

## **PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**Of the**

### **SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

A regular meeting of the Public Works & Transportation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on December 9, 2008.

#### **Members Present:**

Legislator Brian Beedenbender - Chairman  
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chair  
Legislator Wayne Horsley  
Legislator John Kennedy  
Legislator Rick Montano  
Legislator Daniel Losquadro  
Legislator Edward Romaine

#### **Also in Attendance:**

Presiding Officer William J. Lindsay - District #8  
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature  
Sarah Simpson - Assistant Counsel to the Legislature  
Gail Vizzini - Director/Budget Review Office  
Lance Reinheimer - Assistant Director/Budget Review Office  
Kevin Duffy - Budget Review Office  
Bob Doering - Budget Review Office  
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
Barbara LoMoriello - Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
Paul Perillie - Aide to Majority Leader Cooper  
Kaitlyn Boyd - Aide to Legislator Beedenbender  
Bob Martinez - Aide to Legislator Montano  
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay  
Ben Zwirn - Assistant County Executive  
Frank Nardelli - County Executive Assistant  
Gail Lolis - Deputy County Attorney  
Gil Anderson - Commissioner/SC Department of Public Works  
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer/SC Department of Public Works  
Ben Wright - Director-Sanitation Division/Department of Public Works  
Bill Shannon - Director-Transportation Division/Dept of Public Works  
Joe Congedo -

#### **Minutes Taken & Transcribed By:**

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

*(\*The meeting was called to order at 2:26 P.M. \*)*

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

We'll start with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Montano.

***Salutation***

Okay. Thank you very much, everybody. Please be seated. We're going to go right on to our agenda, and the first thing we have is we have a presentation from DPW on the status of our bridges.

This is something that came up at, I think, four -- it might have been four committee meetings ago. And Commissioner Anderson had this presentation ready, but we had such a full agenda we haven't been able to get to it. So Gil, if you would like, take us through whatever you've prepared for us on the status of the bridges that we have throughout Suffolk County.

Oh, before I go there, I'll just say I don't have any cards. Is there anybody in the audience that wishes to address us? All right. Seeing none, Gil, go ahead.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Thank you, everybody, and good afternoon. The presentation resulted out of a CN, or a number of CN's, that came through a few cycles ago regarding emergency repairs to some of the bridges that we needed done. And since we have a large agenda, I will make this as brief as I can.

DPW maintains 72 bridges. We maintain many town bridges, and 28 out of the 72 bridges are on town roadways and 44 are on County roadways. New York State Department of Transportation is required to inspect all the bridges within the State every two years. They provide the Department of Public Works with a detailed inspection report utilizing the rating system. They also are required to evaluate the bridges using two systems: One, their own; the other from the Federal Highway Authority System which has three categories, and I will go into the details of those later.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Gil?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Can you make sure you provide this to us so we can distribute it the committee once you're done.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Sure. Yeah, absolutely.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Typically they utilize their own in-house forces to inspect their own bridges and consultants are utilized for all other bridges. The inspection report evaluates 47 structural elements including 25 components of each span of a bridge as well as the general components. The reports detail conditions of various bridge components including a abutment rating, wind walls, channels, decks, super structures and piers. Suffolk County's Department of Public Works performs its own inspection of any bridge that has an overall condition rating of less than 5.0.

And now I'll go into a little detail on the actual ratings. New York State Department of Transportation uses a rating system that goes from a scale of one to nine. As you see on the screen before you, one is the worst condition totally, deteriorated or failed, and seven is the new condition; eight and nine are not really applicable, but they are on the scale.

***(\*Legislator Kennedy entered the meeting at 2:29 P.M. \*)***

The overall condition rating is not a true indicator of the structural deficiencies and at times can be misleading. The Federal Highway Authority uses three elements in their ranking system. The first is a structural deficient which is significant load-carrying elements are found to be in poor condition, or worse, due to deterioration or damage. The fact that a bridge is structurally deficient does not immediately imply that it is unsafe or likely to collapse. A deficient bridge, when left open to traffic, typically requires significant maintenance and repair to remain in service and eventually rehabilitation or replacement to address. In order to remain in service, structurally deficient bridges are often posted with weight limits. If you go up on 95 through Connecticut into Rhode Island, you'll see where they do list, they currently list in Providence a bridge maintaining a certain weight limit that can't be exceeded because of work that's going on in the area.

Functionally obsolete refers to bridges -- to a bridge's inability to meet current standards from managing the volume of traffic it carries, not its structural integrity. New York State's ranking system helps highlight bridges that should be considered for further review, maintenance repair and rehabilitation or replacement. Within New York State, New York has more than 17,000 highway bridges; 43% are owned by DOT or New York State, 49% are owned by municipalities and 8% are owned by the State or local authorities, such as the Tri-Borough Bridge. Based on New York State DOT data in April of 2007, 12% of the bridges in New York are structurally deficient. No Suffolk County bridge is structurally deficient. Twenty-six percent of bridges in New York are functionally obsolete

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

How many in Suffolk are functionally obsolete?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Hold on. Bill, do you know off the top of your head?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

It's about 30%.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

About 30%

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Around 30%.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So about a third of our bridges in Suffolk County --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Can you use the mike, Ed?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Oh, I'm sorry. About a third of our bridges in Suffolk County are functionally obsolete.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct. But that, again, refers to a bridge's inability to meet current standards for the volume, okay. So whether it's not wide enough, whether traffic -- and Bill can probably answer that a little better.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Sure, go ahead. Bill will expand on it.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Things such as sidewalks, guide rail, really mundane -- what we would consider mundane for a structural bridge. Although they are definitely issues that need to be addressed, but things such as sidewalk and guide rail can put you on the functionally obsolete column. So --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

But that's like getting an A, B or C, a very bright kid but he doesn't work hard so he gets a C. Okay, he still got a C; you're still functionally obsolete.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes, but the point is that from a safety standpoint it's not a category that represents any safety issues.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So what you're saying is that the State rating system is inadequate to discuss the safety of bridges.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Absolutely not. First off, this is the Federal Highway's ranking system which is different.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Correct.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The State ranking system is a numerical method where they rate each of the bridges and the needs based on that.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So then you're saying the Federal system is not an adequate system to address safety.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

No, what we're saying is that -- and the Feds are very clear that functionally obsolete does not imply safety issues.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Well, unfortunately, that sounds like double -- no criticism of yourself, but it sounds like double speak. Because if someone read in the newspapers or listened to a news report and it said, "This bridge is functionally obsolete," they draw a different conclusion than you may as an engineer better understanding the sediment.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Without a doubt, and that's why we're here, to try to clarify that.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

We're lucky that Rick Brand isn't here today, we might see a headline about obsolescence in our bridges.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Montano

**LEG. MONTANO:**

A quick question. Thirty percent of the bridges are functionally, but how does that compare to other jurisdictions in terms of, you know, are we on par with other areas? Because I agree that functionally --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I'll have to find that out, we don't know that.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

You don't know.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No, it's not that important. I would just imagine that a lot of bridges in a lot of jurisdictions are functionally obsolete under that definition.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, the Federal Highway Authority mandates that the State following their ranking system, but the State also developed their own which is that 1 to 9 ranking system where they go through and essentially rank them. They still will look at each component of a bridge to develop whether or not there are issues that override everything else, whether it was the failure, and you'll see later on, of some portion of the span that made it based what we call a read flag, something that had to be addressed right away. It enables us, it enables the State to basically determine, I guess, you know, through the Capital Program, when you need to start looking at a bridge. If something is at a six, you're not worried about it, but as it gets --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Excuse --

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Hold on, just let Legislator Montano finish first.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Go ahead, Gil. I'm sorry.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, if something has a good rating and there's no -- again, every time we get a report from the State, we review the report, we inspect the bridge to make sure we concur. The ranking system is just strictly a numerical means of basically maintaining and monitoring their bridges.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Let me ask you this. Is there a -- do you maintain like a separate plan to deal with this particular issue as opposed to the safety of the bridge? In other words, you know, what you're saying is that 30% of our infrastructure when it comes to bridges are outdated; am I correct in that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, what the --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

And that doesn't mean that there's nothing wrong with them, it just means that they weren't built for the kind of population and the kind of, I guess, growth that we've seen; am I correct in that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

See, it's a -- and maybe we need to --.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Feels like -- well, go ahead.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The term itself is, I guess, very obtuse.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I would agree with Legislator Romaine's comments, that the categories that the Federal Government has established are not very accurate or conducive to an open discussion. Between engineers knowing the terms, maybe it can work, but it's a very vague system that the Feds have. So just because you're in the obsolete column, you could be in the obsolete column, functionally obsolete column and that doesn't mean that even the capacity of the bridge is -- the capacity of the bridge could be fine. There could be a problem with the -- there could be a lack of sidewalks, and maybe there's never been a pedestrian on that bridge ever since it was built, but just because there's a lack of sidewalks, it falls into the functionally obsolete category.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I see, okay.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

So it's very hard to just say, "If it's in the category, we have a problem," it just didn't meet something. And that's something that may very well mean that we do have a problem, but in many cases it means that it's just on the list and we really don't agree that it has a problem.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Right, okay. So obsolete means something different to the engineers than it does to the general public, I understand that.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Do you have an idea of how many bridges are -- well, I won't use the word functionally obsolete, but how many of those are, you know, obsolete and need either to be redone, expanded, improved or -- if you know, I'm just curious.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Of the 72 bridges that we currently maintain, 28 of them are in a program, our bridges program for some type of investigation, upgrade, replacement, rehabilitation. We are currently reviewing 28 of our 72 bridges.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Some of them might be a full replacement; County Road 67 Motor Parkway Bridge over the Expressway next year will be completely replaced, brand new bridge. We have other bridges that --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. That's the one that we took the money out this year because we're going to do it next year; am I correct?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

That's absolutely right.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

So there are -- and there's other bridges that we're just investigating.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Gotcha. All right, thank you. I won't delay it further.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

I had --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Just a request of the Chairman, if I may. Perhaps as committee members we can get a list --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

That's what I was going to ask.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yeah, of the 72 bridges.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Sure.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

What their numerical rating is from the State, what their functional rating is from the Highway, Federal Highway Authority.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. Legislator Losquadro?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Do you have a database of the bridges, of those 72 bridges, you maintain the database?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes, we do.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

To follow-up on Legislator Romaine's request.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes, we do.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Of those 30% that were deemed functionally obsolete, we're sitting here saying it might be a sidewalk, it might be this, it might be that. In that database, do you have a specific notation as to what the State considered to be deficient?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I don't --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I'm sure you had to get that report, correct?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes, yes. And the presentation will speak to it a little bit more on what we do --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay. I know we're cutting you off here, and I apologize, we really should get through this. But I think that that is something that we need to see, because obviously a term like that is going to generate a little bit of concern on the part of individuals. And maybe not, you know, in the engineering sense, but I think it would be very helpful to get a listing of what the department sees and what the review of each bridge showed, what the deficiencies were and what plans you have to move forward on each one. Instead of just making blanket statements, you know, this might be deficient, this might be deficient, I think it would be helpful to be able to see specifically what each one has been deemed to have a problem with.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I think once Gil gets through his presentation, we go over when we receive a State DOT report, what do we do and how do we handle it. So I think once he reviews that, we can address some of your questions and then we can comment on anything else.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay. But that --

**MR. HILLMAN:**

But we can provide that information.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, certainly.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Yes, a complete database. Especially of that 30% that have deemed to be functionally obsolete, so we can get a better idea of what areas they are and what concerns they may have. And even if it's just non-vehicular transit, like you said, you know, or sidewalks or bike lanes or something like that, but it would be helpful to be able to see that. Thank you.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Kennedy and then we'll let you get back to your presentation, we'll hold the rest till the end.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll make it real quick. Through the Chair, this database report that you're going to compile, I'll be perfectly honest with you, I think any of the 18 of us that's got an item in their particular district is going to want to know about it. So through the Chair, I'd ask that you make that available for all members of the Legislature, not just us on the committee.

We may wrestle with what some of the funding instances are in the first instance, but I would not want to find out vicariously that I had issues. And now I'm going to take it to 67 in particular. So is

that bridge a functionally obsolete bridge; 55, Exit 55?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I don't have that off-hand. But I would say since it will be replaced next year it's really a moot point, because when we're done with it it will be a brand new bridge and not functionally obsolete.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

And if I may, if I may, John. Just the issue at hand is the way we do the inspections. It may -- and I understand, everybody's pointed about wanting to know whether a bridge in their area is functionally obsolete. We go through the inspection process and look at each individual item. When we get a report from the State, and every two years they're mandated to get us that report, we look at the report, we look at the individual items because they look at -- and as I mentioned earlier, there are a whole laundry list of items that they look at. And based on that, we then make our determination on what needs the bridge has. If it's something that's structural, if it's a safety issue, we then make those reports or begin to put the bridge into the Capital Program

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Gil, look, this is not a question of whether or not you're doing your job.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I understand.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You're the PE, I'm not. But only two weeks ago you came to us and said we need to take \$8 million out of the project associated with 55 and place it elsewhere because we're not ready in the process in order to go forward with where things are at. So then that means I have to --

**MR. HILLMAN:**

No.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We're in -- we will be under construction next year. We didn't -- the money -- that was basically an offset that we had available because we didn't need the money for this year, but it's all Federally funded.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

The point is I'm not suggesting you're forfeiting money, I'm not suggesting that, you know, the projects that you identify aren't something that's, you know, needed. What I'm saying to you is I just want to be very certain that we're not shifting focus from something that takes 50,000 people a day in and out of that industrial park and not saying, "Well, we have this adjoining parallel priority that we're going to move forward with to the detriment of that," that's all.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

And that was not done. That was not the case.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

All right. All right, I'll yield.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. Gil, we'll let you finish the presentation, then we'll do the questions after that

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

So go ahead, please.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Hold on. Okay, I think we did this, we did that. Okay, and if a bridge is deemed unsafe it is closed to traffic.

The description of our bridge program. As of 2007, none of the 72 Suffolk County bridges are listed in the Structurally Deficient Category under the FHWA Ranking System. As of 2006, 28 of the 72 bridges range from 4.33 to 5.0 in accordance with DOT's ranking system. These bridges will be inspected by Suffolk County Department of Public Works and any necessary repairs will be planned for in the Capital Program.

When Suffolk County Department of Public Works receives an inspection report from the DOT, our structural engineers thoroughly review their reports and input the data into a spreadsheet that weighs the condition of the structural members versus non-structural components such as curb and sidewalk. This is -- basically what you're looking at is a work sheet where we analyze the condition, the weighing scale and then come up with the tally at the lower right corner.

Our evaluation process. Upon completion of the weighing process, we generate a list of bridges that have a ranking of less than five. Structures performs a field investigation of those bridges with a ranking of less than five and identifies mitigation members -- measures as necessary. Minor repairs are completed by in-staff house while major repairs or rehabilitation are budgeted within the Capital Program. It's difficult to see, but when you get this presentation you'll be able to print it out, this is the listing of all the bridges that have a ranking of less than five.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Landing Avenue

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

And so you know, there are no bridges with a listing of less than four. Okay. At that meeting two or three cycles go when we asked for the CN, one of the bridges that we asked for the money for was County Road 99, Woodside Avenue at Buckley. The latest inspection was completed by DOT on June of 2006 and was forwarded to our department. The primary structural numbers were rated at five and the secondary structural numbers were also rated at five. Overall condition ranking was rated at 5.167. In August of 2008, DOT's consultants were performing their biannual inspection and a red flag issue was discovered. Primary structural number had serious deterioration and needed immediate attention. With one hour of notification from DOT, our department had the Director of Bridges and Structures on-site evaluating the condition. It was determined that the member was supporting a raised center median and provided little structural support to the travel lanes. There is a picture of what we did to come in and stabilize it. It was determined that the wood cribbing, or blocks, would provide the necessary temporary supports if the members failed. In addition, since the members were not supporting travel lanes, no additional stress would be applied from motor vehicles traveling over the bridge.

Within two hours of notification from DOT, the department had dispatched a structural engineer to evaluate the situation. We dispatched the bridge maintenance crew and installed a temporary cribbing to make the bridge safe. The department's structural group met with the structural engineers from DOT in Albany and Region 10 on the site to determine the most appropriate course of action for repairs. For the most part, the biannual evaluation system worked. The deterioration was discovered before any failure took place and the matter is being handled. However, the department does have concerns with regard to the quality of the 2006 inspections on County Road 99 at Buckley Avenue. As you can see from the left, the picture in 2006 is significantly different than the one in 2008. It is unlikely that the members deteriorated that rapidly between the two years. The 2006 inspection crew most likely did not probe the deterioration adequately.

We met with DOT Bridge Maintenance & Structures Group to identify this concern. We requested the 2008 inspection be expedited for any County bridge that was completed by -- in 2006 by the same inspection team that inspected County Road 99 at Buckley Avenue.

In summary, none of the County bridges have been identified as structurally deficient under FHWA ranking system. The County bridges are fully inspected every two years. DPW's structural group reviews each inspection report and further analyzes the structural components to provide a list of bridges that need further investigation. Within two hours of notification of the County Road 91 bridge issues, DPW addressed the matter. The traveling public was never in any danger. DPW met with DOT structural groups to determine permanent repairs, designs have been completed and the projects were advertised on the 16th. DPW has requested DOT to expedite 2008 inspections for any of the bridges that were handled by this 2006 inspection team.

In conclusion, the biannual inspection process works well. Suffolk County's structural group does an excellent job evaluating the County bridges and protecting the safety of the traveling public. And that's it. Any questions, further questions?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. Well, Legislator Romaine, I saw your hand first, and then Legislator Losquadro and Legislator Montano

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Could you tell me the condition of the highway bridge at, I guess it's 105 going over the Peconic River?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Not off the top of my head. We can get that information to you.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And can you tell me the status of the bridge at County Road 46, the Smith Point Bridge; what that status is --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The actual ranking?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, the ranking, right.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Smith Point Bridge is a 4.639.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And you don't have the ranking for the Peconic -- for the 105 going over the Peconic River?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, it's not within the table that we have here. Oh, 105 Cross River Drive; is that the one?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's a 4.778.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. I pointed those two out because I'm not an engineer, you know, never studied engineering, but to the naked eye both those bridges look like they need rehab.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

And that's why they're in the program to be addressed, specifically County Road 46, Smith Point

Bridge.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We passed at the last Leg meeting the funds to evaluate it and make the repairs so that it will last well into the new project to replace the bridge.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And you're going to totally replace the bridge.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

In ten -- yeah, in ten years. This is just to rehabilitate it so it lasts while we go through the process of design of a new bridge.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Do you know how old that bridge is? It was built in 1959, it will be 50 years old next year.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes, correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And the Cross County Drive Bridge, do you know the age of that bridge?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

That one I don't.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Thank you. I don't know if it was just the way certain things were phrased in the presentation, but one of the things I noted, it said "As of 2006," as far as the State reports. And then the note I -- the word I noticed was "will be inspected by the Department of Public Works." Have those inspections not taken place yet at this point?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Some have, we're in the process of doing them now.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

How many bridges are we talking about? Because we've had two years.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Well --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No. Okay, the ones that -- and correct me if I'm wrong, Bill. The ones that I believe we were talking about were the ones that we've asked the State to review, they were the ones that that one team specifically did, the Buckley Road Bridge.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

No, it was a slide well before that, that's why I pointed it out.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

When we receive the '06 inspection reports, we put them into our own analysis system, churn out anything that below -- anything that turns out to be below a five we inspect immediately with our own forces.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Immediately

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yes. So those '06 --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay. Well, it's not what the --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right, I know what the Legislator is saying.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

The presentation you made said "will be inspected by the Department of Public Works," and led me to believe that those inspections had not yet taken place.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

For '06 they did. The '08 inspections are now taking place and as soon as we get them we will inspect them again.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay. And that was my next question, is it's December, I saw some of the inspections you reference from the State were from June of 2006. When have -- have you received any information from the State yet for the '08 inspections, or do they come in all in one lump sum?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

They come in piecemeal.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Piecemeal.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, they come in as they do them

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

How many have you received thus far and have you commenced any inspections based on deficiencies they've noted for 2008?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I don't have that information at hand. But let me also point out that the inspection crew might have done it in June of '06, that doesn't mean we get it from the State in July of '06.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

We may get a handful and, you know, start to trickle in in December. The State has to process it.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

How -- when does it usually come into you? When do you expect to have all of the reports for the '08 inspections?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I don't have that information.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

March, April? I mean, historically what has it been?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Again, I don't know that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. I mean, I know in the past, when I've seen them --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

That's what I'm asking, based on past experience.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I'm not saying that this year is going to be the same, but what has it taken in the past, until November of next year, April of next year?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Again, I don't have that information. I would have to ask my Director of Bridges and Structures who deals with the State on a daily basis. I don't perform that function or task.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

All right, if we could find that out. And if we've received any of those '08 inspections, if they've begun to come in yet, and what actions, if any, you've taken based on those new reports. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Thanks. Actually, I think you just answered one question I had. The unit that is responsible for this is under the Director of Bridges; is that the title?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, Bridges & Waterways.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Bridges & Waterways.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Bridges, Structures & Waterways.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Your staffing levels for that department, have they remained constant, have they gone down? What's the staffing levels, let's say, you know, three or four years ago? I mean, that sounds like an important unit, so I'm just curious as to whether or not you've maintained the level of staff, staffing consistently.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

In the last four years since I've been here, we've lost -- our previous Director of Bridges, Structures & Waterways recently retired in June; he was replaced by his assistant who is an exceptional engineer, very, very good. We also lost a fairly seasoned Structural Engineer about three years ago.

We've replaced him with another fairly seasoned Structural Engineer just recently; he's got eleven years experience, came from a consulting firm, very good. We have two other Junior Engineers with four or five, respectively, about two years experience. So we have four Structural Engineers on staff. The Director is very good, the second-in-command is -- you know, he's a pretty well-seasoned engineer. If we are ever to lose that Director, we'd have to go out and find someone with commensurate experience; he's really the true leader of the group, as he should be. So it's been up and down, but right now we're holding our own and the staffing levels generally do work.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right. But I guess why I was asking was that when you came in, was -- because you've identified four people; is that the size of the unit?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Generally four to five people, yes. When I came in there were five, there's four right now.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right, you lost one budgetarily or you lost one that's not filled?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Not filled.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right, so there's one vacancy, in other words. And that's all the vacancies that you have, just one, in that unit.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Well, I handle my section a little bit differently when it comes to staffing. You know, there's a budgetary code that assigns that position to Bridges, Structures and Waterways. I don't -- let's assume I have a Senior Engineer position released and the code is Bridges, Structures & Waterways.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

You'll assign him somewhere else if you feel you need him somewhere else.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

That's correct.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I understand

**MR. HILLMAN:**

And also, if I can't -- to find a Structural Engineer is extremely difficult. It took us --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

At the salary that you pay, in other words, right?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Yeah. Well, yes, but even if you were offering a great salary, they're very hard to find.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Oh, they are hard to find, okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, they are.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Very hard to find. So it took us probably about three to four months and several advertisements in Newsday. And I had almost given up hope on our Structural Engineer and I was interviewing Civil Engineers for our Highway Department for the same position. Luckily, at the last minute this gentleman submitted his resume and we ended up hiring him. Had he not done that, I was prepared to hire someone in the Highway Engineering Design Group so that we could at least benefit from a released position. So it's difficult to really say that there's one vacant position there.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Well, the only reason I'm asking is it's an important function, you know, I don't want to rate it in terms of importance but, you know, that bridge, where was that, Minnesota, that collapsed? That I understand was a structural design or an engineering design that caused that to collapse, not -- you know, we're not dealing with those problems here. But I just want to make sure that your staffing levels are adequate for the task at hand, that's really all I'm asking. If you're telling me yes, that's fine. If you're telling me that you need -- you could use some resources in that area then, you know, we'd like to know that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No. In fairness, I mean, we -- when Tom Rogers retired -- well, before that, we automatically went right up to the 12th Floor and said, "We've got some grave concerns," and Bill can, I think, back me on this. We're very comfortable with the staffing we have with the bridges right now.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay. All right, thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

And if we have any problems, I promise, you'll be the first ones -- or the second ones I tell.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do you know approximately how many inspections were done by this 2006 team that we're going to have to perhaps reevaluate and have we found out which jobs, which projects they had inspected back in 2006 and what, if anything, have we been able to do as a result?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

We don't know the exact number. We do know that the two bridges on County Road 99 that we had to come in before a CN were both inspected by the same crew. So we have been in communication with the State to have them expedite any review that they had completed for the County, please, we asked them to expedite those for 2008, and they indicated they would.

**LEG. STERN:**

Generally, how many teams are involved; could it be all of the evaluations that were done in 2006 or is it a much smaller number?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I would -- with 72 bridges, I would think that -- and the need to get them done in a fairly efficient amount of time. It would be highly unlikely that this crew did all 72 County bridges, but I don't have that answer.

**LEG. STERN:**

And you've asked the State to expedite; when was that request made?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right after this was identified back in -- when was it, August, the red flag?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I think it was in September, wasn't it?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

September; yeah, in September when we requested it because we met with them

**LEG. STERN:**

So it's been a couple of months?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

And when was last time an inquiry was made or a request made for the information?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Well, we're not really requesting -- I don't think we made a formal request for the number of bridges and what bridges they were. We just said --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right, make sure you inspect them.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Make sure you inspect them quickly and get those to us.

**LEG. STERN:**

So it is the -- the State then will be sending out another team to do the inspection for the bridges that were inspected by this team in 2006, it will be a State function to reinspect.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Correct.

**LEG. STERN:**

Got it. Okay, thanks.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Kennedy.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

My question here is hopefully a relatively simple one. The 2006 physical observation showed what appeared to be some significant -- I don't know what the technical term is, it looks like rust; it looks like flaking of the integrity of the steel member near the base where it's joined. In 2008, it looks like that deterioration has gotten to the point where actual portions of the member are now missing, they're gone.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

How come there was no attempt to do something that we all do like with our BBQ's or boat bottoms, like a wire brush and some Rustoleum, or whatever their technical term is?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, generally, as the presentation stated, you know, we can only surmise that whoever did the inspection didn't do -- you know, didn't do any type of exploration. They didn't go in with a screwdriver to see how deep, if it was -- because rust tends to flake, it tends to increase. They didn't hit it with a hammer, because otherwise certainly it would have been evident, and that's the concern we expressed with the State, was -- you know, because the previous report was at a number that really didn't raise any alarms, you know.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Let me also just point out the two pictures, the one on the left that showed 2006.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Comparatively, the one of the right in '08 was after someone took a hammer to it, beat the rust off and removed all the rust that would -- could be removed via, you know, a hand and scrubbing with a wire brush and all that sort of good stuff. So I believe, I was not there on-site, but from what I got from my Director of Bridges was that when he got there, the beam looked like a rusty beam, yes, but it still had paint in areas on the outside, but when you put your finger to it, you could almost put your finger through it.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

So it appeared structurally in tact.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Surface rust.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

But -- okay.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

But the inspectors did not probe it well enough.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay. So the next logical question then is who took a hammer to it; our people or the State people?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Our people.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

So, then the next logical question is, is to what level should we have any faith in this next round of inspections done by the State?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The State, in fairness, identified this issue as a red flag, so somebody went in there and did probing. They didn't bang the entire thing away, but they knew that there was an issue that had to be resolved. They raised the red flag, we then went in and, as part of our continued inspection, if you will, banged the rust off of it, for lack of a better term. They identified it. I mean, the second round when they came through, they went in there and they determined that there was an issue and it had

to be resolved. They are -- I mean, as any inspection would be, they should have been hitting it with a hammer, they should have been probing it, but they didn't. How --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

There's components of a bridge that aren't readily available to visualization, right? But are they part of an inspection as well?

I mean, some of that steel goes down between the concrete footings. When you -- when the bridge is evaluated or tested --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

-- to what extent -- if they can't even get the visual stuff right, why should we be -- you know, have any degree of comfort, if you will, or -- I mean, is the next logical step you guys have to go out and smack it because you know how to do it and the State doesn't? Do we have to go ahead and write to the Governor and say his bridge crews stink or what?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, the State crew is very concerned about what happened and I -- you know, from the conversations I discussed with Bob, they were adamantly going to review their inspection of those bridges. If you look at the bridge on the screen in front of you, you have -- there's a number of parts of it that, you know, even just one span, you're looking at -- on the side you have wing walls, you have the abutment.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Uh-huh.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

In the center you have channels, you have deck, you know, the super structure. Each one of those at every one of the spans gets inspected and gets rated. An inspection report is usually about three-eighths to a half inch -- oh, here you go. This is an inspection report from the State. It identifies every item that's inspected, gives a numerical rating, as you get into the back they get into more detailed inspections.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Gil, Gil, you don't have to convince me that they assemble a lot of paper.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

That's -- we've got enough paper to kill forests. I guess I'm just asking you one more time as an engineer, are you familiar enough with the techniques that they use --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

-- to be able to say that the inspection process that they're undertaking at this point is sufficient to go ahead and say that the integrity of those bridges is viable?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Okay, fine. All right.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Brian, question?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

When we look at a lot of these older bridges we see, you know, the steel girders, the underpinnings underneath the road deck. The new bridges that we're designing and installing, at least from what I've seen, seem to be more the prestressed, precast concrete, much less susceptible to these types. I guess it really depends on the bridge design, but in the overpasses you seem to be able to go with a much more modular approach which also lends itself to diminished construction time and a lot of the fabrication takes place off-site.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Are those designs less susceptible to this type of damage? Do they have an anticipated longer life span, the newer designs that we're installing?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Not that I know of.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No. I mean, because concrete has certain issues with it, too.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Life expectancies, right.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You get spalling, you get all these --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The life expectancy on either one is the same.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

They each have their limitations.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are no other questions, thank you very much, Gil and Bill. I appreciate that. And if you could make sure we get a copy of the presentation and a copy of that database that Legislator Losquadro and Romaine had mentioned, I'd appreciate that. And I'll make sure that -- if you just send them to me, I'll make sure all the other Legislators get them, including those not on the

committee.

So with that, we'll start the agenda.

**Tabled Resolutions**

***IR 1536-08 - Appropriating funds in connection with construction of sidewalks on various County roads (CP 5497) (Schneiderman).***

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion to table

**LEG. HORSLEY:**  
Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion to table by Legislator Stern. Seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 1710-08 - Authorizing a GPS Pilot Program in the Department of Public Works (Romaine).*** I'll off a motion to table.

**LEG. STERN:**  
Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**  
Opposed.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Abstentions? One opposed, ***IR 1710 is tabled (VOTE: 6/1/0/0 Opposed: Legislator Romaine).***

***IR 1848-08 - To expand the County's recycling Program (Romaine).***  
I will offer a motion to table.

**LEG. STERN:**  
Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Seconded by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**  
On the motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**  
I would just like to ask the sponsor where -- I know he was looking into this. Where are we in terms of the E-Waste Disposal and where can the County get to on this?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**  
Well, I see that we have a representative from the County Attorney's Office that sent me an e-mail

regarding this resolution. Maybe it would be best for Gail to come up and explain this. That's a reversal, of course. Usually others ask for her to come up to explain how to kill my bill, but I thought it would be good for --

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

I wouldn't put it quite that way. But Gail, what would you like to say about Legislator Romaine's bill?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

First of all, did you hear that, Gail?

**MS. LOLIS:**

No.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Good, all right.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Apparently you're an instrument of stagnation.

**MS. LOLIS:**

You're lucky I'm under the weather today. The -- I sent the

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Your mike's not on.

**MS. LOLIS:**

Sorry about that. Okay. The cell phones are preempted under State law, and I forwarded the section of the law that expressly states that local legislation as far as cell phones are concerned would be preempted.

As far as our -- the E-Waste contract that we have now, I don't believe the ink jet printers would be covered under that. There is an RFP that is going out, and Gil could probably tell you what that status is, that to the extent ink jet printers need to be, through the County, recycled, that would be covered from that. But with the ink jet printers, they go directly -- and I'm sure all the departments do this. We keep our boxes and the ink jet cartridges go directly back to the manufacturer.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Right, they come with a prepared shipping label, correct?

**MS. LOLIS:**

I believe so, yeah

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Why -- why would a municipality be precluded, by what aspect of the State Law? Why would we be precluded from recycling cell phones? You would think that the State would -- if you're trying to do something that is beneficial to the environment, trying to expand a recycling program, what aspect of State law would prohibit a local level of government from engaging in a recycling activity? That doesn't really --

**MS. LOLIS:**

The Environmental Conservation Law, Section 27-2305, states that, "Any Local Law or ordinance relating to collection return or recycle of wireless phones is expressly preempted." That was a law that was, I think, passed last year.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

The phones themselves? Because I know that -- I don't want to get anybody in trouble here, but I know the town accepts cell phone batteries and things of that nature. But I guess we're talking about the actual devices themselves at this point? I mean, because the battery is really the most toxic part. The battery is a removable item and those batteries are accepted for recycling all over the place. I know the Town of Brookhaven accepts them, lots of municipalities accept them to try to encourage people to give those back in so they don't wind up in the waste stream. So are the batteries precluded, is it just the device?

**MS. LOLIS:**

The law applies to all wireless telephone -- refers to wireless telephone collection, so all wireless telephones. I mean, I know some municipalities collect them and then they try to use them for the 911 and things like that to reprogram them for people. I don't know if that's --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

No, but I'm talking about specifically the recycling aspect and the battery being a removable component. I think that warrants another look at this because that is something that unfortunately people don't pay a lot of attention to and those batteries wind up in the waste stream quite often. Even though we do have, you know, all the cell phone stores, at least the one that I go to, I know they have a collection point that you can drop the batteries back off.

**MS. LOLIS:**

And that's what this law requires, it goes back to the -- this puts into place the requirement that the wireless telephone service supplier take the phones back.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Oh, okay.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Well, I'll make a motion to table for one session and then come the New Year, I'll re-evaluate whether this bill should be withdrawn or reworded.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. Well, motion by Legislator Romaine, I'll second it.

All in favor? Opposed? Abstention? ***IR 1848 is tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 1891-08 - To improve and strengthen Consultant Procurement Policy (Presiding Officer Lindsay).*** I will offer a motion to table at the request of the sponsor.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 1891 is tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 1968-08 - Authorization of alteration of rates for North Ferry Co., Inc. (Presiding Officer Lindsay).***

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER,**

Motion by Legislator Romaine. I will second it. Kevin, do you want to share something with us or are you just here to react? Okay, go ahead then. Sorry, I didn't mean that if it sounded condescending.

**MR. DUFFY:**

I'll be very brief. Basically, the company is requesting a rollback of rates for the walk-on passengers. Our concern with this is that it continues the process where both North and South Ferry have a rate structure that are extremely heavily weighted in favor of the residents. North Ferry, for instance, has four categories -- cars, passengers, bikes and motorcycles, trucks. Cars is the largest category which provides approximately 65% of the income. In looking at what is paid, a resident car and driver constitute 40% of the car ridership, but only 22% of the revenue. The non-resident ridership, they constitute 46% of the volume but 70% of the revenue. The commuter provides 13% of the ridership, 13.6, and 7.8%.

Our concern is basically if the ridership of the casual user starts to drop, North Ferry in particular, since it had borrowed approximately \$5.6 million to purchase the three ferries since 2001, may find itself in a very difficult situation where it will be coming back to the Legislature to seek rate increases and the category that's really the one that it should go to would be the residents. Basically, that's what we have to say.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Romaine?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, Mr. Chairman. What this alteration does, it rolls back the walk-on rate. Now, if you walk on to North Ferry, you pay \$2. They are rolling, they are permanently rolling back the rate, which is a rarity these days, to \$1.50 for residential users. What about non-residents? Well, if they buy in blocks, you know, if they buy a group discount, they can get a similar rate for that as well. So this will benefit everyone. The thing is that if you are just a casual user it isn't going the benefit you, you'll still be at \$2. But obviously the casual user, how many casual users walk on to Shelter Island without means of transportation? There aren't too many.

You want to -- this is a -- first of all, I want to commend the North Ferry for doing this because it's very rare that you see ferries rolling back any rates today, and they're doing this because residents really need -- residents tend to park their cars at the parking lot there and they'll ride the ferry over to Greenport, they can shop, go see a movie in the summer, whatever, and then ride back. I think this is commendable that they're rolling this rate back and I would urge this Legislature to pass this rate.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Quick question?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Kevin, you raise concerns, but are you taking a position on this? I'm not sure I understood fully. Do you have a position on it?

**MR. DUFFY:**

Well, the only thing that the Legislature has before it is whether or not it would -- based on the {Gowan} decision, the Legislature either has a choice of approving North Ferry's request to roll back this one-fare, the passenger fair. But what we're saying is that since I've been doing the ferries for 21 years, North and South Ferry, we've expressed this concern and what appears to be a growing gap that the cost of transporting a car and driver the company estimates to be \$6.07, and when a five day -- a resident with a five day commutation ticket is only paying \$2.20 for that ride, there's

reason to be concerned.

When I expressed this concern about the South Ferry last year when we had the hearing on Shelter Island, the Supervisor suggested -- because what we've been saying is that the residents and the commuters should pay a higher portion of the cost. And when I expressed that concern on shelter Island, the Supervisor offered to give me a Police escort to get me off the Island safely.

*(\*Laughter From Audience\*)*

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Obviously the residents -- I was at that meeting, the residents did not take too kindly to that.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

It's your district?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, we have a motion and a second. Are there any other comments? Seeing none, all in favor? All opposed? All Opposed? Abstentions?

***1968 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2025-08 - Adopting Local Law No. 2008, A Local Law to promote accurate cost estimates for Capital Projects (D'Amaro).*** This needs to be tabled for a public hearing. I'll make the motion to table.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Montano. Was it you?

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No, but I'll second it.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

That's fine.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions. I just see peripherally.

***Tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2043-08 - Directing a study on the feasibility of the use of compressed natural gas to fuel Suffolk County vehicles (Alden).***

At the request of the sponsor, I'm going to offer a motion to table. He contacted my office, I believe it was yesterday, to ask me to table this.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

If I may?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I just want to add, I believe the sponsor -- and now I am a cosponsor because he has amended this to include not only compressed natural gas but propane. There are a number of trucks being run in this County with propane, which is far more efficient and gets a Federal subsidy than natural gas. So he added that in as an additional study element, which I thought was worthwhile.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Propane is more efficient, huh, than natural gas?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

They tell me it is.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

If I may?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Losquadro

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Basically, every fork lift that you see run --

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Yeah, I was just going to say.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

-- is run on propane. It's clean-burning and it burns, depending on the engine, with over 98% efficiency. It's a very efficient fuel.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

If you go into Home Depot and you see any of the machines that lift the pallets, they all run on propane.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

They're all propane.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Interesting.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Montano.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Yeah. I'm just curious, do you know anything about the safety feature in terms of --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Several --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

It's one thing a fork lift, it's another thing, you know, in a truck.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Trucks, there are several trucks, all of -- I know one business, Bay Gas, it's in Kate Browning's district, I know the owner, he runs all of his trucks on propane.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Really?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

All of his trucks. And in fact, he's in discussions with PC Richards to convert their trucks to propane because it's far more efficient. It's the equivalent of about 75 cents. Whatever would propel a gallon of gas, it's about 75 cents with propane with the Federal subsidy, because you do get a Federal subsidy for that.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Oh, I'm just curious, though. Maybe, Commissioner, any studies on the safety factor? It's one thing to be cheaper, it's another thing to be cheaper and much more dangerous. I'm just -- and I'm just curious; I don't really know anything about this.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Off the top of my head, I don't think so.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Okay.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I could actually --

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Losquadro?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I could comment. I know about the CNG and I assume propane would be subject to the same standards. Any fuel tank placed in a vehicle has to meet Federal Crash Guidelines, and that's why some of the costs associated with not only CNG but hydrogen, creating crash-worthy fuel canisters that will survive the types of impacts that they subject them to are expensive. But to get a road-worthiness status from the Federal government, it has to be able to survive those crash tests.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

All right. You know, I'll just comment, if anyone is interested. The reason I ask is I was on vacation in another country, I won't mention the name, and I got into a cab and it was a small cab and right next to me was a propane tank, I was basically sitting on it. And I'm like, "I hope this guy doesn't crash," you know? So that's the only reason I mention it. I found it somewhat surprising.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I don't think that meets NTSB guidelines.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No, I don't think so.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I do know, I did --

**LEG. MONTANO:**

It was far away.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I did meet with the fellows from Bay Gas and they basically told me that the tank will outlast the truck.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

The fuel tank, right, yeah.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The fuel tank, yeah.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Wow, interesting. All right.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, Legislator Montano, I certainly hope that cab had a "no smoking" sign on it.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

I don't smoke, but I'm sure it didn't, to be honest with you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. Did we take -- did I call the vote on that already?

**MS. LOMORIELLO:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2043 is tabled (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2099-08 - Appropriating funds in connection with interchange improvements for CR 111 at the LIE Service Roads (CP 5123) (County Executive).***

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'll make a motion for the purpose of discussion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Horsley.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And the purpose of discussion is --

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Romaine?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I've asked DPW, and we've been trying to arrange a public hearing. There was a study that was done, if you may recall, in 2006 it was authorized, it finally got completed, guys; somewhat late, but it got completed. And what I'd like to do is have a public hearing on that study before we authorize any improvements. That's something that I think if it was in your district or anyone's district, you would want to get the input from the general public. I'm very supportive of this, but you know that doesn't mean my constituents are, or that I would move ahead with a project of this dimension

without at least having a public hearing on the study and show how this fits into the study for the overall roadway.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, my only -- I would defer to you, of course, since it's in your district, Legislator Romaine. But my concern would be this money is in the '08 budget and if we don't do it this time, when we get to January we won't have that million.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And that's why I made the motion for discussion purposes.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. All right.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

But clearly, clearly, we need to have a public hearing on CR 111.

I know we gave a couple of dates, but they were all the wrong times and we couldn't get the consultants and everything else. I, frankly, think as soon as possible in January we need to establish some dates. I know we couldn't do it in November or December, but we need to establish -- that study was authorized over two-and-a-half years ago and at this point it's done, it should get out there. This is one component of that study, we really need to have public input on that study

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

And without question, we have said we will gladly meet in June -- not June, in January; one of the J's.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

It might be June, but okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. And just to respond to a comment made. The length of the time was primarily due to the engineers having to really access traffic hounds during summer months when really they are the peek, and that's what really pushed it back. So I just wanted to --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I understand. But the study's been done literally since September, so I just want to have a public hearing on that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. That's fine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

We promised the people that, the County Executive promised the people that. Let's just have that public hearing, let's get comment, and one of the comments will be about the clover leaf interchange, which by the way I think is the safer way to go, but some of my constituents may not agree with that.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second. If there are no additional comments, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2099 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2131-08 - Authorizing additional planning funds for the implementation of an Automated Vehicle Locator (AVL) System for Suffolk Transit and amending the 2008 Capital Budget and Program and accepting and appropriating Federal Aid and State Aid and County funds (CP 5648) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Stern. I will second it. Do we have any questions? Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

You anticipate this being used to better manage our fleet? Especially during times of snow storms, things of that nature, being able to get vehicles on-site to points where they're needed more expeditiously, I guess?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Absolutely. That's one of the benefits of this system, it will allow us real time, issues can be resolved. If we have to send something somewhere, we can bring it from one place to another. It also helps us resolve any issues such as scheduling conflicts, things like that, so we don't -- you know, we can have real-time track of all our vehicles.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are no other questions, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2131 is approved***  
***(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)***.

***IR 2132-08 - Authorizing the sale of property held by the County as a result of an eviction (County Executive)***. I'll make a motion to approve.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

What is this; George?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, can I have a second?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I'll second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. George, can you just -- Counsel, can you please give us an explanation of this?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yeah. Basically what the resolution says is that the County Sheriff removed goods from a retail furniture store pursuant to a Warrant of Eviction. They've been holding the goods for quite a while and they want to auction the goods

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Oh, so it's personal property.

**MR. NOLAN:**

It's personal property, and that's what they'd like to do.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Mr. Chair, can I follow up with Counsel on that?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Kennedy

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

George, how is it, though, that we wind up securing personal goods when we do an eviction from a personal property, but yet a residential property that the Sheriff affects an eviction on, contents are put out on the corner of the road and, depending on their quality, they're gone in two hours?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Or the weather conditions.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'm curious.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

In this specific --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

You bet that's what they --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

In this specific case, we took the stuff off the street to maintain order. I mean, these were dinettes and kitchen tables and things like that and people were crossing lanes of traffic and actually pushing my guys out of the way. So we just -- you know, we were concerned for the public safety, so we took everything and we brought it into one of our storage facilities, you know, in one of our yards. We contacted the owner and said, "Look, you're going to have to reimburse us for our costs, but if you want the stuff," you know, but he never responded. So we want to get it out, you know, out of our storage building so we can get it back.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

Wow

**MR. ZWIRN:**

Does anybody need a dinette?

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I don't know if I want to go too much further on this.

**LEG. MONTANO:**

No, I don't think so.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Yeah, forget it, whatever.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

That a boy, John.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. Well, if there are no additional questions, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2032 is approved***  
***(VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2133-08 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 11 - Selden with the owner of Coram Estates (BR-1457) (County***

*Executive).*

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro. I'll second that motion. If there are no questions, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2133 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2136-08 - Appropriating funds in connection with safety improvements at various intersections (CP 3301) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Stern. I'll second it. Do you have any questions on the motion? All right, seeing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2136 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2137-08 - Amending the 2008 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the New York State Clean Water/Clean Air Bond Act, Storm water remediation on CR 80, Montauk Highway at Forge River (CP 5516, Phase 2) (County Executive).***

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine. I will second it. If there are no questions, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2137 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2140-08 - Appropriating funds in connection with weather-proofing County Buildings (CP 1762) (County Executive).***

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2140 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2143-08 - Authorizing the County Executive to enter into an Intermunicipal agreement with the Town of Brookhaven in connection with improvements to Raynor Beach County Park (CP 7175) (County Executive).***

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

I'll make a motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

And I will second that motion. Motion by Legislator Kennedy, seconded by myself. If there are no

questions, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**. And Legislator Kennedy, congratulations on your sidewalk.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

Thank you. It is the never-ending sidewalk, Brian.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Yes, it is.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**

We could have mixed the cement and laid it ourselves.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

I was there the other day.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

It has to end, we can't afford never-ending.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

***IR 2147-08 - Transferring holding account funds to the Capital Fund, Amending the 2008 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with improvements and rehabilitation of existing facilities in Suffolk County Sewer District No. 2 - Tallmadge Woods (CP 8188) (County Executive).***

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2147 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0)***.

***IR 2150-08 - Amending the 2008 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the roof replacement on various County buildings (CP 1623) (County Executive).***

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine. I will second it.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Just on the motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

On the motion, Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Roofing doesn't fall under water-proofing?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No. Actually, water-proofing is more recalking, repainting, things like this. This is actual roof replacement.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Actual roofing. Okay, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are no other questions, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *IR 2150 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*

*IR 2160-08 - Amending the 2008 Capital Budget and Program and transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund and appropriating funds for the chemical bulk storage facilities for sanitary facilities in Suffolk County Sewer Districts (CP 8178)*

*(County Executive).* Motion by Legislator Stern. I will second it.

If there are no questions on the motion, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? *IR 2160 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*

*IR 2161-08 - Amending Resolution No. 1277-2007 which establishes the Suffolk County Sewer Assessment RFP Committee (County Executive).*

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Quick question.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Question, Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Tell me, if you would, what the Suffolk County Sewer Assessment RFP Committee does.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We're charged with preparing an RFP of the -- to prepare a report and overall assessment of sewers throughout the County, the needs and such.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And when was this report due originally?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Originally due on -- well, it was to be awarded by December 31st.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

December 31st of this year.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Of 2008, of this year.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So what you're going to do in DPW is you're going to hire a contractor to make this assessment.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

A consultant. A consultant, yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Consultant; contractor, consultant. But now you want to extend that date to July 1st of 2009? Is there a reason you need an additional six months to do the RFP?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Part of the issue is that we were waiting for direction from the Waste Water Task Force on what the RFP would be required, and that has recently been developed. Now we go into the process of finalizing the RFP, getting it out to bid, receiving bids and then hopefully awarding it.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

On the motion?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I have to say, I've heard a little bit about the findings from that committee and I was a little bit disappointed to hear that despite what I thought to be some very compelling testimony and projects that are ready to move, with Rocky Point and a separate study that's going to be taking place in the Rocky Point area, that that task force did not include Rocky Point as part of the recommendation; is that the case?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, it's not the case at all.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yep, it is.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Is it?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yeah.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Oh.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

If I may, I know Legislator Horsley was --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

As part of the recommendation to the RFP Committee?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Horsley?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Well --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

And again, I would -- and I don't mean to cut you off. It would seem to me that the RFP, the engineer is going to have to consider all the aspects of sewers throughout the County.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Oh, yes, absolutely.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Both new, you know, and existing, where we consolidate, there's all these different issues. I mean, certainly --

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yeah, that's a different issue than I think what Mr. Losquadro is talking about. Just so -- Dan, so you know what the rationale was behind it. We had to make decisions that were -- what projects were ready to go.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

So you're going to tell me this for my own good?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Excuse me? What projects were ready to go and that was the determining factor. We knew -- we had a discussion about Rocky Point because we want Rocky Point to go, too; this was not a negative at all towards Rocky Point's project. We recognize that your study was going to be done in the New Year. So at that point in time, then yours would be more ready to go than it was presently. We were talking -- we had to make a report to our Congressional Delegation --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right, this is two separate things. The report to the Congressional Delegation was projects that would be ready in 60 to 90 days shovel in the ground, and that's where the issue was.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay. Well, if you're not ready to go on this you're not ready to go on it. So I'm not going to say --

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Well, are we ready --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

No, I mean on --

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Could we go out and start digging?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

-- this resolution. You know, I'm not going to say, "No, you have to prepare the RFP in the original time allotted," because then you're going to -- well, first of all, you probably couldn't get it out the door in that time period, and even if you could, it probably wouldn't be a very good project. So I'll support the extension, but I would like to -- I'll certainly be contacting the Congressional delegation as well.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Sure.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Because, you know, we keep hearing about --

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

We hold no infinite wisdom, we did the best we could, but it was the issue of readiness.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Right.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

And that was the reason why and we knew that yours was moving forward, because we do have the project that is the --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

The Fairfield parcel.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Right, exactly.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

But again, they were looking for shovel-in-the-ground ready.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Right. But we are hearing -- you know, there's a lot of things swirling around, but that, you know, there could potentially be a large amount of Federal money for Public Works projects, sewerage and the like, infrastructure, in an effort to revitalize this economy in the coming year. So if that is the case, I just want to make sure that, you know, a community that has worked so hard towards downtown revitalization is included in that pot of money.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

And my experience is you'll see that they'll also have to be coming out with funds for projects later in the year, following years, things like that.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

And we all acknowledge that Rocky Point will be ready at that point. We were concerned about you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Romaine?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'm obviously concerned about Rocky Point, but if I could ask my colleague, Legislator Horsley what the status of the Mastic-Shirley project is. Because I hear a great deal about it, it borders my district and I hear a great deal about it. Where is that in the aegis of the world?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

The Mastic-Shirley was basically in the same situation that Rocky Point was in in that it was not ready to go, but we recognize that as one of the major projects which we have to look at. One of the projects we did call for was to expand the Patchogue sewer Plant.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

To East Patchogue.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

To East Patchogue, but also expand it even larger than originally designed to. So we're looking for five million gallons per day, this way we could expand even further along the south shore; whether that gets to the Mastics, I'm not sure.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

No, it won't get there, too far.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

But probably not, it's probably too much for that one. But that's -- but we're -- that was one of the projects that we're more ready to go.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

The reason I raise Mastic, and I'll end on this, is obviously there was a question of installing dry sewer lines with the reconstruction of Montauk Highway. There was also a question of where do we locate the sewage treatment plant. But if we look a little north of Montauk Highway, if we go towards the Expressway and William Floyd Parkway, we have what I consider the failure of sewer policy in Suffolk County.

We have an industrial park which is in my Legislative District, okay, which will be building a sewage treatment plant. About a half of mile or so down the road in Kate Browning's district, we have a college, Dowling College, that will eventually have to build a sewage treatment plant for their dorms. And if we go a little north on the other side of the Expressway, we have Mr. Breslin who is preparing to build a mall who will have to build a sewage treatment plant; this is all within a two-mile radius. The fact that this County government allows a proliferation, now it is, what is it, eighty-seven hundred, 87 sewage -- individual sewage treatment plants in this County? It's just folly. The County should step in, in that instance, and build a sewage treatment plant and assess Breslin, assess the members of the Industrial Park and the college and then look to expand it to the surrounding residential area, which most of which are on small lots, not large lots, which may have some benefit to that residential area. For us to insist that three private individual groups build three separate sewage treatment plants within two miles of one another to me is absolute folly. I've said what I'm going to say. Thank you.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Just in answer to that, centralized sewerage is absolutely the way to go. Ed, we speak the same language. That will be addressed in the RFP when the consultant comes up with the overall plan of where we're going as a system.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

And you should testify at that, you should talk to these consultants. Because I agree. I mean, I even looked at --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

(Inaudible)

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

I even looked at the property which you're talking about now, I'm getting there.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

So let's all work together on this. It's not an easy issue.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2161 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

And just to add a few things. We were talking about the stimulus package, just for everybody -- the

other Legislators on the committee. I've had some conversations -- and Gil, if you've heard differently -- that my understanding of the stimulus package, if it happens, is there will be one chunk of money Federally -- that goes out to the Federal Government that will be for 60 to 90 days. But the way it was explained to me is that it's not going to be the Congressional Delegation being able to say, "We want 10 million here, 15 million here," they're going to basically apportion it throughout New York -- like New York State will get a percentage based on a formula and that money will go. So that's why any projects that are on the TIP, the Transportation --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Improvement Program, yeah.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

-- Improvement Plan are the ones that will go. And I think the Governor said the other day, the number one project is Route 112, that's number one on New York State. So if New York State gets money, they just start going to the TIP and what's on there now.

Waste water. The good news is New York State gets the highest percentage of waste water funds out of any State if they approve some money specifically for waste water. I think we get about 11% of whatever nationally is approved, so that's good news for Suffolk County in that respect.

And then there will be a second part of the stimulus package which will be later on which is for governments and municipalities to say, "These are our dreams." Like we'd love to do -- we'd love to spend \$30 million on -- well, not 30, \$400 million on a sewage plant or whatever going it's going to be and that's going to be the dream part of it. So it's going to be a little different in the sense that we won't be able to say, "Well, our number one priority is X dollars for this and X dollars for that." So I think -- you know, I know you guys have been working and we've been in touch with DPW, you guys have been working with the Congressional Delegation because I know they have information.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

But I think most of the influence is really with the State and whatever is on the TIP and prioritized.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I mean, they're the easy-reaching fruit.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Yeah.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I mean, because they have, especially their Highway Program follows the Federal Highway Program, the way they establish their documents. So really, a lot of this whole appropriation, how they actually get the money to the State and allow the State to disperse it is going to be a big question that really hasn't been resolved yet.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

And from what I'm hearing is that the President-Elect and his staff has been working with the Congressional leaders.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Without question.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

And the -- their preference is to not make this -- not make it look like pork, just pass a big number and it goes out about the formula, so.

All right, with that we'll move to ***2167-08 - Authorizing transfer of four (4) surplus County computers, four (4) surplus County monitors, four (4) surplus County keyboards, four (4) surplus County mice and two (2) surplus County printers to Tri-Community Youth Agency of Huntington Station (Cooper).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Stern. I will second it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2167 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

We have to do something a little unusual for the next ones, we have to approve the findings and determinations before we appropriate the funds. So I'm going to make a motion to take IR 2185, IR 2186, IR 2187 and IR 2188 out of order for the purposes of passing those before we appropriate the money.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Second; motion and seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? All right, all those resolutions are now before us.

***IR 2185-08 - A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improve facilities for Sewer District No. 7 - Medford (CP 8119) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Stern. Seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2186-08 - A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improve facilities for Sewer District No. 14 - Parkland (CP 8118) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Stern. Seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2186 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2187-08 - A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improve facilities for Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (sludge) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Stern. Seconded by Legislator Losquadro.

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2187 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2188-08 - A resolution making certain findings and determinations in relation to the increase and improve facilities for Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (CP 8170) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**  
Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

Okay, we can now go back to ***IR 2182-08 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of serial bonds for improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (CP 8170) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2182 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2183-08 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of serial bonds for improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (CP 8180) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2183 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2184-08 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of serial bonds for improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 7 - Medford (CP 8119) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2184 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

Go back to ***IR 2189-08 - Amending the 2008 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds through the issuance of serial bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 14 - Parkland (CP 8118) (County Executive).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).**

***IR 2190-08 - Amending the Adopted 2008 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 477 Water Quality Protection, amending the 2008 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with storm water remediation to Moore's Drain at CR 48, North Road (CP 8241.111) (County Executive).***

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Question.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

On the question -- on the motion. On the question, Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

We're naming individual storm drains?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

What exactly is Moore's Drain?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Moore's Drain is a stream that discharges --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I figured it had to be some sort of drainage.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, it discharges into the Peconic.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

It seemed like an odd name. Okay, thank you.

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Stern -- oh, motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2190 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Would the Clerk please list me as a cosponsor?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

***IR 2197-08 - Authorizing transfer of three (3) surplus County computer systems to Regional Enrichment Agency of Commack and Half Hollow Hills Community and Youth Agency (Reach CYA-Half Hollow Hills) (Stern).***

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2198-08 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to Huntington Freedom Center (D'Amaro).***

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion by Legislator Stern. Second --

**LEG. KENNEDY:**  
Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Seconded by Legislator Kennedy. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2199-08 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to Tri-Community Youth Agency "CAST" Program (D'Amaro).***

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2199 is approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).***

***IR 2200-08 - Authorizing transfer of three (3) surplus County computer systems to Nassau-Suffolk Services for Autism, Inc. (Stern).***

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved (VOTE: 7-0-0-0).*** Renee, could you please list me on that bill, too, please.

***IR 2204-08 - Authorizing transfer of surplus County computers systems and hardware to Boy Scout Troop 242, Calverton (Romaine).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator Stern.

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***IR 2204 is approved***  
***(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)***.

Having no more business, we stand adjourned.

***(\*The meeting was adjourned at 3:51 P.M. \*)***

***{ } - Denotes Spelled Phonetically***