

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, HIGHER EDUCATION & ENERGY COMMITTEE
LABOR, WORKFORCE & AFFORDABLE HOUSING COMMITTEE**

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A special joint meeting of the Economic Development, Higher Education & Energy Committee and Labor, Workforce & Affordable Housing Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on May 18, 2010 to discuss the matter of the Capital Budget.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Leg. Wayne R. Horsley, Chairman of the Economic Development, Higher Education & Energy Committee

Leg. Steven H. Stern, Vice Chair of the Economic Development, Higher Education & Energy Committee

Leg. Thomas Cilmi, member of the Economic Development, Higher Education & Energy Committee and member of the Labor, Workforce & Affordable Housing Committee

Leg. John M. Kennedy, Jr., Chairman of the Labor Workforce & Affordable Housing Committee

Leg. Kate M. Browning, Vice Chair of the Labor, Workforce & Affordable Housing Committee

Leg. DuWayne Gregory, member of the Labor, Workforce & Affordable Housing Committee

Leg. Vivian Viloria-Fisher, member of the Labor, Workforce & Affordable Housing Committee

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Leg. William J. Lindsay, Presiding Officer

Leg. Ricardo Montano, Ninth District

Gail Vizzini, Director of Budget Review Office

Lance Reinheimer, Assistant Director of Budget Review Office

Jill Moss, Budget Review Office

George Gatter, Suffolk Community College

John DeMayo, Suffolk Community College

Yves R. Michel, Commissioner of Economic Development & Workforce Housing

Jill Rosen-Nikoloff, Director of Affordable Housing

Carolyn Fahey, Department of Economic Development

Justin Littel, Aide to Leg. D'Amaro

Greg Moran, Aide to Leg. Nowick

Jason Richberg, Aide to Leg. Gregory

Robert T. Zielinski, AME

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:10 PM

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, HIGHER EDUCATION & ENERGY CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

All right, good afternoon everybody and welcome to the Capital Budget hearings for EEE and Labor and Workforce Housing Capital Budget Committee meeting.

May we all stand for the pledge.

SALUTATION

Please take a moment of silence for our armed forces who protect our freedom both at home and abroad.

MOMENT OF SILENCE OBSERVED

All right. Good afternoon everybody. Welcome everybody.

This is the Capital Budget Committee meeting for EEE. We'll do that first. Do we have any cards? Nothing. I would assume that the College would like to speak on this matter. Do you want to do that first? Sounds good. Yeah. George, come on up. George, welcome.

SLIDE SHOW PRESENTATION

MR. GATTA:

Thank you for the opportunity to address the joint committee on the 2011/13 Capital Program and the 2011 Capital Budget.

As always we begin by thanking the members of the Legislature for their very strong support of the College. With your support in the past year, we've grown to 25,000 students which is the highest enrollment in our history -- in our 50 year history. And we now have the largest undergraduate enrollment of all the SUNY institutions statewide.

If we look at next fall, applications currently are running approximately 30 percent above the same level last year at this time. And just by -- a little bit additional background this year our enrollment eventually settled at about a 10 percent increase, which again, was the largest single year increase in anyone's memory. It may have exceeded that back in the '70's when the College was growing exponentially but within the past 20 years year, it's not surpassed that. I think citizens county-wide are recognizing not only the quality of our educational offerings, but the great value that they offer.

We do have several concerns. I did touch on these at the public hearing out in Riverhead several weeks ago. The first concern's with what's been proposed for the Capital Budget for the College, the first is project 2159, which is the Learning Resource Center at the Grant Campus. This is a project that has 50 percent funding -- state funding in place.

Earlier this year the Legislature did appropriate \$1.6 million for the design and planning for that facility. Planning and design we've already convened a working group at the campus and we will

have engineers and architects on board this year so that by the beginning of 2012 the facility will be fully designed and will be ready to be bid and constructed.

The proposed Capital Budget has the construction delayed until 2013. So when we look at the need for that facility at that campus where enrollment has grown 47 percent in the past decade from just shy of 5,000 students to currently upwards of 9,000 students, we have -- we're in a facility that's approximately 50 percent of the size of the facility that SUNY standards provide.

I know that Kevin Peterman and some of the folks that work at the library at that campus had sent members of the Legislature a video clip on YouTube, which I thought was very effective. It showed the actual usage of the facility on just a regular weekday, nothing was staged. You could see the tremendous deficit of space, students looking for study corrals, individual study corrals. The fact there are only two group study rooms for a campus of 9,000 students speaks to the significant need that we have currently.

If we delay construction beginning to 2013, we probably would not be in that facility until either mid to late 2014, possibly the beginning of 2015. So the need is urgent; the need is now. We will be ready to begin construction in 2012. We would ask the Legislature to consider that request.

The second is the Health and Sports Facility at the Eastern campus, project 2120. We also have state funds in place, 50 percent funds equalling about \$8.87 million. This project has been eliminated in the proposed budget a number of times in the past and each year the Legislature has restored the project. There currently is no facility for sports and fitness at that campus. We currently do have a learning resource center under construction and we were happy that a number of members of the Legislature were able to join us for that groundbreaking about a month ago.

Currently the Capital Program/Capital Budget has a million dollars for design contained in 2011. And we would ask that that design funding be restored in 2011 and that construction funding be included in 2013. Without that we risk -- not only do we risk, we will lose the funding that we fought long and hard to get through the SUNY Capital Program. And that Capital Program that we're in now runs through 2013.

When you look at the facility, I mentioned there are no athletic facilities. But when you look at the growth of enrollment at the Eastern campus, in the past ten years enrollment there has grown 75 percent. If you look at BRO's report, and, again, we thank them for their very thorough review of each and every project, they cite these statistics and we believe going forward that this campus will continue to grow in terms of student body and service to the residents in the East End of our County.

The last major project that we want to bring to your attention is college-wide infrastructure. As members of the Legislature know, we're celebrating our 50th anniversary this year. And most of the structures, particularly on the Ammerman -- well, all three campuses were built in the '60's and '70's with the exception of some of the original hospital buildings at the Grant Campus, which we inherited from the Pilgrim Psychiatric Hospital, and the buildings that were originally on the Ammerman Campus which were part of the Suffolk Sanatorium. So we have very old structures, some of them being 40, 45 years of age. Critical systems within all of those structures are now aging out. They're past their useful life and there are constant problems with renovations. In addition to the mechanical systems we got -- walkways and lighting pose major safety issues.

So rather than coming with just anecdotal evidence, we do have our Capital Project Director with us today. And he and his staff participated along with all the other community colleges SUNY-wide in a capital facilities assessment and reinvestment study that took most of last year. A third party independent professional consultant working with SUNY and working with our staff centrally on the campuses looked in every nook and cranny of the 48 buildings that comprised our infrastructure; and also assessed the 4.4 million square feet of parking and roadways on all three campuses.

The recommendation when you wade through 100 pages of analysis comes down to the fact that we have -- the value -- the replacement value of that infrastructure is about \$830 million. And in order to maintain the integrity of the systems, the roofs, the soffits, the walkways, the lighting, the HVAC mechanical systems, the electrical systems, the water systems, you name it, it requires an investment of about \$10 million a year for each of the next ten years just in order not to fall any farther behind. And BRO's report, which we reviewed late yesterday, they attest to the fact that this funding is critical. It will cost us more in the long run if we continue to ignore the long term infrastructure needs of the campuses. And so we're very pleased that BRO has also recommended to the Legislature that funding in the amount of \$10.3 million a year in each of the next three years be included so that we can begin renovating structures.

There are a few pictures here. As you can see some of these potholes are beginning to be small ponds. We use the results not only of the capital assessment study, but we also did a paving study last summer and we begun to address some of the short term needs with some funding that we currently have in the current Capital Budget. But it doesn't go anywhere near to address, you know, some of these structures that need to be renovated.

LEG. MONTANO:

If I may, that last photo, was that the Grant Campus?

MR. GATTA:

Yes, it was. That's the Health and Fitness Facility. Actually by the end of today I'm advised that those major pothole repairs will be complete so that when we have 5,000 people on campus this Sunday for commencement, we won't have people hurting themselves and tires being damaged and axles being damaged as people jockey for parking spaces. So those temporary repairs are being made.

But when you look at the 4.4 million square feet of other paved surfaces, both interior roadways and, you know, multiple parking lots on each campus, they have outlived their useful life and need to be completely renovated. And we'd like to do that, begin that now and do that over the next three years.

On the left is a 45-year-old boiler (indicating) which needs replacement. You can see just interior -- excuse me -- exterior walls that define spaces within campus walkways that need to be renovated. They're safety hazards. We do patch these on a temporary basis, but when you get winters like we've just had, those patches just don't hold and you end up -- these facilities are 45, 50 years old and need to be repaired now.

Roofing, the building on the left (indicating) is the NFL building. This is a walkway on the Ammerman Campus that goes from Veterans Plaza to the Riverhead Science -- to the Riverhead Building. Soffits, retaining walls, and those are just a few of the multiple projects that need to be addressed.

We don't come before you today asking just the County for its support. We've been very active and aggressive. President McKay has made it a top priority for us to reach out and secure additional funding wherever it's available to address these issues.

Just to give you four examples, in 2004 we entered into a \$5 million contract with the New York Power Authority to help retrofit and renovate many of our electrical systems within the College. That funding, which was provided by NYPA is paid by the College -- paid off by the College long term through the energy savings that result from these energy improvements.

Again, this year about a month ago Dr. McKay signed an agreement with the New York Power Authority for an additional \$5.5 million, again, for additional electrical upgrades and replacing very energy inefficient equipment. Again, the savings that will result from replacing these very energy intensive and energy inefficient systems will be used to pay back NYPA long term. So there is no net

cost to the College, but it's a way that we can leverage outside funding without coming to the County or the State for direct funding.

The last two are examples of federal stimulus funds. The first \$675,000 that is used -- that is being used to retrofit very inefficient water apparatus throughout the College. Many of our restrooms have very old and very water wasteful receptacles in them. We're also using part of that money to upgrade the electrical system at our sewage treatment plant at the Ammermam Campus. So that's both energy and water efficiency measures.

And the last 430,000 which we've just received from the federal government, again, stimulus funds that's being used to replace five boilers in different buildings at the Ammerman Campus that will generate approximately \$400,000 a year in energy savings.

So those are just a few of the ways that, you know, we've attempted to address short term our needs. We can't be in a position like we've been over the past few years where we get into the middle of the summer and a major chiller system fails and then we're forced to put that facility out of service for a short period of time; or worse if we can't put it out of service, the students and the faculty that are in that facility are not in one that's conducive to a good teaching and learning environment while we make emergency repairs, which always end up costing us more. So that's why we're asking that this funding for infrastructure be advanced to allow us to make those changes.

I already touched on this. The overall replacement value of all of our infrastructure college-wide, all our buildings and hard scape is about 130 million. We're proposing just over one percent a year be reinvested in those facilities.

So to recap we're really talking about three major projects. We're asking to advance the construction of the Learning Resource Center from 2013 to 2012. We will be ready to construct the facility at that time. Asking you to restore the Health and Fitness Facility at the Eastern Campus to safeguard our state funds. And finally asking you to advance and fund infrastructure improvements.

That concludes the formal presentation. We are available to answer any specific questions you might have. And if I can't, we do have some of our technical staff with us that can.

So I thank you for your attention and thank you for your continued support of the College and our students.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, George. And I thought it was a good presentation.

Gail, maybe the best way to start this conversation is to see where the differences are from what the College, their budget and their Capital Budget was presented to the Executive and the Executive either added, deleted or whatever it may be, can you give us what the differences were after it went through the Executive's shop?

MS. VIZZINI:

Consistent with George's comments, the major differences are the gym at the Eastern Campus is removed as compared to adopted last year. The County Executive has included the infrastructure investment project, but in subsequent years. There's \$7.2 million in subsequent years. We actually concur with the College in that there is a significant investment there. And after SUNY established this quantitative methodology to rate the priority of the projects, we believe that the Legislature should consider investing in a preservation of the infrastructure. So there's that.

The Learning Resource Center at Grant we didn't make specific recommendations, although I can see the College's point where they want the planning money advanced. Construction money? Yeah, the construction money.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay, so basically other than the Grant Resource Lab, the difference in that -- whether it be reconstruction or design, but you're in agreement, then, with what the college has presented versus what came to us through the Executive's Office? In other words, I don't think there's any changes that you would make from what the College presented from what we received from the Executive?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Right. I would say we do agree in concept with the major -- those three major projects. We didn't recommend advancing the Learning Resource Center to 2012 because the money for planning was just appropriated in 2010. We feel that we can evaluate that project this time next year. And if progress has been made and they are ready to do construction in 2012, you can put the money in the 2012 Capital Program. Last year the construction funds were in subsequent years so the logical normal progression is it came into 2013. The College is a little bit more anxious to accelerate the construction. And if the planning goes as the College envisions it this time next year, they probably will make a good case to advance it to 2012. But as far as this point, if the money remains in 2013, it really doesn't hold up the project at this point in time in our opinion.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And the gymnasium you felt that that was appropriately earmarked by the College?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, the College made it known to you that that was deleted from the Capital Program.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yep. Yep.

MR. REINHEIMER:

And it was the Legislature's initiative to put that back in last year.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Right. Okay. Are there any questions from the Legislature? Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

George, with respect to the infrastructure money, how are the repairs managed? In other words, is that done through a bidding process through the College? Who signs off on who does the work? Is it in-house, do you contract out and how is -- just briefly how is that done?

MR. GATTA:

When it comes to small jobs, which we handle on almost a weekly basis at the College, we handle those and they're not included in the Capital Program. And we may use in-house staff mostly for that. But when it comes to things like repaving, and even the repaving for this weekend at the Grant Campus, which is critical, in that case we were able to use the County's bid list and use contractors that have already bid on that type of work. So where we can take advantage of savings through existing State or County contracts, we do that.

LEG. MONTANO:

Who makes the decision?

MR. GATTA:

Well, we evaluate the contracts that are out there. And then our internal staff will make a recommendation to administration. And based on their evaluation, we would proceed.

LEG. MONTANO:

So you deal with the companies directly; you don't -- you use the same list as, for instance, County work but you handle that through your own --

MR. GATTA:

Yes, we do.

LEG. MONTANO:

-- in-house department?

MR. GATTA:

Yes, we do. But I can tell you that based on the experience of the Department of Public Works, from time to time we do consult with DPW and their staff to find out, you know, which particular system or method has proven to be most effective. We've recently done that when it comes to -- when it comes to repaving.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. Now I do know that at the State level, there was an Executive order, I believe, that required an increase in minority and women owned businesses having access to state contracts. And if I recall correctly at the last meeting I had up in Albany, the Governor was saying that he had increased minority participation in contracts up by 24 percent. Is there a particular program that -- do you follow those state or are you mandated to follow those state recommendations? Are there any set asides? How does that work with respect to minority and women owned businesses getting contracts for repairs and infrastructure improvements at the College or does it not exist?

MR. GATTA:

I would have to defer to the folks in our capital facilities, which are here today.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

MR. GATTA:

They probably could respond to that.

LEG. MONTANO:

Could they respond? And do you keep figures or any statistics on what percentage of the work that's out there would go to or goes to minority and women owned firms?

MR. DeMAYO:

Good afternoon. My name is John DeMayo. I'm with the Capital Projects Group at the College. In so far as most of our Capital Program projects, we follow whatever the County MB/WB stipulations are and we make sure that should those change through any initiative, that that's reflected in any of our public bid documents. So it would follow if the money is coming through the Capital Program, whatever the County rules and regulations are regarding minority participation. As another example one of the --

LEG. MONTANO:

So you don't use the state guidelines? I would imagine that they are different?

MR. DeMAYO:

They are different.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

MR. DeMAYO:

The one area where we are using the state guidelines is with our Green Innovation Grant.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay.

MR. DeMAYO:

As that was federal stimulus money, we are following those state guidelines that you just referenced because the funding was being administered through a state organization.

LEG. MONTANO:

With respect to the minority and women in business guidelines in the County, could you just briefly tell me what, if any, they are and what they encompass and how they are different from the state? And if it's going to be a long answer, maybe we can do that in private.

MR. DeMAYO:

Well, I can tell what you I know because certainly it's one aspect of the various checks and balances we have to go through in reviewing a bid for any college work through the Capital Program. But in the past there is a MB/WB utilization plan that must be met that the County has drafted. We simply use that document in all its stipulations. We use the same form that is used by the County. All contractors must fill out the form and show, I believe, their due diligence to engage minority business organizations.

In so far as the percentages, the specific percentages of goals or thresholds, that's an information I have. We usually take our lead, again, from whatever the County has been following. But in every project that we bid in the past ten years since I've been with the College, that form is required. If they do not fill it out, their bid is disqualified.

LEG. MONTANO:

Do you know -- do you keep figures on what percentage of the work here, we're talking about \$10 million a year, do you keep figures on what percentage of the work would go to either women or minority owned businesses or do not keep them?

MR. DeMAYO:

We have all the records. So any bid documents that we receive we keep. So we would -- in order to do an evaluation like that, we would go back to every project that was bid and see what the numbers were.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right. But you don't have -- that's what I'm asking. You don't have a specific category that if I asked you point blank now, as I guess I just did, that you could say 10 percent of the work has gone to minority and women owned businesses throughout the College? Am I accurate on that?

MR. DeMAYO:

You're accurate.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. Thank you. I'd like to follow up with you another time. My aide will be in contact if that's all right with, George, just to get some more information on that.

MR. GATTA:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Along those lines, minority and women owned businesses as you understand them and as you work with them according to the guidelines, are those companies that are certified as minority or women's owned by Suffolk County or do you consider those companies that might receive certification either at the state level or through some other certifying organizations to qualify pursuant to our guidelines?

MR. DeMAYO:

We would certainly consider both, county certification and state certification.

LEG. STERN:

Not just Suffolk certification?

MR. DeMAYO:

Correct. So far as the requirements, again, that's not my specific area, but in so far as what we would like at, and the best example I can use would be the federal stimulus money because those are very specific guidelines; where as the recipient of funding, we were being charged to provide all that information to contractors. When we bid the job, we reached out to both the County list of certified MB's and WB's and the state list. So we made a very significant effort to ensure that they were all communicated with directly during the bidding process. And that was in both the area of the plumbing and electrical.

LEG. STERN:

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Really to either you, George, to to Gail, is this the most ambitious college construction program we've seen?

MR. GATTA:

With the exception of the tremendous activity that went on in the late 1960's and early 1970's, when you look at the current Learning Resource Center at the Eastern Campus that's under construction, the design of the new Science Building at the Ammerman Campus which is ongoing right now, and then the proposal for the Learning Resource Center shortly thereafter at the Grant Campus, and the Health and Sports Facility out east, combined with the need to renovate that growth spurt that occurred in the '60's and '70's, I think that's a fair statement.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And, you know, it's not that I disagree with it. I can certainly see the need for every one of these projects, but it looks like it's over \$100 million in construction over the next couple of years. And it's something that, I think, that we'll have to talk about here. And, again, I don't necessarily disagree with the ambitious program because, if anything, we're probably borrowing money now at the cheapest point that we ever have. And the need to stimulate the economy, especially in the construction industry, is certainly very apparent on Long Island, which usually forecast a sharper bidding practice, lower numbers when you put things out to bid so -- but it is ambitious.

MR. GATTA:

Well, if could just make a comment, I think it's ambitious for a couple of reasons. First, we're playing catchup. We haven't had a library at our eastern campus or we haven't had a full fledged or a complete library of the adequate space of the library, I should say, at the Grant Campus since its inception. In terms of renovation, I think that speaks for itself. The facilities are aged out so it's a combination of meeting the needs of the current student body. And when you look at the

tremendous growth, the tremendous number of County residents that want to be at Suffolk County Community College and need to be at Suffolk County Community College, all of that argues in favor of providing the facilities that we need and, hence, yes, it is an ambitious program, but it's one that's an investment in the citizens of this County.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:
Legislator Viloría-Fisher.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. George, thanks for being here. I have a question about the NYPA grant. I had a conversation with President McKay about that. Now it was my understanding that that's a grant but -- so it's not a financing so we don't have to pay that back.

MR. GATTA:

Well, the two projects that I referred to in the presentation were not grants. Those two are financings that NYPA finances.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

I see.

MR. GATTA:

And they fund the upgrade of the equipment that needs to be upgraded.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Okay.

MR. GATTA:

The College pays them back out of the energy savings that result from those energy efficiencies and the lower energy costs. What President McKay may have mentioned to you is that we recently had some preliminary discussions with NYPA and they do have an interest in exploring how they could fund some green energy initiatives. And we're looking to do that at the Grant Campus so that may be what you discussed.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

That may be where the confusion was, yeah.

MR. GATTA:

I don't know. But the other really has no net -- there's no net cost to the College because of the energy savings that result. And, again, we just take pressure off the County Capital Program and the State Capital Program by using that finance mechanism.

And just one last point I'd like to mention, in terms of the overall project, while it is aggressive, I think it's important to note that after years and years and years we were able to have all of these projects funded by the state at 50 percent. So that is something that we don't want to lose. We don't want to lose that funding that has taken us so long to secure.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

And, George, in those infrastructure projects that you talked about, maintenance updating, now you mentioned chillers and other HVAC equipment. Not all of those are covered by the NYPA financing; some of them are just updating our boilers and our different power plants.

MR. GATTA:

That's correct.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

And those would actually also result in savings because you would be upgrading them with more efficient and modern equipment.

MR. GATTA:

That's true, yes.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

So although it's a large outlay, it really will reduce some of the expenses in energy costs.

MR. GATTA:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

George, with respect to these projects, they're contingent upon the state, because they're in the State Capital Budget projection which is a five year plan I understand?

MR. GATTA:

That's correct.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. And if we don't -- if for some reason based on the state economies, that is their plan is modified, and some of these projects are removed, then you would not expect the County to fund these 100 percent; am I accurate? Or would you be asking us to fund these 100 percent?

MR. GATTA:

We have not done that in the past. And we would work very hard, and we would hope you would keep them in the program so we would never have to ask that question. The partnership has always been Capital Projects that we work hard to secure the state funding; and once we have that then we get into the capital -- County Capital Program. Actually it works just the opposite. Without the County's commitment to a project in the first instance --

LEG. MONTANO:

We go first.

MR. GATTA:

-- we can't secure state funding. But then if the County were to pull back its commitment, we would lose state funding. So it's our goal to make sure that that 50/50 partnership between State and County continues with respect to capital facilities.

LEG. MONTANO:

Do you have any inkling or any indication based on where the state is at fiscally as to whether or not these projects are realistic, they're put on the back burner, they're going to go? I mean do you have any way -- and you may not. And I don't even think they probably have an idea right now.

MR. GATTA:

Well, we have been advised --

LEG. MONTANO:

Do you have any indication of where they're really going on this?

MR. GATTA:

We have been advised recently that we need to maintain these projects in the program because there are many, many other demands out there by other SUNY institutions for this funding. If we

are not able to continue to show the local sponsor support, then there is serious concern that we would lose those funds. But to date the funding for all these projects continues in the SUNY Capital Program. We are working very hard with them right now to structure a draw down of that debt. They issue debt just like the County does so that they can maximize their overall allocation and to satisfy the commitments they've made, but not to hold money where it's not going to be used in a timely fashion. So it's a critical situation at this point both -- at the state level.

LEG. MONTANO:

So on a scale between probable and possible and wishful thinking, we're closer to the probable? I'm not putting words in your mouth. I'm just kind of asking.

MR. GATTA:

No, I think -- SUNY is committed to these projects. I mean they are in the five year Capital Program. We have received other funding and there is some discretionary funding that they're drawing back from other institutions where the sponsor has not provided the commitment. So we just need to be vigilante, keep our sponsor's support in place and move forward with projects as we suggested as aggressively as we can because that's our best opportunity to maintain that funding and have these buildings come to fruition.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Is there any further questions from the Legislature? All right. Just quickly you had mentioned that our numbers are up 10 percent from last year and that the applications are at greater numbers than they were last year at this point in time. Do you have a number that you're kind of settling in on that you think that we're actually going to have reach this year with that number of applications? Where do you think we're going to be this time next fall?

MR. GATTA:

While applications are up 30 percent, about 30 percent versus last year at this time, what we're finding is that students are applying earlier because they want to make sure they can secure the seat at the College. They've heard stories of students being turned away, not just in California, in Florida and other states but, you know, they read the New York papers, they see that CUNY, the community colleges in CUNY have turned students away or deferred admission for a semester or two semesters. We think the number we're projecting and we budgeted for a 2 percent increase on top of last year's 10 percent increase, which is also a very, very large number to begin with, but I think what we've attempted to do over the past several years, particularly this current year that we're in, is do everything possible to accept every student that wants to come to Suffolk Community College.

We've worked very closely and cooperatively with the faculty association. We've increased the class size without compromising academic quality, academic integrity. We schedule classes at times when students normally are not attracted to come to school, which is very, very early in the morning. When President McKay was at the Grant Campus he instituted 6:30 AM classes and a thousand students showed up which amazed everyone. We're scheduling more classes later in the afternoon, which is not popular. We're scheduling more classes on Friday. So we're doing everything possible to accommodate students. Where do I think we'll end up? We may end up higher than 2 percent and we work really hard to accommodate every student. But the demand is there. And it's very strong.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yeah, I have an eight o'clock class and I thought that was bad. So we're basically thinking that in the range of about 600 more students, somewhere around that level is what you're anticipating, give or take? I'm just trying to figure the math here.

MR. GATTA:

Well, that's -- we calculate everything in terms of full-time equivalence.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay.

MR. GATTA:

Our 25,000 is our head count -- our full-time equivalent when you boil everything down, right now this year is just shy of 20,000 full-time equivalents. So if we went up 2 percent on top of that 20,000, that's another another 400 students, you know, full-time students which could be twice as many students.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. All right. And that's your best guess and we'll use that as gospel now, George. Okay.

Are there any further questions for the College? All right. Thank you very much. We appreciate your coming down and giving us your thoughts on this. And we're going to be putting together a little working group amongst the committee itself and we'll be discussing it further but we do appreciate your input. We'll be reaching out to you as questions come along.

MR. GATTA:

Thank you for the time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you. This is also Economic Development. Yves, would you like to come up and, you know, give a little chat on what you feel about the Capital Budget reflecting economic development? I'm now sure what's in there but let's take a look.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon everyone. There is one item in particular that I would like to address and also I have my senior staff here if there's any questions or clarifications that's required that I'm unable to address, that is, CP 6409, that is the Downtown Revitalization and Transit Hub Program where we have allocated \$4 million scheduled for 2011 and 2012.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

336 is the page, apparently.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Capital Program number 6409.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

This is the downtown renewal and transportation hub?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Correct.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Say the number again.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We got 6409 as the project number.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That is correct, 6409.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

6409, got it.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

There was a recommendation to delete that. The recommendation is that this funds is a different conduit to put infrastructure in place as opposed to beautification, which the BRO said that there might be some overlapping with that. And I just wanted to make sure that I had an opportunity to clearly state that the infrastructure or long-term infrastructure for 6409 is focusing on transit oriented development and not beautification.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes, Legislator Lindsay, maybe you can explain it us to, then.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But it isn't for a specific project. It's a pool that you want to draw on from time to time?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That is correct.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And what do you envision, the same format that you used for downtown revitalization?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

We've identified three locations where we feel are right for this type of activity. They are Ronkonkoma, Port Jeff Station and Bellport. We feel that using the transit oriented hub as a spring board to revitalize a quarter mile, a half a mile radius around that is the best way to spur smart long-term economic development. And these are areas of what we would say historic regionally significance.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yes.

P.O. LINDSAY:

What is the money for, though, specifically?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Infrastructure like parking, sewers, a little bit of planning, studies and then construction.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Are you thinking Wyandanch?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Wyandanch will be one of the sites that we've identified as well.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Those types of locations?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Correct. Now the \$4 million is not the total amount; it's just the start.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Does it have to be -- does that have to reclassify it as a transportation hub; is there something that -- and who makes that classification? How is --

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

The definition?

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yeah.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Well, the definition of a transportation hub, there has to be public transportation rails for -- like the Long Island railroad. And then outside of that, there has to be the potential of creating office, retail, residential and a little bit of recreation that will also include high level of walkability from where the merchants will be and where one can use public transportation to travel to and from there.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

But then there is no designation as a transportation hub; it's just something that meets those criteria?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That's correct, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

I understand. Legislator Viloría-Fisher, please.

D.P.O. VILORIA-FISHER:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thanks for being here.

The Long Island index gave us some very -- kind of criteria of those areas that are good transportation hubs that should be looked at and developed. And I know because it's in my district that Port Jeff Station met those criteria. And we looked very carefully at that. And I also know that the Town Supervisor is looking at a program that he's calling *light to light*. And that particular area reaches that criteria as well. And so we have a synergy working with the Town, working with the planning councils and commissions on areas that have been designated. And I think all of the ones that you mentioned reach those various criterias. And I think -- I think Legislator Montano was whispering *\$4 million, will that be enough?* And you correctly said it would be the start because we couldn't do all the revitalization in one shot, but it gives us a good handle.

And I had invited the Commissioner to come to the Port Jefferson Chamber of Commerce meeting because I had been meeting with the Chambers of Commerce to talk about the Port Jeff, Port Jeff Station area that's right around the train station, which again was identified in the Long Island index. And, in fact, I was walking there this weekend looking at, you know, what we could do there. And it's an area that you want to capture before it moves further into decay, you know. And we had looked at it and had looked at some of the planning. And I believe that the other neighborhoods we're looking at have been -- you've had the chambers and civics involved in those. I really think this is an important project if we're going to look at jump starting our economy and helping get those small businesses moving.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Yeah, I certainly understand. And I recognize that as well. Just one quick question, bouncing off of that, Ms. Vizzini, you've recommended to remove this from the budget. Do you have a rationale behind that, why the difference? What are you thinking about, the BRO recommendation on this, 6409 on page 336?

MS. VIZZINI:

We viewed the stated improvements, although the budget does say transportation hub, we view the stated improvements in the description in terms of lighting, landscape, architecture, pocket parks, bicycle paths, internet cafes more akin to downtown revitalization efforts. And we point out that there are in terms of the monies in the revitalization and beautification projects, there are substantial available balances. And there is somewhat of a backlog in terms of implementation of projects. So if this is distinguished from that and if you believe it to be a priority, you know, that's your policy decision.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much. So how do you react to that?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Thank you. The Downtown Revitalization Program we do have funds in those programs that have been allocated and approved by the Legislature to certain organizations within each legislative district. Obviously the backlog is as a result of us helping those organizations that receive the award to go through the process in order for us to release the funds.

We met -- when I first came on board Carolyn and I met with each supervisor to outline those funds that are outstanding so we can go back to each organization to help them see the urgency to get those cancelled checks, the receipts in for us so we can disburse those funds. Obviously this year because of the tough economic conditions, we do not have funds allocated for that. And that is a great opportunity for us to clean that up. And that's what we're in the process of doing. And I've been working hand and hand with Carolyn Fahey and other members of my senior staff who are here as well to ensure that that cleanup occurs so we can start fresh next calendar year or fiscal year. But they're very distinguishable activities.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you. The difference is the transportation hub versus downtown revitalization.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Are you putting together a master list, you know, where these monies are going to be spent so we get an idea or -- how does that work? And then I'm going to refer this to you, Mr. Legislator Montano. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Thank you. We identified the areas that are easily or more conducive to those revitalization efforts with a symphony of cooperation from the villages and the towns as well. Since it is not a tremendous amount of money we are participating with them. And this is a conduit to get the infrastructure in concert with these other municipalities.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And you'll be working with the Legislature when you do come up with this master list if this thing is approved?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Absolutely, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Legislator Montano.

LEG. MONTANO:

Thank you. Earlier on you said you identified three major hubs, Ronkonkoma, Port Jeff. Which was the third one? Is that Bellport?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

The third one was Bellport, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. And then you also indicated -- I thought you indicated Wyandanch. Is this list -- how is this list -- are these three on the top of the list and others are going to be included? Or are these the

three areas that you're focussing in on with this \$4 million allocation?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

These are the areas that are further along working with the local municipalities, i.e. they've already done their visioning, their studies. They're further along with getting their engineering firms on board, things along those lines. So if we participate to help accelerate that process, those are the ones that we'll be able to put a shovel in the ground a lot sooner than some of the others areas that we've also identified along the Long Island routes south, central and north.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, these three programs, you've asked for \$4 million and it doesn't seem like a lot of money for the kind of description that you've given in terms of what you'd like to do. So I would assume that you're also relying on some kind of additional funding whether it be federal matching funds or county or village money; is that accurate?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That is correct.

LEG. MONTANO:

And the \$4 million must have been based, I mean you didn't get this figure -- you must have based it on something. And could you just explain to me what you based the \$4 million on?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Sure. It was based on our level of participation as it relates to assisting in the parking structure construction, assisting in areas where we can and cannot waive sewer hook up fees, things along those lines, the infrastructure. So it really is more of the infrastructure versus beautification.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

And how we can participate with the towns where they would probably have the bulk of the dollars.

LEG. MONTANO:

Right. But I would suspect that based on your submission the \$4 million would probably not get beyond Ronkonkoma or Port Jeff and Bellport in this year's allocation; am I accurate? In other words, the other areas you described are more than likely projects that you would be looking at down the road. They're not on the table today, are they?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That's correct, they're down the road. They're further down the road.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. So this is the beginning of a -- or the initiation of a particular project for certain designated areas. And it's probably going to be exclusive to those three areas in this \$4 million; am I accurate?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

In this initial, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. Let me ask you this, the Brentwood downtown area, is that an area that also qualifies under your definition of the transportation hub? I'm talking about the inner part of Brentwood, Brentwood Road, where the train station is, where the theatre, the soccer field -- not in the field but the stadium, is that on your list?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That is.

LEG. MONTANO:

And does it qualify?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That is on the list. And it does qualify but it's a little bit further along because the study from an engineering firm has not been done to my knowledge.

LEG. MONTANO:

Well, do you know about the -- from my understanding there is a study being done both from the Town -- it's a long term study and a study being done by Saratoga Associates.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That is the Wyandanch -- no.

LEG. MONTANO:

No, that's Brentwood.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Brentwood.

LEG. MONTANO:

Yeah, that's Brentwood. Do you know where that study is or how far along that study is?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

No, I can't honestly say I do.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. This Downtown Revitalization Program, that's in the Operating Budget; am I correct? The 500,000 or is that in the Capital? Carolyn is shaking her head so -- I'm looking over your right shoulder.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That is in the Operating, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

That's in the Operating? Hold on, hold on.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Capital. It's in the Capital. My mistake.

LEG. MONTANO:

All right. And what's the status of that now, Gail, that 500,000 that the Legislature was appropriating through the Downtown Revitalization Committee?

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, we have the projects written up project by project status. The capital project 6412 is the Downtown Revitalization Program. That's on page 340 of the report. It gives you a -- you know, a location by location, project by project summary status; however, in terms of the actual funding, there's \$500,000 in each of the years of the Capital Program. There is an available balance, however, of \$2.1 million.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. We'll get to that in the Committee. Let me switch gears on you, Commissioner, and ask you the same questions. I know you were here during the conversation, the dialogue that I had with Mr.

Gatter and his works. With respect to these kinds of expenditures for infrastructure improvements, etcetera, etcetera, it's obvious that the County doesn't follow the state guidelines in terms of how it awards contracts to minority and women owned businesses; am I correct?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

I think there is a guideline. And the state guideline is different than what the County has, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

It is different. Do you maintain -- does your Department or does any department that you know of maintain statistics with respect to where we are with women and minority owned firms doing business with the County? And I do believe there is no set aside program in Suffolk County; am I correct, Carolyn, on that?

MS. FAHEY:

Yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

The most we have is what, the local preference --

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

We do, yes.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. But with respect to -- and I know that a while back there was a -- you know, the website was put out there for women and minority owned businesses to get access to bidding. But I'm wondering do you have any particular figures or statistics that indicate how far along we have come either forward, backward or stagnant?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Economic Development does not but I believe that the purchasing department does.

LEG. MONTANO:

Go ahead, Carolyn.

MS. FAHEY:

If I could, the Office of Minority Affairs has two organizations, one called The Women's Business Enterprise Coalition; the other is Minority Business Development Council. Both are geared to certifying Suffolk County owned business for the purpose of DPW's use and purchasing's use in bidding for contracts. They might have statistics and then the two purchasing divisions in DPW, the one that DPW uses for their contracts and the general purchasing department might have those numbers for you.

LEG. MONTANO:

So those figures would be or could be scattered within the three departments that you just mentioned?

MS. FAHEY:

Correct.

LEG. MONTANO:

Okay. All right. Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much. And if I may now, I'm going to turn the hat over to Legislator Kennedy who's going to ask questions about Labor.

LABOR, WORKFORCE & AFFORDABLE HOUSING CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate it. My questions are very simple, Commissioner. We've seen a number of projects, I guess, that are kind of underway with the Labor and Workforce Housing efforts. I just wanted to confirm that we do have either with yourself or, I guess, through BRO, a continuance for Capital Project that's designed to support Workforce Housing, Labor and Workforce Housing. As I was going through the description, I thought I saw a \$5 million Capital Project going forward. And I presume that's when we would continue to look to -- for our efforts to promote and stimulate development?

MS. VIZZINI:

The project you're talking about is capital project 6411 infrastructure improvements for workforce housing.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Yes.

MS. VIZZINI:

We do have an appropriation balance of \$14.9 million.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Okay.

MS. VIZZINI:

Conceptually this was a very good project, but the turnaround time before we move forward in our cooperative efforts with other jurisdictions is substantial. So we have appropriated 15 million and we've spent \$100,000. The funding as far -- for future is \$5 million in subsequent years.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

In subsequent years? Okay, so we're looking at 2011 and we're not looking at any additional commitment? We're just anticipating we'll continue to move against the existing authorization that we have in place now?

MS. VIZZINI:

I think you could generally conclude that. On page 338 of our report we give a detailed update in terms of where we're at and the different locations that are currently under consideration.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Okay. If I can for a moment, Gail, Jill, can you speak to this at all? What do we have in the hopper? How is your department situated with being able to promote that goal of creation of workforce housing? And then I'm going to want to speak a little bit about some of the general parameters that we have in place such as our local preference laws and naturally the prevailing wage and the approved apprenticeship language. But let's talk first about from the Department's perspective, do you have a sufficient balance to work with to nurture projects that appear to be coming forward?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

The answer is yes. We have Mattituck Court in Greenlawn, 155 units estimate to start spring of 2011. We also have Metcaf Meadows in North Bellport.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Why don't you speak to that one in East Northport? I grew up in East Northport. And as a matter of fact I have never seen a lot that's been the subject of more litigation. That actually went for about

30 plus years. So if I see housing on that in my lifetime, I will be amazed. But go ahead.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

You know, I'm one of the luckiest Commissioners because I do have Jill to my right and she is so head strong --

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Good.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

-- in moving projects like that forward, she has such a great track record.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Good. So you have 155 units there. Where else do you anticipate we're going to have activity coming up?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Bay Shore Gardens. In Bay Shore we have 25 homeownership units. And that's estimated to start in the spring of 2011.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Also in East Hampton 12 homeownership units also estimated to start in the spring of 2011. And Island Gardens at Selden 35 homeownerships estimated to start in 2011.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Very good. So that sounds like, you know, we're approaching a couple hundred units that we may see coming up in the next calendar year. And there's sufficient funding, Jill, to go ahead and address, I guess, the infrastructure investment? That's pretty much what our funding is utilized for; right?

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

6411 is exclusively infrastructure. And if all the projects that we'll be seeking funding for for 2010, 2011 get approved by the Legislature and the County Exec, we will be in need of additional funds to keep the project moving forward. It's been very successful. You could just take the projects that are in the pipeline now, which I'll be coming to you for, we got a total of 403 units that will be built with those funds which is -- will be built at a rate of about \$29,000 per unit which is supreme cost effective for our program.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

When you say 29, that's in other words by unit, what our contribution cost is?

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

A blended rate yes.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Okay. The other question that I have is do we have -- when the County contracts in general for general construction, there is a local preference law that we have for contractors from Nassau and Suffolk. Is there any element of that associated with this project or is that a separate type of an initiative?

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

We don't require it, but we encourage it. And it's almost always worked out that we use local

contractors.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

So without it necessarily being in place, it's just manifested itself and it's kind of something that you have done. And I know that the both of you work very hard and I appreciate your sensitivities to some of the things that we all try to promote as far as, you know, putting those funds towards units that -- and trying to support that framework for a living wage that people can afford to live in. That's the ultimate goal here.

I guess on that note -- let me just turn back to Budget Review. It sounds like everybody's saying what's in the project at this point is sufficient, there's no need for us to go ahead and look to increase it or change it. Does that seem from your perspective based on what you're hearing about the number of units that may be coming to fruition and what we might look at in 2011, does that kind of jibe with, you know, with what your look at the numbers is?

MR. REINHEIMER:

The Department asked for \$500,000 in 2013.

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

Five million.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I'm sorry. What's a zero?

DIRECTOR ROSEN-NIKOLOFF:

About 30 units.

LAUGHTER

MR. REINHEIMER:

And that was not provided through the Capital Program. When we looked at this, we looked at the appropriation to date, we outlined all these projects in our review. Progress has been slowly coming. The Department has a pretty aggressive timetable, whether that comes to be or not, it's hard to say.

You can come back and visit this in a year. They've got \$15 million in projects that they're looking to advance within this 12 months. So to advance the money -- additional funds to 2012 or 2013, we can look at this time next year and see how the progress has been. If it's as aggressive as the Department says it is, then, you know, this may warrant additional funds. But we don't envision that the Department will require additional funds in 2011 especially when they're working so hard on these projects that they've got going.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you, BRO.

Commissioner, is there anything else that you want to add towards that or does that pretty much summarize where we're at?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

That does sum it up. One thing to underscore the money is used more or less for our planning. We do have an aggressive timetable as you all know. And we're actively seeking where it makes sense to put more workforce housing/affordable housing units. And that's when the dollar amount is crucial as we plan moving forward.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Legislator Horsley had a discussion before about the transportation destinations. And we've spoken a lot about that as we have. It's my sense that we really have multiple types of efforts that are going on while we look to try to nurture and promote some of these areas; not only to workforce housing but also the sewerage and the other infrastructure elements that help bring businesses in and, you know, have our municipalities want to, kind of site there and look at those things.

If I can for just a moment, and then I'll go back to the Ronkonkoma hub, and I want to speak for a second, I say this to many, many people, they assure me that we're not losing out. But there's been discussion about development in Wyandanch, the Wyandanch Rising project, we have an effort going forward with Ronkonkoma. And then we also spoke about over at Legislator Browning's area, the Bellport effort. Are those projects all moving forward simultaneously? Or are we engaged in kind of like a race to the finish here?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

Those areas are moving in parallel and they're at different levels. I know Bellport had a fantastic visioning completed which we participated in in my prior life with the Town of Brookhaven. And Legislator Browning was very involved in that.

In Port Jeff there's visioning, there's also planning that's being done. There's a committee with the Village and the Town and also the County to move those efforts forward. So they're at different stages but they're moving forward as fast as they can.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

When you speak with the MTA, because it seems to me that they are the driver with this notion of the transportation destinations, are they talking about nurturing multiple sites or do they speak about only one location?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

They speak about multiple sites.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

And they also speak about packages where they can use reduced costs to get people from other areas to those destination points. By way of example, if you would find someone in the Stony Brook area, if there were packages to have them hop on the train, not in their car, come to Port Jeff, there's a package dealer that they can get the ticket for the MTA but also a discount in the restaurants in that area as well. And that's what you want to put together to help attract people to visit those businesses using public transportation as opposed to their automobiles, yes.

CHAIRMAN KENNEDY:

Okay. Good. I'm pleased to hear that. All right. Thank you, Legislator Horsley.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Legislator Kennedy. And certainly I love it when you start a statement with, *this will take just a second*.

Legislator Montano, you had a quick question? We got to move to Parks.

LEG. MONTANO:

Very quick. The Bellport, that project is in the Village of Bellport or outside?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

It's outside the Village.

LEG. BROWNING:

Outside.

LEG. MONTANO:

That's what I was asking. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

Okay. Is there anything else you'd like to add, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER MICHEL:

No. Thank you for the opportunity for having us here.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

And Ms. Vizzini, is there anything you'd like to add concerning either Labor or EEE?

MS. VIZZINI:

We just switched to Environment and Energy.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We're in Labor. No, we haven't gotten to Environment yet.

MS. VIZZINI:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

We will in one minute.

MS. VIZZINI:

Then no.

CHAIRMAN HORSLEY:

No. Okay. Is there anything else anybody else would like to add? With that being the case I'll close the hearing on EEE and Labor and Workforce Housing, their Capital Budget Committee meeting. And thank you very much.

**MEETING CONCLUDED AT 2:15 PM
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**