

**PUBLIC WORKS & TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**  
**OF THE**  
**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**Minutes**

A regular meeting of the Public Works & Transportation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on June 16, 2009.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Leg. Brian Beedenbender, Chairperson  
Leg. Steven H. Stern, Vice Chair  
Leg. Wayne R. Horsley  
Leg. Daniel P. Losquadro  
Leg. Edward P. Romaine

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

William J. Lindsay, Presiding Officer  
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature  
Barbara LoMoriello, Deputy Clerk  
Rosalind Gazes, Budget Review Office  
Robert Doering, Budget Review Office  
Debra Alloncius, AME Legislative Director  
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Leader  
Linda Bay, Aide to Minority Leader  
Ryan Attard, Aide to Leg. Beedenbender  
Deborah Harris, Aide to Leg. Stern  
Marcus Povinelli, Aide to Leg. Losquadro  
Ed Hennessy, Aide to County Executive  
Mike Cavanagh, Aide to Presiding Officer  
Tom Laguardia, Chief Deputy Commissioner of Department of Public Works  
Lou Calderone, Deputy Commissioner of DPW  
Dan Dresh, Director of Traffic Safety, Department of Public Works  
Robert Hillman, Chief Engineer/Department of Public Works  
Ben Wright, Sanitation Division/Department of Public Works  
And all other interested parties

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Diana Kraus, Court Stenographer

**MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:**

Denise Weaver, Legislative Aide

## **THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:10 PM**

### **CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Could we all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance by Legislator Stern.

### **SALUTATION**

### **PRESENTATION**

Okay. The first thing we have -- I don't have any cards. The first thing we have on the agenda is a presentation by Public Works on red light cameras. So, Gil, you and whomever, you and your Merry Men, please come up or ladies, whoever they may be.

### **COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Good afternoon. I want to introduce, Dan Dresch, Director of Traffic Safety and you all know, Tom Laguardia, the Chief Deputy Commissioner. They'll do the presentation of the red light cameras.

### **CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. Fire away. You can use that microphone. You just have to hold it. But if you want to talk the whole time without having to hold the button, you could use the one at the podium. It's up to you.

### **SLIDE SHOW PRESENTATION**

#### **MR. DRESCH:**

Good afternoon. This presentation today, we're going to start off maybe a little remedial, maybe a quick primer on the background of red light cameras where the County has been, how they operate basically. And then proceed into where we are going from here forward.

As many of you know, red light cameras are used to promote safety. Approximately a thousand Americans a year are killed in accidents that are direct result of red light running. The economic impact to this society is approximately \$14 billion a year. Many cities nationwide, especially New York City right down the road, have implemented programs and have seen an overall reduction of approximately 20 to 80% in accidents. Specifically 30 to 50% in the right angles, which is the direct target of a red light camera.

The principal end product that we're looking for through a program such as this, is to modify driver behavior to respect the traffic control device that's out there. The devices are endorsed by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety as well as the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration.

At least going back to 2001, Suffolk County has been very interested in pursuing red light cameras. It's been the subject of many home rule messages to Albany. And as we all know last month -- excuse me, two months ago, the New York State Legislature finally adopted legislation approving a demonstration project for Suffolk County. And last week the Suffolk County Legislature amended Local Law 18-2001 to reflect the legislation as adopted by New York State.

Some of the highlights of the New York legislation, it authorizes the County to install and operate these systems fundamentally. We are limited to 50 locations during this demonstration project. They shall operate using still photographs or video of the violators. There shall be no images of drivers, passengers or the contents of the vehicle. A violation is not considered a conviction; therefore, there are no points against the drivers or the owner's license. The monetary liability is strictly on the owner of the vehicle. The maximum penalty being \$50 and the maximum late fee is

\$25. There are provisions in the law to allow the owner to go after the operator to recoup his cost. And bottom line, this demonstration project expires in December of 2014. So basically it's a five year project.

The red light cameras typically work by taking multiple still photographs of videos, typically digital. There is a physical connection between the red light camera cabinet and the traffic signal controller cabinet. It gains power and most importantly it takes an electrical output from the yellow and red indications that help identify the violators. Once the red indication comes on the traffic signal, the red light camera is then hot and it's then looking at traditional inductance loops, video detectors or lasers to then photograph -- to trip the camera to photograph the violators. Here's a quick schematic showing the placement of loops, the placement of the camera behind the vehicles and a violator that's actually in the intersection.

The systems use digital technology to capture the images of the offending vehicles. The images are transferred and transmitted to the vendor using high speed and most importantly secure and encrypted networks. The vendor initially performs a quality check on -- for proposed violators and then forwards this information via the internet to a secure website for Suffolk County PD to have their personnel go in and give the final approval. Those violators that are approved by Suffolk County PD are then notified by the vendor that they are -- they're responsible for the fees associated.

The visual evidence that is generally furnished to the violators include the site name and site reference, the date and time of the offense, the offense number, the yellow and red clearance times, time into the red indication and also the time between the images, so really building up the case against the violator. Here are several shots, three or four shots showing violations in progress. And you can see some of the information is included at the top of the photograph.

There are defenses against the violation. The vehicles yielding to emergency vehicles, law enforcement officials who direct the vehicles past the traffic signal, vehicles that were stolen, reported stolen before the offense. Obviously, a traffic signal malfunction. And also if the driver received a traffic summons from a law enforcement official.

There is an adjudication process that will be set up. The vendor is responsible for the accuracy and veracity of the evidence. There are numerous traffic courts countywide as we all know. There is the New York State Department of Motor Vehicle Traffic Violations Bureau. They primarily handle Suffolk County Police districts. There's five eastern towns and there are also numerous village courts.

Right now the County staff over at DPW is evaluating the appropriate placement opportunities. We're also working to establish an adjudication process and we're drafting the request for proposals to seek a vendor. We're allowing the vendor to come back with recommendations of the type of technology, the revenue model between the vendor and the County. But also we are spelling out in there that the vendor shall pay the operating expenses, particularly system maintenance and violation notifications.

As part of our RFP process we are seeking to secure professional services for the many phases of this project; planning, design, bidding implementation, operations, maintenance and overall management of the system. We anticipate receiving proposals from vertical teams comprised of engineering firms who will primarily handle the design, The red light camera vendors who are most familiar with the technology and deployment of such systems as well as electrical contractors who will not necessarily be the contractor who does the installation, they'll be the contractor who will be responsible for the maintenance of a deployed system. Because building off of that point in accordance with General Municipal Law 103, which is spelled out in the New York State legislation, we will be letting the construction portion of this contract separately. And most importantly there will be no capital outlays by the County.

We are continuing to assemble the initial pool of potential sites for the red light cameras. We're

using our Department of Public Works database, known as Drive, which handles all of our County roads very in depth. We're also supplementing that with New York State Department of Transportation's Alice System, as well as information from the Suffolk County Police Department. There is no anecdotal evidence at this point. It's either based in hard data or empirical information from the Suffolk County PD.

We are looking primarily at right angle crashes, the type most usually indicative of someone disregarding a traffic signal. Currently we've identified approximately 66 locations. Using this crash data and the empirical data from the PD we may identify for phase I approximately 12 locations as prime for initial deployment. Secondary and tertiary sites may be subject to continued surveillance and analysis by both Suffolk County DPW personnel and a vendor before final system installation.

We're also seeking opportunities for portability of equipment to allow for further relocation -- future relocation from mitigated sites to other intersections. To maximize the effectiveness of a system there will be additional site analysis by the vendor, field observations that take into account lighting conditions, intersection geometrics and also experiences with our various traffic control technologies out in the field.

An important point to the deployment of this program is our relationship with New York State, the towns and the villages. New York State DOT has already expressed support of the installation of red light camera equipment at their owned and maintained traffic signals. However, New York City and Nassau County have jurisdiction over all non-New York State DOT traffic signals within their borders. Suffolk County does not. Suffolk County DPW designs and builds traffic signals on County highways. When we are completed with those signals, we actually transfer ownership and by extension, maintenance responsibilities to the towns and villages. Therefore, the framework that we've assembled to move forward with the deployment of this project is the expeditious rollout, we will identify locations under the jurisdiction of the Suffolk County PD, that allows us to quickly establish adjudication through the New York State DMV's Traffic Violations Bureau. And also by identifying intersections of two state highways or state and County highways, the engineering firm that will be chosen under the RFP will simply secure highway work permits through DMV.

The future expansion of this demonstration project, we will pursue MOU's with each town and village to facilitate red light cameras at the town-owned and maintained traffic signals on County highways. Furthermore, we'll look to establish adjudication processes within the eastern five towns as well as the various village courts Countywide.

There are responsibilities that the vendor and the County take on with this program. And that is each June the vendor shall furnish Suffolk County PD with an annual report that is quantifying the demonstration project's impact on red light running. The Suffolk County PD will forward copies to the governor, the temporary president of the senate and the speaker of the assembly. These reports shall include at the minimum description of the locations as well as the number and type and severity of crashes both before and after the deployment of the systems.

This last slide shows an estimated timeline that we are looking at at this point. We are preparing the documents for the RFP, we anticipate in July of 2009, advertisement of the RFP in August of '09. The following month we presume we should be selecting a vendor, executing a contract in October and commence design and building of the prime sites in November and December with activation of those prime sites in January 2010. And bottom line, we also anticipate a final build out in about 12 to 18 months.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Romaine had a few questions.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, just a few questions. So within seven months from now these red light cameras will be operating -- for either one of the three gentlemen up at the desk there -- within the next seven

months this will be activated?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

That's correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

All 50 or some of them? How long will it be before all 50 are activated?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

As Danny has in his slide, 12 to 18 months.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So seven months to put up the first red light camera and possibly another 12 months before all 50 are laid out so January 2011. Is that correct?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

That's correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. Are you familiar with the standards for red light performance standards established by the International Association for the Chiefs of Police?

**MR. DRESCH:**

I don't believe I do.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. What I would recommend to you, if you're going to go into this and apparently you are if you follow the Legislative recommendations, is I'd get the red light performance standards that were issued on November 29th, 2007 from the International Association of the Chiefs of Police. I think that would help you in preparing the standards for this. Obviously, I'm going to be carefully monitoring what DPW does to determine whether they meet those standards or not because those are more or less acceptable standards in the industry. So you can't even say if your RFP will meet or exceed those standards, so I'll skip that question. Have you checked with other municipalities that have issued RFP's?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Yes, we have.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Which municipalities are those?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Specifically Nassau County.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. You haven't checked with say, Hamilton, Ohio or any of those other counties throughout the United States who have had success with red light cameras?

**MR. DRESCH:**

We have had access to many of their RFP documents, which have been available on the internet.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

What is the requirement that you're going to establish for the vendor's financial strength? Are you going to require them to submit financial statements? I'm asking this question particularly because in a capital project of this nature since the vendor is bearing the cost, I would assume that one of the requirements in the RFP is that the vendor demonstrate financial strength; that you are going to

require them to submit financial statements and other statements to demonstrate their -- not only their technical, but their financial ability to execute this.

**MR. DRESCH:**

Absolutely. That is a portion of the RFP, looking for the vendor to demonstrate their viability going forward. Absolutely.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

How much do you anticipate in very, very general numbers, an RFP like this might be worth for 50 cameras?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Truthfully I believe it's probably in apples and oranges. Depends on the technology that a particular vendor comes back with, you know, their fixed costs. Also the business model they may propose to the County, so I can't address that.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Obviously you're going to also ask for client references for anyone that would be installing this?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Absolutely.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Are you looking for a turnkey system?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Well, with GML 103 I think that sort of precludes the ability for us to have a turnkey system. It must be let separately.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. Who would issue the summonses and who would do the processing? Would the vendor be doing this? Would the Police Department be doing this? How would this be done? And in jurisdictions that aren't covered by Suffolk County Police district, would you work with the other local police if you choose other police districts other than Suffolk County?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Well, the vendor will handle the violations portion only after approval of the individual violation by Suffolk County PD.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Would you expect the vendor to provide expert testimony in any cases of court challenge? Would that be part of the RFP?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Yes, it is.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Would training for the police, the court, the DA, local town justices if it's out east, be part of the RFP?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Yes, it would be. Setting up the adjudication process.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Are you seeking a digital mode for these cameras?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Pardon me?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Are you seeking a digital mode for these cameras?

**MR. DRESCH:**

I think digital is because of the power of the digital images at this point in 2009, I don't think you could go back to an old style wet photograph.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

What's the minimum requirement of pixels that you are going to require for each frame and image?

**MR. DRESCH:**

It has not been determined at this point.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

All right. Maybe you want to look at 3000 times 2000 pixels per image. Something you may want to take a look at. Are you looking for -- you're looking for video technologies, digital video technologies as well as still pictures; is that correct?

**MR. DRESCH:**

That is correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Multiple cameras and integrated video and still camera for the multiple cameras for each site?

**MR. DRESCH:**

There will be multiple images available. The RFP is really framed out to allow the vendor to come in and demonstrate their particular technologies, whether it's a combination of video still or strictly still.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Will the camera systems component be synchronized to a single standard independent external and variable time and date source for each of these?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Yes. As you may have seen on the sample photographs there are stamping on the images.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Obviously I have an interest in this and -- such as all RFP's, one of the things I did when I was a Legislator in the '80's is I passed a resolution to require that all RFP's be provided as well as bids and audits to the Legislature. So I would be very interested in getting this RFP and taking a look at that. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I'm surprised, I sent over a spec from the police chiefs. You guys didn't get it?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Yeah, I don't recall seeing it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, we did get it. It was turned over. It is under review. This was information provided by a vendor, though, which I believe had that included.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

No, I definitely picked it up from a vendor, but it's not vendor oriented. It's stamped by the Police Chief Association of the United States. I mean it's like a blueprint of what should be in the spec initially.

**MR. DRESCH:**

If it's the document that I'm thinking of with the -- that came in a vendor's package, I am in possession of that. I have not reviewed those documents at this point.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I don't think it would preclude because it came from a vendor. I mean, you could verify the authenticity of it. But it's stamped from the Police Chief's Association or the National Association.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

International.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Without question. Again, as was stated earlier we are still in the process preparing the RFP so everything is, you know, still open.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

That was all I wanted to point out. It just shocked me when you said you didn't have it, you know.

**MR. DRESCH:**

Well, as Gil had said, we had not gotten -- we're still in the early stages of developing the draft RFP at this point.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know that you had mentioned during your presentation something about the images and the angles and the contents, the people who are in. Just go back to that very briefly, that the image is going to be of the license plate. How are cameras angled so that the occupants of the automobile are not photographed or not forwarded to, you know, whichever business or agency is reviewing, you know, the videotape?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Generally the vendors -- first the vendors are instructed that they will come up with a scenario in which to minimize the law. Actually it does not prohibit the photographs of occupants or their -- the goods. But we shall take every precaution to minimize that. So that is actually spelled out in the RFP. I'm sure each vendor may have a slightly different strategy to get to that end result.

**LEG. STERN:**

But the images can be taken of the vehicle from the front. It's not necessarily going to be limited just to the rear. Correct?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Primarily they will be from the rear.

**LEG. STERN:**

I know that ultimately after the cameras have been in a certain location after some period of time, infractions should ultimately go down. Because if you use that roadway after a period of time you know that that's going to be issue. So I would say naturally infractions have to go down. In the course of your research, have you been able to determine based on any kind of studies how long

that generally takes? Is driver modification apparent in 30 days, 60 days, half a year? Generally, how long does it take?

**MR. DRESCH:**

I have not seen consistent studies that have outlined whether it's 12 months, 18 months, 24 months. That is probably something that we'll be finding out for ourselves as we look at the northeast suburban driver here in Suffolk County. As you know a lot of these red light cameras have been rolled out in urban environments so perhaps the impacts have been noticed much sooner rather than the highway type scenarios that our red light cameras will be at.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Part of it has to do with the campaign that we will have as part of our RFP vendor will have to do a public relations campaign to get the word out that these cameras will be going into operation. So the sooner we do that, I think the sooner we'll start getting results. I believe in the city where they use some fake cameras they also get very good results at those intersections.

**LEG. STERN:**

And over the course of time, you know, if we're talking about a full build out within 12 to 18 months, some of the cameras that are installed sooner rather than later, if there is this type of driver modification, if infractions start to go down, I guess my question here is, you know, how long then until you make the determination? Does the vendor help make the determination? Who makes the determination as to when it might be time to pack that one up and move it to another location, you know, where you can construct the process all over again? And if we're talking about a full build out within a year to a year-and-a-half, could there be a situation where one of the cameras that was installed in maybe this first round there, you know, the infractions have gone down but the camera, you know, is not yet going to be moved until, you know, after the full build out is complete. Have you looked forward to see what kind of procedure you're going to be following to determine when it's going to be time to move on? And if so, is that going to happen prior to the end of the full build out?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Well as you know, this is a pilot program. We've been discussing that. One of the issues has to do with the way the law is written. It appears to say that we can only deal with 50 locations. That we can't be moving them right now. We're going to request in the RFP that the vendor discuss with us the possible portability of these devices so that we can look at that in the future. But right now we're talking with the attorneys, it looks like we're going to pick 50 locations with the vendor and that will be part of the pilot program.

**LEG. STERN:**

So there's not going to be any discretion then on our part to be able to move them around until when? When does that ultimately happen? Do you have any idea what procedure we would have to follow at that time if we're not able to do it during the course of this initial pilot?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

As you know, the pilot program is only to December 2014. There's going to have to be legislation introduced early to try to, number one, if we prove this successful, expand it to additional sites. So that's where I think we'll get the additional sites. But nothing's fixed now. We're still discussing with the County Attorneys what the law says and what our flexibilities are.

**LEG. STERN:**

So I understand from the discussion here that there's going to be one company that is going to serve as the vendor for installation purposes and then some other entity that is going to serve to maintain. In general, unless there's something, you know, outstanding or unique, in general, you know, how often do these units need to be maintained?

**MR. DRESCH:**

As with most traffic signal equipment, it is exposed to the elements and extremes of temperature.

So I'm sure the vendor would have a regular maintenance program as the towns and villages do with traffic signals along County highways right now.

**LEG. STERN:**

And approximately, if it's similar, what is that schedule?

**MR. DRESCH:**

I would estimate probably every six to nine months.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Mr. Presiding Officer, you had another question?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Just for the purposes of discussion, when I first started this eight years ago, I went into the city to see their operation and they had a couple of things. First of all, they never reveal the locations where the cameras were located. They only had 50 -- approval for 50 locations at the time. But they had such good results. What they did over time is they -- the camera sits in a box. They started putting up empty boxes so you didn't know which intersection had the cameras and which didn't, which caused a vast improvement over red light running throughout, you know, throughout most of the city, which I thought was an interesting concept. And then I think eventually they went to moving the cameras until I think eventually they got approval to do more than the 50 locations. But it's a program that the state has been reluctant to give us approval and they were reluctant initially to give the city expanded approval of their system as well. So they tried a lot of different innovative things to improve the quality of the system throughout the city. But I thought that might help Legislator Stern in some of your questions.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Horsley.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yes. I like the idea of the empty boxes. That's a novel thought, it's kind of like putting a police car -- a hollowed out police car by the entranceway to a road or something like that.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Thirty-nine, County Road 39.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

There you go. Quick question on how well that these cameras will be protected since they're probably electronically transmitting these images, digital images to wherever the location of this company is, could be around the world, how are they protected as far as hackability, those types of things? I mean, are we concerned about that in our RFP because it seems to me that these things could be easily attacked from outside. I don't know if that's true, but it seems to me like it could be.

**MR. DRESCH:**

Well generally speaking, this equipment will be field hardened and also secure both from the hardware side and from the software and communications side just like we have traffic signal systems out there that communicate to each other and back to our offices. The technology is pretty good and it is fully encrypted. So I think it's as safe as any other wide high band communication system.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Do you anticipate that there will be any requirements that it has to be within country or what are, you know, the RFP itself, are you going to be addressing that issue? Is that something that even if

you want, I don't know, is that something you're thinking about?

**MR. DRESCH:**

I have not included that, but it's an excellent point and I'll make note of that.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Romaine, you had another question.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes. Does the legislation require that a sign be posted where these red light cameras are to give people a warning that they're entering an intersection where there is a red light camera? Is that included in the state legislation?

**MR. DRESCH:**

I've reviewed the state legislation a couple of times and I did not pick up that. So I'm going to say no.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So there's no, like, warning, red light camera ahead?

**MR. DRESCH:**

That is correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. Because that might help people slow down if that's the intent of the legislation. If revenue is a secondary concern and safety is the first, that might be one way to achieve safety. I just thought I'd point that out. Of course, we could always decide to do that since there's no prohibition in the law. Someone had mentioned to me that it might of been included in the law. But you've reviewed it and it isn't. But there's no prohibition from us from including that, something that we may want to consider since our goal is safety and not revenue. Thank you.

**MR. DRESCH:**

I agree. We are considering the efficacy of warning signs because some of the opponents to red light cameras say that the increase of rear end accidents are caused by panic stops from drivers who are aware that there's a red light camera there. So it's something we're seriously considering.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right. Red lights tend to increase rear end accidents as do stop signs. And particularly if someone's making that stop rather abruptly, if they see a camera and the light begins to turn yellow, there may be a tendency to hit the brakes sharper where there might have been enough time to go through the intersection because the light just turned yellow, something of that nature. So a sign giving a warning maybe 200 feet before, 250 feet before, *red light camera ahead*, might serve to improve safety. Maybe not revenue but certainly safety. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. I just had a few questions and actually that was one of them because there's a picture of the sign on your presentation so I was just curious. All right.

The other questions I had, I looked into this a little bit, it seems like most of the systems work. There's three pictures, there's one that's shows you before you're in the intersection with the light red, there shows you one in the intersection and then, you know, maybe there's another one shown you again in the intersection while the light's red. And at least one of those is going to have your license plate. Right?

**MR. DRESCH:**

That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

So that's the sort of system that we're contemplating.

**MR. DRESCH:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

But you also said there was photos and/or streaming video. How does the video come into play?

**MR. DRESCH:**

It's my understanding that some vendors may propose a video system that runs in conjunction with the still cameras.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

So, but that video system would be on -- it'll be triggered by the red light not a continuous camera.

**MR. DRESCH:**

Exactly. It would not be a live feed. It would be in let's say eight or ten second snippets.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. Are we going to make -- once we make a determination of the 50 intersections we're going to be using, do we intend to make that list public?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

We're still discussing that.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

My personal feeling is in talking to some people from Nassau County, it's a good idea as part of the public relations campaign to convince people that this is not a revenue generator, this is a safety issue. That it's a good idea to make the intersections public. But it's still under discussion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. Because I know there are arguments on both sides and both sides would have some sense, but I think in the end I'd probably end up coming down on the side of telling everybody where they are. Because we're hoping that people will stop breaking the law and getting themselves or others hurt or killed, God forbid.

A couple of other questions. The towns, you know, they maintain our traffic lights, but they will have nothing to do with these cameras. So they will have no complaints as an additional cost to them. Correct?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

As Danny said in the presentation, right now we're looking at state County roads to get around the issue of the towns owning the red lights.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

At the State County intersections, the state does those; it's not the Town. So that's how we've eliminated it?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay, all right.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

And then in the future we'll be moving to try to get MOU's with the towns and the villages to allow us -- we're hoping that the program expands.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

And then we'll work with the towns.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Now, we get the whole fine. Correct? I mean the vendor gets the fine. We're not sharing this with another level of government. The whole fine is remitted to the vendor and then we get whatever we agree to by the terms of the RFP; right?

**MR. DRESCH:**

That is correct.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. And the last one, are you sure the question I had was about moving. And, Tom, I think, Tom you said or Dan, I wasn't -- I'm not sure who said it, that we would not be able to move. I don't think the law says that we can, is that something that DPW is putting in the RFP? Because I'm not sure that the law said we couldn't. I thought it said we could have 50 locations. Am I incorrect?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

The RFP's not going to dictate that.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

But our discussions with our County Attorney has indicated that he believes the way it was written is that we're fixed with 50 locations. But that's -- nothing's set in stone. The idea would be that if we we had to move, we probably have to pay the vendor something to move the camera or we would get reduced revenue for some period, so.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

We'll wait and see what the revenue models that they submit to us come in as.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, in addition to that, I know if you have our County Attorney, one of the County Attorneys or the County Attorney's Office has issued opinion, I believe our Counsel is of a different opinion. Is that correct, George?

**MR. NOLAN:**

Yes. The way I read both the state law and the local law that we drafted is we can go up to 50 locations. I don't think there's any prohibition moving from one location to another as long as we

don't go above 50.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Could I just ask, given that, Tom, that you have whichever County Attorney you're working with, reach out to our Counsel and discuss it?

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

Will do.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Thank you, thank you. Are there any other questions? Wayne.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Yeah, hi. It's my understanding that before any ticket is issued it has to be approved by a sworn officer. A sworn officer gives you the okay that this is a legitimate offense. Have we talked to our police department as to how they're going to handle that, the staffing wise and the like. I know it's a big issue today so have you guys chatted?

**MR. DRESCH:**

Yes. As we've been progressing, drafting the RFP and discussing the specifics of deploying this project, we have been involved with Suffolk County PD representatives.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

And they're ready to go with this as well. They've got staff on hand to handle this.

**MR. DRESCH:**

They understand what may be asked of them.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Doing a little research on the topic in my office we came across a couple of sources of information, a couple of sites. *Got a red light and/or speed camera ticket, do you want to fight it in court and win? Learn the tricks now. Top ten tricks to beat your ticket in traffic court*, written by a traffic attorney and traffic court judge, all having to do with fighting red light and speed camera tickets in court.

Perhaps our department should get a copy of this book. And when you are developing your RFP, maybe some of these things should be part of the discussion when you're talking with, you know, potential vendors and whether or not they believe that some of these tools or tricks of the trade are accurate. And what if anything they work into their technology to combat some of the things that are put out there at least to the general public is ways that they can get around, you know, the detection or the enforcement.

**MR. LAGUARDIA:**

If you don't mind sending it to our office, we'd be glad to look at it. Just so you know, the statistics are that only about 1% of the violators ask to have adjudication process. 99% pay their fine.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Distribution should go to the Legislators as well, I'm sure.

## LAUGHTER

### CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Well, we were just joking before then that if anybody has seen the television show Myth Busters, they did a whole episode on proving that you can't beat the camera; that it's going to get a picture of your license plate no matter what, so I don't know if they're scientifically proven.

### LEG. HORSLEY:

Break 200.

### CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

That's right. Yeah, you got to break 200 miles an hour. And I hope that there's nobody here doing that regardless of the vehicle that they're driving.

If you guys don't have anything else, I just want to say thank you. That was very comprehensive and it answered a lot of the questions that were out there and will allow us to answer a lot of the questions that come in from our constituents. So, Dan, Tom, Gil thank you very much.

All right. We'll move directly to the agenda in an attempt to get through this.

## TABLED RESOLUTIONS

The first resolution is **IR 1107, To enhance efficiency in the selection and leasing process for County buildings. (Romaine)**

### LEG. ROMAINE:

Motion to approve.

### CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

There you are. Motion to approve by Romaine. And, Legislator Losquadro, if you'll allow me in the spirit of unity I will second that motion. First, on the motion since I'm the Chairman, I will just say to Legislator Romaine I know that you waited a while to get this passed. I know that there is a good deal of compromise in the end. And I just wanted to say thank you for the work you did as well as thank you to the comptroller who I spoke to as well for the amendment that was made to the SECOND RESOLVE CLAUSE that addressed the concerns that I had. So with that I don't have any additional comments. Legislator Romaine, if you care to say anything.

### LEG. ROMAINE:

Only that we made -- recently made two amendments, one was to increase the size of the square footage that would be covered to 10,000 square feet or more. And the second was to verify that the County isn't being charged for services that are the landlord's responsibility. So those were the two changes that we made to the legislation. Obviously I've been in touch with the Comptroller's Office about this and he's been very pleased with the progress and was very happy to see it moving forward.

### CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

Okay. If there are no other comments. Tom.

### MR. LAGUARDIA:

I would just like to comment, you know, we suggested 25,000 square foot. I just told the Legislature that it will cost us money at this level. It does not allow us the flexibility in the leasing process that is used through the industry. And to be forced to do an RFP for anything over 10,000 square feet, which is the majority of what we do, it'll cost us additional funds.

### CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:

I understand that, Tom, you know, from the time on the Space Management Committee, I understand your concern. I know that the department had requested 25 -- I know that you had specifically suggested 25,000 square feet. Like everything else this is compromise, it winds up somewhere in the middle. The original position of Legislator Romaine and the Comptroller was zero and yours was 25 and we wound up somewhere in the middle. And I realize that that will have some effect on the department. But in the spirit of compromise and I think getting something done, which does codify it, many of the procedures which you put in place yourself when you became Chairman of the Space Management Committee, that's why I tend to support it at this point but I appreciate your comments. Are there any others? All right, seeing none, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1107 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**1114, To implement Sunday bus service and extend weekday morning and evening service in Suffolk County. (Romaine)** I'll offer a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Horsley. If there's no comments on the motion, all in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**  
Opposed.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Legislator Romaine and Legislator Losquadro are opposed. The motion carries. **IR 1114 is tabled. (VOTE: 3-2-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Romaine and Legislator Losquadro)**

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

**LEG. STERN:**  
Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Motion to table by Legislator Stern, I'll second the motion.

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

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
On the motion, Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**  
Just reiterate my previous points that I had made that these fares are quite outdated. And in a comprehensive look at our transit system, in the absence of the MTA actually taking over our transit system, which doesn't seem to be in the cards for our immediate future, I think it is something that needs to be looked at very closely with them being almost two decades old. So just really reiterating that point from the last meeting. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**  
Yeah, thanks, Mr. Chairman. And I'll just reiterate, you know, I agree with Legislator Losquadro on the issue. And I have, as I had said last time, reached out to the sponsor to discuss some of my concerns. His office is aware of those concerns, but to date I don't think that there has been any outreach or any other changes that have been suggested so I renew my motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Okay. If there are no other comments, we have a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Romaine is opposed. Abstentions? **IR 1201 is tabled. (VOTE: 4-1-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Romaine)**

**IR 1456, Requiring the Department of Health Services to establish the objective criteria for dredging projects pursuant to Local Law No. 50-2006. (Schneiderman)** It's my understanding that this motion was -- this resolution was amended. It reflects some of the concerns you had, Commissioner Anderson, and now it's 120 days you have --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

-- to get back, which is the timetable you could work with.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

And at all humanly possible, somewhere before that; right?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We hope.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are any other questions?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro, seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1456 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1492, Amending the 2009 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with building safety improvements (CP 1603). (Co Exec. Levy)** This is an interline transfer from construction -- from construction to planning. Is that correct? Planning to construction.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are any questions? I'll offer a motion to approve.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1492 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1494, Amending the 2009 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with fuel management/preventive maintenance and parts inventory control system (CP 1616). (Co Exec. Levy)** This is another transfer from equipment to construction. Gil.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's for upgrades of our fueling system. I believe specifically toward Yaphank and other outlying systems to meet EPA and DEC requirements.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are no questions, I'll offer a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1494 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1495, Appropriating funds in connection with installation of Fire, Security, and Emergency Systems at County Facilities (CP 1710). (Co Exec. Levy)** This is \$350,000 for the installation of fire alarms, sprinklers and security systems at several county facilities.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Any questions? Seeing none, I'll offer a motion to approve.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1495 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**1496, Appropriating funds in connection with renovations/improvements to Cohalan Court Complex (CP 1125). (Co Exec. Levy)** This is \$2 million for phase four of the improvements. What is phase four?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Phase four involves creation of two street arraignment park courts and some additional detention areas within the Cohalan Complex that weren't originally within the building.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. I don't know if you could answer this question, Gil, but earlier this morning in Budget and Finance we dealt with a resolution that dealt with the bonds between JFA and the Cohalan Court Complex that the County -- this doesn't affect that at all?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, no, this is separately to reconfigure the interior of the building that's to outright purchase.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

This is still the County share of improvements to the building, which we would have paid?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

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

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1496 is approved.**  
**(VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1504, Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Public Works highway maintenance equipment (CP 5047). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is 14 pieces of equipment for \$1.6 million and it's in the budget. Do we have any questions? Seeing none, I'll offer a motion to approve.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

We'll actually just --

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Can I get a second from somebody?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. On the motion, Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Are these any mechanized vehicles or they're off-road type vehicles? I'm just wondering if there's anything we're looking at with the purchase of this equipment towards alternative fuel vehicles.

**MR. CALDERONE:**

No, these are all --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Not that type of equipment.

**MR. CALDERONE:**

-- you know, sand trucks, tractors, fork lifts, excavators. We're actually going to try a salt brine batching system -- we're going to try a salt brine system for, you know, deicing roads. It's that type of equipment.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Okay. Very good, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are no other questions we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1504 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**1509, Amending the 2009 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the traffic signal improvements at the intersection of CR 21, Yaphank-Middle Island Road and Rustic Road (CP 5054). (Browning)** This is a \$100,000 for the installation of a traffic light at this intersection.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct. We don't recommend approval of this resolution.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We have been in discussion with the Legislator for some time about this. The traffic volumes and accident data do not support or meet the warrants by the Federal Highway Authority as well as New York State DOT for the installation of a signal at this intersection. We have done what we can to expand the line of site in the corridor so that it, you know, so that everybody has enough time to make a safe ingress and egress onto the road, but we don't feel at this time that a signal is warranted.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes. If memory serves me correct, Rustic Road and County Road 21 is a three-way intersection, not a four-way intersection.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And Rustic Road does not lead into a major subdivision. It is a single road to the west of 21 where there are very few houses. Having represented that district and being familiar with every street in the district that I represented in the '80's, it just struck me as odd that Rustic road would need a traffic light.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct. It's a one lane in a small subdivision.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I'll second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. There's a motion and a second to table. Gil, if I can just, I guess there's -- you know, I know how they do it with stop lights, but I guess the standard is that the amount of traffic in peak times or just the amount of vehicles that come to an intersection, is that what's used?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It's generally if the volume of traffic is such that it's, you know, very difficult to exit or get onto the road. Similarly, if there's accident data that, you know, supports the need for a traffic light. And these are all warrants or requirements by -- that are established by the Federal Highway Authority that we follow. So at this point they don't meet that.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Now hasn't -- I think if my memory serves and perhaps I'm incorrect, this was brought up -- wasn't there a school bus or some other accident in this location. Maybe I'm thinking of the wrong one, because I know you said the accident data isn't supported, but wasn't this intersection -- wasn't there a recent accident or am I incorrect?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I'm not aware of any recent accidents involving a school bus.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

But even a recent accident, I mean barring a school bus doesn't necessarily warrant a traffic signal. There's accidents at un-signalized intersections on every county road.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Right. Do guys have any -- I don't know if this is an appropriate way to -- or even how you guys look at it, but the degree to which this is deficient, I mean if you're looking for a certain level are we just under or are we significantly under? Or is that --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

To be frank, it's well under, you know, while during heavy or peak times you do have to wait a little while, you know, I mean you might have to wait as long as a minute, there is sufficient time to get out of there if you have to. So you can make the turn, you just have to be patient, you know, at the most peak of times.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Just to clarify because I'm not -- I can't visualize this intersection as I sit here, it says traffic signal improvements. Is this a light where there isn't one or a left turn where there is none?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There is no signal there currently.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. Legislator Stern, you had a question?

**LEG. STERN:**

Yes. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. If it doesn't come close to rising to a certain level, you know, my understanding at least from the sponsor is that the local school district has a serious concern about this particular intersection, so much so that they've directed their buses because of the level of concern, you know, not to make turns here. So I'm having trouble understanding why they believe it is such a significant concern but the numbers don't play that out.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I've had the same discussion with the Legislator. And I have advised her that, you know, if she can get us some type of hard data to that effect, you know, if the school district could write us a letter, you know, something that states their concerns at this intersection that they won't allow left turns on -- from the road onto County Road 21, we would, you know, reconsider that or at least take that information into account, but so far we haven't received any.

**LEG. STERN:**

So that's -- you have not received anything from the local school district, but it's certainly something that could be at least a factor if they get something to you and have a discussion with you about it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It is something we would consider, yes.

**LEG. STERN:**

All right. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Are there other questions? All right. We have a motion and a second to table. If there are no other motions?

**MS. LOMORIELLO:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

There are no other motions. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1509 is tabled.** **(VOTE: 5-0)** Commissioner, I'll reach out to the sponsor and see if she could provide you with that information because there is a school safety concern. If a light isn't the appropriate way to address it, perhaps there's some other means that would address that concern of both the Legislator and the school district, so.

**IR 1510, Directing the Department of Public Works to add a stop on the 3C Bus Route. (Montano) Gil.**

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, I've reached out to the Legislator, in fact, I spoke with him this morning. We've asked to table this legislation to give us time to study what this legislation is requiring that we do. Our concern is that without studying the intersection, or, I'm sorry, without it studying the re-routing into the shopping center, it may, you know, actually harm the route and we'd like the opportunity to study that. And I've asked for one cycle of tabling to have the chance to look into it and then we'll make a recommendation at that time to the Legislator and to this committee.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. I spoke to the sponsor earlier this afternoon and he expressed his desire to get it out. I know the wording of the legislation might not exactly read as it normally would, but I think he told me at least the conversation that he had with you is that it wasn't his intention to make it -- to put it in without a study or to have it looked at to see if it was appropriate. And I know the other thing just from my own experience, you would have to reach out to the property owner and find out if they even want to let you on the property. Because I know over in Coram, I don't know which one of our Legislative District's it's in, it's right outside of mine, I'm confused as to who it is, but there's a Home Depot shopping center that for years the public has wanted this, the bus in, but the property owner has said, *you're not coming onto my property, so.*

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

It's Jack.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

It's Jack all right. Well, we're all right there, so. So I guess you are uncomfortable passing this with -- as it's currently worded. What changes are you looking for?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Essentially I would just like, you know, either to be directed that it, you know, that we're to study the legislation or at least give us the opportunity to look at the situation and, you know, confirm it or express our concerns with it.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. Are there any other questions? So do we have a motion?

**MS. LOMORIELLO:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Do we have a motion?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion to table from Legislator Losquadro. Do we have a second? Do we have a second?

**LEG. STERN:**

I'll second for discussion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Legislator Stern second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Yeah, I think the -- okay, right.

**LEG. STERN:**  
In its current form the legislation would direct the work to be done. But the sponsor himself is saying that that is not necessarily his intent, but to go through the proper procedure and so the legislation would just have to be amended to reflect the proper intent.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
That, yeah. It seems like that's what the situation is.

**LEG. STERN:**  
It seems like --

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**  
Through the Chair, it just seems, though, just the way that it was worded however unintentionally, you know, we just need to -- even as Legislator Beedenbender pointed out, even to have the authorization from the property owner in place, you know, before we do something that, the way that it's worded would, you know, cause us to put something in place we might not even be able to accomplish. So I think we should -- DPW and Mr. Chairman speak with the sponsor and, you know, get the details worked out and get this amended so that it gives everyone the authorization that they need.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Sounds good. Okay. If there are no further comments, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1510 was tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1517, A resolution making certain findings and determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (ultraviolet disinfection) (CP 8132). (Co. Exec. Levy)** All right. I guess this is the beginning of why Ben Wright is here. This is a public hearing. This is \$10 million for the UV system at Bergen Point.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**  
Correct. This makes the -- this resolution makes certain findings and determinations based on the public hearing that was held.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Okay. If there are no questions I'll offer a motion to approve.

**LEG. STERN:**  
Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**  
Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1517 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1518, A resolution making certain findings and determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (infrastructure improvements) (CP 8170). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is buildings, electrical and mechanical systems at Bergen Point. I'll offer a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Horsley. Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I just want to put on the record although it's probably not germane to this resolution, it is germane to the Southwest Sewer District, I had an e-mail exchange with Legislator Horsley, in which I clearly indicated I was troubled and I do want to start raising these questions when Southwest is discussed, I'm a big supporter of the Southwest Sewer District, I'm a big opponent of the outfall pipe. I don't believe that we should be moving to redo our outfall pipe. I think if anything we should be reconfiguring and taking a look at the option of tertiary recharge. We are depleting the water supply and the aquifer in western Suffolk County by pumping hundreds of thousands of gallons a day of sewer effluent that has been treated that could be successfully recharged out into the ocean. That depletion of our aquifer will pay -- will result in western Suffolk residents paying a heavy price in terms of water, creeks and things of that nature.

And I truly think at some point, and I'm going to be raising these questions and I just want to let everyone know -- raising these questions with greater repeatedly about the Southwest Sewer District and how we dispose of the treated effluent. I believe that recharge -- tertiary recharge is the way, not pumping it out into the ocean. And unless someone starts raising these issues, we're going to make the mistake of rebuilding an outfall pipe when instead we have the opportunity to at least look at the cost because the cost is enormous for an outfall pipe of tertiary recharge. And that's something that seriously should be looked at at this Legislature before we move forward with an outfall pipe. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I may, I would make the statement that number one; this is one of the options that's being considered by the, you know, the engineers that are putting together the feasibility study right now. And, you know, there are associated costs. Not only with the land acquisition but it would be a significant distance from the plant inland that you would have to run such a system. And these are all being studied right now and will be part of the findings.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Just to say that it will also give you the opportunity that you would not have to expand the plant, that in fact you might consider a second plant because it would not have to be near the bay or the ocean because you would not be discharging your treated effluent into the ocean; you would be recharging it. And that's another consideration, which I'm sure the residents around Bergen Point would appreciate.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

As I said, this is all being considered as part of the study on what to do with the outfall right now.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are no further comments we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1518 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1519, A resolution making certain findings and determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (infiltration/inflow study/sewer rehabilitation) (CP 8181). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is \$4 million for the rehab of sewers. Same motion, same second, same vote. **IR 1519 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1520, Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (ultraviolet disinfection) (CP 8132). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is ultraviolet. This is the companion resolution to, I guess, 1517, the one we just did. So again, same motion, same second, same vote. **IR 1520 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1521, Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (infrastructure**

**improvements) (CP 8170). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is the companion to 1518. So same motion, same second, same vote.

**IR 1521 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1522, Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (inflow /infiltration) (CP 8181). (Co. Exec. Levy)** The companion of 1519. So same motion, same second, same vote.

**IR 1522 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1523, Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of sewer facility maintenance equipment (CP 8164). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is a million dollars for sewer system rehab and sludge hauling.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, it's for equipment that we use as part of our maintenance operations.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Sounds good. I'll offer a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1523 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1524, Transferring Escrow Account Revenues to the Capital Fund, amending the 2009 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for improvements and/or rehabilitation of existing facilities in Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (CP 8170). (Co. Exec. Levy)** Motion by Legislator Horsley, I'll second. Legislator Romaine.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, I understand that you're transferring this from capital fund 528. Is that the trust in agency escrow account?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, it is.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Could you explain the trust in agency escrow account? And where that money -- what that money was originally intended for and what that account is used for?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

For that one I'm going to have to turn to Ben.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

When there's excess available capacity at any -- of the County treatment plants --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yup.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

That capacity can be sold and it's sold at the going rate, which is in the local law.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Thirty dollars per gallon per day.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes, \$30 per gallon at this time. That money goes into an interest bearing account and then it's utilized for improvements in the future, which is --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

How much money is currently in that account roughly speaking?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

I believe we just had gotten some, you know, maybe another million dollars, but this 2.8 million was basically taking everything out of the bank in order that we didn't have to use serial bonds for everything we need.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Which makes sense. But most of -- and while most of this trust in agency escrow account was created by selling off -- by selling -- people allowing people who weren't in the Southwest Sewer District to join all the way as far as north of Huntington, also other districts -- were other districts involved in gathering this money?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

When they are it goes into an account that's specific for that district.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So this is specific to Southwest.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And this will in essence deplete the account.

**MR. WRIGHT:**

As said, I believe we just have received some additional funds, but they may not be in the account yet. But this does deplete it as of when we submitted the resolution.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right, I understand. Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are no further questions, we have a motion and second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1524 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1525, Calling for a Public Hearing for the purpose of considering proposed increases and improvements of facilities for Sewer District No. 23 - Coventry Manor (CP 8149). (Co. Exec. Levy)**

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Horsley. If there are no questions, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1525 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1526, Amending the 2009 Operating Budget, transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, and appropriating funds for the Yaphank County Center Wastewater Treatment Plant (CP 8158). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is \$2 million in

Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds for the nitrogen removal process. So it will comply with DEC?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. I will offer a motion to approve.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

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

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, could you explain the reserve fund 404 to me and how that operates and where the funding comes from?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

That is not a County sewer district. It's a County facility so it's a general fund district. And the Assessment Stabilization Fund was going to be used to assist in bringing us up to date with the DEC requirements.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right. Where do the funds for the Assessment Stabilization Fund come from?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

A quarter percent of the sales tax is allocated to different funds and I believe 25% is the current amount that goes to stabilize rates in county sewer districts.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Then what, we have about 22, 23 sewer districts now?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yeah, 24.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Twenty-four sewer districts now. So that stabilization fund is meant to help stabilize rates for average customers; commercial, industrial, residential in those sewer districts; is that correct?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

So by taking \$2 million from this assessment stabilization fund for what essentially should be a capital project of the County, funded as a capital project of the County, as opposed to using Assessment Stabilization Funds, would we not put those 24 districts at a slight disadvantage because there would be less money in the Assessment Stabilization Fund?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

I believe that's a budget question and would have to be asked to the Budget Office.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Well then, I will redirect my question to Budget Review. I think you understand the thrust of my question.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

I absolutely understand the thrust of your question. My first question would be to Counsel.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Is this legal?

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

And, Legislator Romaine, I appreciate your question. To Counsel, it seems as though if we're using Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds, which are paid for -- which, well, they have a specific intent for a non-sewer district, did we write something into the law that let's us do that?

**MR. NOLAN:**

I'm looking at the section right now. And I don't know -- I don't see the authorization use the stabilization monies this way for a County owned sewer plant. It's supposed to be for taxpayer stabilization within the sewer districts. So I have a question whether or not this is an appropriate use of these monies.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'll make a motion to table this resolution.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. There's a motion to table. I'll second the motion for the moment, but, Ben, let me ask you, have we done this before?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes. I believe we had \$500,000 last year that went into this particular area for this treatment plant. And it was in the adopted Capital Budget.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. It was in the Capital Budget as sewer? As sewer money or as G-money?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

No, as a Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund funding.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. We'll is this -- there's no time, there's no expedient nature for this, is there? This doesn't haven't to get done today?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

There is a compliance schedule with New York State DEC. The engineer is in the design phase and we anticipate that would be going to construction in a few months.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, given the outstanding question, my suggestion would be if we could either have the County Attorney or somebody point to our Counsel or our Committee as a whole where the authorization for this is because I do think that it is bit of an outstanding question and it's not accusatory at all. Just I think before we approve it we should just make sure we know where the authorization is. If you can provide that to us on Tuesday and there's a good answer to it, I don't think that this committee or this body would be adverse to approving it then. We may need the assistance of the County Executive's Office with a CN to do so. But at this point I don't see how we're allowed to do this. Legislator Romaine, I think I see your hand up.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Just briefly, even if there is silence in the law and consent is considered and I'm sure the County

Attorney will come up with some opinion that will say it's okay, even if that is the case, then it become less whether it's legal or not. There's a legal question, which you amply pointed out, which I caught, but there's also like a policy question. This should be a bonded thing for a County structure. We're using Assessment Stabilization Funds, which was set up for the purpose of stabilization rates in 24 other districts that serve residents and businesses. And we're taking that money to essentially do a project at a County sewer treatment plant in the County. What is it, in Yaphank?

**MR. WRIGHT:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

In Yaphank. This may be more appropriately funded through a bonding resolution as opposed from Assessment Stabilization Fund. I would hate to -- I don't have sewer districts in -- the municipal ones I have are run by the Town of Riverhead. But quite frankly, it raises a lot of concerns about how we fund and finance this. And I understand the benefit to this, but it's certainly a detriment to anyone living in any one of those 24 sewer districts.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Well, I think of this in two lights. I remember last year, and I think it's going to come up again, we had an extensive discussion about the Smithtown Galleria. And I think my point at that time was that I was concerned that a district that was not part of the -- a group that was not part of the sewer -- was not a sewer district was going to be accessing these funds to the detriment of others and that may or may not be true at this point, but this seems kind of similar.

And the other concern that I have is that, you know, in recent times we've been hearing lots about inappropriate transfers. And I am in no way suggesting that somebody's trying to do something inappropriate here. I just think that I don't feel comfortable with the answers we have. And maybe it's just because we don't have the right paragraph of information in front of us. But if you guys could -- whatever the County Attorney has shared with you, if you could share that with us and our Counsel specifically considering there's disagreement.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

E-mail it.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Yeah, if you could e-mail it to us I'd be happy. And if there's -- like I said, if there's an answer and there's something that we're missing, I'd be happy to request of the County Executive on Tuesday that we do this to meet the construction deadline. But failing that we have a motion and a second to table. If there are no other statements on the motion, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1526 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1527, Creating a "Share the Road" signage program in Suffolk County.** I'll offer a motion to approve. Do we have a second?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. We have a second. We'll go Legislator Stern and then Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Was that a second? Second by Legislator Losquadro. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Legislator Losquadro had a question first.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. Legislator Losquadro. Either way, we'll play tennis.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

What are the particulars of this legislation? Is there -- are there monies appropriated to or is this going to go into the sign budget for DPW to actually create these signs? What about installing them? Has any of this been accounted for?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There are no funds included with this legislation besides our concerns regarding that. We also, you know, the time involved in doing it is difficult especially considering that DMV crash statistics do not provide sufficient enough information to detail or identify motorcycle accident sites, you know, high incident motorcycle accident sites. So our recommendation or request was going to be to table this until we could have discussions with the Legislator on this matter. We have had some.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Aren't there other programs that already exist like the Black Spot Accident Program and other ways to identify high risk intersections? We're not reinventing the wheel here. I know that there are other programs that exist both in New York and throughout the country as ways of bringing people's attention to the fact that you're -- for anyone whether you're on a motorcycle or in a vehicle that this is an area that you want to be maybe extra mindful of.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct. And I mean, you know, I would note that there are thousands of miles of highway in Suffolk County not only County owned, but state and local and village, you know, it's a big nut.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Personally I think if you're looking for signage for a roadway when you exit the 106th air rescue wing base there's a sign on the back of the sign that you see from the road that says, *you're about to enter one of the most dangerous areas of the world of public highway, fasten your safety belt and drive accordingly*. I think if we want to bring people's attention to the fact that it's dangerous I think we should put that sign up elsewhere.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. And, you know, our recommendation with the, you know, this would make a better public service, you know, effort and, you know, than to add more signage.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I'll withdraw my motion -- my second on the approval, Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All right. Do we have another motion?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

To table? I'll make that motion.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro to table. Do we have a second?

**LEG. STERN:**

I'll second the motion. And I think going to what the Commissioner had stated here, you know, I

think that the purpose is appropriate. It's an important message to send. I just don't know if this legislation is ready to move. Let's do the analysis. Let's talk about how many sites are going to be chosen. Let's determine how many signs we're talking about and let's put a price tag on it, then we could come back and determine if we want to go forward. But it just seems that as written it's just premature.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. We have a motion and a second to table. If there are no other comments, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1527 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1535, Appropriating funds in connection with construction and rehabilitation of highway maintenance facilities (CP 5048). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is a million dollars for highway maintenance facilities, ironically enough. If there are no questions, I'll offer a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1535 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1549, Appropriating funds in connection with traffic calming measures on CR 19, Patchogue-Holbrook Road from the LIE to CR 16, Portion Road (CP 3302). (Co. Exec. Levy)** Before we have a motion, would the Clerk please list me as co-sponsor. Come on, Ed, you weren't paying attention, I was trying to get a good joke there for you. But this is a traffic calming measure in my area. And I'm happy to see that we are planning for it considering we just approved in the budget the full construction monies to do it. So I will offer a motion to approve.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Actually it's in Legislator Losquadro's district, Ridgehaven.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

We're on 1549. No, no, no I wouldn't have asked the Clerk to list me as a cosponsor. All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1549 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1550, Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, and appropriating funds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 20 - William Floyd (Ridgehaven) (CP 8147). (Co. Exec. Levy)**

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Now I will make that motion, Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro, I will second the motion. Are there any questions? Seeing none, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1550 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1551, Amending Resolution No. 312-2005, as amended, in connection with stormwater remediation at various County roads, CR 96, Great East Neck Road, at Evergreen Street (CP 8240). (Co. Exec. Levy)**

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion to approve

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley. I'll offer a second on the motion. Legislator Losquadro.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

This is reappropriating part of the monies to land acquisition. Is that correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes. It's for the acquisition of the parcels so we can construct retention basin.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Being that it's being taken away from construction, was this more money than was anticipated for the project? Did you not realize you were going to have acquire that property? And if that is the case, is that going to mean a shortfall in the overall price tag for the project?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No. The fee was what was anticipated. There was concern by -- the previous legislation had this as being this -- the monies for this project being bonded. There were concerns because this is basically a stormwater remediation project that the funding should come through 477, which we then resubmitted as it is right now where the funding is coming from 477.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there are no further comments, we have a motion and a second. Nope. Do we have a second? I'll second it. I didn't make that motion, did I? All right, good. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1551 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1553, Amending the 2009 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with alternative fuel infrastructure and compressed natural gas vehicles (CP 5602). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is an 80/20 share with the feds and it's \$45,000 in serial bonds for CNG fueling stations and County employee training program to use the stations. All right.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

I'll make a motion, Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Motion by Legislator Losquadro, seconded by Legislator Horsley. All in favor?

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Madam Clerk, just list me as a cosponsor please.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1553 is approved. (VOTE: 5-0)**

**IR 1556, Authorizing the purchase of up to 28 paratransit vans for Suffolk Transit and accepting and appropriating Federal Aid and State Aid and County funds (CP 5658). (Co. Exec. Levy)** This is \$1.7 million for up to 28 paratransit vans. It's the normal 80/10/10 split between the federal government, the state and the County. And if there are no further questions, I'll offer a motion to approve.

**LEG. LOSQUADRO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0)** Legislator Romaine, you had several questions for Gil before we adjourned.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, very quickly. Gil, as I had e-mailed you earlier last week, I believe, about Hashamomuck Cove.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Sorry. Legislator Romaine, go ahead.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Yes, where are we with this? Now I'm told by some people that you have an intention of adding this to the 2010 Capital Budget; is that correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It is included within the Capital Program, but currently under subsequent years. We were waiting for some direction from the Army Corps and the DEC as to how we needed to proceed. The way --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'm looking at e-mails from Steven Couch and Eugene Brickman. Are you familiar with those individuals?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, I am. They're from the Army Corps.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Okay. Apparently they're under an understanding that the County is going to commit to a local share in 2010, that there's a Capital Project coming forward. I'm going to get exact e-mail, which talks about that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

What they are looking for is a commitment on the part of the County to basically -- hold on one second.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right. This is an erosion study if I'm not mistaken.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, essentially of the whole east, north -- the whole northern fork.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right. Of the whole, well almost --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right, right.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

-- most of the northern fork, not all of it. Let me ask you this, since Hashamomuck Cove in particular is the one that is most threatened and would create a big problem for the County, in so far as if that was breached, that would sever County Road 48. As you know on the North Fork if anyone's traveled there, there's only two east/west roads essentially. County Road 25, excuse me, State Road 25 and County Road 48. 48, it could be breached at Hashamomuck Cove and washed out. And because of the wetlands around there, it'd be very difficult to reconstruct the road. Where are we with this?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That is the emergency project that the Army Corps has - is undertaking right now. That's for essentially strengthening the side of the road with sheet piling. The Army Corps is in the process of acquiring work permits, easements, so that the sheeting can be connected into the existing bulkheading to protect the roadway.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And the County is going to be part of that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

I'm reading e-mails from Army Corps of Engineers where they're under the impression that we're going to participate in this in 2010.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The monies were appropriated last year, I believe, and I could get the --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

For 2010?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes. Might have been last -- might even have been 2009. The money was appropriated because had to reach an agreement and submit a resolution --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

-- to the Army Corps to proceed with that.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

But we are committed and we are going forward with our local share of this project that's 80% federally funded.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

That's as you know, very important to some of my constituents. There are six or seven homes that -- there are many homes in the cove, but there are six or seven that are so immediately threatened --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

-- that unless work starts on preventing the erosion of this cove, that those homes could fall into the sea.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There are, again, there are two projects. There's the Emergency Project to strengthen County Road 48 --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

-- at that specific location. Then there's the overarching study --

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Right.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

-- which is going to be a multi-year project.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Can we work to see if we can expedite the smaller? We can take up the larger? And this is my last question because I know I don't want to hold these gentlemen, but can we break that overall large mostly North Fork project down so we could actually address the emergency project at Hashamomuck Cove?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

They are two separate projects right now.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

And they are. And you'll be able to address that and move this forward for 2010?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. ROMAINE:**

Thank you so much.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRMAN BEEDENBENDER:**

Okay. If there's no further business we stand adjourned.

**THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 3:42 PM**

**{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY**