

**PUBLIC WORKS
AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

of the

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

A regular meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday April 21, 2009.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Brian Beedenbender - Chairman
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chairman
Legislator Wayne Horsley
Legislator Daniel Losquadro
Legislator Edward Romaine

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Presiding Officer Lindsay
George Nolan- Counsel to the Legislature
Kevin Duffy - Budget Review Office
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - DPW
Tom Laguardi - Chief Deputy Commissioner - DPW
Bob Shinnick - Department of Public Works
Kaitlyn Boyd - Aide to Chairman Beedenbender
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk - SC Legislature
Ben Zwirn - Deputy County Executive
Gail Lolis - County Attorney's Office
Debra Alloncius - AME
Russell Barnett - Town of Islip - Environmental Waterways
Jack O'Loughlin - Bay Gas
Mark Goldsmith - Bay Gas
F. Jeanne Anzalone, Suffolk County Resident
Barbara LaMonica - South Shore Press
Michael Engelmann.
All Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer and Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:05 P.M.)

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Everyone please rise for the Pledge led by Legislator Stern.

SALUTATION

Okay. Thank you, everybody. I don't have any cards. Is there anybody in the audience that wishes to address us? Okay. Seeing none, we'll move directly to the presentations. First we're going to have Russ Barnett from the Town of Smithtown, Environmental Waterways and Greater Long Island Clean Cities Coalition give us a presentation.

Oh, we have a card. Okay. Great. Just bear with us a moment, Mr. Barnett, while we do the card.

MR. BARNETT:

Certainly.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Could Jeanne Anzalone, Jeanne, just come up to the podium, please. I think it might say "F. Jeanne", but I can read the Jeanne.

MS. ANZALONE:

Good afternoon. Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak to everyone in the room. I'm Jeanne Anzalone from Oakdale, New York. I am here again to ask everyone in this room to think and to do and let's try to get Sunday transportation for the SCAT service and for the public bus service. And I will tell you, my husband is long-term in Infinity Nursing Home, and I've had the wonderful opportunity to take him into my home on SCAT bus at 311 Ockers Drive.

This is a blessing. This has changed my husband's life, my life and my family. I will do everything to help not alone the SCAT service on Sunday, to improve our regular Suffolk County bus service. The younger people that are on disability and/or cannot afford a car need this. I thank you very much for this opportunity. And again, I thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Thank you, ma'am. Okay. Is there anybody else that wishes to address the committee? Okay. While we are still loading up the presentation -- oh, here we go. Go ahead, Mr. Barnett.

MR. BARNETT:

My name is Russ Barnett. I'm the Town of Smithtown's Environmental Director. I'm also a member of the Executive Board of the Greater Long Island Clean Cities Coalition. That is the United States Department of Energy Organization that exists here on Long Island to provide information about alternative fuel vehicles and to act as a conduit for Federal money to organizations seeking to acquire and deploy alternative fuel vehicles.

I want to share with you today some of the reasons why the Town of Smithtown is moving very aggressively to switch to natural gas as a motor vehicle fuel. Smithtown is the first municipality on the entire East Coast of the United States to mandate the use of compressed natural gas for 100% of its refuse collection fleet. We did this for a number of reasons. Most people who have heard about this initiative think that it was purely an environmental program. And while it is true that over a seven year time period this program will result in our reducing our emissions of nitrogen oxides by 265 tons, and it's also true that over that same seven year time period that we will reduce our emissions of fine diesel particulate matter by 15 tons and that we've reduced our carbon footprint by a full 20%, the truth of the matter is that that program started for financial reasons. We were looking to save money.

Refuse collection in the Town of Smithtown is not some small operation where we're simply

experimenting with alternative fuels. We provide garbage collection services over 56 square miles to 116,000 residents. Most of the town, as you know, is developed as single-family homes. That means that this alternative fueled garbage fleet is making up to 36,000 stops per day. All homes receive garbage collection services from private haulers under contract to the Town. Like most of Long Island, residents receive regular garbage collection twice a week, recyclables pick up once a week, and a call-in service to schedule the pick up of bulk items.

The town historically was divided into 12 roughly equal contract bid areas with the work being awarded for five year time periods to the bidder with the lowest price for each individual bid area. Emphasizing low cost under past contracts, we didn't specify fuel type or even maximum age for the equipment to be used. We got low prices, and we got very old diesel trucks. This is actually one of the contract fleet of diesel trucks that was operating in the Town of Smithtown in 2006. The trucks averaged 15 years old with some of them 25 years old.

Back in 2005, we were in the fourth year of a five year collection contract. It was also the start of a major run up in the price of diesel fuel. When that contract had been up for bidding in July of 2001, the local price of diesel fuel here in Suffolk County was \$1.30 per gallon. In the Fall of 2005, it passed \$3 per gallon. The contract had no fuel escalator clause, and some of the contract haulers threatened to walk off the job and leave the garbage in the streets. We recognized that we had a problem. We needed to solicit bids during 2006 for a new contract to start work in 2007. And the price of diesel fuel was not only up, it had become unpredictable.

The haulers told us to expect huge increases not only to cover the increased cost of the fuel, but to account for future uncertainty for future diesel prices. Looking for a solution, we found natural gas. This report, *Green in Garbage Trucks*, reported on the results of survey work of organizations using natural gas refuse collection vehicles on the west coast to meet air emission requirements.

Uniformly, the people operating the equipment reported high levels of satisfaction with both the performance and the reliability of this natural gas fueled equipment. The trucks and fueling equipment were not experimental. They were proven with over a thousand vehicles at that time back in 2005 already on the road for a number of years. Multiple manufacturers supported the competitive commercial marketplace.

Further research showed natural gas to be cleaner burning than petroleum diesel with significant reductions in the emission of nitrogen oxides and diesel particulates possible. We also learned that the vast majority of natural gas available to us was from North American sources. Over 98% of the natural gas is from either the United States or Canada, as opposed to the petroleum supplies available to us coming mostly from overseas sources.

We are very interested in the environmental benefits, the energy security benefits and the proven technology of using natural gas as a motor vehicle fuel, but those things alone weren't enough. We were looking at alternative fuels to avoid the escalating costs of petroleum diesel and to avoid the financial risk associated with future diesel prices.

We needed fuel prices not just comparable to diesel but cheaper to offset the cost of buying new equipment, and we wanted long-term price guarantees. It was a pretty tall order, but we got them. We negotiated a seven year contract whereby Clean Energy of Seal Beach, California, would build a fueling station at no cost to the town and provide fuel to the municipality and its contractors at fixed prices for seven years. This was the financial basis for our fleet conversion.

We went out for bids for new refuse collection contracts specifying that only bidders utilizing dedicated compressed natural gas fueled refuse trucks would be considered. We ultimately received more bids on this unique first-time contract than we've ever received before on a traditional diesel fuel based contract. Uniformly, the bidders told us that the attraction was quite simply avoiding what they regarded to be unpredictable diesel prices over the coming years.

When our bids were opened, they were competitive enough to result in four different haulers winning portions of our town. Carters in the Town of Smithtown are now operating dedicated CNG fueled refuse trucks. Both AutoCar and Crane Carrier provided trucks for this project in a competitive bidding process. They all use the Cummins Westport LGas Plus Engine. Financially, we've estimated that the first year we saved \$3.34 per home compared to diesel. The incremental cost of our fleet, the cost over a diesel fleet, is \$7.38 per home per year. This cost is, however, offset by a savings in the cost of fuel. That means that our residents are actually saving money while having trucks that are not only cleaner and quieter than diesel trucks, but use a North American fuel that's available at long-term fixed prices. We believe that our savings over the life of our contract will exceed \$2 million.

In sum, what we've done is to use our municipal contracting process to call into creation privately owned CNG fueled refuse collection fleets and the infrastructure to fuel them. The ability to create that demand was the basis of our negotiation with the firm of Clean Energy. The negotiation resulted in their agreeing to build at their expense the largest public access CNG vehicle fueling station on the East Coast right here in Hauppauge behind the New York State Office Building.

There are, of course, other ways to make a switch to natural gas vehicles. Some situations might involve the purchase of vehicles rather than a contract fleet like our refuse truck program. The good news is that there are financial incentives available and multiple major manufacturers of natural gas vehicles creating a competitive marketplace. There are tax credits available to reduce acquisition costs. The tax credits vary with the size and weight of the vehicle, and at the present time, run up to \$32,000 per vehicle. While tax credits normally benefit those who have a tax bill to pay, in this case, they can benefit a municipality such as Suffolk County.

If you are a private party and you have a tax liability, you buy these vehicles, you get a tax credit. If you're a municipality, you don't have a tax liability. If you as a municipality buy these vehicles, however, the law allows the seller of the vehicle to take the tax credit and to notify the buyer of that tax credit. The municipality can benefit from the tax credit available to the seller in different ways. The first is simply that the seller can offer a lower price for the vehicle in the anticipation of his receiving a tax credit.

A second and more reliable way for a municipality to benefit from the tax credit is through the bid solicitation process. If you draw your bid in such a way as to create a competitive situation, identify the tax credit issue and include in the bid provision for bidders to return some or all of the tax credit at their option to the municipality as a rebate, and then set a standard for awarding the bid on the basis of the lowest post rebate cost, most bidders will rebate the bulk, if not all, of the tax credit to the municipality. We, in fact, have done this.

In some cases there are also grants, such as congestion mitigation and air quality funds available to switch to natural gas vehicles. We've actually used both the grant funding and the tax credit rebates to expand our natural gas vehicle program far beyond our contract refuse truck program. We're in the process of converting our entire municipally owned fleet from gasoline and diesel fuel to natural gas.

Using competitive bidding, we've bought a new natural gas fueled Elgin Broom Bear Street Sweeper, we've acquired two new CNG fueled six-wheel Sterling Acterra trucks fitted out as dump trucks and snowplows, and we've just awarded bids for two new CNG fueled Freightliner M-2s; one fitted out as a dump truck and one as a flatbed. We use all of them as snowplows in the winter. And, in fact, had them plowing snow this winter just ended.

We've also been able to actually convert some of our existing diesel trucks to run on natural gas instead. We have a number of International brand trucks that use the DT 466 Diesel Engine. Working with the firm of Emission Solution, Inc., of Texas, we've been able to replace those existing diesel engines with brand new natural gas engines and fuel systems, and we've been able to do that at virtually no cost to the Town of Smithtown because of the various Federal programs that are

available to fund this type of conversion.

The exciting thing with this type of conversion is that it greatly reduces the upfront cost of getting some natural gas vehicles into service. We're also about to take delivery of a number of E-350 Ford Vans and Ford F-250 pickup trucks that will run exclusively on natural gas. That's through a firm known as BAF Technologies. Between grant money and tax credits, these vehicles are costing the Town of Smithtown less than we would have to pay for their gasoline counterparts on the New York State contract.

And lastly, we're fielding a fleet of general purpose Honda Civic GX natural gas powered sedans. These cars are built here in the United States in the Midwest and billed as the cleanest production cars on Earth. Our experience indicates that it is really possible to field natural gas fueled vehicles and that it can be done by a municipality at relatively low or even no cost.

Even if fueling -- fielding natural gas fueled vehicles requires the construction of new fueling facilities, there are multiple options available. If you're launching a sufficiently large fleet all at once, the fuel demand might be enough for a third party to build the fueling station as their own business investment like Clean Energy did in our refuse truck case. If you won't need enough fuel to justify such a third-party investment, you can build your own station. There are multiple options; small, inexpensive overnight fueling appliances exist to fuel single vehicles, overnight or time-filled units exist for small to large fleets, you can combine such small overnight fueling operations with some small fast-fill capacity that you can put vehicles right back on the road, and you can build fast-fill facilities that are capable of fueling small to even very large fleets with no more time than it takes to fuel a diesel vehicle or a gasoline fleet.

If you're interested in natural gas vehicles, there are multiple options for almost every situation. I believe that the growing public interest in alternative fuels will lead a lot of organizations to natural gas. Compared to petroleum, diesel fuel and gasoline, natural gas is cleaner, it's cheaper, it's available from more secure North American sources, and it's available at long-term fixed prices. When you add to those benefits that natural gas vehicle technology has been around for a number of years with equipment already commercially available from multiple major manufacturers in a competitive commercial marketplace, natural gas is not only attractive, it's a viable alternative fuel and it's viable right now.

This is my contact information. If following this session today I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me. As I mentioned earlier, in addition to being the Town of Smithtown Environmental Director, I'm also a member of the Executive Board of the Greater Long Island Clean Cities Coalition. We are the United States Department of Energy Local Organization that is working to funnel State money -- Federal money, excuse me, to organizations such as Suffolk County and private parties here in Suffolk County to put alternative fuel vehicles on the road. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Thank you, sir. We have a couple of questions. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Director Barnett, welcome, good to see you today. I was reading a little bit about the organization and the good work that they're doing in bringing together stakeholders and serving as a way for, you know, those interested to come together and to brainstorm and to study best practices. So it's great to learn about the story and how it is going along in Smithtown.

One of the things that I came across was, and I don't know if you had mentioned it already, if you did, I apologize, but that one of the unexpected byproducts to putting these trucks out on the street, not only is it better for fuel efficiency and the environment, but they actually operate much quieter. And there was an interesting story I had come across that there was someone who timed putting out his garbage based on the noisy trucks that came down the street, didn't want to do it the night before, and now misses the garage pickup because he doesn't hear the garbage trucks come

rumbling down the Smithtown streets.

MR. BARNETT:

Yes. That is actually one of our favorite anecdotes about this whole conversion. It is, in fact, the only complaint that we received about our garage truck conversion, was the one complaint, and it was, as you've indicated, an individual who was in the habit of listening for the garbage truck in the morning and running his can out and waiting for it so he could put it away, and he was missing the trucks because they are -- natural gas vehicles are much quieter than diesel vehicles.

LEG. STERN:

I'd be interested to know how -- how the process went. You know, here in Suffolk County we conducted an alternative fuel vehicle study, the date on my copy says the final draft, May, 2006. So that was some time ago already. So familiar with some of the studies and the considerations that have gone into the discussions here, but I'd be interested to know how the process went in the Town of Smithtown; some of the other technologies that you had looked at, how you arrived at the decision to go with CNG, what you saw as some of the pluses and minuses as opposed to other methods like hybrid and biodiesel and electric and all of that. I also have a question about the seven year term; do you -- how you arrived at that time period, does that seem to be standard within the industry in other municipalities or is that something specific to Smithtown?

MR. BARNETT:

Well, that's a number of questions, so as best I can, I'll try to remember them all. First, what had happened was the Town of Smithtown began its own alternative fuel vehicle testing program a number of years before we made the switch to natural gas for the refuse fleet. We had deployed a number of electric vehicles, we had participated with the Chrysler Corporation and LIPA in a test of electric vans, we had some neighborhood electric vehicles, we had used some biodiesel on some stationary equipment.

And very interestingly to us, we had purchased a single vehicle from General Motors which was a dual-fueled vehicle, which could run on either gasoline or compressed natural gas. That vehicle became a test bed for us, and it was by design purchased for that reason, having a vehicle that would run -- the same vehicle that would run on both fuels would allow us to test the performance of the vehicle, not have to worry about different gear ratios or different specs in the vehicle. Using that vehicle, we satisfied ourselves that the natural gas as a fuel would perform adequately as compared to gasoline in that instance.

When we came to the issue of the garage truck conversion, I will tell you that at the time that we were making the decision, we had a number of guiding principles. Probably the first guiding principle was that "thou shalt pick up the garbage." Garbage collection, as you well know, is a very basic municipal service and we had made a decision that while we wanted to research alternative fuels for that operation primarily for financial reasons, we did not want to employ a technology or try to employ a technology that had a short track record. We wanted to make sure that if we made a switch in the fuels that there would be an extremely low if, in fact, no risk to the garbage collection schedule. We did not wish to jeopardize our refuse collection operation with brand new experimental or perhaps untried technology.

And at the time that we were making that switch back in 2006, there were no alternatives to diesel other than natural gas for a vehicle in that class that had an extensive track record. There were some hybrid trash truck trial periods going on, but nothing that had really been out in the commercial marketplace for an extended period other than natural gas.

Since that time, of course, there are some hybrids out there, diesel electric hybrids. There's also diesel hydraulic hybrids, and they seem to be coming along as well. In fact, I would mention at this point that GLIC, as a US Department of Energy funded organization, is fuel neutral. The goal of GLIC is to promote non-petroleum derived fuels, and we do that without basically pushing one or the other.

Putting back my Smithtown hat for a moment, if I may use that cliché, we chose natural gas because it had a longer track record than the other things that we were looking at. We could go to that report, which I included in my presentation, that Green in Garbage Truck Report, as we could find many organizations that used natural gas fueled refuse trucks. There is contact information in there, and we, in fact, contacted many of the operators of those trucks. I personally went to the campus of Harvard University where they were operating a single truck because of the noise benefits over diesel to test drive the truck, to talk to the operator, to talk to the mechanics and to basically satisfy ourselves that the technology was at a point that it could be relied upon for such a basic municipal operation as trash collection. I'm sure I've neglected one or two of your questions, though.

LEG. STERN:

Well, I didn't want to get cut off by the Chairman so I asked one question with seven subparts. I was interested in how you came about arriving at the seven year term.

MR. BARNETT:

The seven year term does vary with what has traditionally been practiced for the Town of Smithtown and many other communities here on Long Island. The terms historically had been five years for trash collection contracts. We chose seven in this case because the Town of Smithtown had historically not required brand new equipment to be purchased for the delivery of services under such a contract. This was going to be first time that people had to buy new equipment. We spoke to the manufacturers of the equipment. We found that they would give extended warranties on the equipment out to seven years, so we thought we would extend our contract period to seven years for the reason that vendors who had no experience locally with compressed natural gas would get themselves their extended warranties for the seven years, satisfy themselves as to the reliability, and they would be able to amortize the capital investment in the trucks over the seven years, and thus keep our rates to our residents lower than if we had done five years and they tried to pay for the trucks in five.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Good afternoon, Mr. Barnett. It's good seeing you. Got a couple of quick questions, and I'm going to bounce off of one of Legislator Stern's questions first just simply because it works. The seven year contract. Many people have told me that if there is a national shift to compressed natural gas for vehicles, that we will be running into the same problems that oil has, is that it's supply and demand; you are not going to have enough natural gas to supply the United States' energy needs. Do you feel that for the long run that if we all start jumping on the band wagon, which I'm hoping we do, because I think it's good stuff, that there's going to be enough supply to -- so that we maintain the prices at a relatively lower amount than would be with -- with oil?

MR. BARNETT:

Well, let me start by saying that the price advantage that we have found for natural gas is anywhere from 50 cents to a dollar per diesel gallon equivalent in favor of natural gas. Natural gas is commonly sold for a motor vehicle fuel applications in either gasoline gallon equivalents or diesel gallon equivalents. Basically, it's the same amount of thermal energy as you would get from burning a gallon of diesel or burning a gallon of gasoline. So there is a price advantage for natural gas now.

When we looked into this, we found that there are a number of things that affect the supply of natural gas. There have been some major advances in technology in natural gas recovery wells, enabling the industry to recover natural gas from Shell, which has not previously or historically been possible or as effective, which has greatly increased the supply and the forecasted supply of natural gas. There have been some major new fields that are coming online, including one here in New York State.

And very interesting to me as a professional environmental manager is that natural gas is composed primarily of methane, and methane is one of those very interesting simple chemicals. In another

role that I have for the Town of Smithtown, I manage the town's closed inactive landfills. And I will tell you that a major portion of the effort that we have to expend in the management of those closed landfills is the control of the methane that is generated by accident from those landfills. Unlike cellulosic ethanol, which is waiting for a scientific breakthrough, you can make methane now. In fact, it's almost hard not to make methane. All you have to do is take organic matter and deprive it of oxygen and you produce methane.

So natural gas as a motor vehicle fuel does offer the prospect of being a renewable fuel; that we could take things such as sewage sludge from our sewage treatment plants, we could take solid waste, all you need is an anaerobic digester and you can produce methane. It's a very simple process to run and control. And then you can use that as a vehicle fuel. And all of the equipment, whether it be the trucks themselves or the pumping equipment or the storage cylinders, can be used for that generated, that bio methane. So we were not convinced that there was any problem long-term with supply and using methane or natural gas as a motor vehicle fuel.

LEG. HORSLEY:

So you think that we're going to be discovering new ways of capturing methane that's going to give us enough supply that we don't choke ourselves on our own good efforts?

MR. BARNETT:

Absolutely. In fact, there is some interesting work being done -- to go a little further afield, there is some very interesting work being done at Rutgers University. There's something called the Arrow Bio Process, which is being advocated as a new solid waste management alternative where basically the solid waste, rather than going to a waste-to-energy plant or a landfill, goes to anaerobic digester to produce methane to be used as a motor vehicle fuel to fuel the refuse collection trucks to bring the material to the digester and producing a compost out of the solid.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah. We almost had one company that was going to do that on Long Island, but apparently they've gone belly up, but we -- we like the concept. That's interesting. Just a quick question, if I may, Brian.

As you know, the region is going to be putting in a stimulus application for alternative fuel gas stations. I had a question on that, because you seem to be the guru on these things, and I applaud you for that, that's good stuff. By the way, I guess you've heard that the County is going to be putting another million into that application, which is -- I know you are involved with clean cities, we were pleased to see that. And I applaud the gang in the back who were part of that decision making.

Let me ask you, the -- we're looking at possibly one, two fuel centers on the East and the West End of Suffolk County, that's what Suffolk is interested in. Do you see any problems? What do you see as the future of having these centers being used not only for municipalities but for -- but for the general public themselves? If it's municipally purchased or if municipally created, these stations, does that cause problem for use -- usage of the public legally? And you seem to know a little bit about this issue, so I was -- I wanted to throw it out to you today.

MR. BARNETT:

Well, in Smithtown's case, we've actually got two things going on with our stations. The first station, which is here behind the New York State Office Building, was actually a public-private partnership involving two public entities. We worked with the New York State OGS, and we worked with the private firm of Clean Energy and, of course, the Town of Smithtown being the third party. That station was built on state-owned land to serve our refuse fleet and is open to the public. Private firms, anyone who wishes -- a private party, who might wish to buy a natural gas vehicle, can fuel there and open an account there.

We are currently in the process right now in the Town the Smithtown, we have an RFP out, which is

returnable in another week or two for a third party private firm to build a public access CNG vehicle fueling station at our recycling center in Kings Park. We've partnered, again, with another private entity, the Town of Smithtown and the Town of Huntington are partners in this effort; the Town of Huntington wishes to convert its refuse fleet like the Town of Smithtown has converted its. Huntington, wishing to do that, they didn't have a convenient location in their possession for the creation of a station, we did, because our recycling center is right next to the Waste-To-Energy Plant. So we've partnered with them.

Their refuse fleet will provide the future fuel sales of sufficient magnitude to justify the third party investment in building a station with no capital investment from either the Town of Smithtown or the Town of Huntington. That private party will have the right to sell fuel to any entity that wishes to go to that station.

Now, we had had our proposal reviewed by our Town Attorney's Office, which found no problem with that. I understand from previous discussions that there may be some other consideration that the County has with regard to County funds being used for the construction of such a station. And unfortunately, I can't speak to those specific County issues.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I was curious what you felt about that issue; if you thought it was realistic or something we can get around.

MR. BARNETT:

There was no obstacle for the Town of Smithtown, and apparently, there was no obstacle for the State of New York at the OGS site right here in Hauppauge.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Thank you. I'll be brief because most of my questions were asked. You guys did a good job picking through the, you know, the nuances of this. Just one or two questions. I know we had discussed it a little bit -- briefly with some of our DPW folks, but what sort of experience, and since you can talk to real world experience, have you had in terms of range, especially with your over-the-road trucks with the plowing; what sort of capacity and what sort of range are you looking at with those vehicles?

MR. BARNETT:

Well, the thing with natural gas as a motor vehicle fuel that is really at the heart of that issue, is that if you look at gasoline or diesel fuel as simply an energy component, there's a relatively rich or dense energy material. You need 3.7 times the amount of space to store the same amount of natural gas energy as you do for a comparable amount of energy as diesel fuel. In other words, I mean, just to use funny numbers to make the point, if you have three cubic feet of space necessary -- devoted to diesel fuel, you'll need 3.7 times that amount of space in natural gas cylinders to hold the same amount of energy and to provide you with the same amount of range.

So natural gas vehicles do sometimes, but not always, sometimes have a lesser total range and a more frequent filling requirement than their diesel counterparts. In fact, those natural gas Honda Civics that I had shown before, they're even utilizing more space than Honda devotes for gasoline storage. They have a range of about 240 miles. But the Honda Civic gasoline version has a range of over 300.

Now, getting to a DPW-type of application, some of the trucks that we have in the Town of

Smithtown; our six-wheeled plows, we generally have 50 diesel gallons on such a truck. On the snowplows that we have now fielded, we have, depending upon the manufacturer, either 54 or 56 diesel gallon equivalents on those vehicles. Now, that fuel takes up more space than their diesel counterparts take up, but it was possible --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Do you do that in a care-pack configuration?

MR. BARNETT:

You can do it in a number of ways. You can put it in a cabinet. You can stretch the frame 18 inches, and you can put a fuel stack between the cab and the body. And, in fact, you can see that on some of our trash trucks.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Yes, I saw that.

MR. BARNETT:

That's one way you can do it. You can also put cylinders along the frame rails. There's usually, if look under such a truck, six-wheel plow, there's a good bit of real estate under there where you can put cylinders under there and you can get up 54, 56 diesel gallon equivalents.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

But hanging those in a saddle-type configuration outside the frame rails would leave them more vulnerable being at other vehicle impact heights.

MR. BARNETT:

No. What you do is -- you don't -- you generally put them inboard underneath.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Put them inboard on the frame rails. That's what I thought. But based on what you said underneath there, I thought you were talking about forward of the rear wheels and the outboard where they usually hang a diesel saddle.

MR. BARNETT:

You try not to put them in an exposed location.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Right. So you're covering, what is it, 56 square miles approximately?

MR. BARNETT:

Yes.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

So, I mean, I know we're going around, and I hate to bore everyone else here with the technical stuff that I like, but what range are you experiencing with that 50 some odd gallon configuration that you were talking about.

MR. BARNETT:

Well, to be blunt, I'd defer that really to our Highway Superintendent who is involved more with the day to day operation of those highway trucks. I can speak to the trash trucks, and I can tell you that in the trash truck application, what we have done with the trash trucks is we have depending upon which one -- we actually have three different trash truck configurations, I showed you two of them, there is a third -- in those trash truck configurations, we run anywhere from 56 to 76 diesel gallon equivalents on the truck. And on the one trash truck configuration, we have the capacity to go up to 92 diesel gallon equivalents. On those trucks, not only have we not suffered a range

problem, they got greater range than the diesel trucks that they replaced.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Oh, great. Okay. I mean, we can extrapolate from that as to how it would translate into other applications, so that's perfect. Thank you.

MR. BARNETT:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Thank you, sir. That was very informative, and we appreciate you taking the time to share that with us. And if I had to guess, I would say you'll probably hear from some of us relatively shortly.

The next item on the agenda we have Mr. O'Loughlin, Jack O'Loughlin from Bay Gas. If you could come up and talk to us a little bit about propane. Thank you, sir. If I pronounced your last name incorrectly I apologize. Whenever you are ready.

MR. O'LOUGHLIN:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I represent Bay Gas Service. We're located in Shirley on the corner of William Floyd Parkway and Sunrise Highway. This is my co-representative Mark Goldsmith. We both work on propane gas systems for our company and hopefully for the future.

Propane gas has always gotten a bad rap as far as I'm concerned. People think about propane gas as we heat our homes with it, that's what we use it for. We make hot water with it. We have barbecues, the famous barbecue for propane gas. We heat swimming pools. So it's a very versatile product.

Lately, I would say about three years ago, General Motors Corporation came out with a propane fueled truck, an 8.1 liter engine that was fueled with liquid propane. Now prior to this, I would say 50-60 years ago, all propane vehicles ran on vapor, what they call vapor, which is considered the same type of system as natural gas, because it burns a vapor.

Three or four years ago, when General Motors came out with their liquid propane truck, I knew that there was going to be a wide opening beginning of a new career and a new system of trucking. Propane gas burns 99.6% efficient. It's only four decimal points it's off. So it's considered a nontoxic product. What's in this clean fuel, this air mist spray and in five other items in your home, are nontoxic as well and they use propane to propel liquid; facial applications, foot power, stuff like that. So what propane has got the stigma of is a flammable liquid. Well, it's supposed to be flammable because it burns.

So what we did was went out and purchased a couple of General Motors vehicles. I run 12 33,000 pound vehicles every day, delivering to 30,000 customers on Long Island, and every day those trucks go. And since the day we bought them, we haven't one iota of a problem. How it works is we put liquid propane into a tank, which incidentally is 90% usable, where another product is only 20% percent usable, being natural gas. It doesn't have the capacity that propane has.

Propane runs under 140 pounds of pressure, natural gas runs under 1200 pounds of pressure. So when we fill our tanks, we can fill them in a matter of minutes. Propane is sold on the open market. It's a combination of natural gas and fuel oil. And like I say, it's considered a nontoxic product, that's why they can put it in applications like this.

So right now, our trucks run on liquid propane gas. And we're the only company on Long Island that's doing it. However, everybody is vying for that one thing, that alternative fuel vehicle that's going to answer it all. Well, propane on a vapor system has been around for 50 years. Just recently it came out with -- on liquid propane. Now we have Jack Roush -- I don't know if you people are familiar with Jack Roush -- he's NASCAR race car owner, operator and runs -- builds race engines all

the time. Jack Roush has signed up with Ford Motor Company, and they just put out a 150 Ford pickup truck that got into the 250, the 350 Ford, and now they're going to extend it further and they're going to keep going up the ladder, because every engine has to be tested for 120,000 miles before it's released. So the cost factor is large in that application.

But we work with Jack Roush because we know the propane end of it. So every couple of months we're back out in Michigan doing what we can to make these trucks run better. I presently now have a couple of Ford 150 pickup trucks. I have 12 33,000 gallon truck bobtails that run with no problem at all. All gas is acquired. They don't make the noise that diesel fuel makes. There hasn't been anybody that's come along with a diesel engine to stop the tractor trailers that are on the Long Island Expressway, because they just don't have the torque.

But the bottom line is everybody is wheeling and dealing to see if they can be the vehicle that's going to give the answer to the emissions control problem. So I drove here in one of the trucks, in one of the pickup trucks that we use outside. The best thing about the pickup truck is that we get a range of 500 miles on a tank of fuel. A tank of fuel that holds 52 gallons, we'll get a 500 mile range, because we get 90% usable of gasoline. Natural gas gets 20% usable of gasoline.

Propane is a viable commodity because it's made in the refineries. If you go down the Jersey Turnpike, you'll see them burning it off on the top. So propane is relatively low priced. The Federal Government has come up with a plan that they give us back 50 cents a gallon. So for everybody that uses propane, they'll give you back -- on a \$10,000 conversion, they'll give you \$8500 back. On a \$1.50 gallon for propane, they'll give you 50 cents a gallon back. So a guy that's riding around on Long Island with a 33,000 pound truck delivering for a \$1 a gallon is pretty cheap as far as I'm concerned. And I send my trucks every day through Montauk, East Hampton, etcetera, etcetera. I don't have a mileage problem.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

I want to thank you folks for entertaining us and allowing us to make our presentation. My name is Mark Goldsmith. I have joined the company of Bay Gas Services particularly in special projects and our clean fuel initiative. I formally was a CEO of a technology company building state-of-the-art high-tech new type of engines to run on alternatives fuels, natural gas included, propane, biodiesel, gasoline, diesel fuel. And currently, I am on the Propane Education and Research Council representing -- spending time on the Energy Fuel Advisory Committee. So I am -- I've spent many years involved in building engines and -- specifically to run on alternative fuels.

As we have stated, propane is a fuel that carries with it many misconceptions. And the fear in many people's minds is the fact that it is prone to explosions and serious fires. That, by the way, is the case with just about any type of motor fuel that's efficient today. And we believe, and the statistics will bear it out prepared by the NFPA and the National Propane Gas Association, that reflect the incidents of serious harm and damage by use of propane to be extremely small.

As a fuel for vehicles, propane is approximately 80 to 90% efficient by comparison to gasoline and diesel fuel. So that means that a vehicle running on liquid propane will pretty much duplicate the performance levels that have been attained by vehicles running on conventional fuels such as gasoline and diesel fuel.

And I commend Mr. Russell (sic), I believe, for his presentation on natural gas and alternative fuel. And by no means are we trying to pick on his presentation. We do know that propane delivers about two and a half to three times the power that compressed natural gas can deliver. We also believe that the infrastructure cost, the cost that a consumer will spend, will be considerably small by comparison. The fueling stations are relatively uncomplicated and can be installed at little to no cost to the consumer depending on consumption.

And by the way, I have various bits of information. Forgive us, we did not bring a Power Point demonstration, but I do have some information that I will circulate after our presentation. We have

experienced at Bay Gas over the last three and half years, an accumulation of about 300 to 400,000 thousand miles of over-the-road use with our liquid propane engines. And to make a distinction, the systems that we are using are a direct injection system. It's liquid fuel that goes from the tank right into the cylinder head, which is different from the prior systems that have been around for 20-30 years, which are combinations and mostly employing a vaporization process before the fuel enters the combustion chamber. So by using the liquid propane injection system, the efficiencies that we achieve are matching that of conventional fuels, as I said before.

The most significant aspects that we believe are that, number one, the range -- and I heard the question presented earlier -- that basically with a 65 gallon tank that we suggest the user amounts -- and it could be as little as 25 gallons to 65 or even higher -- the range on average usage of the vehicle should be somewhere between 300 to 500 miles depending on the weight of the vehicle and the particular use and size of the tank.

We have a F150 Pickup truck, which is certainly a light duty truck as well as the bulk delivery trucks that we use which haul about 33,000 pounds. And those are what we consider medium duty trucks. So the range that we find important for us, because any of our trucks are making the normal delivery cycle in one day could travel two to 300 miles, and we have never had an incident where we had run out of fuel.

(The following was transcribed by Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary)

We believe that the consumers are best served by installing on their own premises a refueling station, which includes a storage tank and a pump. And it's most similar to any pump that we use that we pull up to any gas station filling our own automobiles. It works very much the same way. So it's not what we consider an elaborate nor a particularly expensive installation. It is something that the government will subsidize as well. They have, through the Federal Government and through certain programs in New York State there are subsidies available for the conversions to the vehicles themselves to liquid propane. That means that if you were to buy a conventionally powered vehicle versus a propane powered vehicle, the incremental increase in price between the two would be subsidized just as if you would make the conversion from an existing gasoline engine to a new propane system. And depending on the weight of the vehicle, the subsidy is between 50 and 80 percent. The eighty percent would be for the heavier duty vehicles.

Further, we know that liquid propane -- propane itself is an alternative fuel and also the consumer will receive a 50 cent per gallon credit back from the Federal Government. And that's irrespective of any tax situation. That's a direct 50 cent credit to the consumer. And what we find that particularly in municipal -- in a municipal environment where the municipality may not be afforded the opportunity to collect that 50 cents per gallon, we certainly are still able to perfect that on our end and we certainly would be in a position then to offer or to provide fuel for the consumer then at a much more attractive price.

We find but with today's prices that we are running our vehicles, of course propane is our business, and we run our vehicles on a cost less than one dollar per gallon. And I suggest that, and again, based on today's prices that consumers can expect to probably do the same running their vehicles on a price between a dollar and a dollar fifty per gallon. Again, based on consumption and use.

Propane has been around for many decades. It is maybe one of the most versatile fuels on the face of the earth. Interesting to note that there are more than ten million vehicles on the globe today running on propane, be it vapor or liquid propane injection, and only 500,000, actually less than that, are here in the United States of America. Countries like Italy, Sweden, are very active and have many millions of vehicles running on propane systems, and very efficiently. And the reason I bring that up is because we have not heard of any incident of any particular harm coming to people employing the use of propane in that regard.

So we find that it's a very viable alternative, particularly in this day and age where we're concerned

about the carbon footprint and concerned about emissions. The harmful emissions of propane are that pretty much the equivalent of natural gas. The one major difference is that by the Department of Energy and the Clean Air Act propane is not considered a greenhouse gas. It's interesting to note because it renders 87% less particulate matter than gasoline or diesel fuel. So we feel that it is definitely a fuel of the future with tremendous upside potential.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Just some quick questions. I was shocked by some of the things that you said. In terms of usability, you're telling me that if you fill up a tank with natural gas the usability of that is about 20 percent compared to 90 percent for propane?

MR. GOLDSMITH:

Yes. The characteristics of the two -- natural gas, because when it's fueled into a tank, the tank must remain -- well, let me put it another way. You can only use about 20 to 25 percent of the liquid volume of a tank with compressed natural gas. The differential or the additional space in the tank is there to accommodate the expansion --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Of the gas.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

-- of the gas.

LEG. ROMAINE:

But -- using liquid propane?

MR. GOLDSMITH:

Liquid propane is 80 to 90 percent the liquid volume of a tank and, therefore, in the range that we're focusing on, you then have the ability to get a great deal more driving range with a tank of liquid propane by comparison to natural gas.

LEG. ROMAINE:

The other thing that interests me with any alternative fuel, obviously just like at the turn of the century when we decided to abandon horses and go with cars, was the ability to have fueling stations, gas stations, because without gas stations you couldn't expand. But my understanding is with natural gas we'd have to build fueling stations, where with propane you literally have several hundred dealers of propane throughout Suffolk County that could easily convert their operation to accommodate vehicles. Is this correct?

MR. O'LOUGHLIN:

Well, it comes into the part of -- the technical part of it is that natural gas runs under 1200 pounds of pressure in a tank, 1200 of pressure. Enough said for OSHA. Anyway, propane runs under 140 pounds of pressure. So when you go to get your barbecue filled at a local service station or a tank area, you can go there and it's filled in a matter of minutes and you are on your way. With natural gas you have to fight 1200 pounds of pressure. How they fight that, they use a compressor and the compressor uses electricity and the electricity forces that 1200 of pressure in. So if you have a tank that's half full with natural gas and you have 1200 pounds of pressure, you have to create 1300 pounds of pressure in order to fill it. And it's a matter of time before one fills the other. Propane will fill in a matter of minutes because it only runs 140 pounds of pressure.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And local propane dealers could provide infrastructure for propane fueling stations for vehicles for the future.

MR. O'LOUGHLIN:

Right now I build my trucks in North Carolina because there is nobody around here that builds. I send a driver down to pick up the trucks to drive them back. They fill all the way back up. U-Haul has just adopted to go to propane. U-Haul Corporation is now going to put all pumping stations inside their U-Haul locations so that when they rent a vehicle out all the vehicles will be running on propane. Jack Roush just signed that contract. So they went in that direction because it's going to be an easy fill, it's going to be a cheaper commodity, and because it is cleaner fuel.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And emissions control for propane versus natural gas?

MR. O'LOUGHLIN:

Emissions control for propane is relatively new. It burns 99.6 percent efficient, so.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

The harmful emissions that you can expect from both fuels is pretty much the same, so there is a very clean burn in both fuels. So the propane emissions are very similar to natural gas.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you. I want to let my colleagues -- I know they may have some questions as well. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

You are getting off light. No gear head questions from either me or Legislator Losquadro.

MR. O'LOUGHLIN:

Can I say one more thing.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Yes.

MR. O'LOUGHLIN:

It is interesting to note that in the State of Texas there is 400 school buses, Blue Bird School Buses, that run on propane gas. They run on propane gas because that's the -- they feel that's the gas of the future. We have currently 3400 pumping stations out in the field that can fill up vehicles, so the infrastructure is definitely in place.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

Just to emphasize that point, the school bus industry and environment is particularly telling because the buses do spend a great deal of time at idle, and because of the lack of toxicity because it's a non-toxic fuel, many of the school bus operators and school districts have gone to that setup and have begun to acquire propane powered school buses.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Legislator Losquadro. Perhaps I misspoke.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

This is going to be serious gear head question, I apologize. But with LP, with the winter that we just had, I know we take a lot of extra precautions with cloud point on diesel fuel and, you know, cost of additives, letting vehicles warm up for longer period of times, you know, having to protect them in certain cold situations. What's the operability of LP in those climates?

MR. GOLDSMITH:

Like I said, we've been running our trucks, you know, for years. There is absolutely no problem. There is no additive necessary --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Don't experience the problems that you do with diesel.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

We don't experience any problem with liquid propane.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Excellent. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Let me gather from your statement that what your business model is into the future. Would you like to see people have propane tanks in their -- at their individuals homes so they could both heat their homes and then somehow turn around and fill up their tank and go off to work? Is that something that you're envisioning?

MR. GOLDSMITH:

I think it's fair to say that there are many homes right now that use propane as a fuel for heating.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Right.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

For cooking, and so there are literally thousands of homes out there that have propane tanks. I think it's best that the fueling process be done in a fueling station.

LEG. HORSLEY:

At a station, okay. Just curious.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

You know, it's the same thing, I believe, as, you know, you would not want somebody refueling their vehicle with gasoline everyday. And the interesting thing about any fuel, such as gasoline, compressed natural gas, liquid propane, biodiesel or any combustible fuel, there has to be a certain level of care maintained in handling it. And if it's handled properly, they are all very safe. It's when the human element might get into it, and I don't mean to criticize anybody.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I'm not one of the gear heads, so.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

The point being is that under a controlled environment they are absolutely safe to use, and I think it's best that refueling be performed at regular fueling stations.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. I just wanted to see where you guys were going with this in the long run.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

Yeah.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Thanks.

LEG. STERN:

I'm trying to get a handle on application. Propane could be used for passenger vehicles. You have been talking in terms of your business and manufacturer of vehicles out of state and using the term trucks. I'm wondering what kind of trucks they are and the applicability of propane to those vehicles and whether or not propane is applicable to the heavier duty vehicles that we utilize, you know, mostly throughout the County.

MR. O'LOUGHLIN:

Well, basically all the vehicles that you use in the County, except for the tractor trailers, you could use propane in right now. There is no developed engine that's going to put out a Caterpillar 400 horsepower engine that will pull an 80,000 pound trailer. Most of the vehicles are designed right now -- all the vehicles that are designed right now that run on any kind of alternative fuel are basically in that 40,000 pound and less category. There is experimentation going all the time, but they haven't succumb to the idea of an 80,000 pound vehicle being pulled by that particular product. That can't get the torque right now. Nobody has that available. So we deal with the biggest one that we can get together right now, and the research being done so far, it accommodates up to a 40,000 pound vehicle. My trucks are 33,000 pounds. They look like an oil truck, the same thing with a tanker on the back. They have automatic transmissions and we have no problem with them whatsoever.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

I'd just like to add that the utilization here in this country with propane as a vehicle fuel is somewhat new and every engine, then, that is anticipated to run on propane has to go through extensive EPA testing and certainly for EPA and carb certification. And, therefore, it would be wonderful if certain states or there was the ability to run automobiles, taxicabs, etcetera, livery vehicles on propane. It happens that Las Vegas has been running their entire taxi fleet on propane for many, many areas. I remember 20 years ago using a cab from Los Angeles running on propane. So depending on the stage and of course at the times that those were employed, EPA standards were a lot different than they are today. The standards are getting more stringent and very difficult to accommodate.

We know that the systems that we are using, and the way it works is that the system obviously is an add on to the OEM product, but to be certified for road use they have to then be extensively tested by EPA for the durability as well as the emissions standards. And so they do it engine by engine, engine family by engine family. It's my guess that over the next several years we will see probably another six or eight or ten different engine families being tested. It's a very costly process and that's why it hasn't really proliferated up to this point. GM I think was the leader with the 8.1 liter engine, and of course GM is having all sorts of issues and problems right now and so the development of additional engines is in question by -- certainly from GM.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Thank you. Presiding Officer Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

What about the availability, the world availability of this fuel and is it domestically produced or is it a foreign fuel?

MR. GOLDSMITH:

Thank you for bringing that up. I did want to mention that propane essentially is a domestic product. It's a process that comes from refining for gasoline, which about 60 percent of the makeup of propane is natural gas, 40 percent are petroleum base. Right now we produce in the US 90 percent of the demand for propane. And the raw material obviously is available here, considering a tremendous spike in the demand for propane. Canada supplies seven percent. So between Canada and the US 97 percent of the propane anticipated -- demand today and in anticipation over the next ten years, will all be domestic. It's amazing because the domestic applications, and we have heard

it before, certainly assuage and eliminate, perhaps, the reliance upon foreign or importation of oil, so. We think that that's a huge plus for the industry itself.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Thank you very much. I appreciate you gentlemen taking the time to come down.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

If I may distribute some information for you?

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

If you give it to the young lady sitting next to you she'll pass it out to us.

MR. GOLDSMITH:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. We'll move right to the agenda.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 2025-08, Adopting Local Law No. 2008, A Local law to promote accurate cost estimates for Capital Protects. (D'Amaro).

This has to be tabled for a public hearing. I'll make the motion.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 2025 is tabled. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

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

I think the testimony we had last time from Public Works is that this was in the process and we are applying for this Clean Cities Grant that would help us implement a program just like this. Gil, I believe that was the testimony you gave us last time; correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. We are not only getting CEMAC funding to purchase CN vehicles and filling stations, but also persuing stimulus funding as well for the same purpose.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

And we're relatively optimistic that those things will come to fruition at some level?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, absolutely.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. If that's the case then, I will offer a motion to table.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

IR 2043 is tabled. **(Vote: 4-1-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Romaine).**

IR 1107, To enhance efficiency in the selection and leasing process for County buildings. (Romaine). Legislator Romaine, what's your pleasure?

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'm working on some changes to this and I'm going to table this for one period. I have also met with some of the people doing real estate work for the County and they have asked for an opportunity to meet with the Comptroller, which I've afforded them that opportunity and I haven't heard back from them. But in light of that I will ask for this to be tabled for one meeting. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I'll second the motion to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1107 is tabled. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1114, To implement Sunday bus service and extend weekday morning and evening service in Suffolk County. (Romaine)

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Motion to approve by Legislator Romaine. I will offer a motion to table.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. On the motion, Legislator Romaine. My eyes were closed, I was guessing, I'm sorry. All right. Just on the record, the reason I'll offer the motion to table is that I don't think that we at the moment have the funding to do it. I think this is, you know, a vital step forward that must be taken at some point, but how we do it will affect how long we will be able to do it and how effectively we'll be able to do it. I don't think that we are there yet and I don't think we have a funding source in place to make sure we can get there. So at this point, you know, that's why I'll be supporting the motion to table. If there are any other comments? Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Simply to repeat what Nike does, just do it.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

But, Legislator Romaine, it would be great to just do it, but how do you pay for it? Okay. Hearing none, we have a motion to table. It is before us. All in favor? Opposed? Abstention?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Opposed.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Losquadro and Legislator Romaine are in opposition. The motion stands tabled. **(Vote: 3-2-0-0 Opposed: Legislators Romaine and Losquadro).**

IR 1123, Adopting Local Law No. 2009, Amending Local Law No. 53-2008, to provide parking for "clean pass" vehicles at County facilities. (Horsley).

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. Do we have anybody who wishes to speak on the motion? Seeing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1123 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1139, Adopting Local Law No. 2009, A Local Law to ensure safe operations of helicopters. (Romaine).

This has to be tabled for a public hearing. I will offer the motion to table.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1139 is tabled. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1201, Directing the Department of Public Works to hold public hearings on new bus fares in order to implement Sunday bus service. (Schneiderman).

Now, just a question for Counsel. I believe this bill was amended and the discussion we had at the last meeting was that if this bill -- under the previous version approval of the bill would have also been an approval of the fares.

MR. NOLAN:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

And it was amended so an approval of the bill now approves hearings on the idea of increasing the fares but would require that those -- that increase come back before us.

MR. NOLAN:

That is correct. It directs Transportation to hold the public hearings to make recommendations, but that the bus fare increase, if it's recommended, cannot be implemented without another resolution of the Legislature.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Motion to approve by Legislator Romaine. I'll second the motion. Do we have any other questions? Gil?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If I could just make a point. The concern that we have with this legislation, obviously as I stated before, we have the overarching bus study which is nearing completion. We have held our public hearings. The consultants are putting the costs together for the recommended improvements. In the case -- in this specific instance, this bill directed us to look at -- or at the last meeting we were directed to look at how much service we could provide for the income that would be taken by the increase in fares. Based on that, we believe that we would be able to add 12 additional Sunday services. The problem is if you look at the report, the report is looking at 24. So, you know, it's where do you draw the line, which ones are the ones to look at.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

If we increase the fares as written, I guess the full fare would be two and the reduced fair a dollar, that would provide for 12 -- we can do 12 of the 24 routes on Sundays.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Including SCAT?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This includes SCAT, yes.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

For that figure we could run SCAT everywhere and 12 routes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, we would be running about 20 SCAT vehicles at the time during a six hour constricted period. It isn't like it's the normal hours of operation. We were looking at a six hour period on Sundays where we'd be able to run about 20 vehicles and this -- but, again, SCAT is -- this is how we based our estimate, and Bob can certainly, you know, give more detail on this.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

So I don't want to interrupt you, Gil, I'm just trying to make sure I understand this. Putting SCAT aside for a second. We have about 24 lines, right, at last check?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Twenty-four recommendations for Sunday service.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Twenty-four -- right, 24 recommendations. With this fare increase we believe we can serve 12 of those.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

And we could have 20 SCAT buses on a compressed time period that wouldn't be the same as the other days.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. And, Bob, how many SCAT buses today? How many SCAT buses are out there and available?

MR. SHINNICK:

We operate about 78 to 80 vehicles on a given day.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

So we could do about 25 percent of it.

MR. SHINNICK:

Yeah. What Gil was pointing out was at the last meeting part of the discussion was directing us to look at a shortened Sunday service, so the figures we are working with is a six hour day for the fixed route as well as the paratransit. So that would be either nine to three or ten to four, something like that. Not a full day's worth of service.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I looked at the report, the draft report, and just -- I don't recall any prioritization listed in there for the routes that they suggested for Sunday service. Am I incorrect?

MR. SHINNICK:

Not in the report you had seen. Part of the consultant's requirements is to give us a staging of the phasing in of the various service recommendations. That may be coming for the Sunday service.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. So the consultant is going to give us something that if we were to choose to go down this route and implement the 12 of the 24 recommendations with the money that we had, we could use the consultants staging list to figure out which 12 we're going to pick? Because just from -- I know you guys have the practical system problem, but, you know, when we come -- the five feet away to over here we have the political problem that everybody pays an increased fare and not everybody gets an opportunity to access.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And that's part of our concern in that you have 12 of 24. We may give you a -- what we believe to be a prioritized list. At the end of the day you will have to make the decision on it; is that accurate, you know, are we going to swap one for another. And that's where, you know, the difficulty lies or part of the difficulty lies.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I just would make three very quick points. One, the public hearing on the busy study really wasn't a public hearing. It was a public information meeting because no one was really allowed to speak. Both Legislator Schneiderman and I attended the Riverhead session. People were just standing around talking. There was no public hearings to speak of where people could get up and put something on the record nor was there any stenographer to even establish a record. So I just want to say that.

Number two, Legislator Schneiderman is simply asking to hold public hearings on this. It may be that people don't want to pay the extra fares, I don't know. But I would say that whatever you do that these public hearings should be strategically scattered throughout the County to allow people to attend. I would start off with two; one on the west end and the east end, and if the attendance

merited it I would expand it and maybe do two or three more depending on the thing.

And the last thing I would say about SCAT is I have never seen a more inefficient system where the County provides for the bus, they pay the driver, they do the maintenance, they cover everything, and the bus company only handles the management. And right now SCAT is located in Central Suffolk so there is no regionalization of SCAT by the companies that run SCAT, the management company that we hire to run SCAT. Therefore, if they get a request from East Hampton, someone has to get in a bus from Ronkonkoma and drive to East Hampton or drive to Greenport or whatever. I have suggested before in front of this committee that we may want to, when we do an RFP, regionalize SCAT east end, Brookhaven, four western towns, and we might get more efficiency in terms of wear and tear on our vehicle, in gas use and driver salary. I certainly don't think the system that we have now is the most efficient and lends itself to the best practices for the taxpayers of Suffolk County. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. You know, I'm looking at Legislator Schneiderman's amended legislation. So as far the procedure goes, I get it and I appreciate the change that he made because clearly this calls for a public hearing and anything that we ultimately did, if anything, regarding the fares would have to come back before us, so I get it. And I see what he is trying to accomplish here. But given what the Commissioner and the Director are telling us, this -- even with the fares as advertised in this legislation, we're only going to get about half the service. I don't understand how we can publicize public hearings inviting the public to come and speak on specific fares that are at best if ever implemented would only give half the service.

I tell you, I would be a lot more comfortable with just advertising public hearings about what the public thinks about Sunday bus service and what kind of a fare increase, if any, they would support. But the fact that there is a paragraph in this bill that talks about specific dollar amounts to be paid but does not also address the point that it would only cover about half of what service could ultimately be provided, I don't know if it's nearly as accurate as it can or should be.

I don't know if it's another change, but I don't see it getting done. And ultimately what would any Legislator, including the sponsor, ultimately think if, you know, if it comes back after having these public hearings that, yes, some support and some don't, and now you have to pick and choose which ones to be able to provide, given that with these fare increases, if ever approved, would only provide half the service. I don't know ultimately how you come to that determination, but that certainly can't be part of that public hearing process. I just don't know if it's ready.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Mr. Chairman, in response.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

You raise an extremely valid point. Let me ask you, will you reach out to the sponsor in the next few days?

LEG. STERN:

I would be happy to. You know, I had the discussion with Legislator Schneiderman about what changes I think he should make and I think he's done some of that. I got to tell you, I would like to see public hearings. I'd like to see what the public thinks about Sunday bus service.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I think we hear a great deal about public transportation in Suffolk County.

LEG. STERN:

But I think, for me anyway, it's about how best to go forward in the most meaningful way.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, I don't disagree with you. I'd like to see it broader because then more issues could be discussed, because the level of frustration with public transportation in Suffolk County is something I hear each and every day from people all over the County, from all 18 districts, about the level of service and I agree with you. I would encourage you to speak -- I will speak to the sponsor, I will encourage you to speak to the sponsor because I think a more fruitful public hearing that will allow the level of frustration to be expressed would be more beneficial. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. I'm going to withdraw my second to the approval motion. Do we have another motion?

LEG. STERN:

I'll make a motion to table.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

We have a motion to table from Legislator Stern.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Horsley. If there is no further comment, all in favor of the tabling motion? All opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Abstention.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Abstention by Legislator Romaine. IR 1201 is tabled, but we will continue to move forward in some way, shape or form to find a way to do this with the money behind it to make sure it actually happens. **(Vote: 4-0-1-0 Abstention: Legislator Romaine).**

Introductory Resolutions

IR 1226, Amending Resolution No. 1220-2008, redistributing surplus County computer systems and hardware from the Huntington Freedom Center to the Tri-Community Youth Agency "Cast" Program. (D'Amaro).

I'll offer a motion to approve.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1231, Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of considering the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (infrastructure improvements)(CP 8170). (Co. Exec.)

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1231 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1232, Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of considering the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (ultraviolet disinfection)(CP 8132). (Co. Exec.)

LEG. HORSLEY:

Same motion.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1233, Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of considering the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (infiltration/inflow study/sewer rehabilitation)(CP 8181). (Co. Exec.)

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1236, Amending the 2009 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the improvements to CR 80, Montauk Highway, between NYS 112 and CR 101, Sills Road, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5534). (Co. Exec.)

LEG. STERN:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Motion to approve by Legislator Stern. All in favor? I need a second. I'll second it. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1236 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1241 - Amending the 2009 Operating Budget, transferring assessment stabilization reserve funds to the Capital Fund, and appropriating funds for the Suffolk County Sewer Assessment Study (CP 8185). (Co. Exec.)

Legislator Horsley, I'll give you the --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

There you go. Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. Legislator Romaine, on the question.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Very quickly. Sewer assessment study, what is the scope of this study, how long will it take, what will the recommendations point us to? I mean, what's the purpose of it? What will we get out of it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This will give us a feasibility study that studies primarily three issues. One, bringing sewers to areas that have been identified by the Wastewater Task Force as critical areas needing sewers that don't have them, and then what do we do with the individual treatment plants that we have throughout the existing treated areas throughout the County. Basically, what's the future; are we going to merge them, are they going to stay individual, things like that.

Lastly is also to look at the possibility of expanding Sewer District Three to essentially fill in the political boundaries of Babylon and Islip. Those are the three primaries.

The recommendation has come from the committee that we'll review the proposals that we receive by July, and I don't have the timeframe on when it's to be completed, but I believe by the end of next year we should have the report complete.

LEG. ROMAINE:

The study sounds well intentioned. You are going to complete it by the end of 2010. Let's talk about the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund. Aren't these funds primarily for stabilizing rates in various sewer districts?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And if we deplete that fund to do this study, what will be the impact on those sewer districts that are looking for stabilization in the future?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, I mean, if we deplete the fund obviously it impacts the stabilization, but I would believe BRO --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I was just going to say -- can I ask BRO, can you tell us what -- or, Ben, whomever can tell us what the size of the Stabilization Reserve Fund, BRO -- but, Ben, you look very confident that you have an answer.

MR. WRIGHT:

Not on the size of it but I --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Can we hold off one sec and see if they have an answer?

MS. GAZES:

I'd have to get a copy of the Operating Budget to give you that.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MS. GAZES:

It will just take a moment.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Yeah, thank you. Ben, go ahead.

MR. WRIGHT:

I'll use the Rocky Point study as an example. In the resolution that appropriated funds it indicated that if and when the district is formed then that district would repay the County for the funds that resulted in the study.

LEG. ROMAINE:

But since this is covering such a broad area and a multiplicity of purposes, there is no one that we can attribute these expenses to directly. My concern, and the only concern I'm raising now -- I think the study is probably a very fine idea. My concern is how do we pay for it and it said here that we are paying for it from the Sewer Stabilization Fund. I want to make sure that at the end of the day should there be sewer districts that require stabilization that there is sufficient funds for that. That's all I want to be sure of.

MR. WRIGHT:

I would just indicate that this study was the initiative of the Legislature and the funding came from this body.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I understand that, but I'm a member of this body and I'm going to hold an independent thought until it's corrected. I mean, right now I'm asking a question. The question is very simple; what is the impact of spending this money, the stabilization money, on other sewer districts that need stabilization -- maybe that we have more than enough, in which case I have no problem.

MR. LIPP:

I could shed some light on that if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Please, Bob.

MR. LIPP:

Okay. There is over \$62 million fund balance in the fund right now.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Have we borrowed against any of that money?

MR. LIPP:

We constantly borrow for different sewer districts and they are supposed to repay, so that's sort of revolving.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right, but only for sewers; we haven't borrowed for General Funds, we haven't used that money in manner, shape or form other than for sewers.

MR. LIPP:

Right, and this would be a study for new sewers, though.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right, I understand that.

MR. LIPP:

Which would be a slightly different approach, clearly.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. I support the study. I think it's something needed. I just wanted to look at the impact of the Stabilization Fund and what that would have, spending 1.2 million. You are telling me there is 62

million, there shouldn't be a problem.

MR. LIPP:

And also to understand that long-term we have some really serious sewer issues and even 62 million at a very long-term perspective is not going to, you know, cut it, so.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Let's say that again. Sixty-two million looking at the long-term perspective, this is sewer districts in Suffolk County, will not be sufficient in your opinion to provide and other funding sources may be needed. Is that what I am hearing?

MR. LIPP:

Perhaps not for what's currently there, but in terms of our needs. Like, for instance, we all know that approximately 70 percent of Suffolk County is cesspools; only 30 percent sewers. And from an economic development point of view also it's hard to expand without the sewerage. So we have some serious long-term problems that we really need to do some studying and of course, you know, the funding is an issue that needs to be looked at moving forward, too. But those are longer term issues. Short-term we have no problem with the dollars in the fund.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Gil, just one quick question. It was my understanding that this wasn't just for possible future sewer districts, but to look at the future demand on current districts and the expansion or rehabilitation or whatever that would be for those districts.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

So it's covering people who are currently sewerage and looking at the possibility of sewerage additional.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Legislator Horsley, since this was your baby for two years, I'm sure you would like to add in.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I would like to add in. First of all, I'm surprised to find that it is actually here.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Turn the mike on, Wayne, so your comments can be --

LEG. HORSLEY:

At long last it is here. This is something that we have all been working towards for the last couple of years to get a master plan on how we're going to sewer Suffolk County, what are the areas that are most important first. You know, what is the economic development impact, what is the impact for future growth, jobs, the environment, and all of those things that are just so critical for proper and quality growth on Long Island. It is here and as you say, this is going to give us an overall plan on where we are going to the future on this all important issue.

Yeah, it's coming out of the Sewer Assessment Fund, but the reality is I'm hopeful that this is

enough money, because I think in the long run this may actually cost more. When we put additional issues into this, will there be a GIS system that's going to mark out exactly where our drains are, our sewers, where they are going to be in the future, etcetera.

I applaud you guys for getting this to this point and I wholeheartedly endorse this for the future of Suffolk County that this is our plan, this is our road map of where Suffolk is going to go for infrastructure into the future. And to the guy that says this is the wrong idea. This is where we should be going and I applaud the Presiding Officer for first bringing to our attention that we should be putting it into one master plan bill, and so I vote to approve.

LEG. ROMAINE:

One last question, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Fire away.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I assume that the consultant that will be selected to undertake this sewer study will be selected by RFP?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Will the Presiding Officer or any representative of this legislative body serve on that RFP committee?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There are representatives of the Legislature on the committee.

LEG. ROMAINE:

There will be.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, there are.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Seeing no other discussion, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1241 is approved.
(Vote: 5-0-0-0).

IR 1242, Authorizing the filing of a grant application for Federal Fiscal Year 2008 Section 5309 Bus and Bus related facilities for Suffolk County transit. (Co. Exec.)

That is a long way of saying we are buying buses or no, we are buying the equipment that goes at bus stops?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is to authorize DPW to go after funding, 90% of which is borne by the Federal and State Governments, and total amount of 306,250 for paratransit vans, replacement of the --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. All right. Perfect. If there are no questions I'll offer a motion to approve.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**.

IR 1243, Authorizing the filing of a grant application for Federal Fiscal Year 2008 Section 5307 Formula Funds for mass transportation projects for Suffolk County Transit. (Co. Exec.)

This is 8.3 million dollars and it's for SCAT vans that we just referenced in the previous resolution, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

For some additional SCAT vans but also to --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Some fixer-up buses?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, for the installation of an auto -- it's also for funding for installing automated vehicle locator systems, AVLs.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. All the stuff we talked about earlier this year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Great. I'll offer a motion to approve.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Losquadro. If there are know question on the motion, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**. That's good news.

IR 1244, Authorizing the filing of an application for Federal American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds for the purchase of up to forty-two additional transit buses including related equipment for replacement for Suffolk County Transit. (Co. Exec).

So more buses. The question was --

MR. NOLAN:

If the committee wishes to put this on a consent calendar it may. Typically when we are authorizing grant applications we normally put them on the regular calendar, but the committee is within its rights to put it on the consent calendar.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Bill.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Will we look -- are we ready to start looking at alternative fuel vehicles?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

For buses?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'll turn this one over to you, Bob.

MR. SHINNICK:

We are ready, absolutely, to look at them, yes. We have some circumstances that are kind of in the way right now. We'll be rebidding the bus system in a year-and-a-half and quite frankly we are not certain whose properties are going to be involved as sites for the dispatching of vehicles. The other element is where exactly would these installations occur where the fueling installations would occur.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I know the argument against compressed gas vehicles is that there is very limited fueling stations, but I don't know how this propane proposal would look at, but I think if we are going to look at it we should look at everything and certainly it seems like it's the wave of the future to get away from gasoline or diesel fuel if it's feasible, that's all.

MR. SHINNICK:

We have no objection to that. We absolutely agree going forward.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Gil, I just had one question. I know that when you and I had spoken about the stimulus funds, some of which are on this agenda later, I think we talked about nine and a half million dollars for buses. This is 13.3. So did we do better or?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, we did better than we originally thought, but this also includes funding that we anticipated this year anyway for these buses.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. So it's still about the nine and a half million that we expected?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. Correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Great. If there are no further questions, do we have a motion and a second?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Motion by Legislator Romaine, seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1244 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**.

IR 1245, Authorizing the execution of an agreement between the County and the New York State Department of Transportation for Federal and State Aid funding for the continuation of the HOV Bus Service on the Long Island Expressway for 2009. (Co. Exec.)

And I just realized we didn't put the last one on the consent calendar. Would this one qualify, George, or does this one have to go on the regular agenda?

MR. NOLAN:

This should go on the regular calendar.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. All right. I'll offer a motion to approve.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Gil.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Can I just ask a question?

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Does the consent calendar slow the process down?

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

No.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It speeds it up.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Does it? Okay.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

We do -- at the General Meeting we vote for all the consent calendar in one vote, but there is only certain things we can put on there. All right. So all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1245 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1249 Accepting and appropriating grant funds in the amount of \$505,740 from the New York State Department of Transportation for provision of dedicated traffic enforcement in the vicinity of certain highway construction projects with 100% support and making a correction to Resolution No. 1239-2008. (Co. Exec.)

I'll offer a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar because this is 100 percent.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1249 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1259, Amending the 2009 Capital Budget and program and appropriating funds in connection with storm water remediation at various County Roads, CR 96, Great East Neck Road, at Evergreen Street (CP 8240).

Great East Neck Road; is that your district, Legislator Horsley? Is that you?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yes, it is.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. Then motion by Legislator Horsley. Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1259 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1264, Appropriating funds in connection with replacement/cleanup of fossil fuel, toxic and hazardous material storage tanks (CP 1706). (Co. Exec.)

This is -- motion by Legislator Losquadro. I'll second it. This is \$350,000 to keep digging up tanks that are in the ground and bringing them into compliance with the Health Code, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1264 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1268, Amending and appropriating funds in connection with the construction of CR 67, Motor Parkway Rehabilitation and resurfacing, vicinity of Long Island Expressway (LIE) South Service Road to the vicinity of CR 17, Wheeler Road under the Federal FFY 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (New CP 5131). (Co. Exec.)

This is fully funded?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

One hundred percent. So I'll offer a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar. No? Oh, it's a bond. I apologize.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You have to first instance fund --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I'm getting ahead of myself. You got this in my head now, Legislator Losquadro. All right. I'll offer a motion to approve.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1268 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1269, Amending and appropriating funds in connection with rehabilitation of CR 4, Commack Road, vicinity of Nicolls Road to the vicinity of Polo Street under the Federal FFY 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (New CP 5567). (Co. Exec.)

LEG. STERN:

Motion.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Motion to approve by Legislator Stern. I'll offer a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1269 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**.
That was three and a half million, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. Yes, it was.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

IR 1278, Amending the 2009 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with strengthening and improving LIE North/South Service Roads from Washington Avenue/Wicks Road to Ocean Avenue, Exit 59, under the Federal FFY 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (CP 5127). (Co. Exec.)

I'll offer a motion to approve.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. But I have some questions, Gil. This bill is for \$10 million in bonding?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

And it's for this one section, I guess Washington Avenue that -- right here. So we are talking Exit 56 to 59?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is from -- this specific bill is from 59 to 63. The job was split into two.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

How is that describing to 63?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I'm looking at the description and it says Wicks Road to Ocean.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Ocean Avenue.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, the revised -- oh, okay. 1179 goes to 63. No, this is 1278.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

This is 1278. I don't think we have an 1179.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, that's already discharged.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. All right. So that one was for the first section, this is for the next section. So that was ten million in the first one; this is ten million in this one.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay, great. So between that 20 million you are going to do from 63 to 56, roughly.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Great. If there are no further questions, I think we had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1278 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1280, Bond resolution of the County of Suffolk, New York, authorizing the issuance of \$4,000,000 bonds to finance the cost of construction of improvements to Sewer District No. 21 (SUNY - Stony Brook)(Phase I)(CP 8121). (Co. Exec.)

Gil, why do we -- before we have motion. Why is this before us? Shouldn't there be a regular bill, another bond? This seems a little bit unusual. Why this process? Because I don't recall another bill where we are waiting for a bond.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This, again, I believe is because this is being funded through the 3FC and the ARA, but I'll defer to Ben.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

This was one of the two projects that were supposed to come through the stimulus package?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

So this just authorizes the bonding, the first instance funding?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes. They require this before the drop dead date with them of May 11th so we have to do -- there was a CN for a public hearing next Tuesday and the bond resolution also has to be passed --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MR. WRIGHT:

-- following the hearing in order to make that application valid.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. Now, there was a second sewer project that was supposed to be under the stimulus funds as well.

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes. That application has already been in. We had public hearings in October, I think it was last year, so that's been taken care of.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

So we won't need to go through this process for that one. That one is already done.

MR. WRIGHT:

Right.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Counsel, I guess my only question is it just seems odd that we have a bond resolution in committee because normally we don't.

MR. NOLAN:

Normally what happens is we just get the bonds on the day of the vote. This was given to us at the last meeting and a determination was made to send it through committee so we could kind of figure out why we are doing it this way.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

MR. NOLAN:

So here we are.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Well, there is no harm in passing it out of committee, right?

MR. NOLAN:

It's fine.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

All right. Then I'll offer a motion to approve.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

Second.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 1280 is approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**. Gil?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, just because of what you are seeing here, the formatting of the process. It's different than what we have ever gone through. At the General Leg the highway projects, they are required specific formatting in the resolution, so there will be attachments attached to these resolutions, the ones for CR 67, the one for CR 3 and the L.I.E. They will be attached and submitted as CN's because of the change in formatting.

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We are just going through this as, you know --

CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

The one other announcement I just wanted to make to the committee, at the next Public Works meeting I know that we have had a lot of requests for presentations. At the next meeting I've set up -- the Water Authority is going to be coming in to talk to us about -- we've had a lot of discussion about the fire hydrants on private communities, but the Water Authority is going to come in as well as a representative from their union to talk about all the other fire hydrants that are not in private communities and how they are tested and how we can be sure that those are operating correctly.

So if you do have any presentations or people that you want to come down, let me know but we'll probably try to bump those into June because next month we are probably going to have a long presentation on fire hydrants.

Seeing nothing else, we are adjourned.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:54 P.M.)