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, Hauppauge, New York on July 28, 2009 at 2:00 P.M.

Members Present:
Legislator Brian Beedenbender, Chairman
Legislator Steven H. Stern, Vice-Chair
Legislator Wayne R. Horsley (Not present)
Legislator Daniel P. Losquadro
Legislator Edward P. Romaine

Also in Attendance:
William J. Lindsay, Presiding Officer
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Rosalind Gazes, Budget Review Office
Robert Doering, Budget Review Office
Barbara LoMoriello, Deputy Clerk
Sarah Simpson, Assistant Counsel
Mike Cavanagh, Aide to the Presiding Officer
Marcus Povelli, Aide to Leg. Losquadro
Kaitlyn Boyd, Aide to Leg. Beedenbender
Deborah Harris, Aide to Leg. Stern
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Leader
Linda Bay, Aide to Minority Leader
Ed Hennessy, Aide to the County Executive
Gil Anderson, Commissioner of Public Works
Bill Hillman, Chief Engineer, Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Ben Wright, Department of Public Works
Gail Lolis, Deputy County Attorney
Debra Alloncius, AME Legislative Director
All other interested parties

Minutes Taken By:
Gabrielle Skolom - Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 2:11 PM*)

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
All right. We're going to get started. We will begin with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Stern.

Salutation

Okay. I have no cards before me. Is there anybody in the audience that wishes to address us? Seeing none, we'll go directly to the agenda.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

The first item on the agenda is **IR 1114 - 2009, 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 Stern. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. ROMAINE:
Opposed.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Abstentions? **IR 1114 is tabled.** ***(VOTE 3-1-0-1, Leg. Romaine opposed, Leg. Horsley Not Present)***

IR 1201 - 2009, Directing the Department of Public Works to hold public hearings on new bus fares in order to implement Sunday bus service. (Schneiderman) I'm going to offer a motion to table. Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. ROMAINE:
Opposed.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Absten -- motion to table fails. Are there any other motions?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
I didn't realize that's what we had. Motion to reconsider, Mr. Chairman, on the prevailing side or as of the motion side.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Can I second that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:
Yes.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Second. All right. We seconded. There's a motion to reconsider. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? All right. 1201 is before us. I'll offer a motion to table. Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. ROMAINE:
Opposed.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
IR 1201 is tabled. ***(VOTE 3-1-0-1, Leg. Romaine opposed, Leg. Horsley Not Present)***

IR 1510 - 2009, Directing the Department of Public Works to add a stop on the 3C Bus Route. (Montano)

LEG. ROMAINE:
Motion to approve.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Motion to approve by Legislator Romaine. Gil, we had HAD a conversation -- do I have a second before we move to questions?

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
I'll second for the purposes of discussion.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
All right. Gil, we had a discussion about this last time. I think it centered on something your department wanted to look at.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. We wanted to analyze the bus stop and review the feasibility of locating the bus stop where it's proposed on the resolution. Since then, we've contacted the property management company about installing the bus stop signs there, and we've received, you know, generally favorable and positive comments, but we're still waiting for something formal back from them before we start the adjustment. Additionally, we're trying to look at the schedule of this particular bus run to see how we -- how we implement it if we have to actually change the schedules of the other bus stops, which is -- we think right now, we will have to do that. I spoke with Legislator Montano's office last night and asked him if it was okay -- we'd -- you know, I'd table it another cycle. We are moving positively forward, but -- you know, and at that time when I spoke to his aide, he said they would be in favor of it, but, you know.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
But I had some experience over in Coram with a similar situation. We need permission. We can't just go onto that property. So you're waiting for a formal, I guess, formal permission or something in writing from the property owner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, we are.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
And -- so, I guess, from what I'm hearing from you, though is that once we get all the ducks in a row, this is something that the Department thinks would be a good step forward?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. But we should table this now is what you're saying?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
At least until we get the property management approved from them.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. Sounds like we are moving in a positive direction. I'll offer a motion to table.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Seconded by Legislator Stern. Tabling takes precedence. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1510 is tabled. *(VOTE 4-0-0-1, Leg. Horsley Not Present)*** And thank you, Gil. I know that Legislator Montano, he'd reached out to my office. He believes that's an important change for his community, so thank you for working with him.

Next bill is **IR 1526 - 2009, 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.)**

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
If I may?

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Please, Gil.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This one, we would ask that it be tabled. The County Attorney's Office has looked at whether or not we could use ASRF funds to fund this project because it isn't a specific sewer district, and they agree this has to be bonded out and not go through ASRF. So we're in the process of revising the resolution, and we will resubmit it.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
This is based on concerns that Legislator Romaine had brought up, and quite appropriately, I would say. At the last point, you see -- had an opinion. I guess you shared that with our Counsel or -- the opinion said you couldn't do it, so we're just -- you're going to bond it in the regular course?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
All right. Then this would be appropriate to table. I'll offer a motion to table.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Could I ask a question?

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Of course. Presiding Officer.

P.O. LINDSAY:
This is the sewer plan in connection with the project in Yaphank that was in the paper today?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is in connection with the existing plan that's out there --

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
Your microphone, Gil.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, that is correct. That's the site. There is an existing plant there now. Under the proposed improvements, they would expand that plant when and if they get to that point.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Well, that was my question. Is -- this process is just starting. I mean, we literally know very little about the whole project in Yaphank. We haven't really been briefed about it as yet. And I know we have to pass a resolution to make the property available, and we must go through town zoning. What happens if somewhere along the line, it stumbles?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, this is separate from that issue. This is actually to do work on the denitrification system on the existing plant as it is right now.

P.O. LINDSAY:
So it isn't an expansion of the existing plant?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, it's not.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Okay. Thank you.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. We had a motion and a second to table, Barbara?

MS. LOMORIELLO:
I don't have it.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
All right. I'll offer a motion to table. Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1526 is tabled.**
(VOTE 4-0-0-1, Leg. Horsley Not Present)

IR 1527-2009, Creating a "Share the Road" signage program in Suffolk County. My notes -- if I remember, at the last meeting, there was a question about compiling the accident locations. This is something I'd like to move forward with. Gil, do you have any response from the conversation we had last time? Was that you? I don't remember. I thought it was you that had mentioned that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, we did mention the fact that we do not have to ability to compile the information to make -- you know, to pick the locations where those signs would be. Just, it's not possible based on the database without going through each individual accident throughout the country -- throughout the County so --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
Yeah, Mr. Chairman. I see that the signage would be consistent with a federally approved design. Where would the moneys -- I don't see anything -- or I don't recall where the moneys for the production of this signage -- would that be done inhouse in our sign shop? Is there a cost associated with that to us?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There will be costs, and there aren't any identified in this Legislation. Oh, and I'm advised it's not a federally approved sign, so that's another issue. And we do have concerns with proliferating signs throughout County roadways, especially when they're not regulatory or warning.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:

I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Second.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. There's a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1527 is tabled**. ***(VOTE 4-0-0-1, Leg. Horsley Not Present).***

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

IR 1572 - 2009, Amending the 2009 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the County share for participation in the reconstruction/widening of bridge on North Ocean Avenue, CR 83, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5849). (Co. Exec.)

This bridge is done so I'm just -- could you explain this? Did we get extra money that we aren't anticipating; was there -- was this an overage or the contract there was claiming additional costs?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is an overage in costs due to an adjustment that was part of the contract for steel, concrete and fuel and, you know, for asphalt. So these were additional costs above the $9 million that the project cost.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. I see you, Legislator Romaine, but just --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And, if I may, I should note that they are -- they will be federally funded. Out of the three --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
It's 80/20. The Fed's picking up 80%, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. Correct.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
When you say that it's part of the contract, just -- I don't understand that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Because -- because of the unsurity of asphalt prices of -- primarily due to petroleum based but also steel at the time, we have an itemized bid, and part of that bid is an adjustment -- a unit cost for an adjustment based on whether if the contractor can come in and prove that the costs have increased so significantly that he's impacted, and we adjust the price accordingly, which is what you're seeing here. It was something that couldn't be anticipated.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
If I could just interject one point, I just want to make sure, the way our contracts are written, our adjustment clause, the contractor can only claim once within the 30-day period; is that the way ours are written?

MR. HILLMAN:
Yes. They are based on New York State DOT's website, and both steel and asphalt are listed on their website, and it's an adjustment factor, you know, either up or down. And every 30 days, that adjustment factor changes, and we base everything on that, so we follow the State format.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
Very good. Thank you.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Legislator Romaine, you had some questionings as well.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Yes. Thank you. You answered some of them. So what happened is, in your contract, you have an adjustment clause based on DOT's adjustment; is that correct?

MR. HILLMAN:
Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:
And based on that adjustment, this project, which was roughly $9 million, went up by $375,000?

MR. HILLMAN:
Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:
And that happened after the fact after the project was closed out?

MR. HILLMAN:
No. We knew about the overrun. It -- to obtain the federal funds, to find an offset, scheduled it on the tip, process it through State and Federal governments took this long to get there.

LEG. ROMAINE:
To approve this?

MR. HILLMAN:
Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:
So that's why we're back looking at this today?

MR. HILLMAN:
Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:
And this isn't -- this is something that's pro forma?

MR. HILLMAN:
Yes. Well, this legislation is required to obtain the reimbursement. It's part of the requirements by State DOT and FHWA, but all the preprocess took this long to get here.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Okay.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Thank you. I'm make a motion to approve. Seconded by Legislator Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1572 is approved.** ***(VOTE 4-0-0-1, Leg. Horsley Not Present)***

IR 1576 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest (Sludge Cogeneration) (CP 8180). (Co. Exec.) I'll offer a motion to approve. Seconded by Legislator Stern. It's $200,000 in sewer district bonds for engineering?

MR. HILLMAN:
Correct.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
If there are no other questions, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1576 is approved.** ***(VOTE 4-0-0-1, Leg. Horsley Not Present)***

IR 1577-2009, Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of considering proposed increases and improvements of facilities for Sewer District No. 9 College Park (CP 8163). (Co. Exec.)

This is just a public hearing. I'll offer a motion to approve.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
IR 1577 is approved. ***(VOTE 4-0-0-1, Leg. Horsley Not Present)***

IR 1586-2009, Directing the Suffolk County Sewer Agency to prepare maps, plans, reports and make recommendations in accordance with Article 5-A to form a sewer district at Spring Meadow and Towne House Village in the Town of Islip. (Co. Exec.) Right before this meeting, Commissioner, Legislator Kennedy asked me to table this because he said that -- I forgot which one of the groups -- I believe it was Spring Meadow isn't necessarily -- isn't onboard with this yet. So I'm going to make that motion to table. Has he reached out -- do you have an understanding of this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, but Ben advised me of it earlier so.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Is there a time factor with this? This is something that's -- I would imagine it being in the works for quite some time.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. This has been in part of the process that developed out of the Sewer District 13 discussions last year.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
This is -- this is the -- not the Galleria -- the --

MR. HILLMAN:
The Wind Watch.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Wind Watch, right. Now, I understand -- and I think it's Spring Meadow is in a high state of disrepair.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

They both are actually. They're both required by the Health Department to upgrade their facilities.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Well, I asked Legislator Kennedy to -- if he has to speak with your department, yourself, or anybody else to try to put this -- to make a decision sooner rather than later only because, you know, this sewer district plan is in disrepair, and we would like to move this process, which is going to take a long time from right now, anyway, just to prepare the maps and get the district going. So if he reaches out to you, please just do what you can to see if we can get this going forward, but it may just come down to the people that he represents might not want to do it so.

With that, I'll offer a motion to table. Seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1586 is tabled**.
(VOTE 4-0-0-1, Leg. Horsley Not Present).

IR 1595-2009, Amending the 2009 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Riverhead County Center Power Plant upgrade (CP 1715). (Co. Exec.)
This is from planning to construction, I think, $550,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. And it transfers 25 from the planning into the construction phase and will allow us to address leakage, exhaust fan failure, structural repairs and some site restoration.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Great. Legislator Romaine?

LEG. ROMAINE:
Quick question. What is this going to do to the power plant? Is it going to make it more efficient? Give it more capacity? What is it going to do? What's the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is primarily to the structure around it, the actual building. We're going to address leakage that we have, you know, between roof work, some exhaust fans that aren't working.

LEG. ROMAINE:
So you are going to retrofit the building?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:
And that's going to cost a half million dollars, a little bit more?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Pretty expensive. How is that power plant? How efficient is the power plant?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe it's in very good working condition. I think it's very efficient. We've been upgrading it on a continual basis over the years, at least since I've been here. And --

LEG. ROMAINE:
What are the emissions involved with that plant? Are you familiar with that or?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, I'm not familiar with it, but I haven't heard anything to the contrary.

LEG. ROMAINE:
If you could have someone just call me about the emissions and whether they meet standards and things of that nature.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Absolutely.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Okay. I appreciate that. Thank you.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Legislator Losquadro.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
Just on the subject of the power plant. Obviously, we're doing all the work on the County Center out there. I would imagine that a lot of the upgrades that we're doing to that building are going to include much more efficient lighting, better insulation, better windows, things of that nature. So I would think that the lobe capacity of the plant should be fine.

MR. HILLMAN:
Correct.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
But like Legislator Romaine, I just want to make sure that we're using the operating plant in the most efficient manner that we can while minimizing the admissions. But that is your intention, obviously, is to actually lower the demand on that plant with the upgrades to the building, correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. LOSQUADRO:
Correct.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Go ahead, Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:
One additional question. I know that plant doesn't operate to generate power for the County Center; that that plant is a backup plant; that if we were going offline, then the plant would go online; is that correct?

MR. HILLMAN:
I believe so.

LEG. ROMAINE:
That's my view of that.

MR. HILLMAN:
I think everything funnels through that similar to a lot of smaller plants that you'd have in different sites.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Have we done a cost-benefit analysis of what it costs us to have a stand-up plant of that size and magnitude, something that is capable by the way of running the entire County Center, because the

County, on days like today, and we've had a very cool summer, but on very warm summers, very humid summers, the County would voluntarily tell LIPA, "Look, we'll go offline at noon, and for the next umpteen hours, we'll run on our plant." Have we ever done a cost-benefit analysis of how much it costs us per kilowatt to generate power?

MR. HILLMAN:
I would believe we would have done that as part of the development of this whole project.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Do you think you could get me that information?

MR. HILLMAN:
Sure.

LEG. ROMAINE:
What I'm shooting at, and let me tell you where I'm going. If it's cost beneficial for us to operate, why are we operating and selling power back to the grid? We have a permanent staff there -- let me just explain that. We have a permanent staff that operates the power plant. In fact, I believe it's -- it runs around -- you've got staff 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at the power station. And if we're only using it for a few hours for a few days or as a backup, how cost effective is that? If we analyze the cost per kilowatt when we are on, we might be better off operating in selling that power back to help us afford the cost of operating a power plant that we operate 7 days a week, 24 hours a day with staff, and it's only backup. That's a huge expense for backup.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
That's a good point.

LEG. ROMAINE:
So, I just would point that out, and at the end of the resolutions, I have one question for the Commissioner.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Okay. Well, I have one too so -- we do have a motion. I'll offer a motion to approve. Seconded by Losquadro. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **IR 1595 is approved.** ***(VOTE 4-0-0-1, Leg. Horsley Not Present)***

Before we get to you, Legislator Romaine -- Commissioner Anderson, because I'm on the sewer agency, I know we just got the RFP responses to the sewer capacity study, and while I won't speak about any of them in particular, what I did notice is that on one of the critical areas, which was listed in the RFP, there were 13. One of them is listed as Centereach, Selden and Middle Island. The reason I bring that up is because when you look at the boundaries, it's generously considered -- if you look at the boundaries, they're generously Selden, but nowhere near Centereach. So -- and in some of the documents, I read that it may be possible at some point for, whenever we pick a consultant or a company to do this work, that there could there could be modification boundaries. And all I would ask is that if we're going to call it Selden and Centereach, what I think do need sewers, the boundaries should include, you know, more than 2% of Selden and more than 0% of Centereach. So I don't know if there's an opportunity for us to address that once we pick a contractor to change those boundaries or if that changes the scope of the work, which it would, because I think it's like a two-and-a-half mile stretch of Middle Country Road that they are looking at, which the Selden/Centereach stretch alone is larger than that.

MR. HILLMAN:
Right. And I believe that area has been -- was identified through either visioning or some other process locally. So either we would change the name or --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:

Well, there was a visioning process in Selden and Centereach, and one of the things was a request for sewers. And, listen, if Selden and Centereach has been left off the list, that's -- you know, I would have been upset, but the study area says Centereach/Selden, and it starts basically almost at 112. The Selden Sewer District is called the Selden Sewer District, but it's in Coram, and it serves very few people in Selden. So I just think if we are going to call it that, people might have an expectation or get something, but this plant wouldn't really serve anybody in Centereach and very few people in Selden.

MR. HILLMAN:
No. I mean, it's based on those bounds that were identified in the visioning.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Well, if there's a possibility you would change that, if you could just let me know. I don't know what that process would be. Obviously, I'm involved when you make the decision. But I just -- if we're going to call it one thing, it has to be that, and if we could, I'd really like it to include that area too. So that's all I had.

MR. HILLMAN:
Okay. I'm sure that's something we could --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Presiding Officer, and then we'll go to Legislator Romaine.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Forgive me, Ed. I just want to talk on this one subject, and I'm going to kind of pat ourselves on the back for, you know, putting the sewer study into the capital budget last year. Within the last week or two, I had a meeting with Congressman Israel and a lot of people in some of my communities. And, as it turns out, and we've talked about this a lot around here, about if we are going to expand sewers in Suffolk County, we're going to need an influx of federal money, and nobody saw it on the horizon.

Turns out, and this is a very recent development, that the Congressman informed us that there is a lot of federal money now that's been identified that's going to be coming down the pike from the federal government and that our sewer study is going to be very important in this process because they are looking to fund specific projects. They just don't want to give a locale block -- block grants. So the study is going to be an excellent vehicle for us getting money into our coffers. So I'm glad the bid's going out --

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
The bid was out. We have responses already.

P.O. LINDSAY:
Okay. But, you know, it's -- I'm glad it's -- we have the responses. We've got to get the work started because the sooner we have that document prepared, the quicker we can get in line to get some help.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Legislator Romaine, you had some questions as well.

LEG. ROMAINE:
Not a question, more or less a comment. I understand that the Budget Committee exercised some wisdom in tabling 1591. I had e-mailed members of this Committee copies of what I sent Mr. -- Commissioner Anderson about 1591, which is a closeout of all capital projects, and what I'm amazed at, and I have the list in front of me -- and this is not directed to the Commissioner, because some of these projects are not DPW projects. This is -- I don't see a representative of the County Executive's Office or the Budget Office, but they're certainly germane to them. There are a number

of projects in this list, and we should take a look at this list attached to 1591, that we've authorized, that we went to bond for, that were not done. Not one penny expended.

Then there's a whole host of other projects in which the majority of funds were not expended. At no point -- at no point did anyone from the Budget Office or any other department of County government come to this Legislature and say, "Oh, by the way that project you've authorized, that you funded, that you voted for the bond, we're not doing." Had we known that, some of us could have done offsets for other projects. Had we known that, I think that would be very germane because we could have used it for other projects. We could have taken a look at things we were doing. But here we are -- I think the Presiding Officer will agree -- we get resolutions. They say, "This project is absolutely necessary. We want you vote for the project. We want you to vote for the bond. Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah." Three, four, five years later, we find out it was on a list that was never done.

Now, I'm sure if we went through this -- most of these, not all, but most -- there would probably be a compelling reason for that. But before I vote on this, I want a compelling reason for all of them. I don't understand why we weren't notified, as a Legislative body, of projects that we voted for that were not done. Who made the decision not to do them? I know I didn't. I don't think anyone around this horseshoe did. This is a two-branch government, and I just want to say that, because when decisions are made without consultation -- and I'm not saying that they were made arbitrarily or capriciously -- I'm just saying they were made in a vacuum without consultation. I don't think 1591, if my colleagues are thinking about it, are going to see the light of day until we have an explanation for some of them. And I've earmarked the ones in which zero was expended. I've earmarked the ones where the majority of funding wasn't expended, and I wonder why we were not notified. Clearly, something is wrong with this process, and we need greater transparency and greater communication between the two branchs of government. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
Thank you, Legislator Romaine. And just quickly on that same subject, I'm sure, you know, you have an excellent memory and you remember when we were here last year. At my suggestion, we had a list similar to this, and the last column was why it didn't go forward, and many of them were because we approved this project, and then later we approved another project on top of it. And at the Budget Committee this morning, we did ask for an explanation on a lot of these, and some of these, I see they're in my district that I know were replaced by other things, and other ones, I don't know so. We were supposed to get that in Budget, and I'm sure I saw your request by e-mail yesterday; I think yesterday evening, I got it.

LEG. ROMAINE:
I copied my colleagues.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
So we will -- I'm interested in getting that information because last year, we did about 14 million. It's my understanding this is roughly about $8.3 million worth of projects. There's some arithmetic that needs to be cleaned up here too. So we will -- we're going to get those answers in Budget, and I know Gil will provide you with whatever he can from Public Works.

LEG. ROMAINE:
That's particularly important when we get criticized for adding to the capital budget when, actually, the capital budget keeps on going down in the amount of actual money expended.

LEG. BEEDENBENDER:
All right. If there's nothing else, we are adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 PM*)