

**PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
of the
Suffolk County Legislature**

Minutes

A regular meeting of the Public Works & Transportation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on **April 15, 2003**.

Members Present:

Legislator Joseph Caracappa - Chairman
Legislator Brian Foley - Vice-Chair
Legislator Andrew Crecca
Legislator Fred Towle
Legislator William Lindsay
Legislator George Guldi

Also in Attendance:

Paul Sabatino - Counsel to the Legislature
Terry Pearsall - Aide to Legislator Lindsay
Frank Tassone - Aide to Legislator Crecca
John Ortiz - Budget Analyst/Budget Review Office
Kevin Duffy - Budget Review Office
Nicole DeAngelo - Intergovernmental Relations/County Executive Office
Charles Bartha - Commissioner/SC Public Works Department
Leslie Mitchel - Deputy Commissioner/SC Public Works Department
Richard LaValle - Chief Deputy Commissioner/SC Public Works
Tedd Godek - Suffolk County Architect/SC Public Works
Ben Wright - Director/Sanitation Division - SC Public Works
Bob Shinnick - Director/Transportation Division/SC Public Works
Laura Conway - Finance Division/SC Public Works Department
Ed Lariccio - Finance Division/SC Public Works Department
Cliff Hymowitz - Transportation Advocate
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 3:06 P.M.*)

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I would like to start the Public Works & Transportation Committee meeting today with a salute to the flag led by Legislator Lindsay.

Salutation

Okay. We have a fairly light agenda today but we do have one card filled out from the public, Mr. Clifford Hymowitz.

MR. HYMOWITZ:
Is that me?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
That would be you. You know the routine.

MR. HYMOWITZ:
Yeah, I know.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
You have 30 seconds.

MR. HYMOWITZ:
Hello. My name is Cliff Hymowitz and I live at 6 Prospect Street West in Selden. And I want to thank the committee for letting me address you and we're at -- what I put on my card to talk about was bus stop signs, bus stops and the bus map.

I was at a Handicapped Advisory meeting and I noticed that they brought a sample of the new bus stop signs which I thought looked pretty good, I had some comments. But the thing that I looked into and I was very surprised about is that we don't have a policy on bus stop signs, so therefore every time new signs are put up it's basically what's decided at that time and therefore there's lack of continuity. So I believe that before anything is pursued that we should document what the policies are.

And I noticed that Maxine had put up a resolution, Introductory Resolution Adopting Mass Transportation Public Information Policy explaining bus route information for Suffolk County and I think this is a good idea and that's only addressing one part of the policy that should be for bus stop signs. And if the committee is interested, I could supply you with a copy of a sample policy that was done by Hartford which is a similar, you know, system as ours. And when they went to put up they realized that they didn't have anything documented and that's why -- and every place I went to, it always went back to the documentation of what the policy is. And I really strongly recommend that before any other work is done on the map, on the bus stops or the bus signs that we come up with a policy, and that's my recommendation. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Hold on. Are there any questions for Mr. Hymowitz with relation to the bus signage? I just want to thank Cliff for his continued

advocacy. You've come into my office and you've showed me a sample of

2

what Hartford had done and it's pretty cut and dry and hopefully we can achieve something similar where the average bus rider or mass transportation user in Suffolk County will have an easier time riding the system and getting acclimated with the system just by looking at a sign. It goes a long way in bringing them back as customers if they have a simpler way of navigating the system, so I appreciate your advice on it.

LEG. FOLEY:
Thank you; ditto.

MR. HYMOWITZ:
Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Commissioner? Mr. Shinnick, why don't you come up as well. I want to ask you a question related to the signs. First I'm actually going to trump the Commissioner and ask Bob a question as it relates to the concerns of Mr. Hymowitz and the signs, where we're at, where we're going, what do you expect to have for us. I have a sample, you've sent a sample to my office which I appreciate; is there something more to it that -- can we expect something more to that sample that you sent to us with relation to bus routes, direction, connections, different connection bus routes, everything associated with the stop that you're at, where it's going and where you can go from where it's going, so to speak. Commissioner, would you allow -- or if you want to answer it yourself, feel free.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:
Maybe I can give a quick overview and Bob can follow-up with a lot more detail.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Sure.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:
There are over 3,200 bus stops in the County. And we have, as a result of prior resolutions and discussion with the Legislature, we have two things under way right now that are going to make the system much more friendly. One is the bus stop signage which we had agreed at a previous meeting was not going -- we weren't going to have the detailed information at every stop but at the major stops we were going to have the detailed information. And in the marketing end, we will -- we'll developing -- we will be developing new maps to provide people better information so they can use it in a more friendly fashion. Bob can give a lot more detail on it.

MR. SHINNICK:
Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Good afternoon.

MR. SHINNICK:
The bus stop sign project, in addition to the stop signs themselves -- as Charlie indicated, there's over 3,200 that will be installed County

3

wide -- will include information displays at 165 of the more major bus stops and that will consist of -- they're actually square canisters in some cases, in other cases a single flat panel which will give the bus route information, an actual map delineating the routes that service that location as well as basic schedule information. So that it will show the times that the bus comes by and some orienting information so they'll know what time the bus gets to the designation and the direction of the bus. And where there's room, we'll put some other basic information regarding fares and some policies as well as information for the SCAT Program.

But there are 278 of these information displays that will be installed at 165 major locations. That's as part of the current project as we configured it.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:
It's been 14 years since bus stop signs went up, so this is obviously a big step forward in making the system known and understood to people.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Commissioner, where do you stand with relation to Resolution 1223 then?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:
We are concerned about some of the details in here and would like to work with the sponsor. And when I say detail, the first RESOLVED calls for us to name the location where each stop is made; with 3,200 locations, it would make for a very massive sign that each of them to have -- each of them to be named. I think it might be more effective if we named the major locations again with the bus stops, but it would probably -- I think it would make sense for us to work with the Presiding Officer or yourself, whoever is designated, and Mr. Hymowitz to see what would be useful.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Is the actual route shown on the maps?

(*Legislator Towle entered the meeting at 3:14 P.M. *)

MR. SHINNICK:

The maps will show the specific bus routing of that particular bus line.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

And specific major stops or intersections, locations along that route. So I walk into a bus shelter, I look at the sign, I'm on Middle Country Road in Selden and I get in the shelter, I see the sign, it's going to have a route, basically a you-are-here, and then I'm going to look to the west and I'm going to see Smithhaven Mall and I'm going to see certain other designated main roads like Holbrook Road and Nicol's Road along this; this is what we're conceiving here?

MR. SHINNICK:

That's correct.

4

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay, not every cross street, not every side street, not every town road or every bus shelter that is along the way. Because I have noticed recently the Town of Brookhaven I, guess, through their Community Development Grants have installed a tremendous amount of new bus stops along Middle Country Road through the Middle Island, Coram, Selden, Centereach areas that aren't County shelters, and I know the town has been responsible for putting them up. Now, what's going to happen with regard to those shelters. Here we are, we have a County shelter literally 200 feet away from one of these new town shelters and it's going to be kind of confusing.

LEG. FOLEY:

To the State or town?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

They're on State roads but they're the town shelters.

LEG. FOLEY:

Are they?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Those shelters are placed at existing stops, that's not creating a new stop those shelters, those shelters are at an existing stop.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay, so that makes it clearer.

MR. SHINNICK:

We have been in contact with the company that's installing the shelters for the towns and to the best of our knowledge they're advising us where they're going to be installing the shelters. There may be a few that we don't know about but generally they're at locations that are appropriate.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

And they will have the information that we're talking about here so.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right. As you said, the goal is to allow someone to become oriented as to where they are and where their options are to go on that particular route.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I usually don't allow it, Cliff, but if you just want to chime in with one thought.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

I just have a question.

LEG. FOLEY:

Come up.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

I appreciate very much, Commissioner and Bob, about what you're saying and I think it's showing a human effort. And you're right, where we have to go it's a major step. But I guess where my concern is is determining what the 165 are because what's considered to be major now five years from now may not be and I'll give you an example of the four corners in Commack, okay. At one time it was called the Macy's stop, then it's called the Sears stop and every time a new route was put in there they renamed that stop. So what I'm saying is that I really think that consideration has to be given not just on a short basis what the 165 stops are but really it should be more -- you know, I really feel how that's determined is the policy, what determines a key stop. And so it's not up for interpretation because it might change five years from now.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Wouldn't you consider a key stop where most of the ridership either enters or exits, which I'm sure the data shows; wouldn't that mandate what is what, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Yes, I agree.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Cliff, would you concur with that?

MR. HYMOWITZ:
I would but I will --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Or do you say that's fluid, that changes?

MR. HYMOWITZ:
That changes. I'm thinking that what the criteria would be is the amount of buses that intersect at that point might be determining whether it's a major destination or not.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:
As the demographics of the County change, we can certainly add signs to reflect the major uses.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Well, that was part of the whole concept where, for lack of a better term, the infrastructural unit of the sign would be the more permanent thing and you would be able to easily change the bus route with a piece of paper sliding in and out; correct me if I'm wrong.

MR. HYMOWITZ:
No, these units --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
This way as times progresses and times change and demographics change, retailing stores or educational institutions maybe increased, decreased, come on-line, go off-line, that we would be able to accommodate those changes based on the ridership and how it's affected by those change; is that true?

6

MR. SHINNICK:
Yes. The bus stops, the 165 as identified so far, will have these canisters or panels installed on them. The information that's displaced will be inserts, they can be taken out and changed. This is not a static situation, so over time as additional locations come to our attention, you know, we'll consider putting these things at those facilities. Right now among the locations listed are those places with bus shelters, shopping malls, major stops in downtown areas. We have a good working knowledge of the level of ridership so the more major stops have been already attended to, but we may have missed a few and there may be a few emerging in the future and we'll take them under consideration.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

I have no problem with that and I commend you --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Use the mike, please.

MR. HYMOWITZ:

I commend you on that and I think it's great. But again, I go back to just the fact that let's just document what it is the criteria of what a major stop is so we have a consistency, that's my consideration, that's my concern, that we have a written policy to what -- so we have consistency, that's all I'm asking is to do that. I'm not questioning what the policy is, I'm just looking for it to be documented.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay. It's a good point, the department hears you, we hear you and hopefully as we come to the end of this, no pun intended, journey we'll have something that makes everyone happy and, again, not only increases ridership but maintains it. Commissioner, you have any other comments with relation to the agenda?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

No.

LEG. FOLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if I could just follow-up.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yeah, on the point that Cliff has raised about documenting, you will now intend to document each of the 165 locations where you have the more extensive information?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Certainly, we can give you a list.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right. Now, do you -- so you'll have that list; do you have it written down as to how they qualify and others don't or is this more of an ad hoc basis of -- people knowing the system so well they just know where these things are. And I think what Mr. Hymowitz is saying,

and there is good reason for it, is there written, how shall I all it, written analysis as to why some locations are -- how this additional information and other locations don't, or is it just catch as catch

can?

MR. SHINNICK:

Well, it's something more than catch as catch can, but we don't have any specific guidance in terms of levels of ridership or anything like that. But where we do have a route crossover points, we have a working knowledge of the general level of bus stop activity.

LEG. FOLEY:

If other municipalities have a written policy as to how they make a decision on where they place shelters or not place it, why wouldn't we want to have a written policy in place for that, Bob?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, if I can just --

LEG. FOLEY:

Sure.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Are we talking about signs or shelters?

LEG. FOLEY:

Signs.

MR. SHINNICK:

Well, generally the bus stop signs are indicated -- and the policy generally is no less than 700 feet apart, normally typically it would be a quarter of a mile apart, up to a half of mile, in more rural areas it can be considerably more. We use locating signs on the basis of where there is actual passenger activity, where there's a history of ridership. For example, something that may look logical to have a bus pull up to and use, maybe a flooding location in bad weather or a conflict with nearby merchants, those sort of things.

The bus system is relatively new but it's been around for a while. There are ridership patterns that people know where they would want to get off the bus, on the bus. We have ridden with the drivers to ascertain the legitimacy of all of the routes, stops along the way. We have histories of bus stops being in existence for years so, you know, that's all of the collective criteria that we use.

LEG. FOLEY:

I look forward to getting any information as to where you're placing these 165 locations. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Legislator Lindsay and then Legislator Guldi.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Different subject, guys; Raynor Park, when are we going to break ground?

8

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The contracts are being awarded. Tedd, do you have an estimate of when we would be breaking ground?

MR. GODEK:

We should be breaking ground within the next two to three weeks.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Two to three?

MR. GODEK:

We have to schedule (inaudible).

LEG. CRECCA:

Were you awarded the contract already?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

They're in the process of being awarded.

MR. GODEK:

The contracts are being circulated for execution. The next step in the process is to schedule a kick-off meeting which we'll do within the next two weeks and you can start right after that.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Could you let our offices know? There's really four Legislators. Because I think -- there's a will I think to get the community together and to have some kind of formal ground-breaking.

MR. GODEK:

We can do that, yes.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

What we can do is if you give us the day, we could arrange for a ground breaking, Tedd, I assume, right?

MR. GODEK:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Also, it's very important that we know sooner than later the exact day because there is a Memorial Day Parade that takes place and culminates at the park at the existing memorial and we want to make sure they can use that --

LEG. LINDSAY:

They changed the route.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

They did change it, okay. The route is changed for this year?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Yeah, they changed the route because it was anticipated that we would be involved in construction by Memorial Day.

9

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Very good. That's all I needed to know.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I really hope we are because otherwise we'll probably look foolish if we change the route of the parade and we didn't start construction.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Like I said, sooner than later. All right, Legislator Crecca?

LEG. CRECCA:

No, that's okay.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Legislator Guldi, I'm sorry.

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah, that's all right. I just wondered, why we were on the bus sign issue, the signage, you did indicate it was going to be a placard and replaceable, but to what extent is the signage going to constrict further alterations to changes in routing, timing and the like? I mean, would there -- obviously there's going to be an expense to replacard in the event we do things that affects that placarding? Has anyone calculated what that will be as we get into this program; it's a future expense issue.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, I don't know how we could calculate it without knowing the extent of the change.

LEG. GULDI:

Well, what's the cost to change the signs per?

MR. SHINNICK:

Well, it's usually around \$100, but that's in --

LEG. GULDI:

So if we change the route that affects -- if we change the route or a

schedule that affects 50 stops, we're looking at a \$5,000 expense for making the change.

MR. SHINNICK:

In that scenario it could be.

LEG. CRECCA:

How do you figure \$100 to change a piece of paper?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

It's not paper.

LEG. CRECCA:

That's what I'm asking.

LEG. GULDI:

It's printed plastic? Yeah, what's the basis of a \$100 figure?

10

MR. SHINNICK:

If you're talking about creating a new bus stop along a roadway --

LEG. GULDI:

No, that's not what I'm talking about. Putting up the signs, they have a replaceable plastic information sheet in it.

MR. SHINNICK:

Oh, I'm --

LEG. GULDI:

What's it cost to replace the sheet with new information?

MR. SHINNICK:

The insert, it's a few dollars probably.

LEG. GULDI:

A few dollars probably or a few dollars?

MR. SHINNICK:

I don't know, but that's my guess.

LEG. GULDI:

How do we -- how do we find out what that cost is going to be since -- presuming that the useful life of the signs is going to exceed the data, otherwise you wouldn't design the sign to have the replaceable sheet.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We'll get back to you on that.

LEG. CRECCA:

Here's a question for you. The signs, without beating this thing to death, is it like the New York City signs where there's that plastic square insert that sticks on the poll?

MR. SHINNICK:

The answer is yes, it's just like the New York City signs.

LEG. CRECCA:

Right. So it's a matter of -- it's the printing of whatever, printing of the map and inserting it in. It's really, you know --

LEG. GULDI:

I know what it, is my question is how much and the answer is that old refrain of we'll get back to you on that.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, you don't want us giving you a shoot-from-the-hip answer.

LEG. GULDI:

Well, only if you don't want us to shoot back.

LEG. CRECCA:

George, I can answer the question; it's a matter of getting it

11

reprinted and then sending somebody out to change all the signs, that's what it is.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Hold on.

LEG. GULDI:

I know what it is; my question was how much.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Hold on, let's not go back and forth. The department will most definitely get that information for us in a timely fashion and we will have it, and if it's something extra ordinary we will debate it on its merits then. But it was a valid question and we will get the information at the next meeting, hopefully. Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Where are we with the jail, Charlie?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Now you're in trouble.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And we just left the Safety meeting, we're up to 65 prisoners being shipped Upstate, it's costing us a fortune and we're looking for something to be done that we can claim to keep some of these waivers in place.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We'll, we're trying to move in parallel to the needs analysis that has to be done. We're going to be issuing a request for qualifications. We're going to use a two step process in selecting the architect for this project because it's such a huge project. Our intention is to advertise in the middle of next month in local papers, the legal papers, Newsday, Engineering News Record to firms to submit their qualifications to do the work. We will also insert in there that there's a Local Preference Law. When we receive those qualifications back, we will then evaluate the qualifications of the different firms and make a short list, invite the firms that we think are the most qualified to handle the County's needs.

Now, a number of firms have been -- have followed the articles that have been in the papers about it and have been reaching out to us, some very impressive national firms that in conjunction with the Local Preference Law, we would anticipate they would be teeming with local architects. What we're also doing at the same time for the advertisement is we're seeking a waiver from the prescribed procurement process in order to follow a professional procurement process. Now, this does not have to wait for the needs analysis --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Right.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

-- in our opinion because whether the firm is designing a 200 bed

12

facility or a 1,200 bed facility, you're looking for a firm with the same qualifications.

So we'll work through this process, when we have the short list we'll then invite technical proposals from the short listed group. And at that time, we have funds that have been appropriated already, slightly over a million dollars that we will use to have the programming performed. We'll enter into a contract with the architect that is different stages, phases so that all the money -- because all the money is apparently not going to be appropriated at once. We will start the programming phase which that stage will use the needs analysis that is being done separately.

Now, with respect to the needs analysis, the Purchasing Office of

Public Works was involved with that process as prescribed by the resolution and they have -- there was a committee set up of ten people, they have made a recommendation as to which firm should be selected and I have forward that information to each Legislator on the needs analysis. Now, that is not something that -- is not a contract that the Public Works Department will be entering into, it's either the Legislature or the Sheriff's office that will be entering into that contract.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Charlie, why are we doing -- why must we do an RFQ? Obviously time is of the essence. We have been here, we have been down this road before, unless I'm missing something with relation to the legal procurement process for government projects. Can't we just skip the RFQ part? Because we know, you said yourself we're having highly recognized national firms contact you, why waste months for an RFQ process when we can go directly to the RFP process?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

There is nothing legally that requires us to do the procedure that I described. We have -- the process I described will be finished before the needs analysis is completed. We can't start the design until a needs analysis is completed, unless the needs analysis is made part of this project. And the reason for a two step process -- and this is not set in stone, but because this is such a big project and because we had a number of national firms reach out to us, I thought it was in our best interest to bring as much competition to the procurement process as possible.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

All right. I asked, you answered. Bill?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Charlie, I don't mean to be argumentive about it. We approved the \$1.3 million in November.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Uh-huh.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Did that do us any good, I mean, have we done anything with that money to forward this process since then?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

There's nothing we can do to forward that process until a needs analysis is done.

LEG. LINDSAY:

That isn't true, they were supposed to run in parallel lines.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Okay, I misstated.

LEG. LINDSAY:

We certainly could have done the RFQ and selected someone before the absolute needs were identified because, I mean, we have a difference of opinion in what the Sheriff thinks is a need and what the survey is going to show to turn up, you know.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

You are correct, we could have done that. But we could not have started the design so we would be --

LEG. LINDSAY:

No, we couldn't have start the design but we could have went forward to select --

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

And we will be done with that process before the needs analysis is done. So it isn't parallel, as you suggested.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I'm giving 5 to 1 on that; anyone want to take me up on it?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

In my favor or --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

My favor.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Meaning which do you think would be done first?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I'll pay five to everyone else, 5 to 1; I'm going 5 to 1 odds the needs assessment will be done first.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Really?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Yeah.

LEG. GULDI:

Come on, Charlie, you already got a hundred dollars on the table this year.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I'll go for it. I thought your bet was on me, I'm disappointed.

14

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

This is all hypothetically speaking, for the record, I might add, Mr. Spota. George? No, I'm joking, Charlie, come on. Seriously, I do think -- you and I have gone through RFQ and RFP processes --

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

-- in the past and it was a new ground-breaking type of thing we were doing as a government. But I think that's why I asked you the question, should the RFQ process even be necessary, because it is lengthy and it's basically -- it's the same process twice, it's the long list and a short list. I think we can eliminate the RFQ process and I think by having the RFQ and the RFP process back to back, that's why I firmly believe the needs assessment process will be done before you guys start putting pen to paper.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I -- if you feel strongly about it, which obviously you do, I would like to give it a little more thought and discuss it with you because it is possible. As I said, it's not cast in stone and I think we can do that.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay. George?

LEG. GULDI:

Yeah, the question I have for you is very quick, very simply, if you -- if it takes its course, the design period you're talking about to design the facility is what, 12, 18 months?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Is it design?

LEG. GULDI:

How long is it going to take you from the time you let the contract for the design to put a shovel in the ground; ball park?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

A year-and-a-half to two years.

LEG. GULDI:

Year-and-a-half, 18 to 24 months, okay.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I think --

LEG. GULDI:

Thirty year borrowing rates right now are at about 4%. Assuming that we are in a four year cycle of a down trend, in 18 to 24 months we'll be in a robust recovery and if interest rates for long-term bonds aren't 6% I'll eat a microphone. The 20 year bond cost for the 2% rate differential on the loan is going to be what over the life of the project? What do you -- I mean, what's the cost of the project going

15

to be? No, let's not do it that way, let's just do it in terms of straight percentage.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Tell me what the project is.

LEG. GULDI:

In terms of percentage of the products, a 2% interest rate differential on a 20 year note is going to cost you over the life of 20 years, you know, 30% principle?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

That's a lot of money, that's why --

LEG. GULDI:

A lot of money. Okay.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We are not holding this project up.

LEG. GULDI:

I understand that. What I want to explore with you is not how we hold it up but how we compress it. Now, you know, we buy lots of automobiles. When we buy automobiles, do we go out and hire a consultant to design them for us?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

No.

LEG. GULDI:

How many jails are there in the State of New York that the Department of Corrections has plans and access to plans for?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

If you think there's a similarity between \$140 million jail and a \$20,000 car, it's going to take more than just sitting here and --

LEG. GULDI:

I understand -- hold on. Yeah, but there is a similarity from one jail cell to another and from one jail facility to another, and if you start with a blank piece of paper instead of an existing design you can modify for your local needs, how much can you compress your process? There are state-of-the art facility --

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

With a jail you have to look at some things more so than any other project because you've got operating costs in the jail are far in excess of any other facility. Simply the selection of doors on a jail, and a lot of these are policy things that involve the Sheriff. Simply the selection of the doors, we have come to learn is worth \$2 million.

LEG. GULDI:

I understand that.

16

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The differential.

LEG. GULDI:

I understand that, but we don't have to invent the wheel. There are lots of these facilities all over the country, the research on the door selection, the layout, the operational costs, the construction techniques done and available literally, not quite off the shelf, but the state-of-the-art is out there. Why is it going to take 18 months to take that and apply it to a facility here?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Would you like it to take 12 months?

LEG. GULDI:

I would like it to take six weeks and save the 2% interest rate; I don't think we can do that.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

But keep in mind -- not to interrupt, George. I'm sorry, but keep in mind, the Capital Program comes out in just a few short weeks. It's at that point in time when we will have the option to go with the County Executive's recommendation to do the Capital, to do the bonding for the facility that he's looking for us to do and the Sheriff's looking for us to do and Public Works. It won't be 18 months down the road when we approve or do an appropriating resolution on the Capital end of things for that money, we could do that by the first of next January. So we don't have to wait 18 --

LEG. GULDI:

I understand that but --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

So I just wanted to make sure -- it's not picking on the Commissioner that the design is going to take so long and that's only then and only then we could do the bonding when we know we can do the bonding based on the Capital plan next January 1st.

LEG. GULDI:

The only problem is that if you bond the money before you're ready to put the shovel in the ground, you're not paying interest on money for a facility you haven't built yet. Yes, you can arbitrage some of that by short-term investments but that's not exactly what we want to do with our bonding. So I want to pursue the line of questioning I'm talking about, though, and that is how do we compress the design to get to the construction phase?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We could absolutely work with that. We have talked to different national firms that have contacted us. I don't have the schedule right off my hip, I didn't anticipate we were going to be discussing this today.

LEG. GULDI:

People have been saying this all day here.

17

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

But I would be glad to discuss it with you and anyone else at the next meeting or before the next meeting to give you some more realistic information on the schedule. We have spoken to the Sheriff's Office and what we're talking about for time to be able to have the work designed, constructed and used matches the kind of conversations they have had with the State Corrections Department.

So I just -- if you detect a bit of a tone here, I get a little bit frustrated that we're --

LEG. GULDI:

You're copping a tune with us?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

No, not you.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Actually, what I'm doing is apologizing for copping a tune because we're just looking for the go ahead and we will get this project done, so far we don't know what the project is. And let me point out --

LEG. GULDI:

Hold on, you're commenting to it just because I'm beating on you for not compressing a project we haven't approved yet; why would you be upset about that?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

That's right. It's like the ball park, we spent more time talking about the ball park than we spent to design and build it.

LEG. GULDI:

All right. But let's --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

You want to get Charlie really angry? Say you want to use DASNY to do the project.

LEG. GULDI:

Come back from --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

At least you two guys got it.

LEG. GULDI:

Come back from the ball park for just a minute if you could and let's stick with the prison or the jail. You mentioned the waiver of procurement process, you mentioned it a couple of times in your discussions just a minute ago; what is it, how does it work and explain it to me, okay?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Okay. Back in '93 or '94 when the State passed an addition to 103 or 104 of General Municipal Law, on Procurement of Professional Services they allow a procedure of bidding to be waived providing there's some procedures that you follow, and the procedure is we request a waiver

18

from a committee that consist of someone from the Budget Office, someone from Purchasing and someone from the County Executive's Office.

LEG. GULDI:

Do we have a waiver committee?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Yes.

LEG. GULDI:

And it's Purchasing, the Budget Office and the County Executive's Office?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Correct.

LEG. GULDI:

And who's on that committee and how often does it meet?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Joe Michaels, Allen Kovesdy and Jean DeNunzio and they meet as necessary, they meet -- I don't know what frequency, George.

LEG. GULDI:

How often have we done waivers? I'm just curious.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Oh, regularly, every time we design a project we go for a waiver.

LEG. GULDI:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We think that engineers and architects, just like attorneys, should be selected by engineers and architects to be the ones to do a project.

LEG. GULDI:

All right, so that committee is under what division; who keeps the records of the waivers, you know, and convenes this committee?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The Executive's Office, Joe Michaels.

LEG. GULDI:

The Exec's Office. And so is there a Chair of the Waiver Committee?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I believe Joe Michaels chairs it.

LEG. GULDI:

Joe Michaels, Okay. So I'd kind of like -- do they keep -- do you know if they keep stenographic minutes or meeting minutes of what they've issued?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I don't know.

LEG. GULDI:

All right. Well, I'd be interested to know the procedure on that, to look at what the work of that committee is. Thanks for describing that.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

George, let me just -- in full disclosure here, on this needs analysis which \$150,000 was put aside back in '99 I believe, the price that's come in from the selected firm is \$193,000.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Yeah, but don't leave out, Charlie, that in their letter and when we opened it up they said that they would work with the County to meet whatever number we had, while the other firm that wasn't selected came in with a higher number as well, lower than the one we picked but said that they would lay on substantial costs to other levels of the project. So there's a very good chance through negotiations, as we always do with someone we select through an RFP, that we can meet the price that we originally set.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Just for everyone's information, I was just handed a copy of the Capital Budget, the Proposed Capital Budget, and time is not a question anymore, George, for the jail. As much as this is -- I'm beside myself where this was such an emergency, 2004 there's \$2 million for planning for the jail; in 2005 there's another \$7 million in planning for the jail; not until 2006 will you see in subsequent years \$33 million for construction followed by in the following subsequent years another \$107 million.

LEG. CRECCA:

For what, the jails?

LEG. GULDI:

I'll give you 10 to 1 odds against the adoption of that.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

So --

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I think all our terms will be up by then.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

To say this is baffling, it's an understatement based on the urgency in the State of the County Address, based on the urgency from the State Commission of Corrections, based on the urgency of the Sheriff's Department, based on the flack we've taken for trying to do a needs assessment on what we were going to plan now, according to them, over the next three years. To have it scheduled out like this in these dollar amounts over this long period of time it's to me almost

comical, it's absolutely comical and absurd. So the discussion you just had basically is moot.

LEG. GULDI:

No, it's not; I beg to differ, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

With relation to rushing the project, that would be my point.

LEG. GULDI:

I beg to differ because like your 5 to 1 bet a moment ago --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I just won.

LEG. GULDI:

I'll give you 10 to 1 against the adoption of that proposed schedule for this project by this Legislature.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I agree, but just to see it writing, just to have it proposed is disheartening.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Mr. Chair?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

And I think we should give them what they ask for, to be quite honest with you. Go ahead.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Charlie, just a rough estimate, what do you think you need in planning for money to do this project?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Ten million.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Ten million; you need that all up front in '04?

LEG. GULDI:

You want it done in six weeks, you need it in six weeks?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Fred's shaking his head; you don't think so, Fred?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Yes, we do, in '04. We have enough to get us started in the process

and not be delayed through this year. With the programming, like I was saying before, with that that million some-odd dollars we can start the programming, we can expedite the whole selection process and start the programming. We can't start the preliminary design or any of that until some of next year's money is appropriated.

LEG. LINDSAY:

And, you know, just to answer your question, it's important that the

21

project be expediated because we're probably up to almost \$2 million a year in costs of transferring prisoners now, and if that accelerates it's just going to go up and up and up.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

It certainly makes sense to me, everything I've heard, and we are anxious to get the process under way because we want to design a facility that can be operated for many years very efficiently and that's -- we need a little bit of time to work on that.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Haven't we taken the first steps, though, in that we're completing the construction on the kitchen there, isn't that the hub? I mean, isn't that being built to accommodate a thousand prisoners?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Well, I believe the kitchen will be able to accommodate --

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay. But wouldn't that be the hub of the future prison to be built around it?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

It has to be -- it's a part of it, absolutely. I'm not sure where you're going with this.

LEG. LINDSAY:

No, I'm just making the observation, we're not starting from absolute scratch here.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right.

LEG. LINDSAY:

We have one piece almost in the completion stages now.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right and that's certainly a point that I would assume is being made to the State Commission Corrections Department.

LEG. LINDSAY:

I would hope so. I would hope so. And as far as the needs assessment is concerned, I don't really see how that has anything to do with you guys selecting an architect.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

No, we agree.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We agree with respect to the qualifications. When you get the actual proposal, that's a little different because at the proposal phase they're giving us cost estimates of what it's going to cost to design

22

the facility and it's -- it can be a big variance there. I hear what you're saying, we can look at trying to find ways to expedite this.

LEG. LINDSAY:

How far down the line do you need that done?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Do we need the needs analysis?

LEG. LINDSAY:

Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

If we had the needs analysis in July, we could have a very seamless process here.

LEG. LINDSAY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay. Any other questions? Let's go to the agenda.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

1090-03 (P) - Approving Cross Bay Ferry License for Bay Shore Ferry Inc. (Presiding Officer Postal). The report has been completed, hopefully all of you have had a chance to read it; I have. Just so everyone knows, because the report wasn't completed when the public hearings were held at our last General Meeting, we had to recess those public hearings which makes the legislation ineligible today. But what should be noted -- just only on one of them and that's the license,

correct?

MR. SABATINO:

No, the rates.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Oh, the rates, the rates, I'm sorry. But just so you know, we'll ask them questions on the record about the report and what the findings were. But if they do come out all right, as I feel they have, after reading the report, we'll do what we did with the Sayville Ferry at the next General Meeting and after the public hearing is closed, based on the finalization of the report, I'll make a motion to discharge at that point in time so we can vote and approve at the next General Meeting so we avoid any further delay with relation to this process.

So on the record, I would just like to ask Budget Review with relation to the report, to cut to the chase, were there any red flags with relation to what we look for, cash controls, the Coast Guard certification, the landing rights?

MR. ORTIZ:

I will have to get Kevin Duffy who worked on the report, I really had nothing to do with it.

23

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay.

MR. ORTIZ:

It will take me one minute.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Sounds good. We'll skip over those for now and go to 1207-03 - Authorizing -- oh, we can do actually 1092.

MR. SABATINO:

You can do 1090 because the hearing was closed on 1090, but 92 is the companion, that's the one you might want to get a report on.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I'll wait until we get the information on the report and we'll go do 1207 which --

MR. SABATINO:

Okay, 1207 we're -- this is the one that we're --

LEG. FOLEY:

Is there a public hearing?

MR. SABATINO:

This is the one -- I'm not sure if we have the report on this.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I don't believe we --

LEG. GULDI:

Let's go to the other IR's until we --

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I didn't think we needed one.

MR. SABATINO:

Yeah, 1207 I don't believe we have the report. I got the report on Bay Shore but I don't recall --

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay, 1223 for now, Adopting Mass Transportation Public Information Policy for displaying bus route information for Suffolk County (Postal). Commissioner, you've made a promise that you're going to reach out to the sponsor and try and correct the one or two things that you see as troubling?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

And I'd hope you do that by the next committee cycle because I'd like to have this approved.

24

LEG. GULDI:

I'd make a motion to table for the additional information on resigning costs as well.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Absolutely. Motion to table by Legislator Guldi, second by myself. All in favor? Opposed? It's tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1269-03 (P) - Appropriating funds in connection with the improvements to County Center, C001-Phase 1 - Addition to Court Record Storage Facility (CP 1643) (County Executive).

LEG. FOLEY:

Explanation on that one.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Charlie?

LEG. FOLEY:

Is this the Fred Towle one?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Is this extra money, are you asking for extra money or are you -- is this actually a transfer of money?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

This is for the part of the project that was not contemplated originally. This is for the addition to the Court Record Storage Facility which what it does for us, it does a number of things.

LEG. GULDI:

Connects it?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Excuse me?

LEG. GULDI:

It connects the interior passageways?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

No, no, no, no, this is an addition on to the Juliette Kinsella Records Storage. And this will allow during the construction or the renovations in the Riverhead County Center, space will be freed up where records are stored now. Those records will be moved into the records storage facility, we'll use that space where the records are now for swing space and then after the construction and we don't need that swing space, that space will be used for a day-care center.

LEG. GULDI:

Okay.

LEG. FOLEY:

I have a question.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Legislator Foley.

25

LEG. FOLEY:

Gentleman, when we look at the overall number it's 3.6 mill. If you look at the second WHEREAS clause, it mentions that, "WHEREAS, 1.47 million has been appropriated in planning funds for improvements and an additional 900,000 is needed to complete the planning for improvements to the Riverhead County Center." Is that nine hundred grand for the addition or is that \$900,000 for the overall planning of

the overall building?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

You will -- you're absolutely right and you'll be receiving a corrected copy before the General Meeting. Four hundred and forty thousand of it is for the record storage facility, 460 is for the design of the day-care center and renovation to part of the south wing that wasn't originally contemplated.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right. So the 440, is that for the planning for the Kinsella or that's for the actual construction?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

That's for the planning.

LEG. FOLEY:

That's for an extension on to the Kinsella wing we'll call it, right?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right.

LEG. FOLEY:

And the four hundred and what, four what?

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

The other 460 is for the design of the day care center area, renovation of the second floor, south wing second floor of the County Center as well as the renovation and expansion of the Legislative Meeting room which was not contemplated in the original.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay. Just on that point, who have you spoken with in the Presiding Officer's Office about expanding the size of the Legislative Auditorium? And have you --

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We've --

LEG. FOLEY:

Legislator Guldi is counseling our architect before he answers the question.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Scary.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

I told everybody not to talk to him.

LEG. GULDI:

It won't do any good.

LEG. FOLEY:

Through the Chair, could we have the architect come forward. Who have you been working with in the Legislature about expanding the auditorium, as reflected in these additional costs for planning?

MR. GODEK:

As it stands right now, we have not reached out to the new Presiding Officer's staff but we will be in the very near future as we approach that phase of the project.

LEG. FOLEY:

Well, how do you justify the additional 460 if it's for day care and other items; this is anticipated planning costs?

MR. GODEK:

These are anticipated planning costs, yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right, so that's the million dollars. Now, about the 2.7, the 2.7 is for the actual addition?

MR. GODEK:

The 2.7 is for the construction of the addition, yes.

LEG. FOLEY:

So it's 440 for the planning of the addition and then it's 2.7 for the actual construction of the addition?

MR. GODEK:

That's correct.

LEG. FOLEY:

And the other 460 is for -- again, just to stay on that -- the other 460 is to do what?

MR. GODEK:

Is to take care of the planning for the increased scope of the project.

LEG. FOLEY:

All right. What I would like by the 29th, through the Chair, is to have not only an amended version of this resolution but also the documentation as to how these two different figures, what they're addressing. I know the one is Kinsella so we have that, but also what the other 460 is for as far as day-care, expansion of the Legislative Auditorium and the like.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

We'll certainly give that to you. We may be able to give you something that we have right now to answer questions.

27

LEG. FOLEY:

Because right now I look at the backup and, yeah, there's one memo but there's nothing as to --

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right, we can do better than that.

LEG. FOLEY:

Yeah, I think so, given the size and scope of the project. You said there was something you can give to us before --

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

Right now.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay, thank you. What will you be giving to us so it's part of the record.

COMMISSIONER BARTHA:

This breaks down the 900,000 and the 2.7 million.

LEG. FOLEY:

Okay, very good. If copies could be made and given to each of the committee members, through the Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Kelli?

LEG. FOLEY:

We can discharge this and you have until, what, the 21st, that Monday?

MR. SABATINO:

Next Monday.

LEG. FOLEY:

Next monday for the amended -- for an amendment? Okay.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

I'll make a motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. FOLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Second by Legislator Foley.

LEG. FOLEY:
Didn't think we'd catch you, did you?

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
All in favor? Opposed? It's discharged without recommendation
(VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1292-03 (P) - Authorizing Public Hearing for authorization of approval
of lateral license for North Ferry Co, Inc. (Presiding Officer

28

Postal). Motion by myself, second by Legislator Guldi. All in favor?
Opposed? Abstentions? The public hearing is set (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1293-03 (P) - Approving the extension of license for North Ferry Co.,
Inc. (Presiding Officer Postal). Motion by myself, second by
Legislator Foley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Approved
(VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

1296-03 (P) - A Local Law to establish policy for connection by
premises outside Southwest Sewer District No. 3 (Presiding Officer
Postal). Motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Towle. All
in favor? Opposed? Tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

LEG. GULDI:
On the tabling motion.

LEG. FOLEY:
That's pending a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Pending a public hearing.

LEG. GULDI:
Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:
Let's go back to the beginning of the agenda. Kevin Duffy has joined
us. Kevin, we're talking about Cross Bay. You have authored the
report and my questions to you, are there any outstanding issues that
we should know about as a committee, have they met all the obligations
set forth by the Legislature?

MR. DUFFY:
What we indicate in our conclusion and recommendations is that Bay
Shore Ferry has provided us with the information necessary for the

Legislature to grant them a license adding Ocean Bay Park as an additional stop. They have provided us with the consents, not only for Ocean Bay Park but also for the Bay Shore Marina where the boaters come from and also for Robin's Rest which it serviced last year. They currently have a license that will expire 12/31/2003, but that only is for Robin's Rest. What their petition sought to do was to add Ocean Bay Park as an additional stop.

They have supplied us with audited financial statements. The company operated at a loss, basically they had \$17,000 in revenue, \$26,000 or so in cash expenses and \$22,000 in depreciation expense. It's my understanding that the company hopes -- well, with the competitive rate that they have which is lower than the other ferry companies that are servicing these two points, they're hoping that with the expanded ridership brought about by adding Ocean Bay park, that this will provide them with additional revenue in order to meet all of their expenses.

The Budget Review Office recommended that the license for Ocean Bay Park be granted. The only question that you have which we don't

29

really address is that the length of the license is within the discretion of the Legislature.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

The legislation is for five and a half years, correct, Counsel?

MR. SABATINO:

Correct, it's back to five and a half years.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Cash controls are in place, Mr. Duffy?

MR. DUFFY:

Yes, they established a cash control system last year using a duplex ticket system.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Very good. In the past they have been certified by the Coast Guard for water taxi only, they're now certified as a ferry company; is that correct?

MR. DUFFY:

Yes, they've submitted additional documentation addressing that issue.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

So everything seems copasetic at this point in time?

MR. DUFFY:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Thank you very much, we appreciate it. There is a motion -- we have to table -- we can approve 1090. Motion to approve by myself.

LEG. FOLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Second by Legislator Foley. All in favor? Opposed? Approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

We have to table 1090 pending closing of the public hearing at the next full Legislative Meeting.

LEG. FOLEY:

1092.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

1092, correct, we'll do that now. 1092-03 (P) - Authorization of rates for Bay Shore Ferry, Inc. (Presiding Officer Postal). Once that is closed we will -- I will make a motion to discharge on the floor so that the time -- we don't have any more time constraints seeing that this company has followed the rules and regulations accordingly as prescribed by this Legislature.

30

LEG. FOLEY:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

So motion to table by myself, second by Legislator Foley. All in favor? Opposed? Tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

Now, Sayville Ferry, Kevin.

MR. DUFFY:

Sayville Ferry, I have been working on the report, I am in contact with their accountant. So our report won't be issued until the accountant addresses my questions.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Okay.

MR. DUFFY:

I would suggest that you table that.

CHAIRMAN CARACAPPA:

Absolutely. Motion to table by Legislator Crecca, second by Legislator Towle. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1207 is tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).

That's it for the agenda. Is there any other business to come before the Public Works & Transportation Committee meeting? Any other members of the public wishing to be heard? Hearing none, we stand adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 4:03 P.M.*)

**Legislator Joseph Caracappa, Chairman
Public Works & Transportation Committee**

{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically