

CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING

of the

PUBLIC WORKS and TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The Public Works and Transportation Capital Budget Meeting was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday, May 20, 2008 at 9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Brian Beedenbender - Chairman
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chairman
Legislator Wayne Horsley
Legislator John Kennedy
Legislator Ed Romaine
Legislator Jay Schneiderman

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Gail Vizzini - Director of Budget Review Office
Barbara LoMoriello - Deputy Clerk - SC Legislature
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - DPW
Lou Calderone - Deputy Commissioner
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer - DPW
Bob Shinnick - Transportation Division - DPW
Ben Wright - Sanitation Division - DPW
Lance Reinheimer - Budget Review Office
Kevin Duffy - Budget Review Office
Joe Muncey - Budget Review Office
Roz Gazes - Budget Review Office
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office
Ben Zwirn - Deputy County Executive

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:47 A.M.*)

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

If there are any Legislators in the building to please come to the horseshoe. Everybody stand for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Horsley.

SALUTATION

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. Everybody can be seated. Okay. Well, I think we're going to start out, obviously going to do some questions and answers, but we're going to start out with a report from Gail and then I'll ask Gil if you could give us a little background and update on what you do. And so, Gail, could you start us off with, you know, I guess the highlights and the big notes of interest in the recommended Capital Budget.

MS. VIZZINI:

Generally speaking I could give the committee a broad and brief overview of this Capital Program. As you all know, it is a Capital Program that was prepared in the shadow of our current Operating Budget shortfall. Therefore, it is considerably smaller than last year's Capital Program. The concern, of course, is the debt service in the 2009 and forward Operating Budgets. Budget Review does an extensive discussion of debt service, which will increase regardless of what we do in this Capital Program by about \$9 million in '09 and another \$9 million in 2010 just based on the fact that we have a lot of projects in the pipeline and more particularly we now have to bond for the jail. So based on discussions with Public Works and projections by our staff, we project we will be borrowing most of phase one even though the money has already been authorized we will actually be bonding for the phase one of the jail.

The proposed Capital Program is about \$92 million less than what was adopted over the three-year program last year. \$88 million of that is related to the highway functional category. The reason that highways are less than last year is -- but there are several reasons. A small portion of that has to do with their own funds expended in 2008. Of a greater policy concern is the fact that the presentation is changing. It is morphing away for the purposes of highways from a planning document that shows that we are pursuing federal funds in future years to a document that shows just the traffic mitigating smaller project funds without the federal funds. So this is a policy direction that the Budget Review Office wants you to be aware of and consider if this is the way the Capital Program presentation should appear for highways.

It's somewhat different than the presentation for the College, which is not necessarily a concern of this committee, but in the case of the College there are several College projects that the Capital Program has always been used to demonstrate to SUNY the sponsor support.

So in that regard, the Budget Review Office will recommend that the presentation be consistent and if it is your policy decision to include these projects, that they be in the Capital Program.

The other area of concern is the sanitation area. A significant portion of the sanitation portion of the Capital Program is for the Southwest Sewer District. There are two major sanitation projects that have been requested, but are not included. One is \$30 million for the development of the Kings Park/Smithtown sewer area. In our report we recommend that the money -- the planning and construction funds be shown in the Capital Program. Based upon further discussion with Public Works and they will speak for themselves, there is significant question in terms of who will assume the fiscal responsibility. Whether it will be the district; whether new or additional districts will be formed; whether, you know, what entities are going to assume the fiscal responsibility. But we would recommend that a portion of the responsibility be shown since we are planning and going on this direction for the economic benefit to the downtown area.

The largest in terms of dollar amounts is the failure to include the Southwest District outfall pipe, the

construction funds for replacement of the outfall pipe. In and of itself the outfall pipe is an absolute necessity as Public Works will tell you, at least three consultants have recommended to us that based on the deteriorating condition and the fact that other localities that have the same type of outfall pipe constructed around the same vintage; have all failed. We are therefore recommending that the \$150 million for the replacement of the outfall pipe also be included. We recommend it spread the funds over three years primarily -- well, for the reason first of all this is a project that has to be done, you'll need the funding.

Secondly, if we fail to put the funds in, if we have to do it on an emergency basis or otherwise based on our own self disciplining offset laws, we will have to cannibalize another Southwest Sewer District project. We can no longer go to General Fund funded projects or other sewer district projects that may or may not be moving forward to get the offset money to do this.

Generally speaking, the commitment for buildings and highways and dredging is good although the Budget Review Office does make specific recommendations for advancing monies or adding certain monies on a detailed basis in the Capital Program. Dredging in particular, the commitment is consistent and better than last year's budget.

The three -- the other -- there's other \$3 million in 2009 as was included last year. However, there is no provision in the event that the state should bill us for our County share of previous dredging expenses. This is an ongoing concern. For some reason, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Government and the state and the County have joint shares in certain ongoing maintenance dredging projects with the Shinnecock Inlet or some of the other projects, there are about four of them. No monies have been included to show that we are aware of the commitment that we will have to pay. Budget Review has made several recommendations that there be at least one project so we could put maybe \$2 million in to mitigate the fact that if the bill comes we won't have to take that money from another project. But again, this is a policy decision on your part.

Another project I'd like to bring to your attention, Public Works has asked for contingency funds for the completion of the Riverhead County Center in the amount of \$2 million. We are recommending that we include the \$2 million contingency in the Capital Program. If we don't, once again, we would have to take that money from another project and since it is such a lean Capital Program we don't advise that. This will give Public Works the opportunity to complete the project as you expect it to be completed, particularly in terms of the necessities for the Legislative auditorium and without having to further value engineer what's intended for that project.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

That's good.

MS. VIZZINI:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I mean, if you want to keep going.

MS. VIZZINI:

No.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MS. VIZZINI:

Just that if you have any questions my staff and I are all here prepared to respond.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Well, I think before we do the questions we'll have Commissioner Anderson come up and talk

a little bit and then we'll delve into all the things that Gail mentioned, whatever he mentioned and whatever other projects the Legislators might have questions about. So, Gil, if you could give response an overview, whatever you may deem appropriate at this point. I'm sure we'll have plenty of questions for you after.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good morning. Thanks for the opportunity to speak and to go over the program. The coming -- this coming year we have a number of capital programs and projects ongoing and I just give a brief outline of those if I could.

Of the three major divisions, Sanitation, Highway and Buildings, I'd like to start with Sanitation. Obviously, as Gail has noted there are some issues that need to be addressed at Bergen Point -- with and including the outfall. We're also looking at the plan to expand the plant. We have a grid improvement, the Grid Plant Improvement Project, ultraviolet facility within the Bergen Point facility that we're doing, we're in the design phase to improve. And additionally the infiltration inflow into the sewers for the Sewer District No. 3 is another ongoing project.

Similarly, we're looking at the Sludge Management Plan right now that has just begun and we're looking to as Legislator Horsley, I'm sure is aware, you can do a community outreach. This way the local community has the ability to have input into the --

LEG. HORSLEY:

I've already asked two people to be on the committee so --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

All right, good.

LEG. HORSLEY:

-- we're growing already.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

All right, good. And speaking of committee, we do have the RFP Sewer Committee, which is ongoing and which we have a definitive timetable, which we're holding to.

With regards to the Highways we were, you know, the Highway staff to their credit we have the project that was completed over on County Road 39, which, you know, we get to claim credit for and deservedly the Highway Division gets that credit. We're working on improvements of County Road 58.

But beyond that, we have four major projects, four major federally funded projects that we're looking to begin construction in 2009. These roads are County Road 67 bridge at the LIE; County Road 80 in Mastic/Shirley; County Road 16 in Ronkonkoma; County Road 57 Bay Shore Road, which will probably go in early 2010 or late 2009.

As was noted, we are shifting gears with regard to federal funding. It's our hope to make better use of the federal funds rather than the protracted projects that because of the process required take -- seem to take forever. We're looking at using those federal funds more for repaving projects where we can get the money quickly, make use of it right away and the money that we would have normally used County funds to do the road repaving projects, we will now use that for improvements -- reconstruction improvements locally rather than, you know, the large projects on large County roads.

In Buildings the jail is ongoing. We're looking to -- we'll be letting the project the -- the fourth phase, phase D, which is the new construction that will be let June 5th. We'll receive bids on August 5th. The Fourth Precinct project right next door is going on now. Construction hasn't started, but they're basically mobilizing, getting all the paperwork in order. We have a contractor on board.

Riverhead County Center also mentioned previously is underway and ongoing as we speak. The helicopter hangar at Gabreski, similarly is, you know, we're in the paperwork portion of it if you will, getting all the shop drawings in order and everything. And lastly, I'd like to mention the fire vehicle storage facility at Yaphank, which is also underway currently.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. Well, I think a large portion of the discussion will have to do with the Sanitation discussion in the BRO report. So with that, Legislator Horsley, I know this is -- my colleague from the great Town of Babylon is greatly concerned about the status of the Southwest Sewer District.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me just go back up from the pipe itself. I see where you've increased the capacity, at least the proposed capacity from 30 to 40 million gallons per day. I've always heard 35 million gallons per day was our permit limit. Could you explain what is our -- what is your intentions? Was there a permit limit of 35 million gallons and how did you come to this 40 million gallon figure, at least just your thinking behind it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay. For that answer I'm going to turn to Ben Wright who can give you a more concise answer than I could.

MR. WRIGHT:

The current limit is 30.5 and the initial project was to increase it by 5 million gallons a day up to 35.5.

LEG. HORSLEY:

35.5, okay. I missed the .5, okay.

MR. WRIGHT:

During the engineering phase -- the planning and evaluation phase it was recognized that with some of the zoning changes that are possible within the district, that with the 5 million gallons a day expansion plus what might take place within the district, the flow should probably be closer to 37 something, you know, and some change. And because of the geometry of the tanks it was suggested that we round it up to 40.5 million gallons a day. So it's -- we're looking now at a 10 million gallon per day expansion, some for in the district, some for being available outside the district.

LEG. HORSLEY:

So are you saying that there is no permit limit that we can go to? If we --

MR. WRIGHT:

30.5 is what the permit is today.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay, 30.5. Now, you would have to go to DEC and say now we want to make it a 40 million gallons per day limit.

MR. WRIGHT:

That's correct.

LEG. HORSLEY:

And they would approve that, there's no upwards end of this of where you can go with this plant? What's --

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, the restrictions come down to the site itself.

LEG. HORSLEY:

What restrictions? Okay.

MR. WRIGHT:

What, you know, what the site can handle and what the -- whether it's the influent sewers or the outfall can handle it. And both of those elements were designed for doubling of the plant size, up to 60 million gallons per day.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Oh, there's the figure I hadn't heard. Okay.

MR. WRIGHT:

Now, you know, whether or not the site can handle that it -- the way it is now is questionable, but, you know, the -- what comes in and what goes out was designed and constructed to be, you know, for a long range increase.

LEG. HORSLEY:

And when was this decision to go to 40 made? Was that just within the last couple of months?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Because that was the first I had ever heard that before, reading that.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay.

LEG. STERN:

I just wanted to be straight on the expansion to 40, is that to be accomplished within the expansion work that's already contemplated or does that take some more additional work or more additional funding? I'm not clear on how you make the jump from 30 to 35 and then 35 to 40.

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, during the engineering phase it was determined that 40.5 is the number that we should be shooting for with the expansion. And it does not include the \$65 million that's now being recommended in the budget does not include any sewer installation work, you know, that -- wherever those -- wherever that additional sewage is being generated would have to install the sewers in order to connect to the facility.

LEG. STERN:

But on the expansion of the facility itself, are you saying that we can get to the expansion number of 40 on -- based on the original plan that was in place to go from 30 to 35? I'm -- again.

MR. WRIGHT:

There was never -- I mean, the only plan was direction that, you know, we should look at expanding the facility by 5 million gallons per day.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah.

MR. WRIGHT:

So we secured a consultant to look into that aspect of it and with a lot of detail on the existing service area as well as, you know, the 5 million gallons per day we got to the 37 and then rounded it up to 40 because of the geometry of the tanks and the availability of the land.

LEG. STERN:

Again, I guess that's my question then. On those other factors that are involved, you're saying that by rounding up and going to the 40 that essentially you're increasing the capacity based on the work and the project that already exists.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. Thank you.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Now, let me just go back --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Wayne.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Kennedy just wanted to jump in on that one point too.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Sure.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'm curious as to whether or not there's been any kind of decision for how this additional capacity is going to be committed? The reason I say that is because I know we've had on ongoing discussions about what the connections will be to the Southwest Sewer District. We've looked at several of the commercial connections up and down the 110 corridor, which have benefited commercial ventures there.

There's also been a lot of discussion over the time that I've in the Legislature about residential areas, Wyandanch, some of the areas in Legislator Alden's district. Is there some decision made yet whether we're having a commitment to additional commercial connection or are we going to now make residential areas included? Where does this go? Where does the additional capacity to?

MR. WRIGHT:

As the result of a Legislative resolution back in 2002, the department prepared a report on the capacity required to serve Wyandanch, Deer Park, parts of Bay Shore and the northern area that surrounds the service area as it is today. And that -- that resulted in that 5 million gallons per day would be generated by those particular areas. And I believe that that's was really where the number came from when, you know, we entered into this initial project to increase it by 5 million gallons per day.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So is it --

MR. WRIGHT:

So it's a mixture, Route 110, you know, obviously would be less residential, but the other areas are probably a mixture of commercial and probably more heavily weighted to the residential connections.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So it's reasonable to assume then that if we go forward with funding this expansion those residential areas are then going to be given the opportunity for connection?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes. And along with that comes a connection fee that you are aware of that's \$30 per gallon per day so that's a potential revenue of \$150 million for connection fees.

LEG. KENNEDY:

But I thought that we had some differentiation between a residential connection and a commercial connection. A homeowner, a resident has to go ahead and incur that \$30 per gallon per day as well?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes. We use Health Department flow standards and a house, a single family house, is 300 gallons per day. So that's a \$9,000 bill to pay for the connection along with the abandonment of what they have on their site today.

LEG. KENNEDY:

If I can just ask, Mr. Chair, the Sewerage Sewering Study Committee, is that part of what the discussions are with the committee as far as the current impact for our residents to actually access a connect?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You talking about the RFP or the wastewater task force? Because there's two committees.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'm talking about the committee that we're trying to figure out how we're going to have people connect without strangling them.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, that's certainly a topic that could be raised as part of the discussions.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. If it's not been put on the agenda yet, I'd ask that that be something that's looked at as far as an impact to residents or homeowners so that they're able to go ahead and avail themselves of actually being able to connect without having to take out a home equity loan. I'd also like to be noticed when the next committee is so I could participate in that. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. Now, Legislator Horsley, I believe you had some more questions.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah. Yeah, I'd like to. So what you're saying in your mind of how we're going to go from the 30 to 40, which I don't think anybody knows about as yet, this a revelation to many, it will be a revelation to particularly to the residents surrounding the district. You're saying you're going -- we're going to go to Wyandanch first. Is that basically what I'm understanding?

MR. WRIGHT:

No.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Which I understand there is monies for the lateral that has provided by Senator Clinton and the business district off of Straight Path that certainly is something that should be considered. And they do need sewers, no question about that.

MR. WRIGHT:

DPW wasn't making a judgment on who would connect first and when. But I understand that --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Who's going to make that decision?

MR. WRIGHT:

-- I said DPW was not making that decision.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. Well then, who is?

MR. WRIGHT:

The capacity will be available for the areas that are in need and, you know, whether it's the task force that develops that or it's the town or a Legislative initiative.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. That's where I was going. Okay. I wanted to make sure that that was the case.

MR. WRIGHT:

But, you know, and I realize that there are some funding issues that have come along with the Straight Path issue, but that was started with the town.

LEG. HORSLEY:

That's correct, yeah. And I believe that's 5 million. I think we'll get literally the pipe would go to Wyandanch. I'm not sure that's going to go take care of Wyandanch. So yeah, then, because what you had mentioned before you mentioned Deer Park, but I know politically in Suffolk that we'll be hopping over North Babylon, which will be much to I'm sure my colleagues concern here, as part of his district.

So this is down the road is what you're saying. We do the capacity first. What is that going to look like at the plant itself, I mean, what -- to get it to 40, what -- how much larger are the tanks? What is that going to look like?

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, you've been to the plant a number of times.

LEG. HORSLEY:

A million.

MR. WRIGHT:

They'll be doubling the size of the primary settling tanks. So there will be four new tanks. There will be two newer aeration tanks, there's eight now, there'll be ten. And there will be one more final settling tank. Other than that, there's just auxiliary equipment that goes along with, you know, all the process.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Would you be building out to almost to like where the fence line is along the golf course? Is that what you're --

MR. WRIGHT:

No, the other direction right now.

LEG. HORSLEY:

The other direction.

MR. WRIGHT:

That's the initial plan is to go toward the bay.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Towards the bay, okay. All right. This is going to take a lot more exploring as we go along, but basically what you're looking for is funding at this point.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

That's where we're going.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay, okay. Lets go to the outfall pipe. I've been hearing it whispered over the last -- since I've become a Legislator that this is going to be something we're going to have to take care of soon. And then I see in the budget itself, you guys didn't include it in it accepting that it was a concern. What was your intention as far as this \$150 million in expenses and how real is that \$150 million? Where's that number come from? And just kind of give me your thinking of how this -- how you were going -- why wasn't it in the plan, the budget plan? What were you thinking where the monies were going to come from other than the Legislature saying we better put this in and give me your --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I think it was in the requested. I don't think it was in the recommended. I think the department did request it, so.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct, correct.

LEG. HORSLEY:

And where did it get lost?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, in the process of the recommended budget, you know, we did -- we were fortunate to have the ability to defend our budget, you know, as the process went forward. The 150 million is a number that was developed very cursory through the initial report that we've done. There are -- we're still looking at a number of possible ways of replacing the outfall the -- between Bergen Point and Fire Island is the section that we're looking to do. It could be anything.

There's a number of different ways that we're looking at it. Each different way has its associated cost and, you know, associated impacts. And that's what we're looking at now. The fact that the construction money was pulled out or is kept in as long as we have the money for the design for the development of the report and the, you know, subsequent design, we felt that by the end of this coming year, we would have a basic direction to go in, that we would be able to hone in on a, I guess, a more finite fee.

Right now, you know, it's the engineers -- the 150, million represents one alternative, which is essentially tunneling under the Great South Bay. There are number of different options, you know, some for less money. But it's going to be a larger environmental impact. So these all have to be

weighed and we felt that by the end of the year we would have a more finite number that could be incorporated into the budget since the budget is really a working document, you know, and in subsequent -- not in subsequent years, but in the coming years we could fine tune that number to a better number.

LEG. HORSLEY:

That's a -- yeah, I had heard the tunneling under the Great South Bay issue. That's an interesting proposal.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, I mean, it certainly would be the one of least environmental impact because you're under -- you're really underground and you're not going to impact anything above the ground, except the two places where you have the --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Where it comes --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right, yeah.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It goes down and comes up.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right, essentially. So, you know, that's one of the reasons we we're, you know, we're considering that proposal. I mean, there are -- there is a direct, for lack of a better term, the direct burial, similar -- the same method of installation as the original pipe was installed, there's been direct drilling been suggested there's, you know, a number of them, probably about five or six that we're looking at right now.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Is environmentally going under better? I know you'll have less --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's less impact, less impact.

LEG. HORSLEY:

-- impact as far as the DEC.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right, right.

LEG. HORSLEY:

But is it better for the district itself?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, certainly engineering wise at the end of the day you're going to have a, you know, you're going to have a new pipe that runs between the two points. You know, again, we're considering, I mean, certainly if you look at, you know, directional drilling, you're looking at a number of smaller pipes, which, you know, isn't really something we recommend. Certainly if we could put one pipe that handles the effluent, you know, and between those two points, that's really what we're looking to do. And then we got to, like I said, we have to, you know, we have to consider economic factors we have to look at, environmental factors and weigh all those.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Talk to me a little bit about the condition of the pipe. As I said, it was almost whispered to me in

passing conversations, oh by the way, we need \$150 million for sewers -- what? You know, is it leaking, you know, and obviously I've been told because I've asked the question many times now, it's not leaking.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's not leaking.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We've done dye tests.

LEG. HORSLEY:

But tell -- how do we know how bad it is? Give me a little -- when do you anticipate that this is really -- what is our -- is there a drop dead date because by 2013 we've got to have this thing out otherwise this thing is going to blow or, you know, what is your thinking on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At this point, the section of pipe that was installed was manufactured and I don't know the name of the company, but it's a prestressed concrete pipe. It's been in a number of other occasions where it's been under pressure the actual bands of reinforcement are snapping, they're deteriorating. And under situations of high pressure, such as like a water main, they've actually blown in some cases. And it's specific to this manufacturer and over the time period that it was manufactured and installed in the late 70's. And we've hired a number of consultants just to confirm what we found, you know, what's been recommended by each and they essentially three out of the four have stated that, you know, this is a concern and it should be addressed.

Fortunately our pipe, our outfall is not under a great deal of pressure. Most of the pressure and, Ben, correct me if I'm wrong, where these failures have occurred is above 30 to 35 psi. Our pipe runs somewhere in the vicinity of three to five, maybe. So we're well below that, but during storm surges it could raise to a point, you know, somewhere up there.

We are -- our consultants went out and they did a hydroponic study of the pipe, they actually installed microphones within the pipe to listen to, you know, the snapping of those bands. And it does -- there is a distinct sound that they've, you know, that they've discovered in other areas where this is occurred. And, you know, the numbers indicate that it is, you know, it is something to be concerned about. Not imminent, but they can't tell you when. You know, it could go, I mean, not imminent, it could go, you know, next year it could go five years, could go -- there's no real way of telling, but we do know that the bands, the number of bands rating is --

MR. WRIGHT:

Yeah, when -- we tested this for a three month period and there were over 700 breaks, but there are a lot of bands, there about an inch and a half apart. But there's no way to tell when they started breaking before that time period, which was in 2003. And if you use that same number between 2003 and now it could be 10,000 breaks. But there are 250,000 wire bands across the bay. It's just that as Gil indicated, we're lucky that we have a lower pressure that we operate under, except for storm surges, which could exceed, you know, 25 pounds per square inch.

LEG. HORSLEY:

So what you're saying is if we do have a hurricane or something like that that this thing may go.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The potential is there, certainly.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah, I know, I'm not going to try to get you any more finite than that, but I mean, but I'm trying to get my handle around, you know, is this thing, is the Great South Bay in imminent danger? And why is the bay section more -- is it pressure?

MR. WRIGHT:

It's a different kind of pipe.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Why is that going -- deteriorating faster than the ocean? You would think it would be just the opposite.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It was a different batch of pipe. It was a different, you know, I don't know if --

MR. WRIGHT:

It's prestressed concrete pipe in the bay. It's a steel pipe with a concrete weight coating that's in the ocean and it's cathodically protected so it is a different kind of pipe. And there hasn't been any problem with what's in the ocean.

LEG. HORSLEY:

So we don't have to replace the ocean pipe --

MR. WRIGHT:

No.

LEG. HORSLEY:

-- which I know is -- I would think might be more costly than the base. I don't know, who knows. It's a mind boggling project. If -- what we've considered, what the working group has considered is putting 50/50/50 over -- starting what, nine, ten -- 2010. Does that make sense to you guys?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You know, certainly again, this is a planning tool and that's what we would view it as, I mean, by next Capital Program --

LEG. HORSLEY:

So by 2012, you could say we need another 50 million.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, yeah probably even by the end of this year, you know, the beginning of next we will have, you know, we'll have a good handle on what we're going to need and then how we, you know, we -- and again, and I realize I'm a, you know, relative short timer here, but this is a working document and it should be able to be revised. If we find we need more, if we need less we'll --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah, does -- let me ask a question then, does bumping it up, the gallons per day to 40, does that put the pipe under further stress? Should one be done before the other?

MR. WRIGHT:

It could if we were seeing 40 and a storm surge, but if you look at the expansion plan itself, it's probably on a longer schedule than the outfall replacement.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It's on a longer schedule than the outfall.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yeah.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay, so -- and you know how schedules go.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes, but it's something that would have to be coordinated, certainly.

LEG. HORSLEY:

But, Gil, in your opinion, 50 million set aside per year starting in '10, that would be adequate?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, at this point certainly. You know, it shows that we have the intent to do the project. I mean, God forbid anything happened, you know, it would show that we are preparing to do the project, that we are moving ahead and, you know, which we were either way. It's just --

LEG. HORSLEY:

And the topic that strikes me as someone who lives and grew up on the Great South Bay, the beautiful Great South Bay with Browntide or otherwise, let me ask you if this -- if the pipe becomes undermined and if we have a problem with it, what happens? What is our plan B in case we have to tackle this immediately?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well part our current plan is in addition to doing -- continuing with the design of this is the purchase of a number of sections of pipe, which we will keep on-site so that, you know, God forbid it does happen we can -- we don't have to wait for it to be manufactured. We can then, you know, get the permits that we need and get down and open up that, you know -- however we would wind up doing, whether it be, you know, whether it would be an open section or, you know, you'd -- we have to case on down, I don't know at this point, but we'd have -- we would have the sections of pipe in hand.

LEG. HORSLEY:

So in other words, if a section goes, it will just -- the effluent would just go out into the bay and it would bubble up. Is that what you're predicting or if it gets crushed?

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Well, it's treated.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I know it's treated. Okay, all right. I understand.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. I mean, the basic impact would be salinity to the bay. It really depends on how it -- what happened. I mean, there's been -- I don't know if proposals the right word, but suggestions that if, you know, if it was a breach, you know, it would actually collapse, you know, there's a number of different ways. But either way you would have --

LEG. HORSLEY:

That's where I was going, if it collapses does it backup? Is that -- do we have to shut the plant down?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, no. I would not believe so. No, we would still be functioning we would just be unfortunately bringing freshwater, you know, directly into the Great South Bay.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. So it's a solidity issue and stuff like that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Even if it collapses it's not like a backup on a pipe then.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, yeah, and there's, I mean, it is a nutrient issue too, If I'm not mistaken. Right?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It would be like a giant RZP in a, you know, stop it at it's -- so, you know, we have the blowout at the plant.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, I mean, yeah. No. We're not all going -- I mean, if it -- no you wouldn't have to stop the plant and shut down the plant. You would have -- it would still be effectively operating.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It would be effectively operating even without the outfall pipe.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Promise me on that one, Gil.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'm sure I'll be there if it does God forbid happen.

LEG. HORSLEY:

That would be -- I just don't even want to think about it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Me too.

LEG. HORSLEY:

All right. I think at the -- it's just too much for me to get my head around at this point, but I will -- we'll discuss this further as we go along.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Certainly.

LEG. HORSLEY:

But the 50 million a day -- per year is adequate. And that's for planning too?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. The planning funds are -- were in there. That was the five --

MR. WRIGHT:

5.4 million is what we -- actually June 10th there's a public hearing on that phase.

LEG. HORSLEY:

And that's okay?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Well, that was in this year's budget I think, yeah.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right.

MR. WRIGHT:

There's 3.4 this year and 2 million in 2010 for the planning phase.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. I know, Legislator Kennedy had some questions and then I think we're moving away from sewers to all the other wonderful things in this budget.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I have questions about sewers too.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. Well, Legislator Romaine then too.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Let's -- there's a number of districts, sewer districts in my Legislative district, I guess, that we talk about and it seems like we talk about quite frequently. But one of my biggest concerns is Kings Park, Sewer District 6. As you know, the report from {Cameron}, I guess, we should see in the next couple of weeks?

MR. WRIGHT:

We've got the final draft.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Oh, you do have the final draft.

MR. WRIGHT:

I mean, there shouldn't be much of our comments before it can be finalized. But I would say a couple of weeks we should have the final report.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So based on what we saw in the PowerPoint with the County Executive sewer summit, which was excellent as a matter of fact, the delineation that I saw for the two districts was even more

comprehensive than I had hoped. Clearly this is a project that, you know, a lot of different entities are now heavily invested in. The Town of Smithtown Town Board, the Chambers, certainly us with the County Executive's commitment to the 2 million to do the study. We've have a commitment on a part of the state by and through Senator Flanagan and Assemblyman Fitzpatrick. And also expressions of interest from the federal government.

Based on what I heard from Gail before, I'm concerned that with not including the additional funding for the composite of the project in our Capital Program going forward, we're going to be sending the wrong message. Why are we making this profound shift midway something that's a couple of years in progress now?

MR. WRIGHT:

I think what Gail indicated was that there was some questions that have to be answered before we go ahead with putting money into budget. And that \$30 million that we initially requested and then it was taken out, when we did get this draft report, it is recognized that one issue in there is when would these certain developments be expanded and revitalized. And if -- when you look at that report you'll see that currently there's about \$300,000 gallons per day that's being generated in Kings Park in Smithtown in those main street areas. It's going to take a ten year period before you double that to 600,000 and a 20 year period until you get to 800,000 gallons a day and then ultimately a million gallons a day as it gets revitalized. But the infrastructure has to go in first.

So one of the questions that's going to be answered in this \$2 million project that we're now involved with or we will be involved with shortly, is if you need to put that infrastructure in now and it's going to cost \$30 million, how is that going to be supported by the unrevitalized areas until they do get that more flow and have a bigger tax base. And should it be the town that pays for that, should it be the users themselves. It shouldn't really be the small sewer district that exist today because they're not really benefitting from it.

So those questions had to be answered, you know, in this report that we're going to be getting that deals with the financial and legal aspects of, you know, how to form a town sewer district, a County sewer district, or should there be contractees to the district? So there's issues out there that are -- that have to be answered and it might give the wrong impression that we know what those answers are if we put the money in there.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Look, I agree with you a 110% that at this stage where this is still somewhat amorphous, we shouldn't be just blindly saying that this is going to be something that's a full cost borne by the district. We've already discussed the business improvement district, we've already discussed the possibility of getting infusion of federal funds. I -- at no point do I think that there was ever a decision or thinking that this was going to be a burden of SD 6 only, to build this out and to go ahead and put the infrastructure in there to allow it to operate.

But I'm concerned that the absence of this larger number going forward in what all continually talk about is a planning document, it's omission sends a message of a lack of commitment to progress the project and to answer these individual questions as we go forward. I don't think that we bear any harm if you will, by including it, so my recommendation is going to be to the Working Committee and I'll speak to this specifically later on, that we pull that back in and add that so can continue to go ahead and progress the project. In another month from now we're doing a field hearing there with Legislator Horsley's committee.

So, you know, it is something we're clearly -- there's a level of commitment across the board. And again, Ben, not having had the planning study I'm speaking just based on what I'm hearing from BRO and what I'm seeing here. I'll be eager to see that study and, you know, happy to speak to it.

Let me just touch on Sewer District 18. Is this moving along sufficiently funded and do we have inclusion of all the entities that we need to in the parameters of the district?

MR. WRIGHT:

The last correspondence with the State Comptroller was last week by the County Attorney and hopefully they'll accept that response and give us an approval that we can authorize the completion of the design.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Let me go to one other one, we just spoke about it yesterday, sewer district 13. Are we looking at anything as far as additional funding from our end, from Counties end or will all the expansion be facilitated by and through the private contractee between Motor Parkway Associates?

MR. WRIGHT:

By the private sector for their expansion. We'll gain some benefit by that expansion with some upgrading of certain equipment, but it's not something that we hadn't planned on doing, you know, so there is no request for funding for that district.

LEG. KENNEDY:

What about 22 right here. What, if anything, are we going to do as far as what are our ongoing operational lack thereof is regarding that?

MR. WRIGHT:

We've requested funding and are developing the RPF for assistance to, you know, look at the recharge situation that we have there and what land might be available in the area for that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Is it functioning at this point or are we continuing to have the same type of issues that we've had?

MR. WRIGHT:

No, it's functioning it's not -- it's a very comfortable feeling. I mean, the plant's working well, it's just that the recharge aspect of it has problems.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. I'll yield, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Romaine, you had some sewer questions.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Just one that has always kind of intrigued me since the Southwest was built, we use an outfall pipe, why don't we do tertiary discharge?

MR. WRIGHT:

Actually with the outfall alternative analysis, we are going to look at that. We're going to look at direct discharge to the bay. We're going to look at inland recharge as well as replacement of the outfall. The answer to your -- more specific to the recharge part is that there's three different ways that we could do that, either injection wells or open beds or, you know, underground leaching pools. And the injection wells are -- well, in all of them would have to go -- we're looking at six or seven miles inland to have enough depth in order to do it properly and that means --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Because I remember when the Southwest Sewer District was started one of the biggest problems were that the stream beds began to dry up because you were taking so much groundwater out and you had to figure out a way to keep the streams flowing, the bodies of water in that -- in the Southwest area. And one of reasons is we were pumping water out of, you know, the area and pumping it out into ocean instead of recharging it into the groundwater and hopefully by this time I assume that the time that they designed the Southwest recharge wasn't totally feasible because of

the content of the sewage that was being emptied out and now I would assume with technology, recharge is a viable option that would actually replenish the water supply of Long Island. And certainly replenish some of the bodies of water in the Southwest Sewer District that when Southwest first went on line began to dry up.

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, the majority of the treatment plants in Suffolk County do recharge.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I know that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Bergen Point would have to be -- there would have to be improvements to get up to that tertiary treatment level, which is part of the equations that we're looking at.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, and the reason I ask this if the outfall pipe is failing, this is a perfect opportunity for us to evaluate, you know, fiscally, environmentally, etcetera, for the long-term prognosis of the Southwest Sewer District whether it would be better to do tertiary recharge as opposed to just pumping it out into the ocean.

MR. WRIGHT:

Well, as I indicated, we'll be looking at option, but the Flow Augmentation Needs Study that was, you know, evaluated that situation for other 20 years really resulted in the conclusion that whatever impact it was from sewerage had already taken place. And I know there's fluctuations between droughts and extra water, etcetera, the first project that we were going to do in that respect was Deer Lake, which is in the engineering phase right now. I rode by there this morning for Capital Project 8110 and the one house that's on there that was for sale because it was waterfront property was sold and the water level is very high. So it may dry up again sometime in the future, but it was very little impact do to sewerage.

LEG. ROMAINE:

But it also deals with the quality and quantity of water available in terms of underground aquifer, which is something that the Southwest Sewer District will have a long-term affect in Western Suffolk. In fact, I know the Water Authority has always considered plans of pumping and one of the reasons for the Pine Barrens, one of the explanations given for Pine Barrens legislation was that the west end will run their aquifers, in fact, I believe they're looking to go into the next layer, the magothy layer of the aquifer because of the shortage of potable water in Western Suffolk. And obviously the Southwest Sewer District has a huge impact on that and that's why I would urge my colleagues from the Southwest because it's a regional issue, it deals not only with the direct delivery of sewage service, it deals with the preservation of the underground aquifer that we seriously consider recharge as opposed to replacing the outfall pipe. That's neither here nor there.

Let me get into some other concerns that I had. I'll go back to Budget Review later for pay-as-you-go because I'd like to raise that issue with you guys later.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I think Legislator Kennedy had one more sewer question.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Oh.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I'd just like to get the sewers done and then we'll move into everything else.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Sure, okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Mr. Chair, there's just one other area on sewers that I'd like to actually request that funding be put into further out-years and that's '81, '82. I noticed that there's 175,000 identified for purchase of software and hardware for sewer billing in 2009. And before we make the commitment to go this route, I'd like to ask whether or not we contemplated having our ten town tax assessors and receivers ought to take this function for us.

We in government are continuing to talk about merger of function or sharing and elimination of duplicativeness and as we all know we have 13 village assessors and ten town assessors and receivers of taxes in place. And I would propose to the committee that rather than investing in the infrastructure necessary for us to continue to do the billing that we do directly we should be availing ourselves of the town infrastructures set in place. Has that -- there been any exploratory activity on the part of the department to look at that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Not that I know of, no.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Is there anything that BRO could share with us?

MR. DOERING:

We did speak with the Department of Public Works with respect to this program. They had already put substantial amount of money into the upgrade. It was our understanding this stage was the 175,000 in '09 is essentially to accept credit card payments, but they had already upgraded quite a bit of the hardware and software.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Then let's go to the credit card payment aspect of it. My understanding is that to date, the only credit card payments that the County of Suffolk can accept directly is through Discover Card because of the fact that they're willing to go ahead and work with a separate user fee that goes back to the actual payor. All of the other credit card companies, the stumbling block has always been negotiating the user fee. For many years, as a matter of fact, we looked to try to implement that in the Clerk's Office, it was a constant stumbling process. What is -- what's transpired since I've stepped out? Do we know?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We don't know. Okay. I'm going to make the suggestion, Mr. Chair, that this be something that we as a body or even as the committee look at possibly moving to out-years.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I'll yield.

MS. VIZZINI:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Yeah.

MS. VIZZINI:

Before we leave sewers, if I may, I'd just like to make one comment, in your Budget Review Office report on page 38 we did an upfront section in regards to sewers and sanitation, particularly Southwest and this recommendation is to the Department of Public Works and probably to the Budget Office. If you notice that the debt service line, the expenditure line on that graph for Southwest, fortunately the debt service is closing in, it's going to plummet from what is about \$11 million in 2008 to only several million dollars and then hovering around \$1 million from 2011 and thereafter.

In the 2009/2010 Operating Budgets it would be an opportune time to establish a debt service reserve fund in the Operating Budget in anticipation of the fact that you have some major projects going on at Southwest. And that reserve fund could help to offset, in addition to assessment stabilization reserve, the rates in the district.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Just on that, Gail, the 150 million, what would be the debt service associated with that because the way I'm looking at it is if we're in 11 million now and that is sustainable through the 3% increase and the sewer stabilization fund, what would that 150 million do to that? I -- because assume we wouldn't bond it till 2011 or somewhere around there anyway. So what's the debt service associated with? So would that be -- would they be pretty much kind of where they are now?

MS. VIZZINI:

He'll get that for you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MS. VIZZINI:

Quite frankly, when you are preparing an Operating Budget, you need to plan beyond the one year.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Right.

MS. VIZZINI:

If you allow an expenditure line to plummet to the extent that this is going to plummet, it's going to be very, very difficult to get that expenditure line back up. But if you know that it is going to go back up because of the enhanced capacity and the need to replace the outfall pipe and the need to do the scavenger waste treatment and other aspects of it, it would be very forward thinking and beneficial to have a reserve fund in there.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. But I guess I was just thinking in terms of what the ratepayers in the sewer district are paying, would that \$150 million, is that similar -- would the debt service costs be similar to what they're paying today? Because if it is that seems a little more of a reason if we could do that while that falls off and then just replace it with something else and they're paying similar.

MS. VIZZINI:

You're absolutely right.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MS. VIZZINI:

The debt service on a 150 million is, you know, over 20 years is going to be about \$11 million a year, but you have other projects.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Right, okay.

MS. VIZZINI:

Besides the outfall pipe.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Right, absolutely. Okay. Well, I think --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah, just one more question on that then, Gail, what would -- well, two questions, let me back up, one would be on the sewer district bonds itself, that has -- they are fiscally looked at from bonding agencies and stuff like that, Moody's, etcetera, independently from the County?

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Robert is coming to the rescue.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah, our rating of the sewer district itself --

MR. LIPP:

No, it's the full faith --

LEG. HORSLEY:

-- is it incorporated within the County's bond rating?

MR. LIPP:

It's incorporated in the County's bond rating. For instance, each -- twice a year we go out and we issue bonds and we do like 120, 130 different capital projects, sewers are included in there, police projects, general fund, it's all part of the full faith and credit of the County.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. Gail?

MS. VIZZINI:

No, just keep in mind scheduling the money in the Capital Program is only the first step. The rates will not go up to related to the debt service until we ultimately bond and we won't bond until we actually need the cash to move forward on the project.

LEG. HORSLEY:

And when in your consideration of looking at a reserve fund for to stabilize our cost and stuff like that are to the ratepayers, when did you think that would be a wise move in your opinion to create a reserve fund?

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, twofold, one is you don't necessarily have to create an \$11 million reserve fund initially.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Right.

MS. VIZZINI:

You can set aside 3 million or 5 million, you know, certainly the Budget Office can look at some projections as the Budget Review Office would do. But knowing that many of these projects could potentially converge at the same time, you know.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah, you're looking for that impact down that the road that could hurt our residents and users.

MS. VIZZINI:

Right. So if you're -- if you have a little savings account or reserve fund that has several million dollars in it, you know, in 2009 and then another, you know, you'll add to it until you need that. It could help you offset the impact when the bonds are issued.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Now the sewer, the quarter cent stabilization dollars, would that go into that reserve fund?

MS. VIZZINI:

It wouldn't go into the reserve fund, but it would be transferred to the sewer district fund. That would be another source of alleviating the rate of increase to the residents.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. I think we got to talk further on it.

MS. VIZZINI:

Oh, absolutely.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I'd -- get my head around that one too.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. Well, I think on the -- now that we're moving away from sewers I think Legislator Romaine was first and then we'll move from there.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you. Since Public Works is here I'll stay with Public Works for the time being. Let's start off with a number of -- a number of projects. Lets start out off with CR 111, which sometimes is known as Captain Daniel Roe Highway, sometimes is known as Port Jefferson/Westhampton Highway. CR 111 is exit 70 of the Expressway, it runs south, southeast to Sunrise Highway. It's used as a major conduit for traffic going to the Hamptons. It is a major thoroughfare and the County's more heavily traveled roads of the County.

I believe, I know I got some money appropriated for a traffic study in 2006. Low an behold it only took two years and the traffic study is now ready. It makes a number of recommendations and four alternatives. Hopefully we will be having a public hearing on that in my district. I will secure the Manorville Firehouse, I'm sure they'll be hundreds of people interested in that study and will come out. But let's talk about CR 111. Did you recommend any funding for the coming Capital year?

MR. HILLMAN:

Okay. There was a request of 18 million in subsequent years.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Did you recommended any funding for 2009? I'm not asking what the Executive -- as you know

with any budget there's a requested, recommended and adopted. Did you request -- did the Department of Public Works request any funding in 2009?

MR. HILLMAN:

In 2009, no. There's no funding necessary.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. And there's no funding planned. When is the funding planned to make improvements to this road?

MR. HILLMAN:

DPW requested 18 million in subsequent years. That's in conjunction with the planned --

LEG. ROMAINE:

What does subsequent years mean? Why don't we put that in English? What does that mean? When are you planning to expend this \$18 million?

MR. HILLMAN:

1213 is the definition of subsequent years, I believe.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. And my understanding is option four would deal with interchange with the Long Island Expressway, where I believe the majority of funding would be State and Federal. Absent money they send to the County, that's their responsibility. So we would have a very small local share of that. Have you considered that possibility?

MR. HILLMAN:

We've opened up discussions with the State. We've sent them the report and we're in dialog with them. Waiting for their comments, but I've had discussions with them and they have no intent of doing the project. It would be the County's responsibility.

LEG. ROMAINE:

My understanding is that the interchange for the Long Island Expressway is a State responsibility. One of reasons I want to have a public hearing among others besides putting pressure on the current County administration to do the right thing, which was indicated in a public hearing that the County Executive had out in Manorville that I think had about roughly about 350 people packed in and out of that firehouse on a cold January day in 2007. I do believe that I would like to put some pressure on our State and State officials as well by having this public hearing and inviting them or a local assemblyman or local State senator, etcetera, representatives of the governors office to this public hearing. Because this clearly is a State responsibility with County participation.

MR. HILLMAN:

Again, we'd be more than happy to give it to the State and one less project for us to do. The capacity issue however, is on a County road. The Long Island Expressway travels underneath.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I believe alternative flow is talking about loops to prevent any left turns from getting onto the Expressway.

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct, but to resolve a capacity issue on County Road 111. So that's going to be the State's position is that our Expressway, which is the State road operates fine and we don't need to improve the interchange. However, due to the capacity issues on the County Road if the County would like to improve the interchange, by all means we'll allow you to do that. That's been their response thus far.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Let's move onto County Road 58. The County Executive had a press conference that he's going to address County Road 58 in 2009. Local newspapers carried it, tell me what you're planning in 2009 for 58.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, currently right now we're in the design phase. We brought a consultant on board to make improvements in the vicinity of the traffic circle.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Let me just interrupt, you did receive both my letter and the supervisor in the Town of Riverhead opposing the County plan as a plan that's not going to do anything, but create more traffic problems with the stop and go. We are of the mind that improvements should occur from west to east because at the western terminus at 58, as you know, it's a five line highway that ends around Cromer Avenue where the Applebee's is, and that we're looking to continue that as far east as we can, not have it go down to a two lane, then expand to another five lane around Mill Road then go down to two lanes a quarter of a mile further by Suffolk Life and then continue to work at the traffic circle, which by the way, traffic still moves around. Contrary to what engineers tell me, that works. To do that, to create a stop and go affect that isn't going to alleviate traffic flow, both the town board of Riverhead and myself are of that opinion. We corresponded with both you and the County Executive. How much money is in 58 for improvements in 2009? How much County money is in 58?

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, I'd like to first address your comment that starting from the west and working east, we first need to determine if creating a two lane roundabout works because it's never been -- it hasn't formerly been analyzed at the moment. We believe it will work. We've sent preliminary designs up to New York State -- roundabout design unit. They've come back with some concerns, but we need to formally review that and get a concurrence from New York DOT Design Unit that it's going to be a safe operational design. If that does not work, there would be really no purpose to extend two lanes because you're just going -- they're going to run into the circle and you're going to have a backup.

It's been the towns position that they don't want a traffic signal so the real key to this whole project is does the round -- does a two lane roundabout work? And if it does, we can move forward. If it doesn't work we need to open up discussions with the town whether they want to live with the existing congestion that they have or do they want to consider a traffic signal. So the first step -- it really needs to be analyzing the roundabout. And as far as funding goes for 2009, I believe \$4 million is in the budget.

LEG. ROMAINE:

4 million. And how is that 4 million going to be expended? What is your plan to expend that \$4 million?

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, the consultant is presently designing or will be analyzing and designing both the two lane roundabout section and the section to the west. That is fully funded. The designs for those will be complete as long as the roundabout works and then at that point an assessment will be made as to when the designs are complete, what the construction cost estimate for each is and where the best use of the \$4 million will be applied.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And you're prepared to expend that in 2009 if you have a viable plan.

MR. HILLMAN:

Without a doubt.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Let me strongly suggest to you, since this is a change of the original plans that were drafted to 58, that as quickly as you possibly can, you consult with not only my office, but with the Town Board of Riverhead and schedule a public hearing on your new proposed plan, which is different from the previous plans.

MR. HILLMAN:

It's not different, it's the -- it's always been the same plan.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It -- those plans did not start at the circle. Those plans did not emanate at the circle. Those plans did not include a double roundabout at the circle. My strong suggestion to you --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

They always included the double roundabout.

MR. HILLMAN:

Certainly.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Why did the County reject that in favor of a light until there was an outcry from the town board?

MR. HILLMAN:

Oh, well from the point of everyone getting on board with a roundabout the plans have now changed. From last years plan, when we developed last year's plan jointly with the town, nothing has changed. So going to a public information meeting, I mean, no public information meeting was held on County Road 39. We knew what we wanted to do and we went out and did it. And I recommend the same process here.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Romaine --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

-- are you done?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, I'm not. I wanted to ask about County Road 48.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. Tell me what's happening on County Road 48. A number of -- you have a number of projects one of which has to do with saltwater intrusion or salt intrusion. Tell me about that and then tell me what other projects you have on 48, which is as you know another heavily traveled road in my district.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

It's the Middle Road. Is that Middle Road?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No. That's sometimes it's referred as the North Road.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Oh, okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Or Sound Avenue.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Oh, right. Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

But it starts as a two lane and then opens up in Mattituck to a four lane then shrinks to a two lane about Southold.

MR. HILLMAN:

The saltwater intrusion project is associated with runoff, road runoff and a recharge basin that during the winter the salt from road salt runs into that. We constructed our recharge basin in 1968. Suffolk County Water Authority came in in 1969 and installed a well fairly close adjacent to our recharge basin.

LEG. ROMAINE:

This is near Ackerly Pond Road.

MR. HILLMAN:

I believe so.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

MR. HILLMAN:

And recently or actually for a number of years the Water Authority has been working with the County to identify whose salt it was and if it was, you know, saltwater or was it from the road salt. It's been identified that it's road salt so we're working with them to resolve -- trying to resolve the issue.

LEG. ROMAINE:

What other monies are you spending on 48?

MR. HILLMAN:

I believe this year we're going to construction on reconstruction of County Road 48 and a water quality improvement in the vicinity of Hashamomuck Beach. I believe that's about a --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Hashamomuck Cove, what are you doing near Hashamomuck Cove?

MR. HILLMAN:

Reconstructing the road and installing swirl separators to treat the stormwater discharge prior to it going into I believe it's Hashamomuck Cove, yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

The Sound.

MR. HILLMAN:

Right.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MR. HILLMAN:

I think it goes into the cove at that point.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. There's no other expenditures? What happened to the circle, the traffic circle at Cox Neck Road --

MR. HILLMAN:

Yep.

LEG. ROMAINE:

-- which has been on the drawing boards for how long now?

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, it hasn't been on the drawing board for all that long. It went through --

LEG. ROMAINE:

It certainly proceeded me. So it had to be a couple of years.

MR. HILLMAN:

No. I don't think it did. There was a --

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's the first project that was brought to my attention by the Southhold Town Board.

MR. HILLMAN:

Okay. Well, there was a discussion about a traffic signal or a roundabout, I mean, there's been discussions about a roundabout at that location for a number of years. That doesn't mean it's been on the drawing boards. Having a discussion and having a capital program to do that are two separate things.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MR. HILLMAN:

That capital program initiating the actual design of that only started last year.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And where are we with that?

MR. HILLMAN:

We are going out to RFP actually right now. I think we should actually be receiving it within a couple of weeks, selecting a consultant to go out to design.

LEG. ROMAINE:

So how much money do you plan to expend in 2009?

MR. HILLMAN:

2009?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. In the Capital Program.

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't believe there's any funds for 2009 for that.

LEG. ROMAINE:

When's the first year that funds appear? Is it subsequent years?

MR. HILLMAN:

For construction?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Uh-auh.

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't have that information.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Or planning and design.

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, planning and design is underway. It's funded.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. And so you are expending money for planning and design in 2008?

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. HILLMAN:

I mean, the RFP's are being delivered to our office within a couple of weeks and we'll begin design.

LEG. ROMAINE:

All right. One other thing that I would recommend to you that you -- and I think we've had correspondence back and forth that you take a look at CR 48 in the vicinity of Soundview Restaurant, as you know there was a fatality there, there's been a number of accidents. The road is not in the best of condition in that vicinity and I think you know what I'm talking about. It needs a major overhaul there, but you may even consider some type of striping or something of that nature or better lighting. The lighting is limited or something of that nature, a caution sign because people cross the road there from the restaurant to the parking lot and as I said, there was a fatality there just last year and there were a number of accidents -- an accident history there so I recommend that.

Finally let me ask you about Capital Project 5370, that's Moriches Inlet.

MR. HILLMAN:

I'm sorry, what would you like to know about that project?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yeah, I saw that there was no funding for 2009.

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, Moriches Inlet is a federally dredged channel so we don't have control over that.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I understand that. But you did not participate in any funding for the dredging whatsoever. There's no local share?

MR. HILLMAN:

There is a local share.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. So let's talk about that.

MR. HILLMAN:

When the feds identify what year it will be funded, DPW will include it in the Capital Program appropriately. The feds have not told us when they will be dredging that channel.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And when do we have Cupsogue Beach in that area of Westhampton, Westhampton Dunes, do we have an obligation in terms of sand pumping there?

MR. HILLMAN:

I'm not aware of any.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. I'd ask you to check into that. I believe the County has some form of legal obligation in terms of restoring beaches there. As a part of a legal agreement that was entered into, I believe, 22 years ago, 23 years ago.

MR. HILLMAN:

I believe it's maintaining a emergency sand stockpile and that stockpile is --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Is adequate.

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes. Well, is it adequate? Depending on the storm, but it's the stockpile as recommended is constructed, built and there.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. And for dredging, how much you have allotted overall for the County of Suffolk?

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't know the total figure. I think it's generally about two to three million a year for --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Do you have a priority list that you have developed?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Could you forward that to my office please?

MR. HILLMAN:

Certainly.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. I think Legislator Stern had a question.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to take a look first at 5560 Commack Road. And I know we're still going through the design phase. I just wanted to -- a couple of things, I'm just reading here about reduction in construction funding by \$900,000, advancing \$3 million in serial bonds for construction. That's seems to be moved up from 2010 to 2009. Maybe you could just give an update on where we're at, particularly regarding the funding and what if anything we need to be on the lookout for coming up.

MR. HILLMAN:

The design has progressed a little more rapidly than we had thought. We scoped the project down slightly from what it was originally intended. DEC -- it's not DEC, it's State, not State parks either, the adjacent property --

LEG. STERN:

The Edgewood Preserve.

MR. HILLMAN:

Edgewood Preserve, that's it. We're going to speak to those folks about trying to get some property to develop a wetlands for road discharge, road water discharge. We rethought that just because it's going to complicate the process a little bit and we went with leaching basins to recharge the water back into the system. So that eliminated that whole process, which allowed us to expedite the design. And also our recent construction cost estimates show that we're within funding.

LEG. STERN:

And quick question of on 5565, this is the Sagtikos Corridor Study. This is for the G Road work through Pilgrim State. See here there's -- there's an increase from 1.3 million to 1.7 million, there's that \$400,000 increase. This is an additional \$400,000 as a result of the increased impact fees. I'm wondering what's going to be done with the additional monies there?

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, right now that concept -- this project is still in the concept stage. We have really no firm cost estimate because there's no real plan. And until we have plan we can't develop a firm cost estimate. So a number of variables will dictate how this project moves forward. First of all, the route of the proposed roadway is on private property with Mr. Wolkoff, so until he agrees to let us build this road, the project's not going anywhere.

LEG. STERN:

Does that agreement come as the study progresses or is that as a result of the analysis that's done? What's the timing there?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yeah, I think it's, you know, let's -- he's going to want to see some analysis; what is it going to do for him; what is it going to do for the overall area; where do you want to put the road; where are your options. And until we get that all laid out it's really --

LEG. STERN:

So clearly, the study needs to go first.

MR. HILLMAN:

Without a doubt.

LEG. STERN:

It has to be completed before you can even have that meaningful discussion with the owner.

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes. In addition, I would just like to add that although it appears to be a dead subject at this point or project, the New York State intermodal also has some impact on this potential road because if it does ever go, this road would cross those rail tracks or could -- one alternative has them crossing the tracks.

LEG. STERN:

And so that information I'm sure is going to be incorporated into the study --

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

-- that's going to go forward and they'll be different options depending on the status of that project.

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. All right, thanks.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. Next I have Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Two areas that I want to go into. One just very briefly, dredging, I do see that we've got -- which is the capital project?

MS. VIZZINI:

5200.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. You have a list in there laid out of projects going forward and I'm curious as to see that I believe it's in 2010 that you list the Nissequogue. Obviously we've had a lot of discussion about where things are at there. Does the fact that it doesn't appear in '09 mean that we're just continuing with what last year's abbreviated attempts were and then you're going to revisit whether or not it worked in 2010, what does this mean?

MR. HILLMAN:

The 2010 funds are for survey. So we -- generally on a program of every three to four years and we would plan to do a survey in 2010 to identify how bad the shoaling has occurred. Since we'll be going back in --

LEG. KENNEDY:

You're going to be in it through '09 though still finishing what we had attempted to commence actually two years ago now.

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right?

MR. HILLMAN:

And this document was prepared before that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Which is fine. Really what I'm asking you is, I guess I'm just asking you to reconfirm what I've asked you a couple of times already, that we have sufficient funding, we have a standing open permit and that we're going to have the dredge back and have the balance of the project completed in the latter part of the this year into the beginning of next year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right. Okay. So we can almost do like a never mind with that what we see in 2010. All right.

Let me shift gears with some of the road projects. And again, some of what Gail spoke about initially I've got some significant concern with because we have over 400 linear miles of County road; I think, and when we space out the lanes we have what, maybe 1200 miles all told of County roadway. And if we at this point by and through this document are saying that we're actually stepping back from what our overall responsibility or mission is to go ahead and improve, enhance and plan these roads out by an through our seeking of federal highway funding, I'm concerned.

Motor Parkway and the reconstruction of the bridge project there, we're not shifting gears in how we're going to implement that. Are we? The traditional way that our federal funding has been obtained has been with that front loading process and then the subsequent reimbursement.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So, are we --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The plan is still to have the bridge under construction at the end of next year.

LEG. KENNEDY:

It is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. And we have sufficient funding identified through next year in order to go ahead and accomplish that?

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct. The State has present funding is in -- actually is in 2008. The State has agreed and it's called NHS funding, I'm sorry, it's BRR funding. It's essentially high priority bridge money. Since typically the funds -- the feds had always allowed us to roll these types of funds over from year to year. They've now gotten much more stringent and said that they won't allow that to happen. However, we don't control that. The federal funds flow from the feds through the State DOT, which has billions and billions of dollars because they handle everything for the State and every County and town within the State. So those funds flow through and then ultimately to the locals. When a

project of ours gets delayed, we don't request the feds to reallocate the money, we request the State to do that. So for lack of a better word, I call it a shell game. They have a shell game that they transfer these monies around. And we don't get to view under the shells, we don't have a seat at the table. So we asked the State, please provide us funds for this project in 2009 because we're not going to be ready in 2008. They've agreed to that. They've agreed to things and ultimately when it comes due to pay the bill, sometimes they've faltered. We have a commitment from State DOT to fund this project in 2009. Come 2009 when we go to collect, I'm hoping it's going to be there.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. I -- you got a commitment meaning whomever you deal with there in Albany through State DOT has given you some of a writing that binds them or obligates them to the 80% component associated with this project? When you let the contract for whomever is going to actually do this project, it's being let based on the fact that we have the funding in the first instance and then where we have a promise to pay from the State or we're letting it based on whatever our 5% or local share is and this letter that says there's this additional money that's coming. Because a paver doesn't care about any of that other stuff he just wants a contract to do the job.

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct. And before we would advertise we get what's called construction authorization. That means the funding's in place. So it will be decided long before the funding -- long before we let the job. My point is that we have -- we presently have money on the TIP, Transportation Improvement Program in 2008. There's an amendment requesting to fund this project for 2009. That amendment has not formally gone through yet because of hold ups with NYMTEC. It's a complicated process, but what I can tell you is that --

LEG. KENNEDY:

NYMTEC amends their plan each year. As a matter of fact, we just bypassed when they amended the '08 or was it '09 plan and that was in March, I believe, where they did that amendment.

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, what's happened is they -- their not allowing what's called TIP amendments right now because the operating procedures are not in conformance with the FHWA. So all TIP amendments, which this request to move the funds from eight to nine is part of a TIP amendment. All TIP amendments have been on hold for five, six months so no federal projects, no changes to federal projects have occurred for five or six months.

Thus, I can tell you that State DOT here in Hauppauge has made a commitment to us to fund this project in 2009. Until it's actually shown on the TIP then it -- when it's shown on the TIP and a TIP amendment goes through, it's a formal commitment from State DOT. And when that happens the plans will be ready in 2009, we'll go for construction authorization and the project will move forward.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Is this project being held up at this point now then because this TIP amendment has not been done?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No.

MR. HILLMAN:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Your planning people are still in the process of doing whatever's necessary to do the specs, the acquisition.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We talked a lot about that Greyhound bus section there, by the way, are we going to pick any of that up?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Only just the portion of it. I don't believe the whole property.

MR. HILLMAN:

Yeah, just a sliver portions for the roadway widening.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Even though we're going to take the balance of Motor Parkway over to 111, there's no ability to go ahead and pick it up in that second phase or third phase?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We only know --

LEG. KENNEDY:

I mean, the bridge is a separate phase from the balance of the Motor Parkway restoration. Right?

MR. HILLMAN:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We're just obtaining what we need to widen the roadway at that -- in that area.

MR. HILLMAN:

And the second phase has no right-of-way acquisition. We've eliminated all right-of-way acquisition from that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I know when you get over by Bridge Road in that area they don't want to see it expanded. You're going to stay within the existing right-of-way.

MR. HILLMAN:

Yeah, we have a 100 ft. right-of-way and that's sufficient for what we need.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right. I'm -- I'll leave that one alone.

Last one that I need to ask about then is the County Road 16, CR 1693 Project. I understand that there's an additional couple 100,000 that's needed to complete the property acquisition.

MR. HILLMAN:

I'm not sure. I'd have to look into that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Can you confirm that for me prior to the time that we have to amend what -- you have a sufficient amount, what's that 5118?

MR. HILLMAN:

5118, but even if we did need money it wouldn't go into '09 we'd have to find an offset in '08.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right. You need it now.

MR. HILLMAN:

Yeah, we need it now if there is additional monies. And if we do need additional monies my staff is going to be identifying offsets and then we'll be discussing with the Commissioner if those offsets are acceptable. So the project's moving forward. We're going to get it out one way or the other.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Do you own that piece at the head where that abandoned building is that's been sitting there for ten years?

MR. HILLMAN:

It's my understanding that we will own all the property by June.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good. That's in ten days from now.

MR. HILLMAN:

My understanding is June 5th.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. When are you going to level the building?

MR. HILLMAN:

As part of the contract.

LEG. KENNEDY:

We can't demo before?

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Not legally.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, if we own it we can demo it.

MR. HILLMAN:

We can't demo before we own it, but when we own it --

LEG. KENNEDY:

June 6th you could go in there with a Cat and level it.

MR. HILLMAN:

We're contemplating both alternatives.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Are you offering, John?

LEG. KENNEDY:

I guarantee you I'll get a permit, a demo permit out of the town if that's what's going to hold us up. No problem.

MR. HILLMAN:

No, no. No, it's more resources and if we lump it into the road contract it frees up DPW staff to do other things. So we're working with the Buildings' Department to determine which is the most effective way to do that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. The project needs to be done and I applaud that fact that you've stayed focused on it. But my preference would be to demo the building before you get the balance of the whole intersection contract let. And also I'd ask you to please let me know if you need that amendment regarding acquisition.

MR. HILLMAN:

All right.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yep.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right, I'll yield. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. I think, Legislator Schneiderman, did you have a couple of questions? Do you want me to come back to you? Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good morning.

MR. HILLMAN:

Good morning.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I wanted to start with County Road 39 and I guess, first, congratulations on the success of that project. There is plans in place for a phase three project to further widen it and do a median and some other improvements with federal funding, but I did notice in the proposed Capital Project that \$45 million was removed for the phase three project. Can you explain that and how we plan to proceed without that funding?

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, it was removed for several reasons really. It's really misleading to say that the County's going to fund \$45 million of that project and that's what it's --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, I understand. That's federal funds, but we typically show it --

MR. HILLMAN:

But we don't --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- in the Capital Budget with a little notation that it's federal funding.

MR. HILLMAN:

Again that's misleading. It indicates that the federal funds are there, which they're not, so that's one reason.

And the other reason is the project's been probably moved to beyond subsequent years at this point. By the time all the funding is -- by the time the alternatives are identified and selected and right-of-way acquisition occurs and we actually get out there to construct, I would believe we're going to be beyond the year 2013, unfortunately.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And now with subsequent years it seems to me that's anything after 2000 and -- or 2012 and beyond. Right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. I believe Bill's -- I think -- I believe Bill's identifying 2013 as --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So there is no beyond subsequent years as long as it's being planned.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, yeah. Correct.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's like beyond infinity.

MR. HILLMAN:

I think the definition of -- I'll defer to Gail.

MS. VIZZINI:

You know, typically the Capital Program is a five year time horizon so the 2012, 2013 is fairly accurate.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Oh, okay. Well, I'm just concerned about taking it out of our planning document. It almost sounds like it's not going to happen. I mean, I do have some safety concerns about the current configuration, I think we all do. It could be better. It dealt with the bottleneck and traffic is flowing again. But it would be nice to have shoulders so people could pull over and make the turns without slowing down in their lane. It would -- so it just seems to me from a planning perspective it would be good to show that money to let the town know and everyone else know that there is a plan to do the broader project -- the, you know, to the higher spec.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, the only thing I would say in our defense is that we, you know, the acquisition property is a three year proposition. We still haven't identified a preliminary plan, which is you're probably looking at, I don't know, next year before we even have that. If we're lucky. So then right there you're looking at five years, you know, certainly, you know, through the federal program we're committed to doing the project it just, you know, the process to get there.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yeah. Well, it's that commitment that's not reflected in the document and the public, I mean, we basically said to the public we were, you know, this is an interim project and the fear out there is that this is going to be it, you know, we'll never see actual, you know, highway.

MR. HILLMAN:

Understood. Well, I'm working diligently with the Town of Southampton.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, I know that you are.

MR. HILLMAN:

As so, I mean, that -- the commitment from the County is that we are moving forward with that and quite often when things are included in the planning document, vaguely, if I want to -- if we want to put it that way, it can be misleading and you know --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, sometimes I've heard that if you don't show it here, you can't get those federal funds. You need to show that in your own internal documents that the money is budgeted.

MR. HILLMAN:

No, you first need to really show it on the TIP. It all comes down to the TIP.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is it on the TIP?

MR. HILLMAN:

The design -- the job is on the TIP. The construction and the right-of-way acquisition is not really funded because it's -- we don't even know which alternative, for example --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

To move forward with, you know.

MR. HILLMAN:

-- it's a -- I mean, you go with one alternative or it might be a \$50 million price tag. You go with another alternative, it might be \$80 million. So what do you budget for, what do we show on a TIP?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right.

MR. HILLMAN:

And we get \$12 million a year for all County roads, so how do we show an \$80 million federally -- we show what we can on the TIP.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, can we do it in phases and break the project up into phases, possibly?

MR. HILLMAN:

And that would -- that's one alternative. But we need a -- even to do that we need a massive amount of --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. So we really need to talk to our Congressmen to try to get a line item for this road beyond the TIP.

MR. HILLMAN:

Without a doubt and the conversations with Congressmen -- the Congressmen and Senators are that, you know, they can get earmarks, but, you know, they're in the single digit millions, one, two million at the most and, you know, when you're talking 70, 50, 80 million, it's a drop in the bucket. So I don't know what the solution is. I do know that DPW is working to come up with an alternative that's acceptable to the community, improve safety and then we'll broach the paying for it when we know what we want to build.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

At least we have a short term solution, so that's something. Last year I was able to get some money into the Capital Budget for a sidewalk in Bridgehampton along Bridge/Sag Turnpike and I just want to check on the status of it. It's hard to follow because it's not mentioned in the Capital Budget by name, though I still see that half a million dollars as bonded in the budget, I believe that

that is for that project, that \$500,000. Can -- this was the year we're supposed to be doing the planning and next year we're going to begin construction. Though all the money was shown in 2008, I believe it's fully authorized now. Right?

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, the -- there have been so many requests for sidewalk that we've modified our approach. In the past we used to do the design in-house and move right into construction, but because of the numerous requests we now need to go out to consultant, which the --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Has that happened?

MR. HILLMAN:

-- this afternoon at two o'clock I have a committee meeting --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MR. HILLMAN:

-- in my office to select the consultants that will be designing these sidewalks. So within three months they'll start work after the contracts are signed.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So we're talking about basically August. I just want to make sure that we're on schedule with this project, there is a town commitment of \$100,000, as you know, it's shown in this year by the town and their -- they would have to amend that if you're talking about next year. So there is a local commitment to this. I just want to make sure the project is moving along.

MR. HILLMAN:

The design is moving forward. The construction, I'm not sure what year that is scheduled in. Again, there's numerous requests for sidewalk.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We had said, I mean, we had said internally not in the document because all the money was slated for 2008, but I understood that the actual construction might not happen till 2009. Is there something that is making you say that it might not happen in 2009, the actual construction?

MR. HILLMAN:

Without a doubt. I don't know the schedule of -- we're having consultants design sidewalks at five locations and we don't have funding for all five locations.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. But we have specific earmark for this project of half a million dollars and I don't want to see that 500,000 start to go to other projects.

MR. HILLMAN:

What specific earmark was -- the town's giving us 500,000?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, no. The County Executive put \$500,000 in last year specifically for that sidewalk. It's a minority community in Bridgehampton that was analyzed, there's a lot of usage along this County Road, it's broken up. Where they walk there's fragments of asphalt paving or sidewalk and there was an agreement to put a real sidewalk in in this lotion and it was a hard fought battle to get the money there, but it is and I don't want to see that money rated for other sidewalks. I want to make sure that that half a million is in there for this sidewalk and that it proceeds according to schedule.

MR. HILLMAN:

The design of all five locations is proceeding. Which goes to construction is a policy issue beyond DPW.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, I will look into it.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

If you could look into it. So you're basically saying that half a million dollars is being used for planning more than one sidewalk now. So we may -- we need to build all five of these sidewalks. We're going to need obviously more than half a million. Half a million will cover -- it may not even cover the one.

MR. HILLMAN:

The five locations total probably 5 million.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. So why are we planning and then we're not showing any more than the half a million for sidewalks. Right? So if we're really -- why waste our money planning for things we're not going to build. It seems to me we need to put more money into the Capital Budget to actually construct those sidewalks. Is that correct? And you're saying about 5 million?

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, I think it's three to five, I'm not sure. It might be a little excessive, I apologize. But it's in the millions, it's probably closer to 3 million for the total of five locations.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I mean, you agree that, I mean, we're going spend hundreds of thousands of dollars planning for projects that aren't not funded. So that doesn't make a lot of sense so we should fix that.

Let me move onto another issue and maybe this is more of a Parks issue, but DPW has been involved with the reconstruction of the historic building at Third House and the exterior's finished, but the interior's not. I believe we're out of money on it. It's -- I would say it's basically three quarters done with the project. Do we need to put some money in to finish that interior? And do we have even designs for the interior?

MR. CALDERONE:

You're correct. There's a -- we've -- with the last phase we finished all the money in that pot and there are no other monies to finish the rest of the Third House.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good job. All right. So that's something, you know, I'm on the working group, but that's something I need to look at because again, we did a beautiful job, a beautiful job on the exterior and I commend all those involved, you know, in Parks and Public Works. We got a great exterior now. We had to make the interior usable. The whole upstairs is not usable, it's all torn up and that project obviously needs to get finished.

Long Wharf, there's money budgeted for bulkhead replacement in 2010. My understanding was that was going to be repainted. I mean, you're probably better off if it's replaced, but can it wait 'til 2010 is my question. Now we're talking about the Long Wharf in Sag Harbor.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's the dock that we walked on that one time?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes. And we saw corrosion, it looked like mostly surface rust.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And my understanding was that we were going to repaint it, I guess, take the rust out off and repaint it, but it looks like the Capital Budget is calling for a replacement. Maybe that's --

MR. HILLMAN:

Again, a little change in how we do business. We used to do a lot of our bulkheading type projects in-house. We now find that we -- because of the number of projects and we need to really go out to consultants so a lot of the bulkheading projects are being delayed because they're going out to consultants this year. Design would be completed in nine and it would probably take place in ten and I know Long Wharf is one of them.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is the funding for design because I don't see any money budgeted until 2010?

MR. HILLMAN:

The money is already appropriated.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

For the design?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

And has it shifted now to reconstruction or is it are we still with the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe that will be determined as we, you know, bring the engineers on board and let them look at it. I mean, from what I remember because we walked --

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Now have you analyzed, I don't know what is it takes to analyze it, but have you analyzed whether that is going to be undermined within the next, you know, before 2010 or whether it's going to be okay? A heavily used dock it's some big --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Absolutely.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- big boats, big yachts come right up against it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The detail -- I don't know, we don't know the details at this point. Those will be developed.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, if you could just do an internal assessment and just make sure that it's -- it can, you know, because the village has requested the repairs there, you know, it's County owned they manage it, but we own it, I just want to make sure that we're not going to end up with a much more expensive project because, you know, water gets behind it and undermines the structure.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

So, if you could look into that for me.

Long Lane there was -- it's been on the books for a long time to do road repairs to Long Lane in East Hampton and there was a capital project that I would have liked to support last week, but it used the money for Long Lane as an offset and I wasn't prepared to vote until I had an explanation. Is the money for Long Lane gone or is it going to -- is there a plan to fix that road?

MR. HILLMAN:

There is a long term plan to do that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

I know it's not in terrible condition, but it's --

MR. HILLMAN:

No, it's really to do the shoulders along that. The concrete panels are in good condition. The shoulders are in fairly poor condition. It's really a DPW project. We don't get complaints on the road.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right.

MR. HILLMAN:

We've been looking to get the job done and it's not a top priority for us. There's no safety concerns or anything of that nature.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Couple more questions. I saw there's money now programed for some of the medical clinics. I think the one in -- for generators for some of the clinics, the County owned clinics and I appreciate that because there has been some questions about vaccines and whether they, you know, whether they'd have refrigeration capacity. Or if there was a, you know, a disaster we might be able to -- we might have to need -- we might need some of these clinics. East Hampton was not included and I'm just curious if -- I know the town owns that building and maybe that's the explanation, but the County operates a clinic out of there, is there a way for us to get emergency generation capacity at the East Hampton Clinic?

MR. CALDERONE:

I'll have to get back to that on you on that, Legislator Schneiderman. I really am not aware. You're right, usually if it's a town owned building we do not provide for, you know, out of our own capital because we don't own the building.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MR. CALDERONE:

Now, is your question, could we provide emergency power?

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. Exactly. I mean, we provide equipment to the building.

MR. CALDERONE:

I really can't answer that. We do have emergency standby generators, FRES has some, I don't know what the size of the building is or what the capacities would be.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MR. CALDERONE:

If there's switchgear it could be a matter just the town getting the switchgear or getting the hook-ups. We could tap FRES for an emergency generator as needed so you could work something out like that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And if you could look into that. The last question really has to do with the Medevac helicopters and I'm pleased to see, I guess it's the EC 145's are working out. We have one of them. We still have the, was it, the MD 902 or something, which is kind of has assorted record in terms of its, you know, its downtime is pretty high.

So there is a plan to replace that, but BRO is recommending that we replace it sooner. I guess what happens is the trade in value starts to diminish with time and we know that need it. The County Executive, I think is budgeting for its replacement, I believe in 2011. But BRO is recommending that we do it sooner. It seems like it would be prudent if we know that it's a better -- it's a better helicopter, a more reliable helicopter and we have a higher trade-in on the MD 902, that we act sooner.

MR. CALDERONE:

I'll be honest, yeah, that question's been posed to the PD. We really don't maintain that helicopter. I wouldn't have any input on that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. I think that Public Safety is either later today or tomorrow.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Yeah, I'll save that question for then. And in terms of the Medevac helicopter hanger, how are we doing with that?

MR. CALDERONE:

As Gil said, we -- we're looking like a groundbreaking in the next few weeks.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

MR. CALDERONE:

Okay.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. And current -- well, I guess this is for Public Safety too, I just wanted to know how many we currently had at the Westhampton facility in terms of helicopters, but someone said two, I believe only one.

MR. CALDERONE:

I'm not aware, you'd have to ask Public Safety that.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you. I'd like to start with -- most of this is for Gail. So let me direct my questions to her. With the pay-as-you-go, Local Law 23 of 1994, we instituted a formal debt policy to prevent the use of capital debt to pay recurring expenses. I have to say that each year I believe the Executive has put forward something to suspend the pay-as-you-go policy despite the mounting debt. Could you address that statement please?

MS. VIZZINI:

Surely. We've actually on page 71 of our report we give a historical presentation in regards to pay-as-you-go, what has been included and what was actually expended in pay-as-you-go. And as you indicated, Legislator Romaine, it has been something that over the past several years has been abdicated in order to address Operating Budget shortfall at some extent. Resolution 283 of 2008 suspended the pay-as-you-go for 2008 and 2009 and more then likely will be followed up by a local law to do the same.

As far as the recommended Capital Program, pay-as-you-go is resumed in 2010. There is \$1.9 million included in 2010 in General Fund transfers, 1.7 in 2011 and 2.2 in subsequent years. But there is nothing in '09.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I understand that. I am concerned about that, I'm concerned in '08, I'm going to be concerned in '09. Unfortunately I believe people in my caucus, being a member of the minority caucus, are likewise concerned and I think the bonding of additional debt, particularly for low end projects are not going to be acceptable to the minority caucus, which while we don't have a majority we do have sufficient votes to block bonding. And I want to make that clear that blocking the bonding for projects, we maybe voting for the projects, but we may be voting against the bonding, we'll be sending a very clear message that we're very unhappy with the abandonment upon the pay-as-you-go and that's hopefully a message to my colleagues in the majority and to the County Executive that he has to rethink that policy because bonding will not be taking place particularly if small end projects there out to bond.

Some other concerns that I wanted to express, I understand that the Department of Public Works has requested an additional construction contingency account for \$2 million to the County Center. Could you tell me how much has been expended to date on the County Center and how much we intend to expend overall?

MS. VIZZINI:

We'll check that for you.

MR. CALDERONE:

If you want Legislator Romaine, I can give {inaudible}.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Can you turn the mike on?

MR. CALDERONE:

Sorry. If you'd like I could just -- I could tell you what the construction costs are supposed to be, 21 million. That was the project was bid at. What we spent to date, we only just started the phase two in January, very little of that money has been spent to date.

LEG. ROMAINE:

But you believe that you're going to need additional expenditures.

MR. CALDERONE:

Absolutely, yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. CALDERONE:

Yes. We went into the project with no contingency fees. Meaning 10% usually -- 10% is the number for contingency.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MR. CALDERONE:

We had 21 million bids came --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Why did you go in without contingency funds? Or is that a complicated answer?

MR. CALDERONE:

Well, it's not a complicated answer. The answer is we had enough money for instruction and as you know, the building's in dire need of renovation so I was hoping to get --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Originally this project started off well over \$30 million.

MR. CALDERONE:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

So I know we're doing the building on the cheap. My question is, you know, usually with Public Works when you commit to a project you want to spend the money sufficient to get that project done adequately so you don't have to go back and readdress. I'm not questioning the contingency account now that you've explained it that you didn't have a contingency, I'm questioning how the project was reduced and what items were left out that were originally included in the original plans to do the building. Because the reason I want to know that and I would hope the committee would want to know that is because I know I may not be serving in this body for a long period of time, but possibly my other colleagues will, they're going to be addressing the County Center in the future because we shortchanged this project when we cut it back and by shortchanging it, we're going to have to address some of those issues in the future that we're not going to address now. When we think we've done the building, it's really not going to be done.

That's my concern. So I just want to put that on the record so that my colleagues can be aware. Yet the building I think was originally over \$30 million. When you cut it back by \$20 million, you're not getting the same reconstruction. Some of the issues with that building are going to come back to revisit this Legislature except instead of being \$30 million the total project is going to grow far greater than that so five, ten years from now, we're going to be still funding the reconstruction of the County Center. It's like a permanent program.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Gail.

MS. VIZZINI:

In response --

LEG. ROMAINE:

You're not going to say anything.

MR. CALDERONE:

Do you want me to say something?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, no you don't have to say anything.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

No. But I think Gail wants to mention something that BRO recommended, Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, in response to Legislator Romaine's question, we did authorize \$35 million in appropriations. We have expended or encumbered 34.1 million.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right.

MS. VIZZINI:

And we have a balance of one -- of only \$1 million.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

And, Gail, didn't BRO also recommend in their report that we add a \$2 million this construction contingency fund to prevent any additional value engineering, which is my new favorite term.

MS. VIZZINI:

Mine too, thank you. Yes we did.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Now to Gail, can we talk a little bit about some of your recommendations regarding land acquisitions that you made in the proposals and how they should be funded in the future. And that will be my last question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. No problem.

MS. VIZZINI:

The Capital Program includes funding for the Legacy Program in 2009, \$15 million and it continues the Multifaceted Program at a funding level, which has been consistent with the past 13.3 million for each year of the Capital Program. The administration has already stated in the Energy and Environment Committee meeting that -- and the Budget Review Office has also stated that our successful and aggressive Land Acquisition Program paid for from these programs, puts pressure on the Operating Budget because that's where the debt service is paid from. Now that we've extended the Quarter Cent Program, we have the New Water Quality Program, we would like to see and we concur with the administration that more of the land acquisition come from the cash or bonds associated with the new Quarter Cent Program. This would provide some level of relief to the General Fund.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Can I interrupt and just ask some questions about that? Okay. Right now the Town of Brookhaven, my understanding is, has absolutely pretty close to zero money left to spend. As you know the town

vote is 60/40 referendum rejected any CPF funding, which the administration at that time based all their hopes for the future on and put no money aside for additional expenditure for land acquisition, there is no stream of revenue in the of Brookhaven.

Furthermore, if you look at the CPF it's very clear to you that there's a north/south divide. The two southern towns of the east end, Southampton and East Hampton have a ton of money where the northern towns, particularly the Town of Riverhead where most of the farmland is on the North Fork, has very little money and is at this point probably very close to being out of money having expended and Southold's not that far behind all of their CPF money. So your recommendations, relying on CPF would leave the areas that have most of the farmland in Suffolk County that's still farmable, left without any assistance from the County and the wealthy towns would have the ability the wealthy towns who have garnered a great deal of money from the CPF, would have a great deal of money.

So that type of policy would be counterproductive if you're looking to save farmland. If you're looking to save any land in Brookhaven, that type of policy would be, you know, null and void because the Town of Brookhaven has no money. I don't know of the programs of the other programs towns because they're not in my Legislative district, but that's a big problem and that's a problem you haven't addressed in your narrative.

MR. DUFFY:

On page 32 of our report, we did discuss that. We indicated that most of the money was being collected in Town of Southampton, Town of East Hampton. We also went onto say that because of some concerns that have been raised and because of the State Comptroller's Officer has announced that it will order these ten CPF funds, that we believe that they County might wish to consider to concentrate its spending at least in the short run on land acquisitions on the west end including Brookhaven and North Fork where the town CPF funds are not as ample as they are on the South Fork.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I believe that is the policy of the County. The five eastern towns garnered more County money for land acquisitions then the five western towns did in the last few years.

MR. DUFFY:

We're making that suggestion. It would be up to the Legislature.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's currently what's happening, by the way, we're spending more money in the west then we are in the east,

MR. DUFFY:

The last analysis we did show that because of -- if you -- including Brookhaven as part of -- yeah, yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, they're from one of the five western towns.

MR. DUFFY:

Yes. That's -- it's just about equal.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. Slightly to the benefit of the west as opposed to the east. But now you have to address what are we going to do now that Riverhead and Southold has very little money left in their CPF because they garner very little money and Brookhaven has none, and how are we going to handle that, are we --

MR. DUFFY:

Well, that's what we discussed on page 32 --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay.

MR. DUFFY:

-- of our report.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I appreciate that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. I just have a couple of real quick ones. Bill, I think I might need you real quick. And then I think we should be done here. What I wanted to talk about real quick was Capital Project 3302. It's my understanding that DPW recommended a 100,000 in '09 and a million in 2010 for this CR 19 north of the Expressway to Portion Road. What I was going to ask, you know, because I know -- I know that it's not included but it was requested, the report I saw was about \$810,000 to do the construction, but I'm not sure if we'll be able to get that whole thing so I was going to ask DPW, is there -- if there's anyway to give me the cost of particular sections because for instance, the section by the school is -- the whole thing is a high priority, but the section by the school is a really high priority because it's dangerous. So I was wondering if there -- if you could breakdown the options and the segments of the plan for me so if it's -- if I'm not able to secure the whole amount, which I'd like to, I could maybe seek a lower target and at least get the section by the school done and other -- anything else you guys might see as real to safety or safety improvements. So I wanted to ask for that.

And I also wanted to ask for an update on Nicolls Road by Purick Street, I know we have a pedestrian improvement project, but, Bill, could you tell me a little bit about that. I know it's not directly related to the new budget, but by one section with the crosswalk there right across Nicolls Road.

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes. We are installing a pedestrian signal. It was funded with an LS STC grant, local safe streets grant. The plans went to State DOT last week and we need to get through the state process and they need to give us authorization to advertise, we'll advertise and go build it.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

So does pedestrian signal mean there's going to be a traffic light?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes, and an only stop when someone pushes the button.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

So it will be flashing yellow or something?

MR. HILLMAN:

No. It will operate more like a normal traffic signal. Hold in green --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MR. HILLMAN:

-- and then when you push the button it will go to yellow, flash and then probably to a solid red. There's a specific operation outlined in the manual.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. All right. That's all I had for roads.

The only other question that I did have is related to that transportation. Gail, I was going to ask, are there any recommendations in the BRO report, which I have not gotten through regarding capital projects for the transportation system, buses and things like that. Because I noticed that Bob Shinnick is here and I just wanted to make sure if there's anything you were recommending that we should discuss I wanted to do that here.

MS. VIZZINI:

There's a formidable commitment with federal -- there isn't. No recommendations, right? There's a formidable commitment in terms of the federal funds for the buses and the replacement buses on their time schedule. So we didn't make any specific --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MS. VIZZINI:

-- recommendations to delete or add any monies.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. And I guess my only other question, Gil or Bob, however could answer this, I read in the latest DPW report that it appears as though we're going to be getting 30 new electric hybrid buses hopefully late '08 delivery date. I just wanted to make sure that I was reading that correctly. Hi, Bob.

MR. SHINNICK:

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Good morning.

MR. SHINNICK:

We are have receiving electric hybrid transit buses later this year.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MR. SHINNICK:

It's four of them.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MR. SHINNICK:

Not 30.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MR. SHINNICK:

We will acquire 30 paratransit units this year.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Oh, okay.

MR. SHINNICK:

As well as going to bid on 55 new transit buses, which is a substantial commitment. They'll be conventional diesel powered, but clean diesel buses, which would expect to be delivered in 2009.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

And the paratransit buses are the electric hybrid?

MR. SHINNICK:

No, they are not.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MR. SHINNICK:

They'll be conventional diesel as well.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

So there's four electric hybrid?

MR. SHINNICK:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

And then there's 30 paratransit conventional diesel, but clean diesel.

MR. SHINNICK:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

And then we're going to bid for 55 clean diesel larger buses.

MR. SHINNICK:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Well if nobody else has any other questions -- all right, well then we stand adjourned. Thank you very much, Gil, and everybody else.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 11:55 A.M.*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY