that?

**PETER GRANICKAS:**
I don't mean to offend you but it's really -- I live right up the block from the park and it’s not a very good neighbor, I'm sorry. You know -- as and far as it goes, we came here tonight, one of the biggest things, on top of all this is what these people do with the
Burrow Pits because we're scared, not because of what it will do for us but what you're gonna do to us. That's why everybody comes here 'cause we're scared about that. That's why I'm here for all this and for me, if you left everything alone and you promised never to build in the Burrow Pits, I'd be like that's fine, at least they're not gonna do that.

I'm 45 years old and I don't know how old John is, he's a lot older than me. If they fill these things in, it'll take 50 years for the pollutant -- I won't be able to eat the fish for the rest of my life.

That's all I have to say and I don't even know how you'll respond to that. I threw so many at you, but everybody -- there is actually eight people here for us. Everybody else is with you or the newspapers or whatever. There is
actually only eight of us and we are all here because we are concerned about half of what you're talking about. I know that you want to keep to your agenda and go about what you have to do and stuff but we keep bringing up this stuff because these are the things that we're here for.

ANGELA LICATA:
I don't want to diminish your concerns, but that's not what I'm here for. I'm not responsible for that and I'm not authorized to speak on behalf of that, I'm not educated about it. I hear you and I hear you very clearly on that.

That was a nice way into Sound Land Use and Development, Category 5: This would deal with these sorts of issues. It would deal with what is appropriate land use, what is appropriate development, not only surrounding the bay and access areas, but also up in the higher reaches
of the Watershed. Those are the sorts of things that we'll be dealing with and you have raised some concerns, very specific concerns about the bay and then there are others that see different visions. They may see high-rise development, they may see residential developments, other types of commercial and some may see some economic returns on certain property that they believe are appropriate for those uses.

We decided to come together and try to judge all those things and find what is best and appropriate and develop a process where people could comment on that before decisions are made.

JOHN FAZIO:
May I speak?

ANGELA LICATA:
Sure.
JOHN FAZIO:
The City of New York owns a lot of property. There's a point, they're hungry and trying to sell their land and they put more people on it, make it more crowded. Instead of selling some of that land, some of that land should be looked into as to putting settling pools and runoff for the streets into the water that could go back into the ground. In other words, that land may be more valuable to the environment than to the coffers of the City, to collect taxes on it and put it to agreed use.

I don't know if anybody is looking at that, I don't think so. They're looking at the dollar signs and how to get rid of all of this unproductive taxable land. The City of New York, and you are the City of New York, should be thinking of other ways to use the land.

PETER GRANICKAS:
I was just wondering that if in 1936 or '38 and the early '60s, a whole piece of land flooded and now I see that they're gonna be building houses on that. I think that just because we haven't had a real hurricane in like 30 years, it seems to me kind of silly to think that we're never gonna have one.

**ANGELA LICATA:**

I couldn't agree with you more; we found a common ground. I just did a presentation at the Regional Plan Association about a month or two ago that showed just that, where there were hurricanes historically and where they're likely to occur in the future and how we need to be cognizant of the kinds of potentially compatible land uses that we place there, build that land with an eye towards those risks.

**IDA SANOFF:**

John and I were at a meeting last night
in East New York where they said that
everything in Jamaica Bay and its
environment was under evacuation zone 1
and yet they're building like crazy
there. Here you have the City of New
York telling you how to protect yourself
in the event of a hurricane, in order to
evacuate 650,000 people in 48 hours and
they should be talking about preserving
the area. The City agencies -- one
agency does not cooperate with the
other. The agencies do not talk to each
other.

JOHN FAZIO:
I need to know about Jamaica Bay. The
DEP has to address the problem, they
have the problem of putting water where
it belongs and it don't belong in
Jamaica Bay. I'm a broken record, put
it in the damn pipe, treat it and send
it off into the ocean and the ocean can
handle it, the bay can't. If anything
comes out of any of these meetings and
that came out, that would be doing more
for Jamaica Bay than any twenty ideas
here. Don't screw up our bay by filling
in the holes with toxic waste.

Fifteen years ago they -- they need to
dredge the Harbor, that's our problem.
Fifteen years ago they poured all of
those and had toxic waste there and now
fifteen years later it's not so toxic?
Gimme a break.

That's exactly what I did for a living,
I was a tugboat captain. I'm still
licensed. I did dredging and I worked
with that slop and now the Federal
Government says put it in the ocean, but
the State can say that we put it in the
bay and that's where I'm worried. The
State and the Port Authority and their
engineers don't know what to do with
this expensive garbage, so Jamaica Bay
looks like a cheap solution and we're
gonna pay and I don't want it to happen.
It won't happen as long as I am out of jail from stopping it. That's exactly how I feel about it.

MARGARET WAGNER:
Is there anyone from City Planning or did they get to see this study?

ANGELA LICATA:
They will see the study, as was indicated by John earlier, they are certainly one of the agencies that we've reached out to very early on. We have had several meetings with them.

MARGARET WAGNER:
You'll coordinate with them?

ANGELA LICATA:
Right, so we'll continue to keep them posted of what kinds of issues that we're dealing with them.

Category 6 is Public Outreach. Now that
you've mentioned that maybe it should be there as well. It's an important time to highlight that it isn't just public outreach, it's outreach among the agencies, the corporations as well as the State and Federal government, so that's very important to the plan as well. I did not mention earlier that we need to sort of have more consistency among the proposals that have to do with the bay. Each person, with their individual expertise, whether it's somebody with water quality expertise or somebody with economic expertise, everybody has a chance to sort of weigh in on the proposal and to make a better strategy.

With respect to public education, we want to raise awareness through young people, try to develop some sort of education programs that make their way into the classrooms. We were thinking of a classroom idea where you would have
to photograph people interacting with the bay and they maybe could interact with some locals around the bay, people that have a rich history with the Bay and that could be shown through the classrooms and in the City so that those folks develop a stronger bond and appreciation of the environmental awareness. Again, it’s just modifying behaviors that have adverse effects on the bay.

JOHN FAZIO:
I also would like to say that local input from people like myself who have been around the bay most of our lives, when we go out crabbing at night, on a hot summer’s night and you can catch the hot water, that hot white, crispy water that I followed it all the way from Yellow Park back to Bergen Basin. In other words, because the channels are marked one way, that doesn't mean the water flows that way. I could tell you
where the water flows, 'cause I watched it, that milky garbage that's boiling in the daytime. It happens to be where most of the marshes are dying. I told DEC that they had fresh water running into Jamaica Bay and they said really, where. I told them Orchard Creek and they said what's Orchard Creek? Just because they buried it over that don't mean it stopped running. It's still running over there by the train station and they said they didn't know that. That's the DEC for you.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
We know that, John. We know that just because you pave over the creek doesn't mean the water stops running.

JOHN FAZIO:
They don't know, they just forgot.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
It still runs and the idea is to try and
bring back some of those surface
features again.

EDWARD O'HARE:
I am the Republican District leader.
On the educational thing, I've been to
Bermuda twice. Like you said, you get
educated from the people. I was there
twice and was taken back by the people,
the way they spoke about their island.
Everybody you talked to was very proud
of their water, their beaches.
Sometimes, like you said, for
educational, find out how they do it in
Bermuda because everybody talks about
it. It's very clean, they do this, they
do that.

If this committee got together, like I
agree with this gentleman, the
government wastes money. They just
throw it away, not your fault, but I see
Gateway sitting on the panel. I am from
Broad Channel. Why isn't the DEC
sitting here tonight on this panel, because they're the ones -- we can come out with Local 71 Law and I've worked on different laws, come through, people's input and this and that, when you get there they can turn around and knock it completely down. Floatables, perfect example. I've been hearing about floatables, floatables. I live across the street from Ellen. The biggest person for floatable is not DEP, its DEC. The floodwaters come in -- Broad Channel for example, I live here and I see the high tides come in, they don't let people put bulkheads in and all your floatables come out and into Jamaica Bay and I'm talking wood, I'm talking whatever is in the ground is what's floating around. How come they're not on this committee tonight? I see Gateway, very good neighbors.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
This is not the full advisory committee.
EDWARD O'HARE:
Is DEC in the room tonight? They're gonna be the ones that come in here -- I sat in on negotiating for the land in Broad Channel, a piece of land and DEC came into the City of New York, came into the City negotiations and said that this is what they want to see in the bill and the whole thing with the DEP tonight, why isn't DEP sitting in this room with us? Where we go with that? They have the power to say stop, they have the power with the wetlands to do whatever they want.

DOUG GREEK:
There is an answer for this. This is part of the greater effort and it's called the DEP Long Term Control Plan. We're taking a look at how to separate the sewers and control combined sewerage that oozes out through the regulators or whatever during storms. This is a
subset of that greater plan. We have to answer to that. We have to develop a plan by this fall that says this is where we're gonna go, this is what the benefits are.

JOHN FAZIO:
Right, they have to approve it and all this money they're spending on sewers at the end of my block -- this is a perfect example. The water runs down my block and down Shack Creek Road -- it's not so much during a regular high tide. The water is coming on the property and wiping stuff out. I could show you, not even during a storm, on a regular full moon.

I'm just letting you know. You asked for people's input, I'm giving input as an elected official, I'll tell you about money -- I mean you're doing a great job with what we're trying to do but we're not even putting a Band-Aid on it. It's
not none of your faults. I want to know what agencies should be involved in here and it's the DEC and I love the DEC but they have to be more involved saying how can we stop killing everything before that, because your storm sewers is approximately six inches. If you want, go over there during a full moon, we'll take a ride to look and see what's going on, just to let you all know. DEC should be super involved in how to make it stop.

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
We'll take that --

JOHN FAZIO:
You'll take it into consideration?

JOHN MCLAUGHLIN:
Yes. I'm not an engineer. We'll take that into consideration and I agree with that.
ANGELA LICATA:
I think that's it. Thank you all for coming.

(Time noted: 9:30 p.m.)
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