

**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, August 14, 2007.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator Jay Schneiderman - Chairman  
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chairman  
Legislator Jack Eddington  
Legislator Rick Montano

**MEMBER NOT PRESENT:**

Legislator Joseph Caracappa - Excused Absence

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

George Nolan- Counsel to the Legislature  
Kevin Duffy - Budget Review Office  
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - DPW  
Tom Laguardi - Chief Deputy Commissioner - DPW  
Catherine Stark - Aide to Chairman Schneiderman  
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk - SC Legislature  
Ben Zwirn - County Exec's Office  
Gail Lolis - County Attorney's Office  
Debra Alloncius - AME  
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer - DPW  
Tom Rogers - DPW  
Jared Ashraf - DPW  
Marc Schneider  
All Other Interested Parties

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

(\*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:14 P.M.\*)

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Good afternoon. I'd like to call the meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee Meeting this 14th day of August, 2007. If you all will rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Eddington.

**SALUTATION**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You may be seated. Public works and infrastructure has been in the news quite a bit lately, particularly in light of what happened in Minnesota with the bridge collapse. In a few moments, we will be getting an update from our Department of Public Works in terms of our own bridges. There's some 72 bridges that the County -- Suffolk County maintains.

Before we get into that presentation, I do have three cards as well as Legislator Kennedy also has asked to be heard. I will start with Eugene Wishod who is speaking on 1556. He has also asked to speak on Resolution 1697. So I'm going to give Mr. Wishod six minutes, three plus three, to comment on the two bills.

**MR. WISHOD:**

I'm here to speak briefly on two diametrically opposed resolutions. One, Number 1556, seeks to compel the Suffolk County Sewer Agency and the DPW to finalize the creation of the Galleria Sewer District. Resolution 1697, introduced on behalf of the County Executive's Office and DPW, seeks to call the public hearing for the purpose of considering a proposal to dissolve the Galleria Sewer District.

The Galleria Sewer District is a sewer district with 178,000 gallons of capacity. It's owned of record by the Avalon Organization represented by John Klein, and John had authorized me to speak on his behalf. John built -- Avalon built the first phase of the plant, some 80,500 gallons, to service 312 apartments constructed by Avalon. My client, DiCanio Residential Communities, built the remaining approximately 100,000 gallons, which presently services some residential homes, some office buildings and some retail establishments.

The sewer district was initially formed in either 2004 or 2005. John Klein and I worked for over a year to finalize the documents necessary to activate to do a sewer district. It sounds like a long time, but there's a lot of paperwork to convey title to the district, to describe the easements, so on and so forth. The district was scheduled to be taken over by the County July 1, 2006. On the eve of the takeover, the Budget Office of the County determined that the rate that the Comptroller had approved when the district was established, which was \$450 per year for each customer, could not be less than a thousand dollars. It's now been finalized at \$1020.

At that stage of the game, the acquisition of the district was held up. John Klein and I attended several meetings. We were asked what our position was, and we said that the homeowners presently paying in the 200 or \$300 a year range, we could not support the takeover of the district at a rate of \$1020 a year and that -- nor did we or Public Works feel that the State Comptroller, who previously approved the \$450 rate, would approve an increase of over a thousand dollars. So we said -- the County suggested at several meetings that perhaps the district ought to be dissolved, and then when it was expanded, as if and when expanded, to accomplish a greater number of customers, the district could be initiated at that time. John and I supported that point of view.

Legislator Kennedy has conducted virtually a one-man campaign together with the Windcrest Condominium to compel the County to takeover the plant implicitly at a rate of \$450. I don't know how the Public Works Committee has jurisdiction to recommend such a result when the County Budget Office says, "We cannot operate this plant for less than \$1020." So it's our position that we

-- having had no opposition, we were perfectly happy to have the district created, but this is going to waste years more, because the State Comptroller is never going to approve that.

The other resolution that we support calls for a public hearing to dissolve the district. If there's opposition to that -- there are different points of view on that -- that can all be expressed at the public hearing. So we would opt strongly to adopt Resolution 1697, to call a public hearing to dissolve the district, at which all points of view can be considered and to reject Resolution 1556, which seeks to compel the Sewer Agency to take over the district. And based on the last meeting apparently, implicit in that is at \$450 a year, which was the original now discredited rate. That's all I have. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any questions? Thank you, Mr. Wishod.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I have some questions.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I agree with you as far as setting the rates. I don't think that the rate can be set legislatively. I think it has to be done on the basis of the economics of the whole thing. However, I, as well as other Legislators, have continually said this, are very, very troubled by the amount of administrative costs that are attached when the County takes over a district. Why it's so expensive for it to be a County district as opposed to being operated privately mystifies me. Having said that, I don't understand the rationale of dissolving the district. If the district is formed and the people are willing to pay the freight, why would we want to dissolve it? And then somebody told me, "We'll dissolve it to reconstitute it." That doesn't make sense to me at all. So maybe you can shed some light on some of those thoughts.

**MR. WISHOD:**

Well, if the people want this to be a sewer district and are willing to pay \$1020 a year in the first instance, so be it. I mean, that's what the public hearing is for. Let's hear it. They're now paying 200 to \$300 a year. Let's assume the people want a district at 1020 and the State Comptroller can be convinced that that kind of an increase over 450 is in the best interest of the residents of the district, it can go forward. I find it hard to believe that the State Comptroller would make that determination or that homeowners who are paying two to \$300 a year would be willing just to --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

So do I. But it mystifies me why it's three times the amount that they're paying to a private company, but that's another issue. Why are we going forward with the resolution to dissolve the district?

**MR. WISHOD:**

Well, we're not. We're just going forward with a resolution today to call a public hearing to dissolve it. The suggestion to dissolve as an alternative to going ahead originated with the County. We were invited to a meeting, they said that was an alternative, either go ahead with creation -- with activation of the district at over a thousand or dissolve it. The County -- the Sewer Agency had over a year ago approved a resolution to expand the district, which is an entirely separate issue -- but they had approved a resolution and granted conceptual certification to expand the district. There are many other pieces of property that desire sewer service. That presumably would increase the base and would permit a future creation of a new district. I don't know what the alternative is.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Assuming the expansion would lessen the cost and not increase it further.

**MR. WISHOD:**

I'm sorry?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Assuming that expanding the district will lessen the cost and not expand it further.

**MR. WISHOD:**

It has to lessen the cost.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

You would think so. You would think the formation of a County district would lessen the cost, but it doesn't seem that way.

**MR. WISHOD:**

Well, I can't comment why it's on why it's administrative costs. I understand this is the way it's been done for 25 years. I just know my client some -- a year or two years ago, the County Legislature approved the connection of two restaurants, Famous Dave's and Carabas to this plant within the original 178,000 capacity. That awaited finalization of the County Sewer District, or now conversely, dissolution. My client had to sterilize very valuable parcels of land in order to get temporary cesspools to allow those restaurants to open. That land remains sterilized.

This has gone on and been delayed for over a year. And it's got to be resolved one way or the other. And I can't understand why there would be such an objection to a public hearing at which all points of view can be expressed, including any desire on the part of the residents to have this at a County district regardless of the cost. But I can't -- I can't respond intelligently to why the administrative costs are so great. I mean, that's a County budget determination.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I believe our Commissioner of Public Works, Mr. Anderson, has something he wants to add to this discussion.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Legislator Lindsay, I just wanted to address one of the comments that you made with regard to the question of overhead, and that was brought up at the last one. I was hoping to address it when we talked about -- when this resolution came before committee again, but since it's been brought up, I just wanted to stress the question of the high amount of -- how did you put it -- the expense of the administrative overhead, administrative overhead really was more of a distinction as to the methodology used in apportioning these costs rather than to identify them as direct expenses.

Essentially, the administrative overhead should refer -- refers to administrative salaries, fringe benefits and administrative costs allocated to the district. In this case, they total 106,750 of the \$316,146 that appear as administrative overhead. Rather than 2%, that actually is 18% of the overall cost. So I just wanted to get that -- if you look at the other items that are in there, they are actual costs that would be -- that are basically charged back to the districts with regards to fleet services, insurance and capital heavy equipment. So, I mean, we are meeting with residents of the district on Thursday night to explain this and to go over each of these items again to them so that they understand. But as Mr. Wishod has said, there's also the question of whether this will even get passed the State Comptroller's Office because of the expense.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Exactly. And that's what the heart of the problem is. We currently have 13 sewer districts, something like that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I believe so.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

How many? How many?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Twenty-three.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Twenty-three. So by the creation of a new one, wouldn't you think the administrative overhead would be minimal? I mean, don't we have these people on staff already? Do we have to put on a whole new staff because we're creating the 24 sewer districts?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, the amount that's charged -- and it's all proportionately charged, you know, it's done on a fair basis, equitable basis. We are -- I don't believe we're hiring anybody to take --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. So if this was to happen and we're adding \$106,000, was that the number of salaries?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, that's the overhead, that's not the salaries. That's the overhead.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

The overhead. So does that mean that the other 23 districts' overhead goes down?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

At the present time, no. Again, this is --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

So where does the \$106,000 go if we're not hiring anybody?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is based on -- this is an estimate, an estimated fee based on an existing plant. We don't know what it's actually going to cost us to run the district. After a couple of years, you know, if it's excess, at that -- in a few years, we can adjust the rate down if we so choose. In the mean time, if there is excess, that goes to the fund, the General Fund. But if we go low, which is what's suggested by the first resolution, then that money has to be made up, and the following year, the residents of that community are going to have to pay that much more.

The costs that are shown here are based on an estimated fee based on Knob Hill, which is a similar plant of similar size. And all these costs are -- this is how we determine the cost of each district. So while -- and Laura, please correct me if I'm wrong, we're not hiring anybody new. Nobody -- no other districts' taxes are going to go down. This is the only real fair way we can do this to estimate or to come up with a cost.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

So if the residents were to approve this and the Attorney General was to approve this, this 100 and some odd thousand dollars in administrative costs, where would it go?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It goes to cover those costs --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

But the costs are already there. The costs are there. You're not hiring anybody new. And, you know, if you said the other 23 would go down proportionately, I could understand it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

After a few years, if it's determined -- at this point, we don't know -- at this point -- again, this is an estimate. We have no idea what it's going to cost, but we can't assume it's going to cost less than it should. Yes, you're going to have the same folks administratively administrating this district, but their time is split among the other districts. In theory, after a few years, we could go back, review all the costs and reduce the costs. At this time --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

But that isn't going to happen, because if we keep pumping out numbers three times what the plant is to operate privately --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's not three times, though.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

What do these folks pay now, three, \$400?

**MR. WISHOD:**

Some pay 200 some odd dollars, the rest pay 300 some odd dollars.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Okay. And we want to charge them over \$1000.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is what it costs us to run it.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

That's three times, though, isn't it?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It might be, but that's what it costs us to run it. You know, it's --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

But my point is we're not going to have any additional sewer districts. Nobody in their right mind is going to opt into a County sewer district with those kinds of numbers.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I jump in for a second? There's a meeting coming up, right? You guys are meeting and are working on some kind of number thing.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

On Thursday night there's a meeting coming up with the district. Well, the numbers -- basically, my intent is to meet with the district -- the folks from the district to explain, again, what these costs represent. We can't reduce the costs, costs are what they are. And to reduce them is either going to cause -- you know, if we go in there with reduce costs, it's either going to cause the district -- it's either going to cost the district more money the subsequent years, or -- you know, this is the cost that the County incurs. It's based on personnel, it's based on experience, plants that are existing. It may be two times more --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think you can understand why some of us are mystified by these numbers. The administrative costs are two or three times the operational costs.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, they're not. They're only 18%. I mean, if you look at the way it's written -- the way it was presented, that was just really nothing more than a misclarification or a miscommunication in what we're calling it. The actual administrative overhead is 106 of the 316,000. So that's only 18% of the overall costs.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I just ask that you to go Thursday's meeting with an open mind and good faith and see what can be worked out.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If anything can be worked out. I really don't --

**MR. WISHOD:**

Mr. Chairman, that's not the purpose of the meeting. The purpose of the meeting is to explain to these homeowners that if you want a County district, it's going to be \$1020. It's not to negotiate a lower rate.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Wishod, I'll recognize you in time. Excuse me. I do want to move on. This was actually Mr. Wishod's time originally, and the three minutes are over -- six minutes I gave him. I would like to move on unless the Presiding Officer has more he wants to add on this. We have one other speaker card, and then I have Legislator Kennedy. I'd like to get to the presentation on the bridges as well.

**MR. WISHOD:**

May I just address Legislator Lindsay's remark?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

In a moment. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Commissioner, you had referred to -- you might have touched on this last time -- but you referred to the fact that any potential increase would have to go before the State Comptroller's Office for approval.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes. Well, any rate that's established has to go before the State Comptroller's Office.

**LEG. STERN:**

Is there some type of a guiding principle as to what the State Comptroller's Office would allow? You know, we talk about a pretty significant increase, and there's some question as to whether or not they would approve it, is there some percentage, is there some guiding idea here as to what we could expect the State Comptroller to ultimately approve or disapprove?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

While, there is no set line that they, you know, hold as a cap, currently -- and I'm going to defer to Ben on this -- I believe it's In -- well, I'll defer to Ben.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Each year they post a limit on special districts, and this year it's \$345 for an average estimated cost applying to a County special district, establishment extension or increase in the maximum cost. So they would look at if they're paying \$300 now, anything above \$645 would be something that would, you know, raise an issue with them?

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Again, Legislators, clearly we're not acting on this today. We're going to allow this meeting to take place, and we'll see this at our next committee session.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Just a last word. The last word is, again, the overall policy mystifies me more than this particular resolution or this district. We live in a county where only 20% of our residents are connected to sewers. Eighty percent are in cesspools. We're a growing county, we're concerned about groundwater protection, we're concerned about economic development. And as long as we have a policy that sewerization is this expensive, we're not going to extend sewers in our County. And eventually, it's going to be the nail in the coffin for this County.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I may just say one thing to -- not to override Mr. Wishod. Again, we come down to the fact that this is a small district absorbing a decent cost. If you look at Talmadge Woods, which went through, it was significantly less because your spreading the cost over a large number of people. This is a smaller district. The impact to each resident is significantly higher. There's no question. That shouldn't -- you know, the costs are what they are. Again --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

No, they're not. You have \$100,000 there that you can't explain where it's going.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There will be time ahead to discuss this as well. Mr. Wishod, I said I'd give you one last brief comment.

**MR. WISHOD:**

I just wanted to point to the Legislature this is an extraordinarily small district. This is not going to set a precedent with respect to County rates. They apply and determined the rates in accordance with same formulas. But there are counties -- most County districts, Talmdage is 400,000, this one is 350,000. This is 178,000. That's why the costs spread among a much narrower customer base is so hard when the -- so high when the County takes it over. That's a very suigeneris situation. It is not a common situation. And it has not and it will not defer creation of County sewer district in the future.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I don't want to get into a lengthy debate. But if you can explain to me where the \$106,000 goes when we're not hiring anybody new and the existing districts aren't going down, I'll defer to and listen to your argument.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Wishod, I'm going to ask at this point for you to take your seat. The next speaker is Marc Schneider, also speaking on the same two resolutions.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

Thank you for allowing me a -- I'll try to be brief -- a brief opportunity.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I appreciate that.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

Having listened to what has been said, I'm troubled by a number of things that just developed. I anticipated coming here today and hearing that everything was going to be tabled until we had a meeting on Thursday, which is what we expected. And we tried to get that in advance, because frankly, I wouldn't have come out here if it was just going to be tabled, but now I'm glad that I came

out here.

I'm a little bit concerned, because we're going to walk into a meeting on Thursday where I'm now hearing from Mr. Anderson that they just want to explain where the charges come from. They can't explain it. We've asked today -- and it's not 100,000. The sheet that they sent to all of you shows \$316,000 of administrative overhead, and yet they're taking it, they're adding it, they're not reducing anybody else's. That's absurd. I mean, what are we doing here to the public?

Let's just point out an interesting fact. We talked about why should this district be taken over by the County. Just this weekend on Saturday, there was a problem with this plant. There was a problem, and a phone call went in. And frankly, thanks to the help of Legislator Kennedy, we were able to get somebody out there. There was an odor. And a phone call went into Avalon at about six o'clock in the evening. Someone didn't show up until midnight for a problem with the plant. Well, that's why County -- when the County operates them, they operate quite differently. The bottom line is that the people should be paying what they should be paying. And when we say we're going to charge them what it costs to operate it, it's not that, we know what it costs to operate it. It costs a quarter of what they're proposing. It's been operated at that cost for several years already. I mean, who are we kidding here?

And I've got to be honest with you, I take serious with Mr. Wishod's comments. Why does he care whether it's taken over by the County or not? I think we all know after hearing today why he cares, because he's got some hook-ups he wants to add up. Who gets those fees if it's not owned by the County? Does anybody have the answer to that? I bet Mr. Wishod could tell us who gets those fees. Probably his client. And they're very substantial.

Let's not cover our eyes and be blindfolded by what's being put forth here. And you can tell that I'm excited, because every time I come down here, the story gets deeper and deeper. And today I'm learning that we're taking costs -- we're estimating costs, we can't explain them, and they're going from 100,000 to 300,00 to \$108,000. And now we're adding costs based upon an old -- a much older facility, and we're not reducing anybody else's. Well, we ought to just take a look -- we talked last time we were here about the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund. You should look how rich that is with funds. Why is that? Well, because every time we add another sewer district, we're adding more money into the pot that's not needed. I don't think that was the intent of what was set up when we established sewer districts, to just take money and build up huge, huge reserves that would never be needed. And we talked about the fact that at this point there's also some movement to possibly use some of that money to preserve open space. Well, why is that money there?

I mean, these are residents. These are tax paying residents, and they should have to pay, and they have no problem paying, what it costs to operate that facility. But they shouldn't have to pay to fund other things, and they shouldn't have to pay costs that nobody can explain. And why do you think the State Comptroller has these guidelines in affect? Because they don't want the public to be, frankly, ripped off. Because that's really what it boils down to is the public being ripped off. You're taking money from people and you're not reducing anybody else's. You want to spread the costs, let's figure out what all these sewer district costs to operate and what we really need to run them. It sounds to me like everybody is getting ripped off in every district.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Schneider, your time has expired as well, sir. Thank you for your comments.

**MR. SCHNEIDER:**

One last request. I'd like to have some guidance to everybody that's coming on Thursday that this -- if this is just going to be a meeting for them to explain, well, these are the costs and if you don't like it -- then there's no sense in meeting. If we're going to meet and we're going to have open ears and we're going to present some information on what it really costs and they're going to listen and maybe we're going to come back and come up with ideas, that's great, that's what the intent is. But I'd like to know that now before I waste anybody else's time.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think you certainly made your wishes clear. I believe the Commissioner wants to comment anyway, so maybe that will be included in his comments. Commissioner Anderson.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Certainly, we will hear what they have to say. With regard to -- again, not to belabor this -- but the overhead administrative costs, I'm going to defer to Laura Conway who can explain this so that it is on the record. We are not ripping anybody off. These are costs that the County incurs. We're not making them up. Again, it's a small district, and it's impacted because of the cost. I'll bring Laura up if it's all right.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's fine. Mr. Zwirn, from the County Executive's Office.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

I'd like the opportunity when the resolution comes before the board -- I just want to make sure the debate isn't ended right now, because there are some explanations that we can --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Nothing is happening today.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Because one of things that we're concerned about, and we talked about it last time with the Presiding Officer when he was here, is that if these numbers are right and that we low ball the number this year, and Legislator Kennedy's suggestion was that if the numbers are wrong -- well, it is actually \$1000 and we charge them \$400, well, we can go into the Tax Stabilization Fund and it will be capped at 3%. And BRO said, "That would be unprecedented." That is a finite fund. Hook-up fees from what I understand do not go into that fund. But that fund is used for capital -- capital programs and for tax stabilization of all the other sewer districts in this County. And if you start setting a precedent by saying this -- "Now we're going -- the County is going to take over this sewer district and every new sewer district we set up," and if we set a low ball fee and that's going to be capped at 3%, we're going to go into that Tax Stabilization Fund and raid and eliminate that fund, and you're going to see taxes going up in all your other districts at the same time. So there's more than just this district. And this happens to be a small one. I understand the resident's concerns and their -- but you have to look at this thing on a County-wide basis. And I just -- I don't mean to dominate, but I'd like to have an opportunity when we do get to this.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You will. When these bills are ready to be acted upon, you will have an opportunity. Commissioner Anderson, you had somebody you wanted to bring up. Briefly, if you will. And please introduce yourself.

**MS. CONWAY:**

My name is Laura Conway. I'm Director of DPW Administrative Services. Mr. Lindsay's comments about the overhead, I'd like to try to explain them a little bit further. When we say that there's \$316,000 in administrative overhead charges that were billed to the sewer district, it isn't necessary that's all directly just administrative fees. There are -- there are some direct labor charges that are include in that. But there's a certain point as far as the County is concerned that you don't want to spend a lot of extra time trying to count for every penny in a certain way, so we allocate the costs.

Now, as far as the direct -- the administrative overhead expenses that we were talking about, you were saying that 20% would be -- you would consider fair administrative overhead costs at the last meeting. I went back to look at the numbers again and broke out the items that in that \$316,000 a bit more precisely to find that out of the nine and a half million dollars in labor costs that are associated with the administration and operation of the sewer districts, that we're only charging --

there's 33,000 that is allocable to administration. All the other -- what's included in the administrative costs, 34,000 is for the admin and another 38,000 is for direct -- is really a direct labor expense.

When we track employees' time working with the field, we do a detailed analysis of the hours that they spend in the field and the rate of pay that they have, but there's also vacation pay, holiday pay, sick pay, worker's comp expenses that those people receive that we have to also allocate to the districts. And we do it based upon a percentage. We take the total labor costs for the direct labor people, which adds up to eight -- over \$8 million. Administrative charges are only 1.8 million in total. We take that percentage of the labor that was allocated to that particular district over everything. And what we're considering for the Galleria at this point, it was 2%. Now, if you take that \$100,000 that -- I'm identifying \$100,000 for administrative expenses as \$34,000 in salaries, about \$10,000 in operating expenses for the office.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Because we're going to end up having to go over these number at a later time when the bill is actually in front of us.

**MS. CONWAY:**

I'm trying to come down to, when you take that \$100,000 and you add it to the \$15 million that is already being allocated, the percentage changes infinitesimal, and it's really not going to make a difference.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Will you be presenting these numbers on Thursday night?

**MS. CONWAY:**

Yes, I will.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. All right. And I'm sure we'll hear from you again too. Thank you. I also have Legislator Kennedy who has asked to be heard in the public portion. Legislator Kennedy, I'm also going to limit you to three minutes, and then I would like to move right to the presentation on our infrastructure, particularly our bridges. Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Well, if it pleases the Chair, actually I'm going to speak on both resos, but I'll make it real quick. First, I'm going to ask the administration by and through Mr. Zwirn if he would join us here for the dialog, because two weeks ago, we did get a representation that, in fact, 1697 would get tabled at this meeting, predicated on the fact that we do have a community-based meeting coming up two evenings from now.

I was going to ask the Chair, and as we've shared before, I'd be happy to go ahead and have 1556 tabled as well, because I think that we may get some meaningful dialog. I'm hopeful we're going to get some meaningful dialog on Thursday evening, even if it is the Commissioner's intent to come and restate those numbers, you know, yet another time. My objective with all of this has been as the Presiding Officer kind of articulated. You know, we've heard from Counsel for the DiCanio Organization about the Budget Offices identifying a cost associated with this. But without boring committee, I'll refresh their recollection of conversation with the Counsel two weeks ago in which all aspects of sewer district operation are first and foremost issues of policy that arised out of this body.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let me save you some breath. I'll make a motion to take both of those resolutions out of order for the purposed of tabling. Do I have a second?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

This is 1556 and 1697.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I think you have to do them separately.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think we can do a motion for both of them.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And there's a second. Same motion, same second by Legislator Montano. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Both bills are in front of us.

**1556. Directing the Suffolk County Sewer Agency and Department of Public Works to finalize the creation of Sewer District No. 4 - Smithtown Galleria (KENNEDY)**

**1697. A resolution calling for a public hearing for the purpose of considering the dissolution of the proposed Sewer District No. 4 - Smithtown Galleria (COUNTY EXEC)**

I will make a motion to table both.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And a second by Legislator Eddington. This is 1556 and 1697. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. Both bills are **TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa)**.

And we'll continue this conversation at the next committee.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you, folks.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We have several presentations. I should say for those of you who have copies of the agenda that Cliff Hymowitz who is the Chair of our Public Transportation Advisory Committee, who actually rides public transportation had to catch the bus. He has now left. He will come at another meeting.

We will move on to a report of our bridged. Everybody I know is aware of the situation in Minnesota with the bridge collapse. And the number of fatalities clearly shows the cost of problems when your infrastructure starts to deteriorate. And we have 72 bridges that the County maintains, and I have asked the Department of Public Works who works with the State, I believe the State biannually inspects the bridges and rates them on a scale of 1 to 7 in terms of their structural integrity and other concerns. I have asked, in light of what happened in Minnesota, that Department of Public Works do a presentation on the status of our County bridges. So I'd like to invite Chief Engineer Hillman forward as well as Commissioner Anderson and any other engineers or support staff that you feel you would like present with you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Legislator Schneiderman, Gentlemen, thank you for this opportunity. In light of the tragedy that has

happened over the past few weeks, we'd just like to put to rest any concerns that the community as well as yourselves may have concerning the County bridges. The County owns 72 bridges and maintains those 72 bridges. All bridges are inspected by the New York State Department of Transportation every tow. They're rated on schedule -- I'm sorry -- on a scale of 1 to 7 with 7 being brand new condition and 1 indicating that the bridge is not safe to handle traffic and should be closed.

A bridge that has a rating less than 5 raises concerns that at that point need to be addressed. Now, they're not necessarily safety concerns. They can be anything from a guardrail needs to be replaced, a sidewalk needs to be fixed, pavement needs to be fixed. But at that point, it comes to a certain level that matters have to be addressed and the work has to be scheduled had. Currently 28 of the 72 bridges are ranked less than 5, with those ratings between 4.333 and 4.984. Twenty-eight of the bridges are either in the process of being repaired now or are in the Capital Program for work, and that includes design. The remaining bridges are going to be evaluated by us as to determine what repairs are needed and to schedule that work accordingly. I've brought Tom Rogers, who's our Director of Bridges and Waterways, here to answer and detailed questions.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I ask first, of those 28 or so bridges, are any of them classified as structural deficient, or is that a misnomer in a sense?

**MR. ROGERS:**

Well, they are on the State's list of deficient bridges.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

But not necessarily structurally?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. Because it's listed as deficient, it doesn't mean it's a structural concern. And a lot of times you'll find that when we get a report -- now, this is a copy of typical bridge rating -- bridge report that we received from the State. And they go over a number of issues. They go over abutment rating, wing walls, channels, the approach. So everything from erosion and scour, footings, walls, stream alignment, erosion and scour, pavement, guide railing, settlement, drainage, those are all what are looked at. And numerically they're scored, and then that score is put together as the number that I mentioned before, that rating of between 1 to 7.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Those scores, is that document available to the public?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It certainly could be FOILed. It's FOILable as a public document.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you have a copy for the committee that would list all the bridges and what their score was?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I can certainly get that.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I have a rough copy.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We'll make some copies and distribute it so we can see if there are any bridges in our own district.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I'd just like to clarify that there are no bridges in Suffolk County that have structural deficiencies

that would lead us to believe we have any kind of catastrophe as transpired in Minnesota. We believe structurally every single of the 72 bridges is capable of carrying the loads designated for them.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What is the lifespan of a bridge?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Generally a lifespan might be anywhere from 50 to 100 years depending on the type of design, materials, whether it's steel, concrete, what type of rehabilitation it goes under, how well the maintenance is performed on it, what environment it's in, if it's over saltwater, it may deteriorate more quickly, is it a movable bridge, is it a fixed structure. So there's a lot of things that go into that. But in general I would say anywhere from 50 to 100 years.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do we have any bridges that are over their age limits?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's not really an issue of age. As long as -- they could be 100, but as long as they're well maintained and in good condition and they're safe --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So you're saying a bridge that might have a 50 year lifespan, if it's maintained and it's 75 years old, it might be fine?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Certainly.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is that the practice, that you're don't replace the bridge after 50 years, you just continue to maintain it?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Absolutely. If it's in good structural condition, that is DPW's practice, maintain that bridge, get as long a life out of it as possible. We replace bridges only when necessary.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

To echo that point, certainly that's a consideration when a bridge is reviewed. You know, when you're looking at any project, and public works or engineering project, you're going to look at the age of it, you know, has it served its serviceable life. You know, at the same point, kind of like the Bionic Man, you might have replaced all the parts for the most part, and it's effectively a new bridge even though it's situated there for over 100 years. There's a lot of things to consider.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Are the Capital funds available to stay current in your maintenance schedules, or have you had to delay projects?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I would say the Capital funds are available to sufficiently maintain all the bridges. I can't speak to delays. I can't say that every project is maintained on schedule. There's numerous reasons why a project might be delayed, but the funding is there to maintain these bridges. And if there was ever a concern that raised such dire circumstances, we would obviously make it an extreme priority. Bridges in their nature are obviously very important. You know, a road that's on the ground when it fails, it has a pothole. When a bridge fails, bad things happen.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Sure. Well, I ask the question in light on the fact that we are building a 200,000,000 plus dollar jail, and we have had to stretch our capital funds out to try to meet that obligation and still maintain all of our infrastructure. I just want to make sure that you have adequate funds in place to stay current, that we're not holding back. And also, a related question too would be on staff too, because money has been tight at the County. I want to make sure that you have enough structural engineers and the types of inspectors that you might need out on the field to make sure that something doesn't slip between the cracks here.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Our Capital Program -- and, in fact, you will be getting a copy of the sheet, which explains all the -- I believe the 28 bridges. And the comments will show whether they're under rehabilitation or they're under design. You will have those shortly. Those are -- you know, that gives you the status. We're comfortable in the Capital Program with where each of those is positioned based on our manpower, based on our -- you know, the condition -- again, I want to state for the record that, you know, the rating of the bridges that we have had flags raised on are just below 5. They're not of structural concern. There are issues that have to be addressed, and we are addressing them.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. I want to take some other questions from other Legislators at this point. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of the 28 that score just below 5, you said that could be for any number of reasons. Are you saying that none of the 28 that under 5 are under 5 because of anything to do with the structural integrity of a particular bridge?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

There are a few that have structural issues, but those issues do not rise to the point where we are concerned at all, have any concern that they may fail. There's a difference in having a structural issue and having a structural issue that may lead the bridge to fail. If I could get into a few of the little -- the little that I know about the Minnesota tragedy is that one of the structural members of that bridge had a four foot crack in one of its members. Now, that is, to me, a huge problem. I can guarantee you we don't have four foot cracks on any of our bridges. If there was, we would address it immediately.

I'm only getting this information through what I've read in the papers, but from my understanding, this crack has been there for several years, closing in on almost ten years of that bridge. There was two alternatives to address that crack. The department overseeing that bridge choose the lesser expensive of the alternatives for the repair. I can tell you that we take our bridges very, very seriously. If there's anything that would indicate that a bridge is in serious jeopardy, we would address immediately with the most prudent alternative to address that situation.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm sorry. Do they use the same rating system there as we do?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What was that bridge rated at, do you know, number wise?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I don't know that, no. But I believe they do use -- I believe it's a Federally Highway Mandated Rating System, correct, Tom?

**MR. ROGERS:**

The rating system we use, the 1 to 7, is a State. There is also a Federal rating system, so I'm not sure what Minnesota is using, if they have their own that's similar to ours, or if they just use the Federal system.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

The structural issues that you mentioned, my concern is that what I've observed in the 18 months is that we tend to try to go with the most economical solution. And you're telling me that that's basically what they did in Minnesota. What kind of reassurance can I give to my constituents that that absolutely doesn't happen in Suffolk County?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Well, you're absolutely correct, we do go with the most economical. But I think that -- only from what I've read -- the one alternative was extremely expensive, and the other alternative was almost like yearly maintenance that would need to occur on a continuing basis. And the other one would have fixed the problem. And I can only assure you that the recommendations from my office, and I would imagine the Commissioner would echo me from his office, is that if something is of dire need, the recommendation will be to fix it the right way. We have opportunities to find funds in numerous places if something is that critical. I take my job on protecting the public extremely seriously as does Mr. Rogers and I believe Mr. Anderson also. The only thing I can give you is my assurance that I will do everything I can to make sure that the proper mitigation measure is provided for each situation.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Thank you, Mr. Hillman.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, I would echo Bill's statement that, you know, again, economic does not mean necessarily cheap. There is a balance that's made between engineering decision, which is our prime concern, and the economics of the issue. If we have to find additional funds to make sure that the project is done correctly -- again, to echo Bill, our prime concern is the safety of the public.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you have any issues with this being released, the list of the bridges? People may have questions about which bridges fall above 5 or below 5. And I know it's important that the public, if they are perusing this list, understand that a number below 5 does not necessarily mean it's, you know, any structural deficiencies in any way. But in terms of releasing this --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The only thing I would say is the one with the 28, the ones that actually are below 5, that one might be easier to understand. I haven't seen the list that Bill has, but at least it explains where we are with the process of rating for each bridge, the name of the bridge, and then where we are with repair, rehabilitation, design, etcetera.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I would say that in this form, I would not want it released, only because there's a lot of handwriting and chicken scratch on it. We can provide a clean list of all our bridges and where they fall in the rating system and the status of activities on that bridge if you would like us to put that together.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah. I would appreciate it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We'll resubmit the list then in a clean form.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think community members may want to know.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Absolutely.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Of the bridges that fall below the 5, the most traversed, do you know, Nichols Road maybe or? Any one in particular that -- while you look at that, I had a question the other day about a bridge. I don't think there's any cause for concern, but somebody, I guess, who saw maybe some coverage on News 12 about the bridges called me about, I think, Exit 63, Ocean Avenue. I guess maybe there's some work going there. But he described the bridge as bouncy. Maybe one of the engineers want to comment about that affect and when to be concerned and when not be concerned about bridge stability.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I'll say a few things and then turn it over to Tom Rogers. But the first thing I'd like to say is that the bridge is owned and maintained by New York State DOT. We are presently widening that bridge for the State, because we need more capacity on our roadway. And that bridge links the two roads. So we need to rebuild it due to capacity, not for structural issues, but more for capacity. Bridges are designed to flex. That's a very common occurrence. They are not very rigid -- you would think they would be rigid, but they're not, they do bounce. I'm sure you've all been on the Verrazano and the George Washington Bridge in traffic. And you want to feel bouncing, those really bounce. So, yes, County Road 83 Bridge does bounce. And it's no reason for concern. Typically bridges do bounce. Tom, do you have anything to add?

**MR. ROGERS:**

Just one of the reasons for that is you have to allow for expansion and contraction of the beams. So there has to be some flexibility in the structure.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And now the only other question in terms of the bridges below 5, are there any of them that are particularly heavily trafficked?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I do see a few on here; Nicolls Road at Portion Road. There was also another Nicolls Road, Nicolls Road at Holbrook Road.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So it may help with some of these to have some kind of description as to why they ended up getting a score below 5, if it needs to be repainted or a guardrail is dented somewhere.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

The other thing that I'd like to just point out is that when the State system -- and Tom may be better able to elaborate on this a little, because I wasn't around when it happened -- but when the State system was implement, DOT actually -- DPW actually lobbied DOT to revise the system, because we felt that the ranking -- drawing a line in the sand at 5 was a little unfair and that it would put numerous bridges on the deficiency list unwarranted. Because we feel that it really should be for structural issues more than for guide rail and things. The guide rail needs to be fixed, the pavement needs to be repaired, yes, but in the essence of a ranking system for a bridge, which it's primary duty is to be structural sound, we felt -- DPW at the time felt that that would be the most indicative reason to put it on a structural deficiency list.

They did not take our comments into -- into light and chose to maintain this ranking system, which we feel, again, that a 5 -- when a bridge is in and around 5, it's still in fairly good condition. It's an indication that you need to start looking at it more closely, but the word deficiency is a strong word. And to put it on a deficiency list, we felt that maybe there should be some grading in the system where maybe you put it on an actively monitored list and then onto a deficiency list, but that's not what they choose to do.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

But in your professional opinion, none of our bridges are structurally deficient in any way; is that correct?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Structurally deficient --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Structurally.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Structurally deficient to where the public is in danger? No. There are several bridges that have structural deficiencies that need to be addressed in a timely manner, yes, but they are in no way a danger to the public.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any other Legislators have any questions about this? Thank you for that presentation. Now we have a second presentation. I should mention -- I was going to mention it later when we got to the agenda, but I should probably get it on the record now. Legislator Caracappa has an excused absence from today's meeting. Our next presentation, also from Public Works, is about our energy programs that are ongoing. Tom Laguardia has prepared, I think, a Power Point presentation for us. So I will turn things over to you. I know you are also being joined, if you'll help me out, by --

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Javed Ashraf. He's our new Energy Engineer. He came on board a couple of years ago, and he's been doing an excellent job moving along all of programs.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's terrific. Welcome aboard.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

I want to thank the Public Works Committee for allowing us to come and update the Legislature on what Public Works along with our partners in the Department of Environment and Energy have been doing to keep Suffolk County in the lead on energy conservation and energy initiatives. Today, I'm going to try to discuss several different areas and update you. The first area that we're going to look at is the legislation that the Legislature and the County Executive have passed over the last several years to help -- guide DPW in where they're going to go.

We're going to look at LEEDs and what the department is doing in the area of LEEDs. We'll explain the different projects we have that will be under LEEDs. We're going to highlight our energy performance contracts and how much money we've saved and how much CO<sub>2</sub>, the SO<sub>2</sub> and other bad actors in pounds, in actual pounds, we've eliminated from the environment. We'll talk about Capital Project 1664, which is the project that we do most of our smaller projects with in the area of energy conservation.

We'll discuss how the County helps the general industry work in emerging technologies and how we support that area. We'll go over demand side management and where the County excelling in that area and how much money the County is reaping by participating in those programs. We'll talk a

little bit about LIPA rebates and how much money the County has gotten from LIPA in rebates. We'll discuss green power quickly. We'll present you a quick slide that shows you how much money we've saved the County over the last several years in dollars over our various programs. And then the last thing we'll do is we'll go over where we're going in the future.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let me see. Do you need a couple of minutes to get the technology up and running.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Yes. He's coming up.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Why don't we take a five minute break, and we'll resume with the presentation.

**(\*A RECESS WAS HELD FROM 3:00 P.M. UNTIL 3:10 P.M.\*)**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let's call the meeting back to order. And I will turn things back to you, Mr. Laguardia.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Just to let you know, Legislator Schneiderman, we will be e-mailing each member of the Public Works and Transportation Committee a copy of the Power Point this afternoon or tomorrow morning, this way you have all the details.

I understand that you have a large agenda, and I'll try to move quickly with this. What I tried to do with the next two slides is highlight some of the legislation that the Legislature along with the County Executive has passed in the last few years that's helped guide us in what we're doing in Public Works. Starting in '03, we had the Energy Star resolution where all future purchases have to meet Energy Star requirement, that includes in we buy appliance, CFL light bulbs, etcetera. That is on the books now, and we are following that.

In '04, we had the pilot program for LEEDS. The Fourth Police Precinct is part of that, and we'll talk more about that as I get into the details of the slide. In '05, a bond resolution for \$250,000 for photovoltaic at Police Headquarters. Again, we have a whole presentation on that later. Again, in '05, emission free energy by purchasing from renewable sources. We'll talk about what we have done in that field. Go all the way back to '02 again, the Legislature's Energy Advisory Committee came out with a County energy plan. We're following that. It basically says we should be as energy efficient as we can in the simplest terms. Again in '05, requirements for us to purchase green power. We'll go over those details. Feasibility study for wind power, I'll tell you where we are with that.

In '06, we have several more resolutions further implementing LEED for projects over a million dollars. I'll tell you all the different projects that fall under that. Also, '06, renewable energy park, we'll talk a little bit about that. Evaluate the feasibility of co-generation, we're moving ahead on that for the North County -- the Yaphank County Complex. And in '05, just to remind you that the County Exec did his Clear Energy Action Plan, which we are also following.

LEEDs, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design. This is a program that was started by the Green Building Council. It was a certification program that attempts to move us in the direction of the best design criteria for our buildings. We have two resolutions, one for the Fourth Police Precinct, which is pilot program which is going to try to help us and establish and certify what are the real costs to move to a green building. Right now the industry has a lot of figures out that go from approximately one to 6% additional cost to build a building green. We're going to try to qualify that for our own building. The consultant who's working on the Fourth Police Precinct is still working on those numbers, and we should have those numbers in the next couple of months when we bid that project.

The LEED system rates the buildings from the lowest level of certified all the way up to platinum. Our goal is that we must be at least certified for our buildings. We are not required to actually certify them, but we plan to do at least the first two buildings, which will be the Fourth Police Precinct and the Scully Estate will both be certified buildings.

The rating system basically has five categories where you can get points; site work, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere, materials and resources, indoor environmental quality, and also some points for innovation and design. Each of our projects will have to meet at least, like I said, the minimum certified level. Our first project, which is the pilot project for the new Fourth Police, it's a 30,000 square foot building. It's going to comply with LEED Standard 2.2. We expect to get 34 points, which is the silver level, above the certified level. And you see all the different points that we're getting for the different things.

In addition to all that, LIPA has provided us with a \$600,000 grant to put a solar system on that project. I believe the Legislature recently passed or was recently laid on the table legislation to accept that grant. And there will be a very large -- probably the largest municipal solar system on Long Island will be on that building. It's about 50,000 KW. Other LEEDs projects in process, back to the Fourth Precinct. Again, we got a LIPA grant for 600,000. We're getting a LIPA rebate of approximately \$500,000 just for the energy efficiency that we would normally do. And because we're going to certify this, LIPA has offered up an additional \$150,000 in rebates to us for this project.

Next project that's getting certified is the Scully Estate. That's the Environmental Interpretive Center down in Islip that we're working on. We have spent about a million dollars so far working on that project. The Legislature and the County Exec gave us another approximately million dollars to finish that project. That work is just about to start. It will be a certified building. We're done energy modeling on it. We're going to try to put in a special ecological sanitary system. We're working with the Health Department on that. We're not quite sure that's going to work or not, but we're trying to do some innovative things. We've put the best condensing furnaces in. We've replaced all the incandescent lamps with fluorescent. So we've moved quite far along on that project.

In the future, based on the recent legislation, these following projects will now be LEEDs projects. Basically the legislation calls for anything over a million dollars either in construction or renovations. So Capital Project 1459 for improvements to the Board of Elections will be under LEEDs renovations; 3013, which is expansion of Criminal Courts Buildings for the Sheriff, that's over a million and will be done under LEEDs; 4003 will be our next new building, that's the environmental health laboratory for the Health Department, we're just starting the programming for that; 5736 will be a new general aviation terminal at Gabreski; and 6011 is the Tier II homeless shelter, if that project moves ahead it will also be a LEEDs project.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I thought they took the aviation terminal -- I thought that Capital Project had been eliminated.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

That's possible.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think that's off the table right now.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Javed, can you just check on that? We'll make a note and get that off the slide if that's true.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And the Tier II homeless shelter, where's that going? Not in my district.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

If it goes ahead, it's \$17 million, it will be a LEEDs project.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Energy performance contract is the largest way that we move ahead our energy renovations to our buildings. It's based on Article 9 of the New York State Energy Law. And basically it permits municipalities to enter into performance contracts whereby all of the capital improvements are paid for through reductions in the Operating Budget. There's no capital outlay. Our first big project in this area was Police Headquarters. We completed this project in '05. We're gaining approximately \$200,000 in annual savings, which not only pays the debt on the Operating Budget, it pays for all of our costs, but we also have a net gain -- small net gain to the Operating Budget. And for that we did over two and a half million dollars in retrofit to the building. You can see the emissions savings per year, 1376 tons of CO2, six tons of SO2 and about 1.6 tons of NOx.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you know, do these types of conversions, are they eligible for carbon trading credits? Are you familiar with what I'm talking about? There's a program where people can transfer carbon credits. If you make application that you're saving a certain -- that you're reducing you carbon footprint by a certain amount, you can actually get a grant toward that.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

I know a little bit about the program, but I don't know -- Javed, are you fully familiar with the program?

**MR. ASHRAF:**

I've heard about that program, carbon trading, but we have not really explored fully if we were able to trade. I can certainly look into it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Find out, because apparently there's a lot of money out there. A lot of traditional companies are looking for places -- so they can continue their operations, they need to pay to purchase credits. It's basically giving them the right to pollute by having somebody else do the work of reducing greenhouse gases. If you could look into it, it may provide some funding for the County.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

We would be glad to. The ME-DA Building, that work is under way right now. Last year we awarded a contract for almost \$6 million in Capital renovations and expect to save \$450,000 a year when complete. It should be complete late this year, early next year. Significant savings in CO2, over 2000 tons SO2 and NOx. Yaphank County Center, this project is energy performance contract, but was done in a slightly different way. We're working with the New York Power Authority who come with their own funding, which is an interesting way to do it. The only disadvantage is the control the consultants who do the design, and we have less say in the process, but it still works.

We're completing Yaphank now with an annual savings of \$250,000 with a project close of 3 million. The other disadvantage of using NYPA are these are not guaranteed savings, these are all projected. The other energy performance contracts, we're guaranteed. If we don't get the savings, the company who did the work pays us for the savings anyway. So we're trying to work with all different sources, so we've done a couple of NYPA projects.

We have one going on Bergen Point, the five buildings at Bergen Point. We'll looking at upgrading that project as it's about to get under way. Again, reasonable savings, 145,000 with about a million-two in cost with no capital outlay. Next way we save money and conserve energy if through

Capital Project 1664. That is the fund that we use to do almost all our smaller energy retrofit programs, and we'll go through a whole bunch of them real quick. Here we generally either hire a consultant or our energy engineer designs a change in the system and we implement it.

We also monitor to make sure that we're getting the savings that we projected. The following highlights just some of our projects. The Farmingville is very similar to an energy performance contract except for we did it in-house with our own consultants. We have proposed cost savings -- they look relatively small based on the \$725,000 we're going to invest, but what we don't see in there is we have a lot of infrastructure improvements that go around the energy savings; ceilings and other things that aren't really directly energy related, but we have to do to do the project. So we're going to still get a savings. And we're upgrading this building totally energy wise.

Special Patrol Bureau, small job; lighting upgrades, replace the old oil-fired heating system, annual savings of \$12,000 with only a \$60,000 outlay. Very successful project. Police Bureau, again, boiler upgrade. Now, these are all done in-house Javed. He went out, did the analysis, implemented the work, got the contractors in there, oversaw the work, \$20,000 in savings -- I'm going to use round numbers -- with only \$40,000 -- basically, a two year pay back. All the money goes in our pocket.

Materials laboratory, again, boiler upgrades. Three thousand dollars proposed savings; projected cost, \$38,000. Dennison Building, we're moving to more lighting upgrades there. We're going to put in more occupancy sensors. We expect to save over \$13,000 a year with about a \$39,000 payback. So a three year payback. Again, very quick payback, and then after that, all the money goes into our pocket. Police Headquarters, the boiler -- in addition to the energy performance contract, we've identified additional boiler upgrades we can do to save even more money there. Javed estimates about \$14,000 a year in savings with about an \$82,000 investment. Again, large CO2 savings, 80 tons a year. Commack Garage, we're doing a bunch of sites in Shirley. Any of these that you want more information on, we'll be glad to do. We just wanted to give you a smattering and show you that we're working all over the County in all different locations. Yes, Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I noticed one of your slides said, "Farmingville Health Center."

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Yes.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I'm not familiar with the Farmingville Health Center.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

It's actually not -- it's a misnomer. It's their administrative offices on 62 just south of the Community College.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Okay. All right. Thank you.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

It's been called the Farmingville Health Center for the 20 something years I've been here. Next area where we're -- where we're working is emerging technologies. It's another area where we're working. It's not our policy to install emerging technologies into our buildings, because they're still being developed. But what we try to do is provide to developers platforms where it's not going to hurt our operation, where at their cost they can come in and install this technology and test it out. We can to monitor it, we get to see how it works. And we've done this successfully at several locations.

We've installed a micro turbine at our ME Building. This is the second generation. First generation failed fairly poorly. It operated poorly, it gave us all sorts of problems. KeySpan came in and replaced it with a new more modern unit from {Capstone}. Right now it's successfully operating. It's tied into our -- it's providing both electricity and hot water to the building and initial cost of -- we only paid \$195,000. The initial cost was higher than that, but that was borne by KeySpan. We're saving quite a bit of electricity in thermal and you can see over 150 tons of CO2 and so on.

At your building we installed 5 kW plug power cells. And we went from one generation to the next generation. The demonstration is done, and now we're talking with LIPA about coming back and installing an uninterruptible power supply with a fuel cell. Again, this is emerging technology. It's being used some places as base technology, but most people consider it still emerging.

Photovoltaic. This is probably the technology that's most now moving into the main stream. It still has a lot of R and D going on with it. We've got a small system at the ballpark that's operated successfully for many years, and it's being taken over by the County now. It was operated by LIPA for the last five or six years. And now, it's going to be totally County-operated.

We talked about the \$260,000 grant we got from NYSERDA to install photovoltaic in Police Headquarters. That project is under construction right now. Hopefully, it will be finished by the end of the year. We will a 40 KW system on that roof. We will be saving 34 tons of CO2. Javed, do we have the reduction in electricity costs? We don't have the costs, but it will be saving 65,700 kW hours per year of electricity.

Fourth Police Precinct, we have a \$600,000 grant from LIPA to install a 50 kW system on that building. That building is currently coming close to the end of its design process. We hope to bid that building some time late summer, early fall. This should be the largest municipal system on Long Island. Wind turbine, request for proposal. We put out a request for proposal in accordance with the legislation. We only got one vendor that came in and even gave us any type of offer. What we've decided to do -- the real problem with this is because the RFP for Yaphank and the redevelopment of the Yaphank area, the wind turbine guy is uncomfortable doing the study at his and offering any type of wind turbine installation until we see what's going to happen with that process. So we're going to wait six months to a year when we know what's happening in Yaphank with the affordable housing and the stadiums and all that. We will reissue that RFP, because we do have one gentleman who is interested in installing a wind turbine.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Originally when I -- this was my resolution originally to study the feasibility there, and there is kind of a wind row between the two farm fields that it seems natural, almost right up against the Long Island Expressway. And I believe that LIPA and NYSERDA, they were on board for funding the, you know, lion's share of this feasibility study. Has that money disappeared?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

No. The money is available. But we don't know -- number one, we're not sure it's fully sufficient; number two, the study is difficult to do unless you know where you are going to use the electricity. And as soon as we get a little bit better idea on how Yaphank is going to be developed -- and this is after sitting, talking with the gentleman who did --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you remember when this resolution was passed by the Legislature to study the wind feasibility at Yaphank? I'm going to guess like 2005.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

'05. It was '05.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's two years now, right?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

It took us a long time to identify -- - if you remember, a long time --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Because now you're saying six more months.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

If you remember, Legislator Schneiderman, it took us a long time to identify the funding. Once the funding was identified, we went out with the RFP. Did we get any back the first time? I'm trying to remember if we went out twice. But in the end, only one gentleman came in with a proposal, and he really was not willing to move ahead unless we guaranteed him the development rights, because he doesn't know what he's developing until he sees -- smaller wind turbine, just to do something on the farm, larger wind turbine to maybe do a more regional supply, how will it affect affordable housing next door, maybe he could supply the stadium. So we felt after not getting a really good response from him, the best thing to do was just wait a little while --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It is moving forward, though. And if the funding is not there, is the County prepared to fund it?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

We believe a good developer, once he knows what's going on, is just going to fund the study at no cost to the County as part of the development of proposal.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think it's a logical site. And I think once we have a spot where, you know, people can actually see these wind turbines and understand that, you know, they are quite, they're not the, you know, aesthetic problems that people, you know, think that they are. I think it will create the conditions that will make it more possible to promote wind energy for Long Island in other locations. I think it's an important project. We're not thinking I don't think of too many in that location; one, two, three, maybe four, but, you know, we're not talking about a whole big farm field full of wind turbines.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Correct. We're expecting to be, like you just said, between one and maybe three, but how big, how tall, how big are the turbines, it all depends on where the loads are.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I think it's also that site makes a lot of sense in that children are already coming there to learn little farming and agriculture. It would be nice to have them learn a little bit about renewable energy as well.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

That's absolutely correct. And I failed to mention that as part of the Police Headquarters photovoltaic, there is a small demonstration project being done at coop also. So it's going to be like a little renewable energy site. And wind turbines make sense there.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The spot was picked also because it's easy to tie into the grid there, and it's also quite a distance to the nearest residential property. So I'm keeping my fingers crossed that maybe something will happen at this site.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. Thank you.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

In the area of demand-side management, we've been working with the New York Independent System Operators in there {ICAT} Program. It's a program where we make our generators available on an emergency basis to help stabilize the grid in a major power outage or a power brown-out situation. And we get large payments for it. Up-to-date, from September '06 until June of '07, they paid us over \$400,000 just for the availability of our generators. And, Javed, correct me, I don't think we've been called once, have we?

**MR. ASHRAF:**

No. We have been asked to test our generators, but they have not called an event yet. This is just for making our capacity available to the grid. We have received over \$404,000 in payment.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Good work.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Just to let you know how well and how aggressive we've been --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

In the same vein, do we get -- for some of these photovoltaic systems, if we produce more electricity than we're using, do we -- are we able to sell any of that back to LIPA or no?

**MR. ASRAF:**

LIPA doesn't allow sell-back to the grid at cost for commercial accounts. It's only available to residential properties.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Are they actually getting the excess energy and not compensating us?

**MR. ASRAF:**

No. Right now, we don't have a photovoltaic system as such.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

But we're putting in what you said was going to be the largest one on Long Island in the Fourth Precinct.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

It still doesn't meet all our needs for the building.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. So there won't be any excess electricity.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

At some points there might be, but what happens is the generation goes no place. We just don't use it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can we look into the issue of whether LIPA will -- whether we can sell some of the excess energy back?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

It's called net metering, and it's not permitted by commercial. We, along with many other people, have been --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We're not exactly commercial. We are governmental.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Institutional.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Institutional.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

It puts us in the same boat. But, yes, we will continue to have discussions with LIPA regarding that. Just to let you know how aggressive we've been with LIPA from many other projects in addition to some of the larger dollar values we talked about, this is what we've got back on several other jobs over the last couple of years; almost -- over \$800,000 in rebates.

The Green Choice Program. There were two resolutions. We've combined them into one. And we have signed up with a Green Choice provider. There were three buildings that are basically 100% under the attributes. If you understand, we actually don't get green power, but we get the attributes of green power. The H. Lee Dennison Building, the Rogers Building and the Skilled Nursing Facility are all considered fully under the green attributes legislation with a total cost to us after the LIPA rebate of \$86,000. I believe the legislation authorizes up to 100. And we will be monitoring that to make sure we stay within the provisions of the two resolutions. One required 25% by 2010.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Something like that. Or 20 or 25%, right. So this was like the first 5%. I was going to ask you, then that resolution must be at least two years old now, the one that sets that goal, that target. At this point, we probably should be up to 10% renewables, something like that.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

We're well ahead of the resolution already. Javed, do you have the figures in your head?

**MR. ASRAF:**

Well, as you can see, we have 15% of our consumption is green power just for these three buildings. And as we move forward, we intend to look at other buildings, especially the Fourth Police Precinct, which we can pick up one more lead point if we go with green power. And LIPA gives us a rebate. The maximum rebate allowed is \$30,000. So as we go forward --

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

So we'll stay on top of it and monitor it and make sure we stay with the percentages. One was only a goal, and the other one actually had a mandate. I'm sorry, I don't remember --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The 5% was a mandate, the Green Choice Program.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Yes. And we were well above that.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

This is just a quick slide to show you over all those projects that we talked about and many more smaller ones, what we've saved; electric savings, almost eight million kilowatt hours; oil savings, 125,000 gallons; and energy cost savings of over a million dollars so far. You can see what that translates into CO2, almost nine million pounds. And if you look at what we're doing with the Green Choice Program, we're saving another 18 million pounds of CO2. So I think we're doing a pretty good job.

In the future, we're going to continue to look at demand-side management to reduce our energy

profile. We're going to continue to look at renewable sources; more solar, more wind, make more platforms available for more fuel cells and micro turbines if necessary. We're about to put out an RFP for a cogeneration plant at the Skilled Nursing Facility. That should be very successful installation. We expect to save a couple of hundred thousand dollars in operating costs per year. We're going to issue a performance contract for the Criminal Courts Building in Riverhead. There's significant savings there to be gotten. And we're going -- we're doing some general exploration in whether it makes any sense for the County to purchase natural gas from a supplier rather than through KeySpan. Our initial look says it's probably not worth the small savings, but we're researching it anyway.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I didn't hear you mention the biodiesel thing, but the changing of the fleet over to biodiesel, has that kind of fallen to energy savings? Well, not really, but more in terms of reduction of fossil fuels.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

That's reduction of the bad stuff that goes in the sewer too and the other things that go into the air. So, no, it wasn't part of this presentation. But that's moving ahead. And then the last bill by Legislator Cooper, I think we sat with his staff last week and we made --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, there was a bill by Legislator Losquadro, the B 20 Bill. And then there was another bill about -- more about air emissions. That was Legislator Cooper's bill about --

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

His was ultra low sulfur, which we can also use B 20 with that, so it's -- they're all kind of intermingled together.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I mean it appears from the presentation we've been keeping you busy. It looks like you're doing a phenomenal job. I think that other members of the Legislature would probably love to see this presentation, so when you -- certainly when you e-mail us the Power Point, probably include all the Legislators. And if you have time, I think, particularly the Committee on Environment and Energy.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

We gave a similar presentation about a month ago.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

A couple of months ago to them.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I just wanted to ask you about exploring the options to buy natural gas, and you said that it really didn't look like a significant savings, because isn't that what Broadwater is basically saying that it will be a tremendous significant savings?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

The research we've done so far, it's a limited amount of dollars that is saved with a large liability to us and possibly increasing in staff to monitor all these accounts. But we have closed -- we're looking at it. So hopefully in the next six months we'll be able to come back and say we have all the information, this is what the actual savings are, but this is what it will cost us to do it and this is a

liability. So I really don't have a solid answer.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Cool. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any other questions? Is that your last slide or is there more?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

That's our last slide.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

No other questions? Thank you.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Very informative. Good work.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Are they going to e-mail the Power Point?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Are you going to e-mail the Power Point, right, Tom?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Sure. We'll e-mail it to the entire Legislative body if that's what you would like.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That would be terrific. Legislator Eddington wanted to point out that the Farmingville Health Center is not in his district. All right. Again, Legislator Caracappa, has an excused absence. I think I can move the agenda at this point. Remind me when we get to the bills that we've already taken out of order. First one, I guess, we didn't have to take it out of order, did we? It was the first. All right. 1556 we've already taken care of.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Legislator, can I make an opening statement?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Absolutely, Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Okay. I don't want to belabor this point, but -- and I had hoped to be able to make this statement during the discussions on the I.R. 1556, the Galleria, but there were some issues raised -- and I am in the process of preparing a memo, and I didn't get to finish it, but I did want to get it out there, because of the last contentious meeting we had on this issue. There were some comments made that I'd like to address. I'll be as brief as I can, and I will follow-up in writing so you have it.

It was indicated at the last meeting that in accordance with Section 451 of the General Municipal Law, the allocation of administrative costs to the district is illegal. I wanted to state, once again, that for the record, the County Attorney has rendered the opinion that it is the imposition of the sewer district costs upon all County residents, including those residents which are not within a County sewer district and contractually connected to a sewer district which is legally prohibited.

Another issue that I'd like to just briefly discuss is Legislator Kennedy -- and I had hoped he'd been

here, I'm not trying to speak, you know, out of school, but I've indicated expressed concerns to the County Comptroller regarding calculation of these charge backs to the districts. In 1997, an audit was conducted of the charge back system to the County Comptroller's Office. There were no exceptions taken to the methodology in allocating the Fund 261 costs to the districts or the propriety or accuracy of the amounts assessed to the individual districts. They did, however, find that an additional \$1.2 million of costs should have been assessed to the districts at that time.

It was stated at the last meeting that fictitious costs were used in the preparation of the budgets. All of the costs incurred in the operation and maintenance of the sewer districts are based on legislatively approved budgets. Actual expenditures from 2005 were used in the calculation of the current budget which is being proposed for this sewer district. The current rate of \$470 that is the basis of the Legislator's resolution was calculated in 2002 and admittedly was incorrectly calculated. It only contains the costs that incurred at these sewer treatment plants, but not the applicable administrative costs.

Last year, DPW submitted a resolution with this rate to the County Executive's Budget Office, which was rejected and was returned for correction. The current rate of \$1,070 was calculated based on the standard operating procedures of the Department of Public Works, which has been consistently applied in the calculation of sewer district rates since the early 1980's. The issue regarding the administrative fees I will discuss with Legislator Lindsay at another time. I think we discussed that enough today.

A couple of other issues briefly. It was stated that the DPW has been uncooperative in negotiating a rate. We've met a number of times with both the district -- folks in the district as well as the Legislator, and I take exception to that. I wanted to make it a point that we have met with them a number of times to try and discuss the issues. And I think one of the big problems that we have to get over is the misconception of the rate being negotiable. It's not. I think we need to clarify a little more so the Legislator Lindsay and Legislator Kennedy understand it, but at this point -- and I won't belabor it anymore -- it is really what it is. And it's -- we do understand what the community's going through, but as a department, we feel comfortable in the fees that have been established or are being established and the direction we're trying to take this. Thank you. I appreciate that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you, Commissioner Anderson. I have questions, but I think I'm going to hold off, because I feel like we're going to be back in this issue at another time.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I'm sure we will.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let's move on.

**1575. Establishing a written notice policy for Suffolk County Accessible Transportation Services. (SCHNEIDERMAN)**

I think Mr. Hymowitz wanted to speak to this. I'll make a motion to table it. You know, we're going to revise the bill, so it's going to be somewhat different. And I think it will be satisfactory, hopefully, to the Department of Public Works and Mr. Shinnick, in a way that, you know, we can notify each individual without undue burden to the County staff wise or fund wise. So I'll make a motion to table 1575, seconded by Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1575 is **TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1623. A Local Law to reduce the emission of pollutants from diesel-fueled motor vehicle operated by or on behalf of Suffolk County. (COOPER)**

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to table by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Question on the motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

On the motion, Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I just wanted to ask the Commissioner, this is a reintroduced bill, is it not?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, it is.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right. And I thought I heard one of the earlier speakers elude to changes in the bill.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Last I remember, your department was opposed to the bill because of cost factor. Have the changes been made that now alter your position on this bill?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There were a number of issues, cost being one of them, but also there was the issue of the requirement that the original bill be mandated over contractors that do work with Suffolk County. We've met with that on a number of issues. And I haven't seen the final revision, but I'm advised that, you know, we are comfortable with it in its present form.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I ask you on a related issue that I'm working on, it's more along the bio diesel end, do we have a significant amount of equipment, not fleet, but equipment, whether it's power generation equipment or other machinery, road equipment that runs on diesel, you know, in addition to our fleet where that, you know, could be running on B 20?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. I mean, totally we have 439 diesel-powered vehicles in the County's fleet. Of those, 185 are basically the on-road, the rest are equipment that can be used and will be used in the bio diesel.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Losquadro's bill doesn't cover anything but the fleet itself; is that correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I'd have to look back.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It doesn't cover the equipment, the generators, backup generators, power generators, like for the

Riverhead Jail?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Could you maybe provide me -- or is there somebody at DPW with a list of diesel-powered equipment, not fleet, but equipment that could be potentially powered with the same B 20 as the fleet is?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. I know -- and yes. That would be fine.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. I'll kick around the idea of extending what Legislator Losquadro did to the other diesel equipment.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We do have some current concerns about that, and I can certainly --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I would love to hear that too.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, absolutely.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm not introducing anything yet. Of course, I'll meet with you and hear your concerns.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Sure.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

16 did we -- we didn't vote. There was a tabling motion and a second. All in favor of tabling? Opposed? 1623 is tabled.

**MS. ORTIZ:**

I don't have a motion.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We didn't have a motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

**TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1659. Directing a study of the feasibility of the use of propane to fuel the County fleet. (ROMAINE)**

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

I'm going to make a motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion to table by Legislator Eddington, second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? I think we may need to hear from the sponsor. **TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1661. Authorizing public hearing to rescind Resolution No. 1039, North Ferry Rate. (ROMAINE)**

I think we were advised that we're prohibited by law to do this, so I think we'll just table again. Same motion same second. All in favor? Opposed? All right. Hold on on that vote.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I was going to ask for an explanation, but your point is that --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Table it subject to call?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Well, I just want to clarify. I was going to ask for an explanation on the bill. You asked -- you said -- what I heard was that we're not authorized to do this?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I don't believe we are.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

So then I would just make a motion to table subject to call, if that's the case. Take it off the calendar. If we're not authorized to do it, why put it back on? I'm refraining from asking the explanation, because of the time, or the reason why this was introduced.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah. I believe the testimony at the last meeting was that we were prohibited by law from doing this. We have no authority to do it.

**MS. LOLIS:**

That's correct. Without application by the ferry company, that's correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. There's a motion to table subject to call by Legislator Montano. Is there a second?

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? I'm going on abstain. That was 1661. **TABLED SUBJECT TO CALL (VOTE: 3-0-1-1 - Abstention - Legis. Schneiderman; Not Present - Legis. Caracappa)**

I would have preferred a simple tabling.

**1662. To rescind Resolution No. 1039-2006, authorization of alteration of rates for North Ferry Co., Inc. (ROMAINE)**

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Same.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It looks like the same thing.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What is the difference here?

**MR. NOLAN:**

The first one is to have a public hearing to rescind the rates.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's kind of interesting. There's nothing that prohibits us to have a public hearing, but why hold the public hearing on something we can't do? That really would be disingenuous, wouldn't it? Okay. So same motion, same second on 1662 and same vote. **TABLED SUBJECT TO CALL (VOTE: 3-0-1-1 - Abstention - Legis. Schneiderman; Not Present - Legis. Caracappa).**

All right. 1697 we've already taken care of, it's been tabled.

**1747. Authorizing transfer of one (1) surplus County computer and one (1) surplus County monitor to the Smithtown Parkinson's Therapy Association. (KENNEDY)**

Motion to approve by Legislator Eddington, seconded by Legislator Montano. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1778. Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, amending the 2007 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds for improvement to the Yaphank County Center Wastewater Treatment Facility (CP 8158). (CO. EXEC)**

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion, Legislator Eddington, seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1784. Amending Resolution No. 1155-2002 for participation in engineering for the reconstruction of CR 67, Motor Parkway, Town of Islip (CP 5172). (CO. EXEC.)**

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I'll make a motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Montano, seconded by Legislator Eddington. Commissioner Anderson, if we could have some more detail.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. This resolution is to appropriate \$440,000 for engineering of the project. There is Federal funding, 80% Federal, 20% County funding of the project.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I would just add --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

You want to --

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yeah. The original resolution that amended the Capital Budget and Program and appropriated the money reflected an 80/20 Federal to County --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I'm sorry. You're right.

**MR. NOLAN:**

-- cost sharing. This reflects a 60/40 split and authorizes the issuance of more serial bonds to reflect that.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

We don't need to take money out of another account, we're not -- we're just issuing serial bonds that are a higher amount?

**MR. NOLAN:**

At a higher amount, because it was less Federal money than was believed originally.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1784 was **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa)**.

Okay. **1785. Amending Resolution Number 925-05 for the reconstruction widening of CR 3, Wellwood Avenue bridge over the Southern State Parkway.**

Is there a motion to approve? Legislator Eddington, seconded by Legislator Montano. Is that one of the ones that's on the list? I didn't see that on the list?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No. This was just to -- this revises the original resolution appropriating \$200,000 for engineering. Originally, the original resolution -- excuse me -- stated that the share was appropriated for Federal funding for 80% Federal, 20% County. In fact, the appropriation is revised to reflect 100% County funding.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Is there a reason why it's being 100% County funded, why we don't have any State monies on that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Let me bring Bill up. He probably would be the best one to answer that.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

It was really just a simple error. I know it's a fairly costly error, but it was -- the Federal funds were not available.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What about, like, {Marchecelli} Funds, if I'm saying it right?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

The {Marchecelli} funds are built on top of the Federal funds. So without the Federal funds, the {Marchecelli} can't be accessed.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Did we not put it on the Federal list, is that what happened?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

The project in its total was on the -- the majority of the project is Federally funded. And if we look at the project in its total, it probably is very close to 80/20. Additional funds were needed -- the additional 200,000 was needed to complete the project. And we believed at the time that there were sufficient Federal funds to have an 80/20 match. That was not the case. But if you look at the entire project, it's a \$10 million construction project, probably \$2 million in design or a million dollars in design. If you look at it in its entirety, it's very close to 80/20.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So we have to kind of shoulder the last 200,000 on our own.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

On our own. Correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. There was a motion and a second to approve. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1785 is **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa)**.

**1787. Amending the 2007 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the County share for participation in the reconstruction of CR 57, Bay Shore Road, from NYS Rte. 27 to NYS Rte. 231, Towns of Babylon and Islip (CP 5523).**

Let's do the same motion, same second. Commissioner Anderson.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The resolution before you is for additional funds for land acquisition in connection with the project. The original estimate was based on a certain design, which we went for an ultimate design which was larger in scope.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

That's fine. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1787 is **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa)**.

**1788. Amending the prior capital authorized appropriations under Resolution 1093 of '98 for funding construction improvements at Suffolk County Sewer District Number 3 - Windwatch. (CO. EXEC.)**

Same motion, same second. Commissioner, anymore information on this?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, this is for additional funds requested to -- for it to finish the project.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How much over budget is it?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

A hundred thousand. It's an additional hundred thousand that's being requested.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa)**.

**1790. Authorizing the filing of a Federal grant application on behalf of the Town of**

**Brookhaven for mass transportation capital assistance for the purchase of vans for the town's Senior Citizen Transportation Program. (CO. EXEC.)**

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Eddington, second by Legislator Stern. On the motion, Commissioner, these vans, they're all handicapped accessible; is that correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes. It's for the Town Senior Citizen Transportation Program, yeah.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Now, are they moving toward a more energy efficient fleet? I believe they are in Brookhaven, right, using some hybrid --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I believe so.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is this a hybrid van, do we know?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That I don't know.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Either way, there's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1790 is **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa)**.

**1792. Amending the 2007 Capital Budget and Program by accepting and appropriating grant funds in the amount of \$600,000 from Long Island Power Authority (LIPA) in connection with the design and installation of a Solar Photovoltaic System at Suffolk County Fourth Precinct building (CP 3184). (CO. EXEC.)**

Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa)**.

**1794. Authorizing transfer of one (1) surplus County planetary camera to the Central Islip Public Library. (MONTANO)**

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Montano, seconded by Legislator Eddington. What is a planetary camera?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Bob? No. It's surplus equipment. A memo came over, we called the library, and they said they'd be glad to take it. But I'll leave a technical explanation to Counsel, if he has one.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's for microfilm.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's for microfilm. Thank you. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thanks for asking.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You didn't borrow it from, like, the Hubble, you know, Space Telescope, right? I was wondering if we should get that for the Montauk Observatory. **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1800. Amending the 2007 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with improvements to CR 80, Montauk Highway, between NYS 112 and CR 101, Sills Road, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5534). (CO. EXEC.)**

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1800 is **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1801. Amending the 2007 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the County share for participation in the strengthening and improving CR 80, Montauk Highway, Towns of Brookhaven and Southampton (CP 5014). (CO. EXEC.)**

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion by Legislator Eddington.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1801 is **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1802. Amending the 2007 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the County share for participation in the strengthening and improving CR 97, Nicolls Road, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5014). (CO. EXEC.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1803, Appropriating funds in connection with the rehabilitation of CR 83, Patchogue-Mt. Sinai Road, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5563). (CO. EXEC.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1804. Appropriating funds in connection with intersection improvements on CR 16, Smithtown Boulevard @ CR 93, Lakeland/Rosevale Avenue, Town of Smithtown (CP 5118). (CO. EXEC.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1805, Amending Resolution Nos. 1325-2005, as amended, and 929 of 2006 for participation in engineering in connection with the reconstruction/widening of CR 3, Wellwood Avenue Bridge over the Southern State Parkway, Town of Babylon (CP 5851). (CO. EXEC.)**

Didn't we just do this before over the Southern State Parkway? Is this different, Commissioner, than the other one?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. This is a different -- it's the same project, same bridge, but just different funding.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1810. Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve funds to the Capital Fund amending the 2007 Operating Budget, amending 2007 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds for improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 10 - Stony Brook (CP 8175). (CO. EXEC.)**

Any questions? Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1811. Amending the 2007 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with elevator controls and safety upgrading at various County facilities. (CO. EXEC.)**

No questions? Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1813. Amending Resolution No. 560 of 2003 for participation in engineering in connection with improvements to North Highway, CR 39, Town of Southampton (CP 5528). (CO. EXEC.)**

Same motion, same second -- do you have the improvements you are doing there?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This revises the apportionment of funds for engineering services connection with the final plan.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. It's part of the 39 widening?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You're doing changes at North Highway?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I make the motion on that?

**LEG. EDDINGTON:**

Sure.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I make the motion, seconded by Legislator Eddington. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1814. Amending the 2007 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the County share for participation in the reconstruction of CR 16, Horseblock Road, from the vicinity of Long Island Railroad to the vicinity of CR 21, Yaphank Avenue, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5511). (CO. EXEC.)**

Motion by Legislator Eddington, seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1815. Amending the 2007 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the reconstruction of Shinnecock Canal Locks, Town of Southampton (CP 5343).**

I kind of thought we had already done this. Is this additional expense?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is the additional funding for the repair that are needed to do the locks.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How much more do you need?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Another \$200,000 for a total of 550.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Additional money. Where are we taking it from?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let me do a motion and a second, then we'll -- motion by myself, seconded by Legislator Eddington. On the motion, Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I just wanted to know where the -- it's an additional 200,000, so the question is where is the money coming from. Is it coming from another Capital Program?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

From another Capital Project requiring land acquisition, which we're just not up to that point yet.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstention? 1815 is **APPROVED. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

**1829. Authorizing the filing of an application with the Federal Transit Administration an**

**Operating Administration of the United States Department of Transportation for Federal Transportation Financial Assistance for Mass Transportation projects for Suffolk County authorized by 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 Title 23 United States Code and other Federal statutes administered by the Federal Transit Administration (Upgrade Diesel Engine). (CO. EXEC.)**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Eddington, seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?  
**APPROVED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not present - Legis. Caracappa).**

I actually have one question. I don't really need anything lengthy here, but County Road 39, right after Labor Day we're going to start the construction of that project. I'm getting an awful lot of calls about the road cones, which have been working great all summer. It's really -- you know, for many people, it's a tremendous difference in their lives, their time that they have to enjoy their families instead of sitting there in traffic. Any prospects of being able to continue the cones after Labor Day when the construction begins?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Presently, it's extremely unlikely. Again, we've looked at it every which way. You know, the best thing that we can do at this point is to get the contractor working. He will be on-site immediately following Labor Day starting work. He has control of the site, you know, to basically run a program. You know, at this point, it just would delay, you know, the project.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Will he be doing construction or the company be doing construction during that period in the mornings.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

He'll be starting probably 6:30-7:00. They'll be on the site probably 6:30-7:00 starting work.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Because that's when it's bad, from 6:30 to about nine o'clock.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. Well, we've given him permission to operate, obviously with our approval, 24/7. So he can really be out there all day, all night. And he's got an incentive on the contract to make sure he gets it done and gets it done quickly.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Has he given to you any construction schedules in terms of when lanes will be closed, any kind of detours? Is any of that information available?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We've asked him for the first two week schedule. At this point, anything beyond a two week schedule is really difficult for him to establish. So we've asked him -- we've required that he submit a two week maintenance traffic schedule to show any lane closings, things like that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I ask that your office and my office as well as the Town of Southampton coordinate some kind of public information meeting so that we can answer questions, allow the public -- let the public know how they will be affected by the road construction and what some of the concerns are? I'm getting an awful lot of calls about it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I know it's not going to be pleasant. I absolutely would be more than glad to --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. Catherine from my office, if you can work on a date that you would be available. We'll try to do it maybe in the evening when residents will be able to attend. I would appreciate that. Mr. Zwirn.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

All I was going to add is that this is a performance contract, and, you know, we always knew that when this project was ever going to be undertaken, it was going to get worse before it gets better. And I think what Gil has said and Bill and everybody trying to recognize the problems in the area with getting traffic through -- I know I hear from East Hampton Business Alliance, Southampton Business Alliance, and they have my home phone number, so they call at home, which is fine, because I ride that road as everybody else does. Fortunately, for me I'm going the other way.

But the fact is that this road is -- the aim is to have this be the last year that will have -- even have the cone project. So the longer that is in affect, the longer this will take to get done. And I know that part of the problem is -- and it's just the nature of the beast -- is that this is also an Election Year. And the voters who are also traveling that road are going to be very miserable during that period. The fact is the -- people who travel that road on a regular basis are going to be miserable at some point. And the question is do we delay it? Because, as you know, the St. Andrew's Bridge Project was done on time, under budget, and the DPW did a great job. And that allowed this other project to go through. You see the poles being moved. I mean, the project is really going ahead at full speed.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I mean, the real problem is that the time when the road -- the traffic drops down is the winter, and they can't pave in the winter. So they really have a very limited time. And the spring is worse than the fall in terms of traffic. So I think the goal ought to be to try to get this done as soon as possible and maybe avoid some of the spring backlogs if at all possible.

**MR. ZWIRN:**

We have been having meetings. I mean, last night Bill Hillman and I attended a meeting out with people who live off County Road 39 who would like to see all the traffic diverted off of County Road 39. So everybody had interests here. And we're trying to accommodate everybody. But we'll take your message back to the County Executive. I know that Supervisor Heaney has been in touch with the County Exec and DPW, usually, I would say on the average of three times a day.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, maybe you'll be able to attend this public information meeting as well too and we'll be able to at least answer the public's questions and concerns. Okay. We're adjourned. Thank you.

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

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY