

PUBLIC WORKS
and
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

of the

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

A regular meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday January 26, 2010.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Jay Schneiderman - Chairman
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chairman
Legislator Wayne Horsley
Legislator Tom Muratore

MEMBER NOT PRESENT:

Legislator Tom Barraga

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan- Counsel to the Legislature
Kevin Duffy - Budget Review Office
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - DPW
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer - DPW
Bob Shinnick - Transportation Division - DPW
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office
Rosalind Gazes - Budget Review Office
Catherine Stark - Aide to Chairman Schneiderman
Linda Bay - Aide to Minority Caucus
Paul Perillie - Aide to Majority Aide
Barbara LoMoriello - Deputy Clerk - SC Legislature
Ben Zwirn - County Executive's Office
Dot Kerrigan - AME
All Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:34 P.M.*)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'd like to call the meeting to order of the Public Works and Transportation Committee this 27th day of January, 2010. If you all will rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by our new Legislator Tom Muratore.

SALUTATION

If we could collectively pause for a moment of silence to remember all those who died in the terrible Haitian earthquake. I think it's now over 150,000, may rise up to as many as 200,000. If we could take a moment in honor of their memory.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Thank you. Well, it's nice to be back. I spent a couple of years, I think, as Chairman of this Committee in the past and this is the first meeting resuming that Chairmanship. I don't have any speaker cards, but I would like to ask Commissioner Anderson if he'll come to the front table.

Certainly Haiti has their share of infrastructure rebuilding to do. I think 2010 they're talking about -- at least ten years to start to put that place together. But in terms of the County, I think we're doing fairly well with our infrastructure, but there are certain things I know that have come up in the past that I'm sure are still issues. And one thing I'd actually like to ask you about in particular -- well, actually two things. One, is there's a new program that's coming to the EPA, it's called MS 4. It's a municipal storm-sewer program.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's not a new system -- it's not a new program. It's an existing program but they're revising it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They're revising it. They're asking -- we recently passed something where we're going -- for the County, we've got to inventory all of our own -- our own drains and sewers. But the towns are being asked or might be asked to provide an inventory not only of their own structures, but every residential cesspool, sanitary system as well, which is an extraordinarily onerous requirement to place on the towns. And I think also to certify that each system is operating or test each system. Can you tell me about that, because I'm getting some calls from the municipalities about it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't have -- well, basically what you said is correct. Whether it's the County or the town, jurisdiction over septic systems will be required. They will be required to be located, tested. You know, if they are found to be faulty, they will be mandated to be repaired. And we sent a letter on January 15th, you know, in opposition of this and with our concerns both for the County as well, you know, as the town. So it's a huge lift. And I don't -- no municipality or county is going to be able to do what they are asking.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This would cost, I think even for small municipalities, millions and millions of dollars to comply with this and may not even be able to comply with it. Now, the comment period is closed?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's closed as of January 15th.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So I think what -- I mean, it would be good to get a sense of what the impact on taxes would be at the local level, not at the County level, to something like this, but I think we need to start

bringing the parties together to figure out how we're going to stand unified on this. Of course, anybody who says they're against it may seem like they're anti-environmental. But we here in Suffolk County have, I believe, an extraordinary record of groundwater protection. And we've got the 208 Study, you know, comprehensive regional groundwater planning, we've got tremendous acquisition over our aquifer, we've got zoning in place throughout the County to protect groundwater. And then to have to spend what may be hundreds of millions of dollars to locate and test these systems, we're already doing so much groundwater testing throughout the County through our Health Department.

We're not -- I don't think we're going to be able to provide anything that we're not already, you know, testing for. So it just seems like it's throwing out tax money at that time when the public is struggling to stay in the County, to make ends meet with the economy so weak and property taxes so high. I think we need to figure out a way to bring all the parties together at one table; all of the towns, and figure out how to get to the EPA and maybe craft some kind of exemption for an area that is already protected, it's aquifer.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, as I said earlier, I can provide you with letters from other communities that have also objected to the, you know, the stringent draconian measures that they're -- you know, that the EPA is basically mandating. You know, we can -- we can certainly open discussions with other communities, municipalities -- local municipalities to continue this. I mean, you know, that's an option.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You know, another topic that's been a topic for a long time -- and then I'll let you talk about I think any topic you care to update the committee on -- but I know Legislator Romaine and myself and others have pushed for a long time for Sunday bus service. You know, not having Sunday bus dates back to the Blue Laws when the shops, retail establishments, weren't operating on Sundays. A lot of people who don't have cars, can't drive for whatever reason, you know, not only rely on the bus to get to work but on their day off, you know, would use the buses, I believe, to go shopping and that would help drive sales tax revenues, which is something that the County has seen an unfortunate drop in.

A couple of years ago, maybe it was a year ago, I had put through a bill looking for -- trying to hold a public hearing on increasing fares to -- and then using the additional funds on the bus -- because we haven't changed the fares in 15 years -- to provide Sunday service. I would like to see Sunday service go into place. And I have a new bill coming that also looks at a potential nominal fare increase.

I'm just going to ask you guys to revisit some of your numbers, because the last I did this, you calculated the cost of Sunday service based on the entire system versus the Cherwony Study that was done, only recommended, I think, 24 lines for Sunday service, which is not the whole system, it's a percentage of the whole system, and to try to determine what fare would be the minimum fare necessary to deliver that service.

So I'd like your cooperation with this, because I really think that not only is it needed, it's something that's going to help stimulate the economy of Suffolk County, and it's about time. You know, last year, some of us called for the MTA to take over the system. And certainly the MTA's fares are substantially higher than our own fares, but they do provide Sunday service. So there may be a way short of an MTA takeover of our system to be able to provide Sunday service. And if we can, I think that we ought to. You know, really, it's overdue. If you want to respond to that as well as any other issue you want to bring to the Committee's attention.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Certainly, the Sunday service, as you know, was recommended in the Cherwony report that we

distributed at the end of last year. The fees are included with that report. The only issue that isn't part of the report was that whatever we decide to do on Sunday service or however we expand the Sunday service or, you know, any services, SCAT also similarly has to be expanded. So those costs would have to be included, and that's not part of the report. You know, certainly we can -- we can review our numbers and get you what we think it would cost to -- you know, for an increased fare.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The numbers you gave me last time did include the SCAT numbers too, but again, it was for the entire County, not just -- you know, not limited to the 24. You know, frankly, I would like to see SCAT on Sunday too, because people who, you know, are physically challenged, you know, I'm sure they would like to get out and go shopping on Sundays as well, too. And what I'm hearing from the general population who ride the buses, that although the fees may go up, the fact that right now they're paying for taxi rides on Sunday, they'll end up saving money if there's a Sunday bus, because the taxis are so expensive on Sundays that they're depending upon to get around.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We'll get you those numbers.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there anything else you want to apprise the Committee on?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Actually, I was going to do it at the end, but I guess I can do it now. At the General Legislature next Tuesday, there will be an CN. The intent of the CN is to approve an easement to install sewers along County Road 80 and Montauk Highway in Patchogue, just east of the Village of Patchogue. The Town of Brookhaven is going to be doing the installation, they'll be paying for the sewers. The issue is timely only because they need to create the district, have all the easements, everything in place so that -- as expeditiously as they can so that they can basically piggy back our road construction project which is ongoing.

The intent is we will get the road project finished at a certain -- by the end of this year, the town can come in before we do the final layer of pavement, place the sewers and then we can come back in after they are completed and top the road. And that's the reason for the CN. You know, I know that nobody likes CNs, but there is -- there is an actual time concern.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can you give us a quick update on the jail and on County Road 58 in the Riverhead area, how those two projects are going?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Both are moving along well. On the jail, we're well into Phase D, which is the actual building construction of Phase 1. We've pretty much enclosed the building. We're working on the interior. I believe it's the middle of next year when we should have that on schedule. Again, any time anybody would like to come out and take a tour of it, we'd be more than willing to, you know, to the Committee, any Legislators interested in seeing progress, you know, as we are doing it.

58, we're underway. We have been -- I believe we have been working in the vicinity of the circle. We're on target to have it done, I believe it's Labor Day of next year. Okay. It's Labor Day of next year. So everything is moving along well.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Labor Day of next year for 58 you said? What about --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'm sorry, this year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Of this year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I forgot what year it was.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So how are we going to deal with, you know, Memorial Day Weekend and the summertime? Do you have it planned so that we're going to be able to keep traffic moving without much interruption during the summer season? I didn't realize it was going to go through the summer, the construction.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It is Memorial Day. I had both the date and the year wrong.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Memorial Day. That's a big difference.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Ask me anything, I'll give you the wrong answer.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Then I don't need -- so it's going to be done by Memorial Day?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's great. What about -- while you're here -- on County Road 39, there was a plan to extend that -- the extra lane all the way down to the end of the -- you know, the terminus, the eastern terminus of County Road 39. And I thought that was going to be done in the wintertime or spring. Has that been postponed?

MR. HILLMAN:

No. We were trying to wrap the plans up for January and do a letting shortly after, and we are on -- we have been on target to do that; however, this is a Federally-aided project. We need to go through the State for the letting and we need approval from DOT. Because of the fiscal crisis in New York State, we've been told that no projects with Federal aid that need to go through the DOT will be advanced prior to a new budget coming in, which would be -- their fiscal year technically should begin in April. That's if they pass the budget. Many times it goes into June. Then you are going to have a que of projects that will be waiting and will need to get out. So it will be delayed, but not by any of our doing. When we're told, we will be ready. When we're told we can advertise by DOT, we will let the project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So it's more likely to be, what, this winter coming?

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, we don't do construction over the winter, but we would -- we would let it hopefully over the

summer and maybe get a contract awarded for the fall. They could get a portion of the work done, and then wrap up for the winter and then finish it up in the spring of '11. That is one possible scenario. If it gets delayed to the point where we don't advertise and let the job until the fall of '10, we would just -- you know, we would award it and start construction in spring of '11. So I really can't -- it's so vague right now. It could be April 30th, the State passes a budget. We're the first in the queue, and we're awarding this in June. But I don't think that will happen, but it could.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Are there any other major capital projects people want updates on, other questions?

MR. ZWIRN:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Just real quickly and I guess -- how are we doing -- it's not on? There you go. How are we doing on our Dredge Screening Committee? Do we have dates together?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. I'll have that for you hopefully by the end of the week.

LEG. HORSLEY:

You're a good man.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'm trying.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:

County Road 16, a little update on that, what's going on there. What happened was I came across a letter from you, I guess, to my predecessor, and it refers to some e-mail that might have been received, but for the life of me, I cannot find any records in my office. Everything is either misplaced or removed or whatever. So if you have a copy of this e-mail that you're referring to in this letter dated November 25th, 2009, to the Honorable Brian J. Beedenbender, just bring me up to speed on it. Because I know I spoke with George Schram from the civic in Ronkonkoma, and we know how the civics get involved in these things.

What I would like to do is maybe set up a meeting with you, me and him and maybe we can go down and look at a few things and see what he's alluding to and what you're saying here is not being done versus being done. Is that possible?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anyone else? All right. To the agenda.

Introductory Resolutions

All right. Starting with **IR 1005, Directing the Department of Public Works to add a stop on the 3C Bus Route. (Montano)**

LEG. STERN:

I think I would have a question for -- for the Commissioner, Mr. Chairman. Gil, you have received an okay, permission from the owner, but I think when we last had spoken on this measure there was still an outstanding question as to whether or not it was warranted, whether or not there was a request for this type of ridership and that an investigation was being done. Where are we at?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, at this point, I believe we were -- my understanding of it -- and I'd defer to Bob -- but we were still waiting for certain paperwork and, you know, certain information from the site owner, because we hadn't received it from the sponsor's office. We offered to, and to be honest with you today, I sent an e-mail to the Legislator saying if they needed us to take over, you know, rather than being liaison, us to deal directly with the site, you know, developer, we'd be glad to do that.

There are issues that once we get beyond the paperwork issues; the insurances and all those other things, the route itself does have issues. The report would make certain recommendations. This stop will impact -- whether go with the report or we don't go with the report will impact that bus line. But we -- and Bob can certainly speak more on this -- we don't -- you know, at this point, until we get everything -- the first part all taken care of before we move on to actual scheduling or rescheduling of the route, we wanted to get all that in order.

LEG. STERN:

So this measure as it reads right now is premature?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. We would ask for it to be tabled.

LEG. STERN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can I -- I'm sorry. Commissioner, I don't know if I've ever seen one -- a resolution quite asking for this. It's not typically how we would do this, but I guess this is a way to achieve a bus stop. But, you know, I do remember holding hearings years ago and public in various different areas came out and said, "Oh, we need a bus stop here, we need a bus stop there, we need a bus stop there." Has the department done kind of a comprehensive review of where it believes bus stops are needed? Does this conform to it? And with those other places where -- you know, I remember sometimes you had 30 or 40 people saying we need a bus stop. Have we moved forward in building any of those bus stops?

MR. SHINNICK:

The answer is yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

To which part?

MR. SHINNICK:

The analysis of the location of bus stops. As part of the Cherwony report, we had a separate consultant who actually inventoried all of our bus stops, the passenger activity on and off, they did some inventory of the specific sites themselves. The purpose was to prioritize a listing for where future bus shelters would go. And part of the data that we needed is basically the level of passenger activity. But it did take into consideration all 3400 bus stops in the County.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Now, was the stop that Legislator Montano is recommending, was that one of the places that was recommended under the Cherwony study?

MR. SHINNICK:

Not specifically in terms of going into that shopping center. The question of going in is really not as much of an issue as -- you know, aside from the permission to be there, is how to reconstruct the particular bus lines. The Commissioner meant that -- mentioned before it does have some scheduling issues. And to give you a quick example, that particular bus travels from the Federal Courthouse up to the Central Islip Train Station. It's a ten minute ride on schedule. The bus is having difficulty now meeting that timeframe. It would take probably another three or four minutes to go into the shopping center. These are little things, but it's the kind of things that we have to pay attention to.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This isn't asking for a shelter, it's only asking for the bus to stop at this location?

MR. SHINNICK:

That's correct, enter the shopping center, stop at one location and then leave again.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

In terms of cost, there's no cost involved with it other than maybe a sign that gets put up, or do you have to put a bench up?

MR. SHINNICK:

That's one of the issues the property owner is bringing up. Normally, we'd just have a sign located at the particular site. If there are a lot of users, then a bench might be needed or a shelter at some future date.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And you would have to eliminate, I guess, parking spaces that might be there be.

MR. SHINNICK:

You know, we've done obviously a preliminary look. And in this particular case, it's a ring road that we would be using as a bus stop so we wouldn't be involved in the parking at all.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And you've looked at it in terms of safety in terms of getting in and out of that location?

MR. SHINNICK:

It's controlled by traffic lights at both entrances to the shopping center.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is the -- this is on Carleton Avenue right between the Federal Courthouse and the Central Islip Train Station, but the Central Islip Train Station isn't on Carleton Avenue, correct? It's the next block over.

MR. SHINNICK:

That's correct. You have to go up to Suffolk Avenue and travel about a half a mile over.

LEG. STERN:

Right. And so this is talking about the big shopping center -- that relatively new shopping center on Carleton Avenue?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

On the west side of the road, yeah.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah. It's a big shopping center. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So again, because this sounds like this might be actually a good spot to put a bus stop, so what is the process here that you're recommending in terms of doing this? You need more time to look at it or you guys --

MR. SHINNICK:

Well, once we get permission from the property owner, and we'll be working on this while we're waiting for that -- that issue to be straightened out -- but we do have to reschedule the bus line. We have to go through the whole operation to bring it back on time. It is having problems.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And what's being suggested is this be done in a coordinated way. But all those other suggestions that were made by the public, are we going to pull things out of -- you know, pull certain ones out if Legislators say, "This is the one I want now"? I mean, is that the best way to approach this, or are we going to adopt the Cherwony study and try to bring in all these recommendations at once?

MR. SHINNICK:

At once is a large task. These things will always come up. At any bus stop, there's always -- bus system there's always changes and these kinds of problems. But we are moving towards the recommendation of the plan which is a little bit longer term, it does involve additional funding, so that's another issue. What we want to do here is correct the problems with the existing schedule, but not do something that would be counter to what the plan is looking to do either.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Does this bill do that?

MR. SHINNICK:

Yes. It's just asking us to go into a shopping center. There's just other issues that we have to address. It does.

LEG. HORSLEY:

If we were to pass this today, does this help you in giving you direction in your planning or do you want us to hold it? What is the recommendation on --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Like I said, I would ask for it -- and I apologize for interrupting. I would ask that it be tabled until, you know, we have the -- for lack of a better term -- the deal worked out with the landowner explicitly, and then at that point we could, you know, we could move forward.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But you are actively talking or reaching out to the landowner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We will be, yes. Prior to this, Legislator Montano's Office was acting as liaison with the landowner.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. So can we expect by the next cycle that you'll have at least made some attempt to talk with the landowner and hopefully have a positive result from that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

TABLED (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga).

IR 1021, Authorizing the conveyance of County-owned surplus unused right-of-way fronting a parcel of land having a Suffolk County Tax Map Identification Number of District 0200 Section 593.00 Block 01.00 Lot 015.000 pursuant to Section 125 of the New York State Highway Law. (Co. Exec.)

Can we get some background on this, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This and the resolution that follows, 1022, are for conveyance of small parcels of land that are in the vicinity of the intersection of County Road 51 with County Road 55 and Sunrise Highway. Both of them are small parcels -- excuse me -- that are adjacent to an old paper road. We have been requested to convey the land. We feel the land is surplus, it serves no purpose to the County. You know, we did the appraisal -- well, the appraisal was done, we reviewed it, everything seems in order. And, you know, we don't object. The land is of no value to the County.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So in this case no auction is held, it's just conveyed to the adjacent property owner? Is that how it works?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Legally, yeah, the first step is to convey it to the landowner adjacent to the parcel.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Any questions?

LEG. STERN:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve.

LEG. MURATORE:

Mr. Chairman, can I make a motion to table this?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's a motion to table.

LEG. MURATORE:

Only because I don't -- you know, I'm not pleading ignorance, but I'm just not up to speed with all this stuff and I don't know what's going to be happening. Do we know what Legislator this property is in, what district? I haven't spoken to him. Have we spoken to him? Does he have concerns about it?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

CR 51 is in my district. Do we know -- this is just one piece of property on this one?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This piece, I believe, is in Legislator Romaine's district.

LEG. MURATORE:

So it's not in yours, it's in Legislator Romaine's?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, it goes through both, I think.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't know where this piece of -- whether the property is in my district or Legislator Romaine's district.

LEG. MURATORE:

So we're actually giving this property to the landowner besides it, selling it to him for 14,500?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. I have the maps if you'd like to see them, if they help.

LEG. MURATORE:

Do we know what's next to this property? What is it?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Why don't you show the map. Is there any time sensitivity on this? Not really. So it could happen next cycle, too. Well, why don't you take a quick look at it.

LEG. MURATORE:

And the other parcel that coming up, is that also in Legislator Romaine's office -- district rather?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. MURATORE:

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak to Mr. Romaine about this and get his true feelings. It's his district. And it is yours also, so I don't know how you feel about it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I mean, in looking at the map, it looks like those were probably set aside as County properties in case there was ingress/egress onto Eastport-Manor Road. So I mean -- I mean, you might want to -- DPW is saying it's never going to need that property for ingress or egress on to -- what is that -- Eastport-Manor Road, which is actually a town road? Maybe we should check with the town.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. The property probably was taken for some development of that paper road, which is in between them. It's not a road -- I mean, it's not a physical road, it is a paper road.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Oh, it's a paper road.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. Which we feel will never be developed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Here's what I'm going to recommend, because this is mostly -- this is basically pro forma and we do this kind of thing quite often. I'm going to actually suggest that we discharge this to the full Legislature. And if in the next week we're not able to get the answers we need, then we can always send it back to the committee. So it would give it a chance to move forward without holding it up, but it would also give you a chance to get your questions answered. And I'm fairly satisfied knowing that it's not an open road, that we wouldn't need these two little feeder pieces. And if that's what the recommendation from the Commissioner is, is that they're not going to be needed, then I'd rather see the tax money come in to the County for it and get these properties on the tax rolls as well. It seems to make sense. So I'll second the motion to discharge. There is a motion to table.

LEG. STERN:

My motion was to approve. I'll withdraw the motion to approve and make a motion to discharges without recommendation so that that can go forward. And if Legislator Muratore has additional questions, there's plenty of time between now and our General Session to have them answered.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll second the motion to discharge without recommendation. Are you maintaining your motion to table?

LEG. MURATORE:

No. I'll withdraw it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So the motion to table is withdrawn. So we only have one motion before us which is to discharge without recommendation. Any other discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga).**

We now will have **1022, Authorizing the conveyance of County-owned surplus unused right-of-way fronting a parcel of land having a Suffolk County Tax Map Identification Number of District 0200 Section 593.00 Block 01.00 Lot 013.001 and District 0200 Section 593.00 Block 01.00 Lot 014.001 pursuant to Section 125 of the New York State Highway Law. (Co. Exec.)** before us.

Same motion, same second. If nobody objects, same vote. **DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga).**

Okay. So both 1021 is discharged without recommendation and 1022 is discharged without recommendation.

That will move us to **1026, To implement Sunday bus service and extend weekday morning and evening service in Suffolk County. (Romaine).**

I have been informed that the sponsor has asked for it to be tabled. So I'll make the motion to table.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Seconded by Legislator Stern. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED**

(VOTE: 4-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga).

That gets us to end of our agenda. We are adjourned. Thank you.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:14 P.M. *)

{ } DENOTES HAVING TO BE SPELLED PHONETICALLY