

**PUBLIC WORKS**  
**AND**  
**TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**  
  
**of the**  
  
**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

A regular meeting of the Public Works and Public 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 Tuesday, December 12, 2006.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator Jay Schneiderman - Chairman  
Legislator Wayne Horsley - Vice-Chairman  
Legislator Kate Browning  
Legislator Edward Romaine  
Legislator Jack Eddington  
Legislator John Kennedy  
Legislator Louis D'Amaro

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

George Nolan- Counsel to the Legislature  
Kevin Duffy - Budget Review Office  
Gil Anderson - Chief Deputy Commissioner - DPW  
Lou Calderone - Deputy Commissioner - DPW  
Catherine Stark - Aide to Chairman Schneiderman  
Richard Baker - Deputy Clerk - Legislature  
Ben Zwirn - County Exec's Office  
Gail Lolis - County Attorney's Office  
Soon Jong Ha - Gaia Property  
Bill Doble - Gaia Property  
Bill Hillman - SC Department of Public Works  
Clifford Hymowitz - SC Transportation Advisory Board  
Eugene Wishod  
All Other Interested Parties

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

**(\*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:42 P.M.\*)**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Good afternoon. I'd like to call the meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee to order this 12th day of December, 2006. If you all will rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator D'Amaro.

**SALUTATION**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We will move right to the agenda. I have one Legislator out in the hallway who we'll bring in. We are going to start with a presentation. We have some gentlemen here, I think four of whom or three of whom, who have come a distance to be here from Japan, one who's from Long Island. They are with the Hydro Thermal Treatment System. The main presenter is Soon Jong Ha. Mr. Ha has extensive educational and training background on the Hydro Thermal Treatment System and is currently writing his thesis on this technology. He has received a Master's Degree in Chemical Engineering from Gyoung-Song University in Chin-Ju City, Korea and is a candidate to earn a PhD from Tokyo Institute of Technology in January of 2007.

I had a presentation by these gentlemen after they had a read an article or an editorial in Newsday relating to the Solid Waste Management Commission and what to do with Long Island's trash, which we produce tremendous amount and then we cart off that trash. And in that presentation, they talked about sewage treatment as well in terms of what to do with the end products of the sewage treatment process. And it just so turns out that we have quite a bit of material, I think maybe 2000 yards a day, somebody can correct me if I'm wrong, that gets carted out to Georgia to be land filled currently, and that's why the County was looking into the incinerator, which led to quite a bit of controversy and eventually the defunding in the Capital budget of the rebuilding or refurbishing of the incinerator at Bergen Point.

I thought this technology was interesting and promising and at least worth bringing to this committee. I know Legislator Horsley has also reviewed it as well, and I wanted the opportunity for this group to present to the full committee today. So without further adeu, I will turn things over to our presenters, Mr. Ha. Mr. Ha, if you will maybe introduce who you have brought with us today and then take us through your presentation.

**MR. DOBLE:**

If I might, I'll make the introductions.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay.

**MR. DOBLE:**

Mr. Ha has recently joined us as a project manager for the organization. And {Shu} is the president --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Bill, if you'll introduce yourself too.

**MR. DOBLE:**

Oh, yes. My name is Bill Doble. I brought this upon Long Island. {Shu} is president of the company. And the inventor is sitting next to me. He's the gentleman why we're able to present this. He has many, many years of experience with this particular system. His name is {Joe Dekashi}.

**(A PRESENTATION WAS GIVEN BY THE COMPANY OF GAIA PROPERTY, INC.)**

**(PLEASE SEE ATTACHED HARD COPY)**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let's go with some questions, because I think some of it may have been confusing. So you guys have invented a system, this gentleman has invented a system that takes organic products, food, or in our case, sewage sludge and it converts it in a fairly short period of about 30 minutes.

**MR. {SHU}:**

That's right.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Into a product that usable as a fertilizer or as a component in some other industrial process, correct?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Yes. That's right.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And it's a closed system, it's a nonpolluting system; is that correct?

**MR. DOBLE:**

That's correct. It doesn't containment the air, the water, the soil.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It seems like it vents some steam.

**MR. DOBLE:**

Just like a normal boiler in your own home would do that too.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right. And in terms of smells?

**MR. DOBLE:**

There's absolutely no odor.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's no odor associated from the process?

**MR. DOBLE:**

Not at all, no.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. And the product at the end is a sellable product, it has some valuable?

**MR. DOBLE:**

That is correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. And the cost for operating it in terms of electricity or gas -- what does it run on?

**MR. {SHU}:**

It all depends.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It depends? Diesel --

**MR. {SHU}:**

Gas or kerosene or.

**MR. DOBLE:**

And it's difficult to judge at this point. If we're to put a system like this on Long Island, it varies with electrical rates, water rates.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How big is the system? What's the size?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Twenty feet, 20 feet, and height it's about 40.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

40 feet?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Sorry. Twelve feet, 12 feet and 20 feet of height. So 20, 20 and 40.

**MR. DOBLE:**

Twenty, 20 and 40.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Forty feet high.

**MR. DOBLE:**

Yes. If you look to some of the diagrams I've provided you with, this unit, especially for the system that I saw when I was permitted to view the site, currently, the sludge actually comes out of a window, and it goes directly in a truck, which is hauled away. According to one of the gentlemen who showed me site, you're able to take that -- we don't even have to incorporate a building that high, because it can automatically be brought in through a conveyer system right into the hopper. So you don't need any building that extremely high for this.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you know the cost -- I mean, right now, Ben, what are we paying to cart it out of here, \$80 a ton?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Eighty-three sixty-four a ton.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How much?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Eighty-three dollars and roughly sixty something cents per wet ton.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Eighty-three sixty-four per wet ton.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And the cost of running your operation, what type of numbers could you deliver?

**MR. DOBLE:**

As far as in the past, we've discussed in the range it will be between 80 to \$85 a ton to process this particular type of waste that you have at the plant.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's if you had your own site, or that's if the County provided a site?

**MR. DOBLE:**

You know, we can put one of these temporary buildings, again, you'll see that in the documentation, and it could be done right next to where the sludge is coming out of. We can erect this temporary -- it's not a permanent structure. It's very, very simple.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So it wouldn't actually save the County money, but it would reduce truck traffic, is that --

**MR. DOBLE:**

Well, that's one tremendous advantage you'd have.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What are the other benefits?

**MR. DOBLE:**

Well, there's a byproduct that you could sell --

**MR. {SHU}:**

You can sell. It's a variable byproduct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

But in your figure of \$80 -- \$80 to \$85 a ton, you are keeping the funds from the byproduct.

**MR. DOBLE:**

We are, sir. We are going to take the byproduct and we're going to sell that to the open market. The benefit coming back to the County would be that we are going to use a system that they're currently using in New York City where they're running the plastic. And what this particular company is turning around and giving back to the City, X amount of dollars per ton, because essentially the waste belongs -- the plastic belongs to New York City.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Now, do you know -- you toured the Bergen Point facility; is that correct?

**MR. DOBLE:**

That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Now, it's a specialized facility that converts not just to a sludge, but it's a kind of dewatered sludge. It's been -- it's gone through a whole series of processes.

**MR. DOBLE:**

That's right.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Now, has this technology been tried on a similar type of product?

**MR. DOBLE:**

This has been tried in Japan. This is exactly what they are doing in Japan for four years.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You know, I know that some of the concerns would be -- you know, would we have space for it, would -- what about odors. You said there are no odors associated with this.

**MR. DOBLE:**

No. There are no odors. I've been there, I've seen it. You can take this in your hands actually after the processing, and you're going to find absolutely no odor at all. I know it's difficult to believe, but you have to experience it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right. All right. Let me see if there are other questions from other Legislators about the technology. It is up and running though in Japan right now?

**MR. DOBLE:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is it up and running anywhere right now?

**MR. DOBLE:**

No, not yet.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Why not?

**MR. {SHU}:**

(Inaudible). But the business partners are separated. So they have a little bit of trouble in Japan. That's why they stopped it right now. But we have all the data from the running, okay?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Are there other areas looking at this technology in the United States?

**MR. DOBLE:**

As a matter of fact, at four o'clock, we're making a presentation to Nassau County, so the answer to that question would be yes. I'm trying to keep this local, because coming from Long Island for the last 34 years and realizing the problems we do have, not only in Long Island, but we essentially have a problem all over the country with this type of situation. This would be ideal to bring it in, obviously. Well, the plan is to bring it in, introduce it, have it exposed not only for the benefit of Long Islanders, but contact the United Nations, and you'd have a lot of people coming out here from all over the world.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

One of the things that we had talked about is trying to get support for may be doing some kind of pilot project.

**MR. {SHU}:**

Pilot project is a good idea.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That would be no cost to the County.

**MR. DOBLE:**

That's correct, other than the tipping fee.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right. Right. So we pay the same tipping fee we're currently paying, and then you can demonstrate that it worked.

**MR. DOBLE:**

Correct.

**MR. {SHU}:**

So you can take data for three months or something like that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right. But you would need a spot for three months to set up.

**MR. {SHU}:**

Yes, we can do that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How much volume would you need to test it out?

**MR. DOBLE:**

A hundred tons a day. I've been told that that facility has 100 tons a day plus another 100 tons from scavenger waste from all over Long Island. So if you could afford to give up that 100 tons, we can work with that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, see, I don't know. I mean, it doesn't change our cost, but I don't know what our arrangement is with the current carter. If we're doing -- I thought we were more than 200 -- is that what it is, Ben, 200 tons a day?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Around 200, a little bit more.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What did I say before, 2000? That was way off. Two hundred tons.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yeah. You said yards before, cubic yards. It's around 300 cubic yards.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Well, I was wrong either way. It's 200 tons a day we do?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I might bring you up in a little while, Ben, because if we are going to look at the potential for a pilot project, obviously we can't do it if it's in violation of the current contract we have. So I need to have that information. All right. Other Legislators. We'll start with Legislator Horsley.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Good afternoon. A couple of quick questions. Knowing that you are going to be speaking to Nassau County, I understand that there's differences between the waste -- not physically -- the waste between Suffolk and Nassau is digested and undigested. Does it make a difference in your process, the sludge itself?

**MR. DOBLE:**

Could you repeat that question one more time so maybe Mr. Ha will be able to respond to that?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

The question is I understand that Nassau County's sludge is processed in a different way than it is in the sewer plant in Southwest Sewer District; one is digested and one is undigested, it's my peripheral understanding. I'm just wondering does it make a difference in this process how the sludge is processed in Southwest Sewer District versus that in Nassau? Does it make a difference at the end of the day for you guys?

**MR. DOBLE:**

Well, I think the response to that would be that we'd like to take a tour of both facilities and see the way it's done and have the engineer decide if there is a difference. The one thing I do understand the difference between Nassau and Suffolk is that the tipping fee out there is a hell of a lot higher, I believe.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Well, that's --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It might be because there's a higher water content.

**MR. {SHU}:**

Our system is undigested, okay?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Your system is undigested. Ben, ours is undigested, right?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay. That's question number one. Question number two, I notice on your -- ah, operating flow chart, here it is. It says steam vent. Where does that steam vents go to? I see steam in, steam out. Where does the steam out go to.

**MR. {SHU}:**

The vent go the cycling system, okay.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

So it returns?

**MR. {SHU}:**

It returns.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

It's an enclosed system, it doesn't vent into the atmosphere?

**MR. {SHU}:**

It's closed, closed-in cycling system. And it's separating heavy metal -- water -- you know, steam and heavy metal. Heavy metal and steam.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay. So the steam in a closed system then returns to the steam injection; is that right?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Steam goes to, you know, the tank, okay. And heavy metal --

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Separated out.

**MR. {SHU}:**

Separated out.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Then you're saying it's recycled. Does it go back to the steam injection then or back into the system itself?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is there a vent pipe that steams out to the air.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

That's basically what I want to know.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Basically, is there --

**MR. {SHU}:**

The inside of the tank is vapor, and the steam will be in the water.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

The steam will go back to water. And that same water would then be reused to create more steam injection.

**MR. {SHU}:**

We would drain it. After, you know, taking all the heavy metal out, and after that, we would drain it out.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

You would drain it out. Okay. In that draining process, is it open to the open air? I mean, I'm looking for possible consequences at the sewer -- sewer plant that would create odors, because I've heard similar systems proposed before and that they are still odorous even though they has said that they weren't. I'm not saying your is. Problem but this has been a problem in the past with similar systems that there's odors emanating from this project. I want to make sure -- I want assurance that there is no odors going into my residence.

**MR. {SHU}:**

I understand. This one is (inaudible) very, you know, exclusive system. Everything is happening in the reactor. So you don't need to worry about odor anyway. No stink at all.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

No stink at all. The stench factor you mentioned.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What about noise. Any noise associated with it?

**MR. {SHU}:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's silent?

**MR. {SHU}:**

There is a silence. Very quite.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Where does the steam come from in the first instance? Does this unit have a boiler attached to it?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Yeah. There is a boiler, as he mentioned, a steam injection. Over there, there is a boiler.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Off the screen, I understand. But in other words, you furnish that boiler as well?

**MR. DOBLE:**

That's correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. And how is that boiler fueled? Is it gas-fired?

**MR. {SHU}:**

It all depends on, you know --

**MR. DOBLE:**

The availability of what they currently use.

**MR. {SHU}:**

If the kerosene is cheaper or the natural gas is cheaper, you can do it. (Inaudible) is cheaper, you can use it. Any type of boiler is okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Any type of boiler is okay. The drying component at the end of your cycle, you have a 60% reduction in the first instance. So if you have a ton go in, 2000 pounds in, you have -- whatever the math is going to be there -- you're down to -- you know, what is it, 1200 pounds or something like that -- and then ultimately dry material, you're down to 200 pounds of material. Where does that intermediate step -- where is that drying action, where does that go on?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Good question.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The question is physically, would that be happening at the -- let's say this was at Bergen Point Facility, would there be an area that you would have as a drying bed? Would it be outdoors?

**MR. DOBLE:**

You would need an area for drying.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And what about smells associated with that?

**MR. DOBLE:**

There are no odors to this process.

**MR. {SHU}:**

After treatment, you don't need to worry about the odors.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I understand the odor aspect of it, gentlemen, which I appreciate. But let's go back then again to how much material will this unit process in a day?

**MR. {SHU}:**

One unit, five cubic (inaudible) is 60 tons per day.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Approximately 60 ton of product a day.

**MR. {SHU}:**

Yeah. By one machine. And if you need 120, you need two machines.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So you have -- how many pounds of material are going to be produced that have to go through the drying cycle then? If we have 1200 off of one ton --

**MR. DOBLE:**

If you were to put 100 tons into the machine for processing, you're putting 100 tons in and you're getting 100 tons out.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Can we go back to that screen then? I'm really more confused than I was before. Now, doesn't that show at the end there 10% of whatever when in? So if we had a ton, if we had 2000 pounds worth of material, bile mass going in in the first instance, at the end of the whole process, we should have 200 pounds of dried fertilizer material, correct?

**MR. {SHU}:**

It's 200 pounds okay. After the de actor, you can have 200 tons. It's the same. A amount will be A amount, because there will be steam. But after that, as we mentioned over there, after drying, it's reduced.

You understand?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

After drying it's reduced down to 10%. But your first graphic there at the discharge point shows 60%. So is there a 60% reduction in the volume having gone through your --

**MR. {SHU}:**

Your question is 40%?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So it's a 40% yield. All right. So we have 800 pounds --

**MR. {SHU}:**

Sorry. This is another material. That is the moisture content. You know, a 60% moisture content product.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Forty percent solid.

**MR. {SHU}:**

It's a 40% -- okay. Probably your sludge is 80%, you know, moisture content.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You know what, gentlemen? I don't want to get caught up in the particular ratios. I guess then, let me just go the broader question. How many area do you need in order to deal with the drying

function, and what's the period of time associated with it?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Seventy-two hours, okay? Seventy-two hours. Okay. And the area is 30 feet and 70 feet, sorry.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Sir, can I take a shot at this?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think he answered -- 30 feet by 70 feet is the drying area?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And how high?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Twenty one hundred feet.

**MR. {SHU}:**

Just flat drying area.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll yield. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thirty by 70 is, what, 2100 square feet. That would be for one machine -- that's for doing 60 tons?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Tons, yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Sixty tons worth of sludge. You would need the room for the machine, which you said is 20 by 20 by 40, and then you would need a drying area of 30 by 70.

**MR. {SHU}:**

That's right. Exactly. Correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So if you wanted to do all of the waste at the facility, you'd need three machines roughly to do 200 tons -- roughly three machines, and you would need --

**MR. {SHU}:**

That's right. Three machines. That's right.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Six thousand plus square feet of drying area.

**MR. {SHU}:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. Any other questions? Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

All right. Then to continue that process, now you have this large volume of sludge after treatment, and it's out in a building hopefully somewhere and it's been processed and it's been dried, now what do we do with it?

**MR. {SHU}:**

It will be manure. And you can serve it to --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Sorry. It will be what?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Manure.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Oh, okay.

**MR. {SHU}:**

Manure to the (inaudible). You can serve it to agriculture.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, you know, but how do we get from A to B? You know, just saying that we can sell it to agriculture, what is the cost of doing that? Is there a market to do that? Do they pay us or do we pay them to take it? I mean, these are the questions I would have.

**MR. {SHU}:**

That is a valuable, you know, material. So they will pay to buy the manure from us.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

There's a demand for that here in Suffolk County?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Yeah. I hope --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

So we don't really know.

**MR. {SHU}:**

-- there is, you know, enough demand for manure here. So in case, we close everything here, and you can raise your product here.

**MR. DOBLE:**

If we were to use this particular site for this, and we're running the plant, it would be our responsibility, not Suffolk County's, to take the byproduct and sell it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah, but if you can't sell it, then it becomes our problem, okay? You know, we went through this 20 years ago with recycling plants where this was this world-wide alleged market for aluminum. And all of these plants were built, and you know what? There was no market, and it became a big problem.

**MR. DOBLE:**

That would be our responsibility to find that out.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. But it's our responsibility, ultimately, if there is no market. So what I'm asking has any

research been done as to what we do with the end product and where is the market? Where are you shipping to now? Have you identified these markets? How costly is it to get to those markets?

**MR. DOBLE:**

We have not gone that far at this moment.

**MR. {SHU}:**

In Japan actually, had one company working already, and it will be -- what you call -- it's organic manure.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah. But it would have to be -- to be attractive to businesses, it would have to be cheaper and competitive. Do we even know that?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Or a better quality.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay. How do we know that, that it's a better quality?

**MR. {SHU}:**

You can have all our data, what is included inside of our manure. You can compare with, you know, the other market. Okay?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Has that been accepted then by -- can you point to specific markets that have agreed that it's better quality and they want this product instead of others?

**MR. DOBLE:**

That documentation, they have it on previous sales into the Japanese market. Of course, we haven't done this here yet, so there's no way we can document something like that.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Has the byproduct, the end product, been tested by any official authority that you know of, and who would that be, please?

**MR. {SHU}:**

In (inaudible) in Japan, there are areas in agriculture exam center, and they examine everything. They have all of the data. And you guys need, we can provide it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I guess the question is has it been approved for use on food crops or other agricultural types of uses in the United States. And the answer is not yet or you don't know?

**MR. DOBLE:**

No. We don't have that data for you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I don't want to keep you much longer because I know you have to go Nassau County and present, but I want to see if anybody from DPW had any questions while you are here. I know you have come a long way. Mr. Wright.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Not necessarily questions. I just want to make a general statement I guess, that, you know, we are open minded in Public Works to look at, you know, whatever processes my assist with the district operation and maintenance, and we also look at the big picture. And the big picture to us is that we

have a sludge management plan that's just being initiated where a consultant is going to look at 40 processes to screen them to see what's viable for Bergen Point, and they're going to narrow that down to ten options, which they're going to do a detailed analysis on. It's going to lead to a selected plan. And that selected plan is going to have input from regulators, the community, elected officials and our technical staff.

What I'm concerned about is if you look at having a pilot facility that's going to cost us something -- and by the way, we have had probably five or six proposals along those lines from people that have seen the article that you referred to earlier, that do something similar. You know, they're going to produce a product that's marketable or they're going to solve problems. And that's fine as something we'll look at, but at the same time, we can't enter into somewhat of an agreement with all of them. If this pilot facility for 100 wet tons a day is going to cost \$8000 a day, then that's something that, you know, we're going to have a follow General Municipal Law in order to implement that. And it's not something that, you know, we should take lightly.

We have an existing contract with the hauler that has given us the most comfort of all the haulers that we've dealt with, and this is in a time when gasoline prices, fuel prices have gone skyrocketing and they complained, they've tried to do their best just to take whatever we're producing and get it off the site. So I don't want to really interfere with that contract. So anything we do, you know, has to take those types of situations into account. I would have some questions for this particular process if we had more time to evaluate the slides. And, you know, I can suggest that it would -- it could part of the sludge management plan evaluation, those 40 options that we have.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is it currently listed as one of the options?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

No. In the proposal of the firm that we selected, there were 40 listed, but they could be fine tuned basically. There is, you know, like, biogasification, which might be similar to this, pyrolysis, etcetera, that we'll be looking at. So there are some that are similar. And we can find tune to incorporate anything that's viable.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Have we picked a company, though? You're saying we have.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes. Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What's that coming in at, can I ask?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Coming in at?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What's the price?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Five hundred and nine thousand dollars.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Five hundred and nine thousand to study the alternatives.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

I mean, I would say a third of that has to do with workshops and educating the public and community, etcetera. There is a big element of it that has to do with that type of task. The actually

evaluation and screening is probably about half of the whole process.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. It just seems -- you know, you have the possibility -- you're saying there's some cost to the County. Certainly there's a cost in terms of square footage and providing a space. It sounds like what these gentlemen are proposing would be at their own cost, they would cover the utility cost, they'd cover the shipping of the equipment

**MR. WRIGHT:**

I thought I heard the tipping fee, except for the tipping fee, which is the \$83 per wet ton.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Which would be the same as the tipping fee we're currently paying. So that wouldn't be an additional cost to the County.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Not an additional cost, but --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

In fact, I think I heard -- when I met with them I think they said they would do a tipping fee that was less than what we are currently paying.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Well, at \$80 a wet ton and \$100 a wet -- that's \$3 million a year. I mean, that's a substantial contract that would have to go through the right process in order to implement.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Like I said, we did have suggestions from a facility that's being -- a vendor building a facility along the same lines with heat and pressure of sludge in California for a facility larger than ours that's under construction now. You know, something -- we've considered talking to them, but, you know, we want to go through the right process and evaluate everything on paper first.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So you're saying even if you went with this type of process, it would have to an open competitive bidding process.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Will the guy -- will the company that's doing this analysis, will he be soliciting proposals from various industries and companies?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

They have, you know, wide knowledge of the processes that are used to stabilize and dispose of residuals in the treatment plant.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

No, I understand that, but I also know of one particular county that was looking to do something similar, and they put out request for, I guess, expressions of interest kind of thing. What would you do to help us solve this problem?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

That's part of the evaluation, whether or not we have to go along those lines or not, depending on -- you know, after the first series when they narrow the 40 down to ten, you know, that will be the time when we make a decision on whether we're going proceed with designing -- you know, leading toward a design of a system or issuing an RFP for, you know, those viable solutions, because we don't want to open it up to 40 or more options that will be submitting requests or proposals rather for an RFP. We want to narrow that down to things that are going to be viable for the plant.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'd like to see at least this type of solution looked at to see if it's viable.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

That can be done. It's our plan.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Maybe we can have some coordination then between the company and the presenters so at least they can follow the process. Other questions? Okay. Thanks, Ben. Anything else you want to add Mr. Doble?

**MR. DOBLE:**

Gentlemen, is there anything you would like to add.

**MR. {SHU}:**

I mentioned that our system is, you know, very new actually. It's totally different from, you know, our incinerator and the pyrolysis system. And yeah, so the point is the biggest (inaudible).

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm sorry.

**MR. {SHU}:**

The point is (inaudible).

**MR. DOBLE:**

The system, basically, if you utilize it as a pilot plant, I would venture to say, and correct me if I'm wrong, Joe, we can have a system up and running within a six month period of time and you saved yourself \$509,000. And if it doesn't work, then we'll just pull the system out. That's the guarantee we offer.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Just one other question. And I'll go back to that -- the slide that you had about the operations of the system. I believe that you show that there were rice husks that were included in the system in addition to the sludge?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That was it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That was it. On the left there is that what that says, "rice husk?"

**MR. DOBLE:**

That's exactly what it says.

**MR. {SHU}:**

So you expect the (inaudible) manure in case you don't need. But you know, to put the, you know,

rice husk over there to get some, you know, (inaudible). So both you can do it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Is there a similar type of medium that you would have to add for us here?

**MR. {SHU}:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. And who would furnish that, you or us?

**MR. {SHU}:**

So in your case, we don't think we need any, you know, material like rice husks. We can do just (inaudible) itself. And we can expect the (inaudible) manure in case.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Gentlemen, I want to thank you for presenting. Good luck in Nassau County. Maybe you can talk to Mr. Wright there so that you can keep in contact as the County does an analysis of various technologies so that your technology -- that the consultant is aware of your technology.

**MR. DOBLE:**

Thank you very much.

**MR. {SHU}:**

Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. I have one speaker card that's come, Mr. Wishod, Gene Wishod.

**MR. WISHOD:**

I guess you must be pretty fed up with me appearing and saying basically the same things, but let me have one more shot. And I'll be brief. We are very pleased that the sponsor has amended the Local Law to grandfather projects that have received either conceptual certification or final approval from the Sewer Agency. That's a very, very positive stop.

And from the viewpoint of grandfathering, it really makes no difference in my view whether it's conceptual or whether it's final, because it's at the point when the developer get conceptual that he starts plowing an awful lot of money into a project. And the only difference between the two is you can't apply for formal until you have a SEQRA determination. But to get to the point where the local municipality can make one, an awful lot of money has been invested. And in my experience, and I've handled a lot of these, in no cases where the agency has granted conceptual certification have they refused final approval. So I think that's a very, very positive step. I know Legislator Kennedy has some doubts about including conceptual certification, but, I mean, in my view, it just -- it's very, very important.

Beyond that, let me just think. It would be better if they could phase it in \$20 next year, \$25 in '08, \$30 -- if it's going to be \$30 that it be phased in over a three year period, but I've made that suggestion before. The analysis to justify the \$30 figure, as I mentioned before, I think is flawed, because it's based solely on the Southwest Sewer District costs. And there are 20 other districts, many, if not most of which, have gotten their plants without any cost, unlike the Southwest Sewer District, so. But if it's going to be 30, it's going to be 30.

But I think it would certainly be fairer to try to phase it in over three years rather than double it in one year.

And my only other comment is I wish Counsel would take a look at the authorities that the Local Law cites to exempt this from SEQRA review, because they just don't stand up. I mean, there's a statute cited that has absolutely nothing to do with exemptions from SEQRA review. The regulation deals with preliminary studies, and this is way beyond the point of preliminary studies. But, you know, I may be, you know wasting my time on that, tilting at windmills, that's what I was looking at. But I don't know. I would feel better at least if your Counsel took a look at that and agreed with the citations that exempts this from -- makes it a Type II Action exempt from SEQRA review, because if it does, it's not on the basis of the authorities that are cited in the Local Law. So that's about more -- I have one other comment on a different -- on that policy on connections, but --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let me take Legislator Kennedy's question.

**MR. WISHOD:**

Yeah.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Counselor, thank you. You are right. As a matter of fact, we've had conversations about the inclusion of conceptual. And I guess we're fortunate that we have Mr. Wright here because, you know, I defer to your decades of practice and experience in this area, but I'm advised by my municipal department that in no way, shape or form is conceptual approval binding upon the department, nor does it compel them to have to act in any way, shape or form going forward.

And the burden in my opinion of what a developer has to meet in the first instance when they seek conceptual is very light. And multiple years elapse from the time a developer may obtain that conceptual until they seek formal, and there can be substantial change in the area that is being proposed to be developed. We have had conversations specifically about some of the area where you've had clients, it's in my Legislative District, it's undergone a tremendous amount of revision. And so I guess -- and I've had the same conversation with the sponsor. Obviously it's up to the sponsor as to how they go.

But I believe I'm going to ask Mr. Wright to go ahead and comment on that as well and draw the distinction from our side as far as municipal and -- I'm sorry -- as far as conceptual and formal. Pragmatically practice speaking, I have no reason to disagree with what you state. But that's not what I'm told is the practice, I guess, or where the department is obligated or burdened in any way, shape or form on conceptual. They represent it as a very --

**MR. WISHOD:**

Let me respond briefly. You are absolutely right in terms of being legally binding. The agency makes clear that it's not bound to grant formal approval and that the purpose of conceptual certification is merely to advise the developer in preparing his environmental assessment form what type of sewage treatment the agency would like. But, you know, at an excessive question, you would not make that final and binding determination.

You do hit on another issue that I think is valid in that a lot of time can go by between conceptual certification and final approval. When the agency grants final approval, a developer has a year to sign a contract, a connection agreement. And if he doesn't, he's going to have to go back and make a case for an extension. There isn't such a deadline for making an application for formal approval if you've been granted conceptual certification. That's a gap that ought to be filled, and I've recommended that to Mr. Wright. But that's not a Legislative -- that's a matter of policy that the agency can adopt. And I would recommend to the agency, as I know he would, to bring in a one year period. Also, if there's going to be more than a one year gap from conceptual to final, the developer ought have to make an explanation for that just like he would if he doesn't sign a connection agreement in a year. But that can be done not Legislatively, but as a matter of policy. That's an entirely different issue. But I think it was the DPW who recommended the inclusion of

conceptual certification as well as formal approval. But I'll Mr. Wright, you know, address that.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Which I appreciate. And as I said, I, you know, look to go ahead and discuss the matter with them through the Chair.

**MR. WISHOD:**

I just feel very strongly that notwithstanding from a legal point of view that conceptual certification may not be binding. From the viewpoint of determining whether a project that has conceptual certification ought to be grandfathered from a doubling of a connection fee, I mean, I feel very, very strongly that it ought to be.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Pragmatically speaking, and I heard this at a public hearing only two weeks ago, what happens is the applicant having obtained conceptual, then subsequently when they seek approval at the local municipal level, says that there's been reliance, and that the reliance has compelled them to expend substantial sums on architectural and planning and other types of pre site development work, and so now they say they have been disadvantaged if they don't have the ability to go ahead and obtain the formal. So that's where I find that, you know, we may legally not necessarily be bound but astute advocates and developers will go forward and then when it comes time to get that formal say, but how can we not get it, look what we have done.

**MR. WISHOD:**

But there has been reliance. I agree with you.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So then again, we point out the problem.

**MR. WISHOD:**

It may not be legally justifiable reliance, because conceptual certification is not binding on the County. But the whole purpose of the device was -- what used to happen is the developer would submit an environmental assessment form to the local municipality, and they'd ask him what -- how are you going to handle sewers. And he says, well, I'm going to build my own plant. And he goes forward, spends a lot of money, get a SEQRA determination, they come back to the agency, and the agency says, "We're not going to let you build your own plant. We have a strong County policy against proliferating sewage treatment plants. We want you to connect to Sewer District 5, Sewer District 7, which has capacity for you."

So the whole purpose of conceptual certification was to give guidance to the developer as to what the County wants in terms of sewage treatment, because there isn't any municipal approval of a subdivision, of any other type of site plan approval, that is not conditional on a Health Department approval. And that means, you know, formal approval of a method of sewage disposal.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Counselor, I appreciate it.

**MR. WISHOD:**

Sure.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you. Okay. That's the only speaker card I had. We also have one other brief presentation by the Chair of the Transportation Advisory Board, Mr. Clifford Hymowitz.

**MR. WISHOD:**

I had a comment on another one. I put in one card.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Cliff, if you don't mind.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Gene, you could come forward. I was asking Mr. Hymowitz to wait a moment so you could finish.

**MR. WISHOD:**

This is on that change in policy on connections. The sponsor, Legislator Alden, had invited me to submit -- it all has to do language and some ambiguous language. I had written a letter to him on his invitation. Can I leave a copy with you as part of the record? It's not a big deal, except that it is confusing. And I'm hoping that he'll make that change.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Wishod, Legislator D'Amaro also has a question for you.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you. I would like to see your letter, because I was looking at that legislation myself, and I also had a discussion with the sponsor about that legislation, and I think it might be a positive step in the right direction to put in some kind of guidelines, because sewer capacity is a limited capacity, and we need to plan for the future and make sure we're going in the right direction. And when we're granting hook-ups, have more of a prospective approach and a global approach to the area.

**MR. WISHOD:**

I agree. I have no objection to it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Okay.

**MR. WISHOD:**

I just think some of the language is a little ambiguous.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. I recall your testimony last time. There was some ambiguity in the language that you took issue with, which is fine. We welcome those comments, and I want to see your letter. What I wanted to ask you is going beyond just the ambiguity that you saw in the present legislation, is there anything else as far as guidelines or standards that you would recommend? Do you think that this legislation, if we clear up just the ambiguity, is all encompassing to achieve the objective of having more of a global strategy going forward over the next ten or 20 years in hooking into these sewer districts, or do you think the guidelines should be more extensive, are they -- are they missing any area?

**MR. WISHOD:**

Well, I think the guidelines in the new legislation are really being effected substantially today by the Sewer Agency, depends on your aspect. I haven't given any thought as to whether there should be any other guidelines. But off the top of my head I would say no. I think the Sewer Agency and their staff do a fine job of implementing County policy. My only suggestion would be that --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Well, that's an unwritten policy, though.

**MR. WISHOD:**

I'm sorry?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

You're saying that the guidelines that are embodied in this resolution are pretty much followed anyway.

**MR. WISHOD:**

In my opinion they are.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

They are, but they're unwritten.

**MR. WISHOD:**

Well, they're unwritten in terms of legislation or a local law. They may be written in County policy.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Where would I find that? Do you know offhand?

**MR. WISHOD:**

Suffolk County Sewer Agency. I don't know if they reduce to writing or not, but they could be.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

But that's been your experience?

**MR. WISHOD:**

I would not -- my experience in what inquiries the Sewer Agency makes and what kind of a showing they want you to make --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah.

**MR. WISHOD:**

That these guidelines are pretty much implemented.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

To your knowledge, has the Sewer Agency denied a hook-up?

**MR. WISHOD:**

Sure.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yeah?

**MR. WISHOD:**

Yeah.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Using those guidelines whether they're written or unwritten?

**MR. WISHOD:**

Yes. Yes, they have where they felt it wasn't beneficial. What bothers me is, you know, they talk about what it would cost the developer to build his own plant, and, you know, one of the strongest policies the Sewer Agency has, and it's a County policy for many years, is to avoid a proliferation of small sewage treatment plants.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right.

**MR. WISHOD:**

So if you want to build your own plant and you're coming before the Sewer Agency, you better have made a pretty comprehensive investigation that any sewer plant owned by a County Sewer District

or owned by a private party, like an HOA, does not have capacity to accommodate your project. That's a very strong County policy. That's not expressly in this new local law, but it's been a policy of the Sewer Agency for a long time, and a very sound one.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you. I appreciate your comments.

**MR. WISHOD:**

Sure.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you. Okay. Mr. Hymowitz, welcome back.

**MR. HYMOWITZ:**

Thank you. I guess this is kind of anticlimactic after all this talk about sludge and sewage, but I'm here to talk about transportation. I just want to take this time to thank you for the opportunity to address you today and to wish you and your family on behalf of the board the happiest and healthiest holiday season you can have.

Over the many years I've been working with the Executive and Legislative Branches of Suffolk County on transportation and accessibility related issues, I must honestly say that this Legislative Branch has been the most receptive to different opinions and recommendations. As an advocate the rewards of your efforts come slowly, so it's critical to know those who can remind you that a systematic change may be slow, but that in the process, you change people's lives and that is what truly matters.

I'd be negligent if I didn't express my frustration and discontent at the lack of response to one of the recommendations that was part of our policy recommendations that was submitted to you on September, 2006. The recommendation was a request for review by the Legislature's Budget Review Office to identify if there is adequate funding and resources available to do more comprehensive marketing. Although I'm not familiar with the Adopted 2007 Operating Budget, it is my understanding that part of the Legislative Budget Review Office's report was the following: The 2006 estimate for advertising is \$101,200. Based on expenditures of \$1223 through October 11, 2006 and the 2005 actual expenditure of \$1200, the estimate should be reduced by \$98,700 to \$2500.

I'd be grateful if a member more familiar with this 2007 Operating Budget will clarify for me if this is -- this reduction of 98,700 will no longer be available and not be replaced. I remain optimistic that the TAB will receive responses to our recommendations and through patience and persistence some of these recommendations will be adopted.

In conclusion on behalf of the TAB, I request that the Chair and the Members of this Committee, during the next two weeks, submit comments and any questions regarding the recommendations included in the report I submit to you today. After we've had an opportunity to respond to your comments and questions, we will make it available to the consultants for use in the comprehensive bus route analysis study.

I'm just going to give you a quick overview of what the report says. And again, to remind you that this was as the result of the comments submitted at the May 5th public hearing. The recommendations were broken down to three categories. Nine were recommendations to modify schedules. These modifications include adding stops on a trip without changing the route. These stops are scheduled on other trips on the route. The second one -- there were seven recommendations that require additional buses. These are recommendations possibly -- that possibly reduce the head ware on a route, for example, from one hour between trips to one half hour. These modifications may result in later service for increased service.

The last is 11 recommendations that definitely require review by the comprehensive bus route analysis. These include requests made by participants at the public hearing that require extensive modification of a route or routes. As a summary, there are 27 recommendations involving 18 routes. The following pages give you details of the recommendations, but in the summary, I give you some of the areas to be addressed; access to Hampton West -- Hampton West Estates, access to classes at NYIT, access to the new Brookhaven Townhouse and Belle Haven nursing Homes, the fact that residents in Patchogue and Mastic communities who need access to services at DSS and the Health Center in Coram must first go to Riverhead, access to the Bayport Library and access to Southside Hospital and the Suffolk Community College Nursing Program, service for residents in Leisure Village, service for residents in Artist Lake in Middle Island, service for residents in Strathmore Village in Ridge.

I just leave you with the thought and request that you take a look at the recommendations and, please, you know, provide, you know, me with any comments or questions so that we can present this as a document to be used in the comprehensive bus route analysis. Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Questions for Mr. Hymowitz? Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Not a question for Cliff. I think the reason that the Budget Review -- and this is just a personal opinion -- reduced that money is because the Executive had put in the full amount last year, 101,000 and spent only a thousand of that. It's similar to a lot of positions that we had to debate. We put positions in the budget in various departments because we feel they are needed, and then the Executive doesn't fill them. And this Legislature has deemed itself inadequate to the task of compelling the Executive to fulfill those requirements. So as long as we deem ourselves inadequate, those requirements will not be filled. And as a result, the path of least resistance was to delete the money to make sure that it would not sit there unspent again and to create a fund balance that was unnecessary. One day, maybe one day, we will stand up and do what we should be doing as a Legislature, but that day is yet to be here.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Hymowitz. Your presentations are always on point, and certainly they are helpful to me in my district. I have a question for you based on some of the ccs you sent to me about a study that was released very recently, access to transportation on Long Island. As a matter of fact, I sent a letter out to the department for their comment. In reading your e-mails, it seemed to me that you were somewhat concerned. This was study done by NYMTEC that was an assessment or recommendation or near?

**MR. HYMOWITZ:**

Basically what is was was a determination of what our -- where does responsibility for providing transportation lie, whether it be within the public or the private sector. My only concern about the study was my feedback from the people that were involved in the public participation felt that when they went there, the consultants already had a, you know, point in mind, and that their, you know, recommendations really went, you know, unheard and it was sort of, you know, a moot point.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you. I'll take this up with you personally, because obviously there should be something else done with this, I guess. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Cliff, before you go, first of all, thank you. I know you spent an awful lot of time pulling these

comments together and presenting them in an organized fashion. And I had attended one of the hearings, the one out in Riverhead and not the one in Hauppauge. You were at the one in Hauppauge, and I'm sure you spent a lot of time reviewing the transcript from the one in Riverhead.

What I'm not seeing, and maybe because I've just take a very brief kind of cursory look at this, there was several requests for -- not for new bus stops, but for bus shelters. One may have been in that Ridge and one maybe in the Manorville area.

**MR. HYMOWITZ:**

There's three reports. The third one is going to be on bus stops and bus shelters. The reason I was releasing them in stages was hoping that we would have a chance to respond. You know, I didn't want to dump all three on you. I wanted to do it in stages so that we had an opportunity to work on them. The last one will be on bus stops and bus shelters. So that's why.

The just addresses routing and scheduling. Like, for example, in the first category, there are situations where you have a bus going to -- ending in Riverhead, and it goes back east -- westbound empty. I mean, why not put people on it? So it's those type of changes that won't really impact, you know, the route. It's just a matter of, you know -- or you have situations where from Bay Shore, the first stop doesn't stop at the Bay Shore Mall. Now, there are people that at the Bay Shore Mall are transferring to that bus to get to Hauppauge, but if the bus doesn't stop there, they have to wait for the next bus to get to Hauppauge, which out them late. So, you know, that's why you don't see anything about bus shelters. The next report will have --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

On other comment you had -- in your opening letter, you had mentioned something about us giving you and comments and questions regarding recommendations for bus routes and services that you would relate to the consultant. And, you know, my intention is to meet with the consultant myself, so.

**MR. HYMOWITZ:**

What I was saying is that before we give them document, we wanted this committee to have the opportunity to review it and see if there's something erroneous in it or that you know something of contrary nature or that we, you know, left something out. So it's not for you to, you know, to eliminate your communication, it's just -- you know, we are here to serve you, and so, therefore, we want to give you --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So that's strictly -- that comment was strictly on your report, comments or your report?

**MR. HYMOWITZ:**

Exactly.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. No. It looks like it's well done. Thank you, Mr. Hymowitz.

**MR. HYMOWITZ:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thanks again for your volunteer work on behalf of the public transportation riders in the County. Okay. So we'll move to the agenda. I'll ask Mr. Anderson to come forward, if there are any questions and any of you colleagues that you would like to bring with you. Before we move the agenda, Legislator Romaine has asked me for a moment.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'll let you get seated, Gil. Could you tell me now, today, what the status of the Northville Beach situation is? Something that has been kicking around in my district long before I even got there.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Yes. At the present time, we are initiating a study, in-house study, using Vector Control people to ascertain exactly what's out there as far as the piping system that goes from the Northville Preserve property over into Long Island Sound. Also, I've been in discussions with the owner of the North Fork (sic) Preserve to get rid of water that's on the site so we can make some repairs of that one spot that's in question next to the Lotitto property.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Well, as you know, apparently that water has backed up. It is threatening about 38 homes. However, you should be aware that probably at the next meeting I will be offering a resolution regarding this. And I would appreciate if you or someone from your staff, maybe Mr. Hillman who is engaged in conversation at this point, but possibly could discuss this with me so I could go over the intent of this resolution, because we need those pipes mapped out, we need that flood removed, we need that contaminated water that's pouring out into the Long Island Sound dealt with, because it possesses a health hazard. And this is becoming an increasingly -- you're getting an increasingly agitated civic association over that.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Understood. I've been --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right. Mr. Moran, Kerry Moran is their president, as I'm sure you're aware.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Yes. I've been in relatively weekly discussions with Mr. Moran. And we are moving ahead with the Vector Control people as I said.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And the last -- the last question and then I will fall silent is my understanding is that there was a change in the working conditions of the workers of DPW that apparently had flex time, which I'm very familiar with as a department head that instituted flex time in my department and benefitted from that, that that has been changed and that is to the dismay of many of the workers at DPW. I certainly would appreciate your comments as to why that change took place and whether you feel it's beneficial or not.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

The change to the flex time policy was initiated at the request of division heads. There were issues with staffing, you know, maintaining staffing. And we, two months ago, three months ago, sent out a memo to the staff that it would be eliminated at this time. We would -- we are considering any -- what would be the term?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

Hardships.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Hardships that, you know, that would be submitted in writing. And we would -- you know, we would consider them, and, you know, if we have to, we'll obviously on an individual case by case basis. But the overall proliferation of the flex time was being eliminated.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. I just thought I would mention it, because you do have a number of unhappy people as a result of that change in policy. One last question, how many budgeted vacancies (sic) in Public Works approximately are now vacant?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

I wouldn't want to guess. I really -- off the top of my head, I really don't know. I don't have that information right in front of me.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I understands that. And Mr. Anderson, maybe over the next few days, you can pick a date certain, December 1st, December 12th, whatever, and say as of that date, Public Works has so many budgeted positions that this Legislature budgeted for vacant.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Okay.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I would like to get that information. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So we're going to move the agenda now. I'm starting with **1854, A Local Law No. 2006, A Local Law to increase connection fees for sewer district contractees located outside the geographic boundary of a sewer district.**

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion to table by Legislator Horsley, is there a second?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. On the motion? Any discussion? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1854 is **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member).**

**1973, Authorization of alteration of rates for Fire Island Ferries, Incorporated.**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Tabled for a public hearing. So same motion, same second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1973 is **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member).**

**1977, To conduct pilot program for S92 Bus Route.**

Legislator Romaine, what's your pleasure?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

It is my understanding that Mr. Anderson recommended -- or I got the impression at the last Public Works Meeting -- that this study might be best conducted during the spring-summer and early fall months where it might have some greater validity than at other times of the year; is that correct?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I would ask Legislative Counsel then to amend the resolution to reflect that the study should take

place somewhere between April 1st and October 1st. And as a result of that, I will move to table this until that amendment is effectuated. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I will make a second. On the motion, if this does happen for the summertime, it would be more to me that it didn't suddenly stop in the middle of the summer.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So it would have to go through the end of the summer. So I'm not sure how many weeks you've contemplated on it.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Well, you know, what? That's something that perhaps, because it effects both of our districts, Jay, that we should speak with Mr. Anderson, because we all know the game that sometimes are played with statistics.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's fine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

In general. In general. Not anyone in specific.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Ideally, you know, April through October, it's a long study, but it would, I think, would be a great use to the area.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

All right. Good.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So there is a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1977 is **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**1984, To transfer portion of CR 63 (Peconic Avenue) to the Town of Riverhead.**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Before I make a motion, I know at our last meeting the Commissioner said that they were working with the Town of Riverhead rather industriously and thought that they might have a solution by this meeting, so I will defer to the Commissioner.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Regretfully, we're still reviewing the report. We haven't got --

**LEG. LINDSAY:**

I don't think you're on.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I will make a motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1984 is **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**2095, Directing the Department of Public Works to conduct a feasibility study for the construction of a pedestrian bridge over William Floyd Parkway in Shirley.**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Legislator Browning?

**LEG. BROWNING:**  
I'm make a motion to table again.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
There's a motion by the sponsor to table, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2095 is **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**2139, To dedicate corner of Pulaski Road and New York Avenue in Huntington as the "Carmen-Ramos Calixto-Laas Corner."**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Has this gone through the Naming Committee yet?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
We will need to table it.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**  
Motion to table.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**  
Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Motion to table by Legislator D'Amaro, seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2139 is **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**2171, Adopting Local Law No. 2006, A Local Law to establish a Safe and Sustainable Procurement Policy.**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**  
My office is still working with the County Executive --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
There's a motion to table by Legislator Romaine, I'll second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2171 is **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**2299, Adopting Local Law No. 2006, A Local Law to strengthen the policy for connections by premises outside of sewer districts.**

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the motion, Mr. Chair?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Just for purposes of the discussion, I don't want to interrupt the agenda, but at some point I would like to get some comment from Mr. Wright about some of the dialog we had with Mr. Wishod before. So -- at your call and discretion.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Do it now.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let's try to get through the agenda. Maybe we'll come back to that, if you don't mind.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's fine.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. We are going to table it either way, right. So it's all in favor of tabling? Opposed? Abstentions? 2299 is **TABLED**. (**VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member**).

**2348, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with improvements to CR 99, Woodside Avenue, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5175).**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion to approve, is there a second.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I will second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator Browning. On the motion, Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes. Can I ask how this is being funded?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Serial bonds. It's being funded with serial bonds.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And what is the amount that's --

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

One hundred thousand.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

One hundred thousand. Okay. I'm just going to put on record that members of the Minority Caucus have met several times. They're concerned about the debt overhang in this County. Debt overhang is about \$388 million. We're concerned that we're bonding many capital projects when it is projected we're going to have a \$133 million dollar surplus. We're concerned about the increase in the debt. We think that some of these projects, particularly the smaller ones, six figures or less, should be funded through a pay-as-you-go system. I have nothing against this project, but I will be abstaining on this resolution.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What's the number on it? It's a hundred what?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

A hundred thousand.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You know, I have to say that philosophically hundred thousand I have to say that philosophically, I agree we shouldn't be borrowing if we have the cash available just so we don't have to pay the interest rates, it's good fiscal policy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

However, I'm going to be supporting this until we have a better policy in place.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I would ask BRO to just go ahead and speak to us again about the -- Legislator Romaine mentioned that we're projected to have a \$133 million dollar surplus. Earlier in the year, we have had funding identified to go ahead and do some of these smaller projects in pay-as-you-go; is that correct?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

The 2006 adopted budget did have, I think, \$3.5 million for pay-as-you-go projects, and that was not used. And it was incorporated into the 2007 budget to balance the budget. So there are no appropriations left in pay-as-you-go.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'm confused with that. When you say it was not used, my recollection is that what happened was there was a budget amending resolution in the earlier part of the year, that might have been April or May, when there were some predictions of some dire shortfall, and at that point, pay-as-you-go was essentially voluntarily forfeited; is that correct?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

It was suspended for 2006 and 2007.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So despite --

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

The policy. So you had the option of bonding projects that by definition, are normally pass pay-as-you-go projects.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

If you would yield, John?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Sure. I'd be happy to.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

If it's November and December, we have a surplus, everything is great. If it's March or April, the roof is collapsing, and we have to come up with a deficit reduction plan. And that has been the calendar for the last three years that this administration has followed. Obviously, we don't have that type of situation. We now have a projected surplus. We should be using that surplus to do pay-as-you-go so we do not run up the bonded indebtedness of this County.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair, similar I believe that this project has merit. I'm familiar with the roadway, but nevertheless, I have the same concerns as far as methodology for payment.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator D'Amaro?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Yes.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

I just want to make a correction on the record, the adopted budget included 7.5 million in pay-as-you-go, the 2006 adopted budget.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And again, what is the estimated surplus at this point?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

I believe it was around 133 million. But that funds -- or those appropriations for pay-as-you-go are used to offset any increases in property tax.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Ironic in that we're willing to embrace financing, debt financing. Thank you. I appreciate the clarification.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any other discussion? Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I had a question for the Budget Review Office also. We keep talking about a surplus, but it's my understanding that the County budget is balanced. When we say surplus, do we mean the turnover savings, in other words, the funds that get turned over to the next year and given back in effect to taxpayers, which also enables us to keep the property taxes lower as opposed to raising them? Is that what we mean by surplus here? I want to get the terminology straight.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Yeah. Correction of terminology. Turnover savings is referred to budgeted positions. And the

amount that's budgeted for positions is reduced based on anticipated vacancies or vacant positions.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Does the County have a surplus?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Well, like we said, what you had said --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Do we have money just laying around --

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

No.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

-- that we can spend this year because it's surplus, and then going into next year's budget, we don't have to account for that money?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

No. You were correct when you said the \$133 million that's used to offset the increases in property tax. And we are dependent upon replicating a significant large surplus each year to prevent taxes from increasing.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Right. And I understand that's a whole other issue and debate as to whether or not we should try to move away from that model, but the point I'm making is I keep hearing about surpluses when, in fact, we don't have a surplus, what we're doing is in effect funding next year's budget thereby not increasing property taxes. That's my understand.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

That's correct.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Two questions on that. Lance, on that \$130 million that we're -- I guess, we call it turnover savings, is that -- that's different?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

No. No.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's different.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Turnover savings is the difference between what you budget for positions and what you anticipate you would use based on filled positions.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So the 130 million is a budget surplus?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

It's the current year's budget surplus. Budgets are continuous. We're growing concerned. So that addition -- \$133 million is used to offset increases in revenues. And property tax is a revenue that's used as the balancing portion. All things being equal, if we had no surplus in 2006, you would have

to raise property taxes an additional \$133 million dollars.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Now that \$133 dollars is predicated on sales tax revenues in the fourth quarter coming in around 2.6%; is that right?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And everything right now look like they're coming in substantially higher than that; is that correct?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Based on the sales tax check that we just received, that's right. We have indications that the last check, which will have adjustments to it; there's probably a two million dollar negative adjustment. So all that being said, it looks like sales tax is coming in about what we estimated it to be in 2006.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

For the year, but when we did the budget, we had corrected it from our original projection to a lower projection, right? We had corrected it from, I think, 3% down to 2.75.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

The estimated budget was -- is lower than what was adopted.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We also then projected for next year 2.5, and if we end up with the 3% -- coming in at the 3% we projected for '06, if we were to revise our projections for '07 and also revise the numbers for '06, we're in much better shape than our budget would indicate, right? So what is the difference?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

I wouldn't say much better shape. It's a few million dollars, and it all depends on, obviously, the economy in 2007. I would say that right now our sales tax projections for 2006 are reasonable and looks like they'll be coming in, which -- and maybe would come in a couple of million dollars higher, which raises the base, which all things being equal would be a couple of million dollars more in 2007.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

When you say a couple, you mean two million dollars, or do you mean 10 or \$20 million?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

No. More like maybe four to seven million. But that's all things being equal. So on a sales tax projection of a billion dollars, you know, a hiccup is several million dollars. So I think our sales tax projection are reasonable for 2007. And maybe they'll come in a little bit higher, but, you know, that's hard to say that at this point in time. I think the best thing to say is that they're conservative, which is a good thing.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Going back to the resolution, how much money is in -- I know this doesn't tap pay-as-you-go. Is there money that is available in pay-as-you-go? Is there a budget line that is not encumbered in any way?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

In 2007?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

In 2006.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

No. In 2006, there are -- the funds that were adopted for pay-as-you-go are estimated to be zero, which goes into the fund balance and all that. And the 2007 adopted budget had no funds in for pay-as-you-go.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's no funds in '07 for pay-as-you-go?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And the funds that were in 2006, we've already authorized transferring them out?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

It's not a transfer, it's based on the estimated budget, which is used to determine the estimated fund balance at the end of the year or surplus, which is used to balance the budget and determine the property tax.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So the budget that we adopted assumed that all the pay-as-you-go money would be applied toward next year in the surplus; is that correct?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

It goes to fund balance. It's in the 2006 estimated fund balance. That \$7 million is implicit in the \$133 million fund balance.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right. Which we also have called the surplus.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yeah. I would like -- I don't really care at this point how we pay for this right now. People are being killed every month on this road. This has been in the works since Legislator Foley was here. I would love to be able to write a check myself to get this done, but people are dying. And I think this is a thing that has to be done immediately. Would I prefer to have money somewhere that we can take it out? Yes. But I'm talking lives right now. So I'm very concerned about this.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I appreciate that.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Move the issue.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. All right. So there's been a motion and a second on 2348. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Two abstentions, Legislator Kennedy and Legislator Romaine. **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstentions - Legis. Kennedy and Romaine).**

**2431, Adopting Local Law No. 2006, A Local Law to reduce the emission of pollutants from diesel-fueled motor vehicles operated by or on behalf of Suffolk County.**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

This needs to be tabled for a public hearing. There's a motion to table by Legislator D'Amaro, seconded by Legislator Horsley. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member).**

Moving on to Introductory Prime. **2456, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Public Works buildings operation and maintenance equipment (CP 1806).**

Is there a motion?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Can you describe for us what the equipment is, Gil, and then, BRO, can you tell us how this is being acquired?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

The piece of equipment we're looking to purchase is what they call a genie broom. And Lou might be better able to, you know, tell you about that?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

With all the newer buildings, especially we just opened up the new Supreme Court, the ceilings, we've got replace lights in ceilings that are 25, 30 to 40 feet up in the air. And it's getting to be a real problem. We've been renting equipment. It makes sense now to have our own genie broom. You see them in the malls. It's that type of broom. And, you know, it just makes sense to get one. And we can move it around the County and use it as we need it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. What's the useful life of a genie broom?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

I really couldn't say. It's got to be -- you know, I know there are ones that are out there that are ten or 15 years old.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Obviously, it's probably gauged on the hours of use, whether the equipment --

**MR. CALDERONE:**

Quite possibly. How you use it. Maintaining it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It's a natural gas fired --

**MR. CALDERONE:**

No. No. This would be electric, this particular one.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Oh, it's electric.

**MR. CALDERONE:**

It's an electric one, correct. It's more for indoor use, not outdoor use.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. And is this something -- well, one question, I guess, and I will just take a moment to refer to the audit that was produced by Mr. Sawicki recently regarding the operations of DPW for the last three years. You gentlemen have had an opportunity to see this?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Yes, we have.

**MR. CALDERONE:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. One of the several items in here that, I guess, you would call -- I don't know what they are, citeables or items of violation is an inventory of equipment. And I saw in the response letter that there was a question on the part of the department as to the need to furnish an inventory of equipment to the Legislature.

A, I would certainly be interested in seeing that inventory, because like any corporation, equipment is a fixed asset that we presumably have, maintain and own and have a responsibility for. Having said that, I'm probably going to abstain on this acquisition too, but nevertheless, I'm sure it will pass. I'd to see the genie broom on the inventory that we hopefully eventually get, because a \$46,000 piece of equipment is something I think we all would be liable for if it was nonfunctional or missing. So I would like to see that we have some kind of an inventory of what we have, what we own and what we buy. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. There's been a motion to approve and a second on 2456. All in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

One abstentions. Legislator Kennedy, are you abstaining? You mentioned you might abstain, are you abstaining?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Two Abstentions, Kennedy and Romaine. **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstentions - Legis Kennedy and Romaine).**

**2457, Appropriating funds in connection with the weatherproofing of County buildings (CP 1762).**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is there a motion?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley, seconded Legislator Eddington. On the motion, this is, what, 150,000; is that correct?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**MR. CALDERONE:**

That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you want to explain what the project is?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

This is for weather proofing of various County buildings, including the H. Lee Dennison Building, Sheriff's Academy, Civil Bureau, Labor Department Modular and Health Department Modular.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

This has been before this committee before, right?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

That's correct.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Yes, sir, it has.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We approved this a couple of weeks ago.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Right. But then it was rejected at the Legislature.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It was rejected and has been resubmitted. Okay. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

The roof at the Dennison Building, is this going to be patched or is this going to be replaced?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

This is not roofs funds. That's a whole different Capital Program. This is weather proofing. This is doing masonry repointing, ceilings, sides of buildings, cement work, brick work, that kind of work. It's not the roofing capital. There's a separate Capital Fund.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It is -- in other words, the mortar and the joints on the Dennison Building are that deteriorated and compromised that we actually need 150 grand to repoint it?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

Yes. It's never been done. Renovations were done to the building approximately eight or nine years ago. That was not included in the renovations. That's all the original -- original roping, original caulking, all that is all original. And actually two sides have been done, and two sides have not been done.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Tell me a little bit about masonry work and the weather conditions.

**MR. CALDERONE:**

What would you like to know?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You can't mix cement under 32 degrees, can you, unless your throwing calcite in it?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

That's correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Why are we approving a repointing project for the winter?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

It's not for the winter, it's to start to design it and get it out for the spring.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

How much lead time do we need for this?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

We would like as much as necessary to get a design and get it out to bid properly and get the work under way as soon as the weather breaks.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Again, I'm going to BRO, is this something that's going to be bonded?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

It was defeated at the last regular meeting.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll yield.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Presiding Officer Lindsay.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Well, the only thing that I want to point out is that to move this along. It's the end of the year. If you don't appropriate the money for these projects now, the money dies.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any more discussion? I'll call the motion -- I'll call the resolution. 2457, there's been a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Abstention.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Kennedy and Romaine abstaining. **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Legis. Kennedy and Romaine abstaining).**

**2458, Appropriating funds in connection with intersection improvements on CR 100, Suffolk Avenue @ Brentwood Road/Washington Avenue, Town of Islip (CP 5065).**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator Horsley, seconded by Legislator Eddington. On the motion, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member).**

**2478, Authorizing the execution of an agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 1 - Port Jefferson with 125 East Oakland Avenue Building (HU-1355.1).**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is there a motion?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Horsley, seconded by Legislator Eddington. On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you. With this, I guess, I would just ask Mr. Wright or somebody to speak to us about the possibility that there may be some substantial change in the connection fee shortly should Legislator Alden's resolution go through. This contemplates the existing grain. I know we've spoken about grandfathering, but what, if anything, do we contemplate or consider?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Wright.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Are we somehow going to have these things flagged for us that they've been grandfathered, approved, or how will we differentiate, Ben?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Well, this is a formal approval. I mean, SEQRA has been completed. But this building has been connected to the sewer district since 1975. And this is formalizing the connection. Just a quick

story about it was that it was part of a nursing facility where one lot was in the district, and this was a lot associated with the nursing complex that was out of the district. The town had been billing them assuming they were in the district, and we didn't start billing them until 2001. So they were doubled billed for, you know, the last five years. And this is to finalize the connection agreement, which, you know, is for a medical office building. So, you know, it's not a conceptual-type situation. It's a building that has formal approval.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

It's been connected for 30 years, I guess, all right, that answered my question.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions. 2478 is **APPROVED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**2481, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with improvements to CR 80, Montauk Highway (CP 5534).**

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to approve, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine abstains. **APPROVED (VOTE:7-0-1-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstention - Legis. Romaine)**.

**2483, Appropriating funds in connection with the construction of sidewalks on various County roads (CP 5497).**

Is there a motion?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley, seconded by Legislator Eddington. On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Where will we -- oh, I'm sorry, I see it. Elwood Road and Pulaski Road, is that where the sidewalks are going in?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

It's Elwood Road from Pulaski Road to the Long Island Railroad.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

300,000?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Is there -- I'll yield, forget it. I have no problem.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. There was a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Two abstentions, Romaine and Kennedy. **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstentions - Legis. Romaine and Kennedy).**

**2493, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the County share for participation in the closed loop traffic signal system (CP 3309).**

Is there a motion? Going once.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Horsley, seconded by Legislator Eddington. On the motion, no discussion. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

One abstention. **APPROVED (VOTE:7-0-1-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstention - Legis. Romaine).**

**2494, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program, transferring funds from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund, and appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 9 - College Park (CP 8163).**

Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Eddington. On the motion, any discussion? Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Again, I guess I'd ask Mr. Wright, this is just overall systems improvements? What is this, Ben?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Wright.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

This is a small building with a filtration system on the end the treatment plant in order to extend the life of the recharge facility, which we've been having trouble with.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Where is College Park.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

It's off College Road near the campus in Seldon. You know, it's 200 and so -- 206 single family homes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

But it doesn't service the Community College?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

No, it doesn't.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2494 is **APPROVED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**2499, Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, amending the 2006 Operating Budget, and appropriating additional funds for the Environmental and Feasibility Study of grease/scavenger waste treatment facility by the private sector (CP 8179).**

Is there a motion?

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion by Legislator D'Amaro. Is there a second?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator Horsley.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I recall seeing something recently where there was a pilot facility opened up in Bohemia that is going to take restaurant grease and convert it to bio diesel. Did we -- did we work with that? Is that something that you gentlemen are aware of?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

We are aware of it. They did the facility sometime ago.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Do you know as to whether it's been successful, whether it's viable, is it something that we're looking to promote?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

It's a good thing, but I believe it's mostly dealing with yellow grease, and what we're dealing with is brown grease. You know, it's a little more -- I think a little more sophisticated as far as getting it to the point where it can be used for bio fuel, a good end product.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You know, I'm going to pass on the question. I really don't need to know the difference between yellow and brown grease, I guess, do we? To me, I guess grease is grease, and you would just figure that's the way to go.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Restaurant fryers it's, you know, yellow grease.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Mr. Chairman.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll yield.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I know a little bit about it because the facility in my district. It's a for-profit facility to dispose of this waste. Instead of paying a fee to the County to dispose of it, a private entrepreneur has gone into business to, you know, provide a disposal site locally instead of trucking to Jersey or -- where are we taking it now, Ben?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

It goes to New Jersey and also to Lindenhurst.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And this guy thinks that he can make money on converting it to a fuel. But it has really nothing to do with the County business. I mean, some people, I guess, commercial users still depend on the County to dispose of their grease, and this is a new option. I don't know whether it will catch on or not.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate this. But is this something that we're -- so this would not be an option for us for our residue from Bergen Point to go ahead and work with this individual?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

No. You'll see in the title it says grease/septage. It's really for both, because the majority of what's generated is in the Town of Brookhaven that goes to Bergen Point. We're looking for another location to take off, you know, some of that load from Bergen Point. It's really two concurrent projects that we're looking at; one is finishing up an Environmental Impact Statement for constructing a facility in Yaphank, the other is will the private sector come in and build something on County land and operate and maintain it rather than the County being involved in it. So this funding is to finish up those two projects.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Projects that are under way?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. I'll yield.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Ben -- through the Chair, Ben, isn't Maggio Place on 109, doesn't he do brown grease?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

He takes in grease there and septage and leachate, yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Is it brown grease?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Ben, you had mentioned the idea of taking County land and allowing a private company to do this kind of an operation. I just want to make sure that that's the same type of process we talked about before when we were talking about septic sludge in terms of having the County -- a private company come under County land. So it would be the same kind of open process, we would bid that out?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

This would most likely be an RFP once the -- and it looks as if it is feasible, it just has to be big enough so the private sector can make a profit on it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So it's not one particular company that you've got in mind?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

No. No.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any other questions? All right. There's a motion and a second on 2499, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2499 is **APPROVED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**2501, Appropriating funds in connection with the rehabilitation of Smith Point bridge, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5838).**

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Second.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Cosponsor.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion by Legislator Browning and a request to cosponsor and a second by Legislator Eddington. On the motion, legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'd like to ask Budget Review, this is a new capital project that's coming forward at this time, or we're just appropriating something that was in the 2006 budget, in the Capital Budget?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

This is in the 2006 adopted Capital Budget. It's appropriating \$500,000 for planning.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

For planning for the rehabilitation of the bridge?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And was that -- are we switching the funding or was it always serial bonds?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

No, this is serial bonds.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah. I'm just reading a note here. So we're appropriating -- or we're looking to appropriate 500,000 because we're anticipating replacement of the existing bridge? We're going to build a new bridge?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

This is strictly money for the consultant to develop plans -- you know, the bridge itself has become somewhat deteriorated.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Can I read to you specifically from your note to Mr. Zwirn --

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Sure. Yep.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

-- on November 22nd? "This appropriation will allow us to hire a consultant engineer to perform preliminary design of a new structure to replace the existing bridge to ensure public access to the beach." Are we building a new -- are we going to do a whole new bridge?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Again, depending on what we receive from the consultant, yes, that's a possibility. He may come back and very well say we can rehabilitate it. But at this point, we need to bring someone in basically help us assess that point.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, I appreciate the clarification, because it appears to me from your note that it is a foregone conclusion that we're embracing a new bridge at this point.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Hillman, how are you?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

We've progressed a preliminary study that has indicated that the preferred alternative at the

moment is replacement of the bridge. However, we have not excluded rehabilitation either. But the preferred alternative at the moment is replacement.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Smith Point Bridge?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Replacement with a non bascule bridge.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

A non what?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

A nonmovable bridge.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

The movables.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

One more time so that I understand that. You are saying at this point that it appears from what you are looking at that your recommendation or suggestions is going to be to build a new bridge.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Not a drawbridge, though, a suspension-type of bridge.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, maybe not suspension.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

From our preliminary study, the next engineering funds will advance the study and come to is a definite conclusion of which bridge -- which type of bridge we should construct, wither a new bridge or rehabilitate the existing bascule bridge.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

How much is a new bridge?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

A brand new bridge, top of my head, 15, \$20 million. But rehabilitating a 50 year old bascule bridge could be ten to \$15 million in and of itself, and you'd still have a rehabilitated 50 year old bascule bridge with moving parts, electronic parts. So it may very well be in the best interest of the County to replace it with a nonbascule bridge.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

We're still working it out.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll yield.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There must be utility costs associated with operating that bridge, right, and the labor costs as well,

right?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Correct. There is someone there 24/7 to open and close the bridge.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes. I assume that there's someone there 24/7 to operate the bridge, because the Smith Point Narrows is part of the Intercoastal Waterway and is a heavily-trafficked area. What would happen in terms of the height of the bridge to allow vessels such as sailboats, etcetera, with large masts to pass under it? Would the bridge become considerably higher, would the bridge have, you know, a longer point from when it would start elevating? Maybe you could explain if we were going to build a new bridge what would be involved in that.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

First of all, the height would allow for sailboats and such to -- if it was a nonbascule bridge, would allow those types of vessels to go underneath.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

What's the height that we're looking at from the mean water line.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I don't have that information right now, but I can say that it would most likely be in conformance with all the other nonbascule bridges along that canal.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Well, the only other one that I'm familiar with is the Ponquaque Bridge, which is in Moriches Bay, and that really goes way high, probably three, four times the height of the Smith Point Bridge.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

It's my understanding that the Ponquaque Bridge also years ago replaced a bascule bridge. So it would be following similar suit. And we do have the same similar distances between, so we feel we can achieve that height.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any other questions? So we had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**APPROVED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member).**

**2504, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and Appropriating Funds in connection with the purchase of highway maintenance equipment (CP 5047).**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator D'Amaro --

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Just one second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Not a motion. This is 2504. I'm looking for a motion.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I'll make a motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Presiding Officer Lindsay.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

I'll second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. Any discussion? Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Just an idea. Again, a million-two of what kind of equipment?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

It would be for a stump grinder, skid steer loader, Pay Loader, mowers, tractors, a trailer, a couple of trucks and a -- super duty trucks and a dump truck with a plow and spreader.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Are those items typically bonded, or they're just bought out of your regular budget?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

They're typically bonded.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

They are?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

All the big -- yeah. All the big stuff.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All the big equipment. Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

A point of information for the Counsel. Was this resolution before us at the last meeting, and was it defeated?

**MR. BARRY:**

Can you give me a minute to check?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Sure.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is that going to change your vote one way or another? It may? All right. So let's pass over it.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

It was before us, and I voted -- I think I abstained the last time, and I fully intend to do that again.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. Then let's call the vote with that assumption then. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Kennedy and Romaine abstaining. 2504 is **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstentions - Legis. Kennedy and Romaine)**.

**2505, Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, amending the 2006 Operating Budget, and appropriating funds for a Safety and Security Improvements Program for sanitary facilities in Suffolk County Sewer Districts (CP 8103).**

Is there a motion? Legislator Eddington makes a motion to approve.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator D'Amaro making a second. On the motion, any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2505 is **APPROVED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**2508, Appropriating funds in connection with safety improvements at various locations (CP 3301).**

Is there a motion?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Browning, seconded by Legislator Eddington. On the motion.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I'd like to know where the --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Anderson, if you could tell us where these locations are.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

This is for land acquisition in the vicinity of County Road 46, William Floyd Parkway and Surrey Circle in Mastic.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Any other discussion? Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I just would note that this resolution was before us once before, and this body choose not to adopt it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What was the amount on this?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

This is for \$100,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's a \$100,000. Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine and Kennedy abstaining. (\*Please see Page 74 for the correct vote\*).

**2512, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of highway maintenance equipment/vac-haul machines pursuant to Phase II Requirements (CP 5047.524).**

Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator D'Amaro, seconded by Legislator Horsley. On the motion, Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I believe this motion was before us at our last General Meeting, and it was defeated.

**CHAIRMAN D'AMARO:**

Mr. Anderson, do you want to explain this resolution?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

This is for the purchase of what's generically called Vac-Haul machine. It gives us the ability to clean out catch basins, leaching pools and allows us to further, you know, basically address stormwater issues prior to any stormwater coming from any of our facilities into an open body of water.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

On the motion. Mr. Anderson, just what is the ramification if we don't provide the funding and we don't ultimately receive this equipment, how does it affect what you do or the people who live around the areas where the work is proposed?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

This would severely limit our ability to clean out catch basins and leaching pools.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Are they located in residential neighborhoods?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

In some cases, yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Are they located throughout Suffolk County?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

How are you cleaning out the basins presently?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Let me defer to Bill Hillman on this one.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Thank you.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

We presently have, I believe, it's two older that Vac-Haul have mechanical difficulties and problems and are in the shop quite often. These would be to replace and supplement these others.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

Is it more cost effective to replace them then it is to continuously repair what you have?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

The technologies advanced so greatly that these Vac-Haul use a completely different system, much more maintenance free. So at this point, yes, it's much for effective to replace these. In addition, I'd like to add that this is 477 funding and went before the Water Quality Committee and was approved. So I don't know if that bares any -- I know that we have been having an economic --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do we trade the old Vac-Haul in, or do we auction them, what happens to them? Do we just keep them as back-ups?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

We would probably keep them as back-ups at the moment.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

What is the acquisition the price of each Vac-Haul? How many would we be acquiring through this resolution?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

This is for \$900,000, and we estimate that each one will cost approximately 300,000. So we estimate that each one will cost approximately 300,00. So we estimate to get three Vac-Haul, one for each maintenance zone within the County.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

And what will happen to the existing two?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I can't answer that. I'm not sure. That would be a question for Lorraine Hickey to answer.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Who mans these machines?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Our crews, our maintenance crews, Highway Maintenance crews.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. And it's my recollection that we have about 14 or 15 people assigned to DPW who are funded out of 477 funding; is that correct?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

That is correct. And we would anticipate using some of that personnel on these -- on these crews.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

How many folks man a Vac-Haul? What is a crew for a Vac-Haul?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Probably two to three depending what the structures are, catch basin structures. I believe you need to be a CDL licensed driver, and then you would need laborers to support that driver.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

How long does it take from the time that we approve a resolution until the time that you actually take delivery on a piece of equipment?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

That's difficult for me to say. I would defer to Lorraine Hickey who is not here right now. But the process would be we would go out to bid for this. When we receive acceptable bids, we would then issue a purchase order. And assuming that the equipment is readily available, I would think it would be fairly quick. If they were backlogged and it was back orders, it would take a little longer.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. I'm going to just ask one question for BRO at this point. I believe that there is pay-as-you-go funding in the '07 Budget; isn't that correct? Your statement earlier was that there was no pay-go in '07.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Yeah. Based on what I had for the adopted budget, it didn't show any. I think there was a consideration depending if sales tax came in that we were going to put some in there. You're correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Again, what I'm going to suggest is -- at this point is with the inability to go ahead and determine how long it takes in order to get receipt of one of these vehicles without some of the personnel here and cognizant of the fact that it's important to go ahead and maintain storm drains, particularly in the 12th Legislative District, I don't know that we would incur that much of an imposition in waiting about ten days or 12 days until we get into '07 and possibly have the opportunity to acquire it directly rather than paying for it ten years or 20 years with financing. So I'll abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Mr. Chairman, I feel compelled after Legislator D'Amaro's remarks to just remind my -- I have not voted against any of these resolutions. I believe they are all worthy. And the reason I am abstaining is the principle of the method of financing. And I strongly suggest that before the meeting -- the General Meeting on Tuesday, the County Executive who has constantly reminded us, particularly on projects that deal with my district, that we can't have it all, consider meeting with the Minority Leader to discuss our financial options so that these projects can move forward. My abstention is a matter of principle on this issue. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. There was a motion and a second on 2. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Legislator Romaine and Kennedy abstain **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstentions - Legis. Kennedy and Romaine).**

**2520, Appropriating funds in connection with the County share for the reconstruction of CR 80, Montauk Highway Shirley/Mastic, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5516).**

Motion by Legislator Browning, this is in her district, seconded by Legislator Eddington. On the motion, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2520 is **APPROVED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member).**

**2525, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with safety improvements at various intersections (CP 3301).**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Same motion, same second, same vote. All in favor -- I'm sorry. On the motion, Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'm just raising my hand to abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. 2525, all in favor?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

If I could say something briefly about this one.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Sure. Deputy Commissioner Anderson.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

We would request that this be revised. And actually, we have, under 2508, requested \$100,000 that would be needed for this program. And since property acquisition usually takes about two years, we'd request that the 360,000 for the construction be included in the 2008 Capital Program. This will align the construction funds with the anticipated construction.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion to table.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

If I might.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Presiding Officer Lindsay.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

This is in the 2006 Capital Program, so if it isn't appropriated now, it's going to die. I mean, either -- you know, if you want to modify it, ask the Executive to come back with a CN on Tuesday or else approve this, and once it's appropriated, it can be modified as you move forward. Am I wrong on this?

**MR. CHIUSANO:**

I'm Carmine Chiusano. On the construction component of this project, it was used earlier in the year as an offset. So the three -- the 360 that appears under construction is no longer there. It was used for, I believe, radio towers, Capital Project 3221, earlier in the year. So if you move this forward, you would be increasing the Capital Budget without an appropriate offset for the project.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion to table.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Sounds like it has to be tabled.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. But keep in mind, the \$100,000 in this is still alive for the land acquisition. That wasn't used --

**MR. CHIUSANO:**

That's correct.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

-- as an offset.

**MR. CHIUSANO:**

That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

But we're going to have to have a new resolution, though, to accomplish that.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

A new offset.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

The sponsor should really --

**MR. ANDERSON:**

I believe the \$100,000 that's needed for this is in IR 2508, which was adopted earlier today.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion to table and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 2525 is **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member)**.

**2541, Approving determinations and findings made pursuant to Section 204 of the Eminent Domain Procedure Law, and directing the Commissioner of Suffolk County Department of Public Works to prepare and file with the Clerk of the Suffolk County Legislature acquisition maps in accordance with the selected alternative for the acquisition of lands in connection with the acquisition of properties for the reconstruction of CR 80, Montauk Highway from William Floyd Parkway to Barnes Road, Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County, New York (CP 5516 PIN 0756.68).**

Could this bill have had a longer title? Is there a motion?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I think I'll make the motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion by Legislator Browning, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Explanation, please.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Explanation, Mr. Anderson.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

Again, I'll defer to Mr. Hillman.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

This is for the Montauk Highway project that we have.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'm fully aware --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

This is the findings and determinations for the County Road 80, Montauk Highway Project in Mastic Shirley. We had a public hearing, and I think everyone is in concurrence that Alternative 5 is the preferred alternative. And this would put the stamp of approval on that alternative.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

If you had said possibly the majority, I might concur with you, but I doubt very much that everyone is in agreement with Alternative Number 5.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Well, the majority, right.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

That would be a better phrase. The majority that was present at the public hearing.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

That's correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

That would define it even more.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Correct.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Can I have a minute?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. I was at that public hearing. And there was a great outpouring of Emergency Services Personnel, ambulance, fire departments in support of Proposition 5. I believe there was 1000 cards?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Approximately 1000.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

One thousand cards, comments period, and only 100 supported Proposition 6. So based on the findings of the engineers --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I said the majority at that meeting was strongly in favor, but not everyone. That's the only correction I made.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Not everyone.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right. Thank you.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

A very small few support of 6. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So we had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member).**

**2543, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating additional funds in connection with the improvements to County Center, C001 Riverhead - Phase I Renovations to the Data Center (CP 1643).**

Is there a motion?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley, seconded by?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'll second it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

-- Legislator Romaine. On the motion, Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I was just going to ask for a brief explanation. I see Ms. Cates-Williams is here, but then I also wanted to speak just briefly about the Riverhead County Center. So I'll yield, and if you can explain on this, I'd welcome it.

**MS. CATES-WILLIAMS:**

Well, this is the Riverhead County Center.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I know that, but I had an overall question for you.

**MS. CATES-WILLIAMS:**

Oh, okay. So I'm going to speak about the center. Good afternoon. I just want to say that this is the most business-critical project that I have on my plate. And if you never approve another IT project, and by no means am I suggesting that, I would really like your support and prompt attention on this immediate problem. I have some handouts that I would like to give out to you, if that would be okay with the Chairperson.

It's four handouts, two of them are letters of support from the two elected officials that are located out in this building, Judy Pascale, the County Clerk and Angie Carpenter, the County Treasurer. I have been working very closely with these two individuals as well as the Director of Real Property Services. And I also have an IT presence out in that center as well.

This has to be one of most interesting data centers that I have ever seen in my 20 plus year career. There are numerous problems with this system, and in your handouts, once you receive them, there is a letter from the Department of Public Works. And I've been working very closely with them as well on this project. As a matter of fact, we had a meeting yesterday of all of the

departments that are affected by this project. And we went through the specifications that the Department of Public Works has put together on this project.

Public Works has estimated that the total amount necessary to improve this County Center comes to \$600,000. And this resolution is requesting 400 of that amount. There's also a letter in there from the Director of IT that I briefly just want to touch upon so that you can get a feel for some of the problems. And it reads as follows:

"Over the course of 2006, the Riverhead Data Center has had three major failures," -- and let me just point out, that is three too many, that is totally unacceptable for a data center -- "which caused unprecedented impact to the user community; banks, mortgages companies, attorneys, title representatives, etcetera."

"Specifically in April, a complete failure of the UPS," -- the UPS is the Unified Power -- I'm sorry, the Uninterrupted Power System. And this is the device that when the electrical power fails, this device is supposed to kick on giving us enough time to take that data center down, meaning to shut down all of the servers so that there will be no data loss. But when the UPS fails, there will be some data loss, and that's what happened back in April.

In this case, it resulted in a complete data center outage for five hours. The user community that relies on this data was impacted at roughly \$150 million per hour in real property transactions. Subsequent outages were failures of the air conditioning units in June and July, and as recently as last week, caused flooding, which in turn could have caused complete equipment meltdown. And in that case, when the flooding from the air conditioning units -- we got really lucky, because the water actually flowed in the opposite direction of the servers. But as you can imagine, if the water had flowed towards the servers, they would have shorted them out, thus causing a major catastrophic issue for us.

And, of course, that was discovered by an individual who happened to be walking in the hallway noticing the water, which was pouring into the hallway. Two of the four air conditioning dehumidification units have not been in operation for years. I was totally shocked by that when I first visited that center, that we would have air conditioning units sitting there, huge units just sitting there, unoperational. These incidents could have caused an outage that could have lasted days, let alone the impact of the real estate industry, etcetera, etcetera.

Also it should be noted that the atmosphere in the data center is not properly controlled and needs to be sealed, meaning we have an outer room, outside of the data center, and you can actually -- if you look at it, you can actually see into the other room. So anything that's going on in that outer room, any air -- bad air, dust, is all going in there. And as a result of that, a tape drive and three servers were lost this year alone.

I can go on and on, and you can certainly read this. And, of course, we have windows in that data center, which is also another big no-no-no. If you've ever visited a data center, you will notice that -- the first thing you will notice is there are no windows simply because you don't want anything from the outside to come in, and also, you don't want people seeing in, because that's your -- your operation hub, so you don't want anybody really to no where that is.

So I say all this to say to you that this project is extremely important to me. And it has a lot to do with disaster recovery as well. We have three campuses. We have our Hauppauge Data Center, which is located in this complex, out in Yaphank, we have a data center, which is in the Police Department, and Riverhead should be our third data center.

In an optimum environment, you will have data mirroring between those three centers. So if Riverhead goes down, the Riverhead individuals could depend on either Yaphank or Hauppauge for their data, meaning they would be up and running. All we would have to do is move them to another location. But unfortunately, we do not have that situation here. And if we don't do

something about this center, I'm afraid that we're not going to make it through the next hurricane season. I know that those air conditioning units are not going survive. And I'm putting it out -- up to you. You're talking about over 25 million pieces of data plus out there, and we need to protect them. So I'm asking you for your assistance. Thank you. Did that explain?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's fine. Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Fortunately Sharon, both John Kennedy and I are intimately familiar with the data center. And it was my number one request as County Clerk, because the other departments -- we just wanted to do it County Clerk's Department, I see you're doing it for everyone, which makes a lot more sense. But no one else has taken the lead. And each time I put it in, it was shot down. So I'm glad that the criticalness of this is finally coming to light. I think that's very important. And as critical as it was today, it was as critical two years ago when it was shot down and last year when it was shot down. So that's important to remember.

I think it's highly important that this data center passed, because we could have additional crashes. And as John and I knew, because we had to deal with it on an everyday basis, that system keeps on going down day after day after day. I don't think people in this Legislature understand, when that system goes down, no one can search a title, no one can close because they need a continuance, because they just don't have the data to see if any liens or judgments or any incumbrances have come in on the property. People don't understand how critical that data was. All I knew was that I was fighting for it as County Clerk, and it was turned down twice. And it was my top priority. In fact, I went in front of the committee and said, "Kill every else, give me the data center." And at that time it was \$400,000. And each time I was denied. So I'm glad to see that someone is coming forward with this now. Are you going to finally station a person there full time for the data center? Because right now --

**MS. CATES-WILLIAMS:**

I have two people there now.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Oh, you have two? Because when I was Clerk, there were zero.

**MS. CATES-WILLIAMS:**

Yeah. I have two full time employees there.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Zero people stationed in the County Data Center in Riverhead and a system that went down on an almost daily basis. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll make the motion.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion by M. Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll make the motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's already been a motion. Hasn't there, right? There was a motion and a second. All in favor?

Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member).**

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I'd just like to make a statement on it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

2543 is approved. Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I'd just like to make the statement that I'm happy to hear that 25 million pieces of data is enough to get everybody's support here, even though it's being bonded, when I'm losing on Woodside Avenue six lives a year, and that's just the deaths, not the critical injuries. We have people in comas and stuff. So, it's interesting in how we evaluate this. But I'm interested in data, but I'm more interested in life. Thank you.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I think Mr. Eddington's point is well taken. In June of this year, we adopted a 200,000 traffic study for County Road 111 in which there has been 67 accidents in that road in the last year alone. I had commitments that we would move forward on this. It now appears that that study isn't going to be done until next summer to prevent any amending of the Capital Budget, because it would be too late for that, and after all, the argument that originally, when I attempted to amend the Capital Budget was we don't have a plan, so we can't amend it or put any money in without a plan. And now that plan is being delayed again.

So I hear you, Mr. Eddington, but let me tell you, it cuts both ways. And until we realize that, until 18 people get together and understand that, and not here, but back there, and have your discussions, we will do much better for our County and our residents. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Moving on. **2548, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the replacement of Public Works Fleet maintenance equipment (CP 1769).** Motion by Legislator Lindsay, seconded by Legislator Horsley. On the motion.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Can we can explanation on this one, Mr. Chair?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Explanation, please, Mr. Anderson.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

This is for replacement of lifts in the highway fleet garage. Currently, four of the five main garages are operating with only one -- are operating -- only have -- I apologize. Currently, four out of five main garages are operating with -- operating, only have the vehicle lifts in service. The remaining lifts have been taken out of service due to mechanical problems and health and safety issues. This would replace those lifts and improve our ability to, you know, repair cars and trucks.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Mr. Chairman.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

My question here, and again, I don't mean to be redundant, but I guess I will. And I've expressed my concerns already. What's the life on one of these lifts.

**MR. CALDERONE:**

A life on a vehicle lift could exceed even 25, 30 years if it's maintained properly.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So the ones that we have, they're out of operation, we threw in 30 years ago, 40 years ago?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

Yes. Well, they're the originals in the highway maintenance garages. They've never been replaced.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. Is the lift working in this one here in Hauppauge?

**MR. CALDERONE:**

I can't answer -- do they all work, are you asking me? No, they don't all work. Which one does or doesn't, I really don't know.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I heard Gil speak about it. I'll save the dialog. I think that this is something that needs to be done, but I think it's more appropriate as-pay-as-you-go.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

This question will be directed to Budget Review. This resolution essentially is before us because we are converting the method of funding. There's \$75,000 involved, and we're taking it from G to \$75,000 in B; is that correct?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

We're changing the funding source and appropriating the funds.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

For \$75,000.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

For \$75,000.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Kennedy and Romaine abstaining. **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstentions - Legis. Kennedy and Romaine).**

**2549, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of drainage systems on various County roads (CP 5024).**

Motion to approve by Legislator Lindsay, seconded by Legislator Horsley.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

On the motion, Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

The question is for Budget Review. Is this reason that this resolution is before us is because we're changing the method of funding from G to B?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

We're doing two things; changing the method of funding and appropriating funds.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

But essentially we're changing the method of funding?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Well, you have to do both to appropriate -- I mean, we're doing two things in this resolution.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I understand. I appreciate it thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any other discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Legislator Kennedy and Romaine abstaining. **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstentions - Legis. Kennedy and Romaine).**

**2550, Amending the 2006 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with traffic signal improvements (CP 5054).**

Motion by Legislator Lindsay, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. On the motion, Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Mr. Chairman. Question directed to the Budget Review Office, this is -- this resolution for \$100,000 in planning and design and supervision is before us today because we are switching the funding from G to B?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

That's correct, and appropriating the funds.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Is this just for the maintenance of traffic signals -- traffic signals across the board, or is this one -- is this one set of traffic lights? What will this project fund?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Planning.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

I'll rely on Bill Hillman for this one.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

These are general design funds to be applied across the County, non specific at the moment as to where they would be used. We have an ongoing consultant contract where on an as-need-basis we ask him to design certain traffic signals for us.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's fine. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine and Kennedy abstain. **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstentions - Legis. Kennedy and Romaine).**

**2551, Appropriating funds in connection with construction of sidewalks on various County roads (CP 5497).**

Motion by Legislator Lindsay, seconded by Legislator Horsley. On the motion, maybe an explanation as to where these sidewalks are.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

The sidewalks are -- I believe they're at County Road 10 and at County Road 11. Let me confirm. And County Road 35.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes. This is \$200,000 for sidewalks County Road 10 and 11.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Where are they.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

CR 10 and 11.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Where are they?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

In Huntington. Actually, it might be duplicate resolution to what was proposed before. I think we touched on it earlier. Elwood Road from CR 11, Pulaski Road down to the railroad.

**LEG. D'AMARO:**

It's the same resolution.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is this a duplicate?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I think I see what's happening. 2483, I think, was for 300,000. This is the remaining 200,000.

**MR. ANDERSON:**

And this is intended for construction of sidewalks on 35, County Road 35.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

That is correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Just a question for Counsel. These two resolutions don't conflict, do they.

**MR. BARRY:**

I don't think so, because they appropriate different amounts of money, but it's probably a better question for Budget Review.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

They don't conflict. There's \$500,000 scheduled for construction in 2006. And the total of these equals 500,000, so they don't conflict. One adds to the other.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Let me just understand what you said. There is a total of \$500,000 for sidewalk construction.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

In 2006, correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

In 2006. And in these two resolutions, we're going to appropriate all that money for these two projects.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

That's correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Thanks. And nowhere else. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So there's been a motion to approve and a second on 2551. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Abstain.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Abstain.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine abstaining, Legislator Kennedy abstaining. **APPROVED (VOTE:6-0-2-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member - Abstentions - Legis. Kennedy and Romaine).**

A couple of quick things. Housekeeping first, on 2508, Counsel has brought up an issue. We had approved that earlier. Counsel, did you want to relay what that concern was?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Budget Review will speak to that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Thank you, lance.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Upon looking at this resolution, we noticed that these funds were included in the 2006 Adopted Capital Budget as G Money. This resolution appropriates serial bonds, but does not amend the Capital Program. I brought this to Counsel's attention.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Counsel, if I may? Mr. Chairman. Counsel, on the face of that information, is that resolution defective?

**MR. BARRY:**

Well, to the extent that it doesn't amend the Capital Budget in the resolution, yes, because it does change the method of financing without actually indicating it.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'll wait for someone on the prevailing side to make a motion to reconsider so that we can table this motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. So we're going to have to end up doing this by CN. I'll make a motion to reconsider 2508 for the purposes of tabling, seconded by Legislator D'Amaro. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**2508** is in front of us again. There's a technical problem that sounds like a fatal technical problem with the bill. So we will have to table that.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Poorly written.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Romaine will make a motion to table, I'll second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So it's **TABLED (VOTE:8-0-0-0 - Presiding Officer Lindsay voted as an ex-officio member).**

Before you go, there were a couple of other quick things.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Mr. Chairman, one more thing. Because of this action, Legislator Browning's resolution is not in

conflict, 2525, which appropriated \$100,000 and amended the Capital Program. We also researched and saw that the \$360,000 for construction, the best that we can determine right now, was not appropriated during 2006. So this resolution is not in conflict.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Which one is that?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

2525.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

2525 which was tabled.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

That was tabled because it conflicted with 2508, because \$100,000 was already appropriated. The 360,000, the best we can tell, was not appropriated during 2006. We did a search while sitting here and it looks like those funds are still available for appropriation.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So there's a motion to reconsider the tabling of 2525 or untabling. I'm not sure what the proper motion is.

**MR. CHIUSANO:**

I just want to make one comment on 2525. Again, the 360 wasn't appropriated, it was used as an offset for another project. I believe the offset was 3221, it was for radio towers.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So it still should remain tabled?

**MR. CHIUSANO:**

Yes.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

I'll have to look for that. I didn't see that resolution. Do you know the resolution number? Because according to our records, that was not used as an offset.

**MR. CHIUSANO:**

I have Resolution 576.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

While that's being looked up, if I can ask Mr. Anderson a question or two. The Medevac Helicopter hangar at Gabreski, has construction begun at all on that? I don't believe it has. And when is that going to start?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

I can get that. I don't know the exact dates. I believe the plans are still under way.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So this is almost a public safety question. So right now, there's still just the one East Star kind of pursuit helicopter that's been modified into a Medevac Helicopter, that's the only one that's there. So there must be three Medevac Helicopters at another location, I guess at Mac Arthur. So we don't yet have the two Medevac including the full service Medevac at Gabreski, which I'm hoping for, but we can't have that until that building is built. So I guess what I'm saying is could you get that going?

**MR. ANDERSON:**

It is under way. I know that they -- you know, my staff has been talking about it. I don't know the exact dates, I can get that for you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah. Another question, I had asked your department look into -- I don't know if Mr. Hillman is still here -- look at the feasibility of a sidewalk on Bridge-Sag Turnpike out in Bridgehampton. Is there -- has that been begun, or is that going to happen? Are you familiar with that, Bill?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I am familiar with it. I know our Highway Department was investigating it. I don't know the status of that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. If someone could get back to me as well with the status of that.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Sure thing.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You know, when I hear all these highways -- these are not highways -- all these sidewalks being built all over the place, I'm still waiting to hear about the one in my district. I think it's important.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

To finish up, that was --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Getting back to the earlier question.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Yes. Okay. I hate to say it, the County Executive was correct. For whatever reason, our records didn't show -- there's actually \$10,000 left. They used 350 of the 360.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So that has to remain tabled?

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Yes. That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think Legislator Kennedy, while Mr. Wright is still here -- maybe this can wait or maybe Legislator Kennedy would like to do it now -- but I believe on 2299, establishing a Local Law, strengthening the policies for connections by premises outside the sewer district, although it's been tabled, I thought that Legislator Kennedy may have had a question or two.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair, I don't want to hold the whole committee with an extended dialog. The only thing that I feel compelled to hear from and put on the record is whether or not, you know, Ben, concurs with the statement that was made by Mr. Wishod that for all intent and purposes, that a conceptual approval on a sewer district project is equivalent or analysis to a guarantee of formal approval. If that's the case, I think we really need to take a hard look at this process. I've had extended conversations with him, and as a matter of fact, I was assured by the department when it came to the conceptual approval for the Galleria expansion that that was nonbinding. So here we are three months later, and I'm hearing that it's a foregone conclusion that's going to be done. Is that the case?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

The conceptual certification resolutions say that it's not binding. And I know most times they are approved because, you know, you get into the process and it indicates what the Sewer Agency would do if SEQRA was complete. So there's good foundation on why a project would be going ahead, but it don't always happen. And it does indicate it's not binding.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. We will keep talking on it. I appreciate it. And that's what I thought had been related to me. I guess we just need to sort it out as to what, you know, practices and what we do. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. So motion there's a motion to adjourn. We are adjourned.

**(\*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 4:28 P.M.\*)**

**{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY**