

**PUBLIC WORKS
AND
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

of the

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

A regular meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday April 20, 2010.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan- Counsel to the Legislature
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - DPW
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer - DPW
Bob Shinnick - Transportation Division - DPW
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office
Catherine Stark - Aide to Chairman Schneiderman
Linda Bay - Aide to Minority Caucus
Paul Perillie - Aide to Majority Aide
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk - SC Legislature
Ben Zwirn - County Executive's Office
Dominick Ninivaggi - Vector Control
Walter Cherwony - Gannett Fleming, Inc.
Josh Diamond - Gannett Fleming, Inc.
Tracy Edwards - Verizon
Patrick Lespinasse - Verizon
Tim Mooney - Fire Island Water Taxi
Dot Kerrigan - AME
All Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:10 P.M.*)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good afternoon. I'd like to call the meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee Meeting to order this 20th day of April, 2010. If you all will rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Barraga.

SALUTATION

You may be seated. Okay. I'm going to begin with public portion. Thank you all for coming out today. I have two speaker cards. Tracy Edwards is our first speaker from Verizon, and she will be followed by Tim Mooney speaking about the Fire Island Water Taxi. Ms. Edwards, you have three minutes to make your presentation.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay. Good afternoon. I just wanted to come back and talk with you about the Local Law 1102. After our last meeting, I did put a proposal to you all of you in writing for your consideration. So I wanted to make sure that you didn't have questions in reference to that letter. And also just to give you an update on how many poles have been removed thus far.

We are on track for the -- for the removal plan. We have taken down or removed from the database, because some of this is database cleanup, so I send my folks out to remove a pole, sometimes the pole is not there, it was in the database as it was there. So we have on the books 1399. We are exceeding right now. Please keep in mind that in the letter, I also included that I was going to try to start out east as much as possible, because during the summer months, we have to slow down a little bit because of the traffic out to the Hamptons. But we are also working in East Hampton. Supervisor Scott King has been kind enough to find us a pole yard so we do not have to transport back and forth on the Expressway. So that's all I have. I just wanted to see if you had any questions, concerns or comments.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I appreciate the letter. I got your letter too. I had written down some concerns, I don't know that I've conveyed them to you. But it basically had to do with reporting, the frequency of reporting. I think your target was -- was it 250 poles per month, is that --

MS. EDWARDS:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. How would we know how many you did and where they were done? And I was going to suggest maybe like a quarterly report.

MS. EDWARDS:

That's fine. I will appear quarterly, I can send it to you quarterly.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't know that we need to see you, as much as we'd love to see you.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay. That's fine.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But if you could, you know, send in to the Clerk's Office something like that, a quarterly -- I'm not sure that that's going to satisfy my colleagues. But in my mind, as long as you're keeping to the goal that everybody felt was reasonable, then I don't -- to me, I don't see why there's a need to push it further. You have a report today with you that shows 250 plus poles, right?

MS. EDWARDS:

I do. And I have it down by town. Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

By town. Okay. Can you submit that?

MS. EDWARDS:

Sure, I can. Legislator Eddington isn't here. Other Legislators have questions?

MS. EDWARDS:

I also made a commitment to Mr. Horsley that I would be glad to --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Come tomorrow?

MS. EDWARDS:

-- sit down with -- tomorrow?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Tomorrow.

MS. EDWARDS:

What time?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Two o'clock.

MS. EDWARDS:

I can.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I will see you there.

MS. EDWARDS:

I may not be able to talk too much because I'm having a tooth removed, but I'll be here

LEG. HORSLEY:

He is ready to talk.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay. All right? Here, sir? It's in this building?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Right here.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay. Sure. I'll be here.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm sorry. That report is being submitted? Why don't you just really quickly run down how many poles did you do in the last month? What was the numbers?

MS. EDWARDS:

Six hundred and thirty four.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Oh, so you've exceeded you're target?

MS. EDWARDS:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's good news. We appreciate the efforts. Okay. No other questions? Okay. So when we get to the agenda, I will make a move to table this bill.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay, sir. I will be here.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you. 1102 under Tabled Resolutions. We're probably going to have 20 to 30 minutes of presentations. Maybe we can let the Verizon folks go if we take it out of order as long as we're inclined to table it. All right. So let me make a motion to take 1102 out of order. Can I have a second? Waiting for a second.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I'll second it, sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Legislator Barraga seconding the motion to take 1102 out of order. Okay. It's now before us. I'm going to make a motion to table -- I call the vote. All right. On 1102, all in favor of taking out of order? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. STERN:

On the motion, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

I have no problem with taking it out of order. I don't want Tracy and everybody to have to stay more than they need to, but this was just put before us. I'll take it out of order, I'll support that, but I would just like a few minutes to review what was placed before us.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You just entered, so okay. So we're voting on taking it out of order.

LEG. STERN:

Is there something else we can move onto and then maybe come back in a few minutes?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, one more time, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, the bill is now before us.

1102, Adopting Local Law No. -2010, A Local Law to ensure the timely removal of damaged utility poles on County-owned roadways. (Eddington)

I will make a motion to table 1102, is there a second to tabling.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Seconded by Legislator Barraga. On the motion, Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Again, I have no problem taking up the bill out of order. But we were just talking about a table of numbers at a rate over the past couple of months, it was just put before us. I just want a couple of minutes to take a look at it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You may have missed the presentation Ms. Edwards just did. So the goal was 250 a month. They did some 634 for the month of March. So well more that double the goal. There is some focus, as she explained, because of seasonal issues out on the East End, which, of course, is nice for me. But the reason for that is because of the traffic. Those numbers will go down in the summertime and they will get to other areas. But I'm certainly satisfied with the rate they are going. And I think in good faith it warrants our tabling at this point.

LEG. STERN:

Was there any mention as to what the decline would be as we get into the summer months, what the rate of decline would be?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They're not saying the rate of pole removal, just the distribution. And I think they were -- they did remove poles in every single Legislative district. Ms. Edwards, if you'd step forward.

MS. EDWARDS:

Legislator Stern, what I'm trying to do is spread it out by Legislative districts so that I could make sure that I'm caring for all of your concerns. As Chairman Schneiderman did say, I'm trying to focus out east, because it's going to be very difficult for me to get back out there. So those numbers will decline, other numbers will come up. If you look in here, like in Setauket, I didn't do too many. I have to focus on there. So I am absolutely confident that I'm going to continuing at the 250 annual range. I don't really know right now how many it's going to decline. I'll come back to you next in the report and give you that information. But please be assured that I will spread it out, and I will always either meet or exceed the numbers.

LEG. STERN:

So geographic location might shift, but the bottom line numbers should remain at the same rate.

MS. EDWARDS:

That's correct.

LEG. STERN:

And that -- just to be clear for the record, that was a monthly number, not an annual number, correct?

MS. EDWARDS:

That's correct.

LEG. STERN:

Got it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think it's also -- and maybe you can -- you can also say something about this, but in the numbers that I saw, each Legislative District in terms of the number of these double-woods are not the same. Some have far more than others.

MS. EDWARDS:

So I'm trying to focus where there's a larger percentage of the double-woods. So when I give you a formal report -- I just gave you what I had in my hand. So I'm going to submit a formal report. I'll give you how many poles exist, how many poles I've taken down so that you'll know. And I'll also make sure that I have an administrative column so that I'm not actually doing the work, I'm taking them off the books and credit for it, but they're not actually coming down, because they weren't there in the first place. They used to be there, it was removed. But if I give you the total number, the total number will show what exists, when, in fact, it does not. So I will have all of that down for you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

My point being, if you're saying the goal is 250 poles and you just divided by the 18 Legislative Districts and not with the number of poles in each district you removed, that wouldn't be fair really either if one district has, you know, ten times more double-woods than another. So it has to be somewhat proportioned, you know, throughout the County, but, you know, at a rate that's relative to the extent of the problem in that area.

MS. EDWARDS:

That's correct. I'm trying to focus on that, also where there's County Roads and also making a little bit more towards where they have a larger percentage of double-woods.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are we satisfied with the -- with voting? Okay. So I made a motion to table -- oh, I'm sorry, Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Hi, Ms. Edwards. Just a couple of quick things. I see -- first of all, it's brought to my attention that we should make sure that we speak to Mr. Eddington about this and make sure that he gets a copy of this.

MS. EDWARDS:

Sure.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Good. Secondly, I see we have a number of 634 for the month of March, which sounds like an ambitious number and you did a good job and all that. Why does that prevent you from that 250 number that is such a difference? I mean, why into the future can't you do more than 250? Is that something really -- why the difference?

MS. EDWARDS:

Well, honestly, it really depends on weather conditions, it really depends on seasonal, it also depends on the numbers of employees that may be on vacation. So I just happened to have in the month March a really good weather pattern, plus Scott King was very kind enough to give us some help out east where he gave us a pole yard. So I was able to send some crews out there and just stay out there for a while. I'm not going to have those same conditions in every other town.

LEG. HORSLEY:

You don't want to get too over the top.

MS. EDWARDS:

I don't want to miss my commitment to you. I do not want to miss my commitment.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I think I understand now. Just -- and lastly, tomorrow, again, it's two o'clock. It's the Economic Development, Energy and Higher Education Meeting. I will give you time. You'll come up much like you're doing right now. You'll come up to a card and say, you know -- what your concern is with the LIPA relationship, and then I'll give time for Kevin to respond at -- when he does his remarks. Does

that sound all right?

MS. EDWARDS:

That's fine.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Good. We're going to make a marriage.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay.

LEG. HORSLEY:

There you go.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So I made a motion, it was seconded by Legislator Barraga. All in favor of tabling? Any opposed? Abstentions? IR 1102 is **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**. Thank you.

MS. EDWARDS:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Our next speaker is Tim Mooney talking on the Fire Island Water Taxi.

MR. MOONEY:

Good afternoon. My name is Tim Mooney, President of Fire Island Ferries and Fire Island Water Taxi. This is kind of a head's up discussion. We're going to be into the Legislature next week with two petitions; one is for a license renewal, and the second one is for a rate increase for the Water Taxi Service.

Just to give you a little background, we bought the water taxi in 2004 from Mr. Dave Sanders. And that water taxi service provides lateral services along Fire Island, the entire length of fire Island, as well as cross bay service. At the time we took the business over, unfortunately, we didn't get any data from Mr. Sanders when we took the business over, so we were kind of flying by the seat of our pants at the time. We came up with pricing structures and zone structures that we thought would fit our bill at the time. And subsequently, we've come to the realization that that doesn't work very well, because we're losing about \$170,000 a year running the water taxi business.

So we're looking to remedy that. And we've put in a request for about a 16% increase in the fare structure. And again, this is the first increase we've requested since 2004, so it's been six years. And the new pricing structure more directly reflects the actual distance traveled by the passenger as opposed to some obscure zoning technique that we used previously.

We've been working with the Budget Review Office, working with Lance and his organization. The petitions and resolutions are in with Renee. And we will be here next week with the resolutions and the petitions being laid on the table. So I stopped by today just to give a head's up, see if anybody had any questions or information that they would like from me at this point in time. But that's about it. So we will see you next week at the full Legislative Meeting.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Thank you. That's all I have for yellow cards. We have two presentations. I think I'd like to do them in the opposite order then they are on the agenda. I'd like to do the Vector Control piece first. I think it will be shorter than the comprehensive bus study. So if Mr. Ninivaggi can step forward. I asked Dominick to come into today. Catherine from my office is going to distribute a letter I sent recently expressing some concerns about the high water table and the sheer amount of

standing water in Suffolk County and whether we could do adequate preventative treatments so that we don't end up with an enormous adult mosquito population this year. And obviously, the risk of West Nile that that could pose.

I wanted to -- I had seen in a report done by the Department of Public Works that had expressed a staffing level concern about the increased standing water -- you know echoing the same type of concerns. So Dominick, I want to be proactive here. I think in my letter I suggested reaching out to some of the towns and enlisting some of their people to maybe do some of these storm basin treatment, be it, you know, BTI or Altracide or mosquito eating fish, whatever you typically would do on a preventative basis.

If you could respond. I don't think I'm alone in seeing all the water that's there throughout the County. If you could comment on that and you Vector Control efforts to identify these new standing water areas and what concerns it might pose to West Nile.

MR. NINIVAGGI:

You're correct that there's a lot of standing water around. You may have seen the article in Newsday that water tables are at a historic high. I live near Lake Ronkonkoma, and you can see some of the ponds there that are about four or five feet above normal. So there are areas that are wetter than normal. It's going to take a long time as USGS noted for the water levels to decline.

Nonetheless, we've been very fortunate, and I should not say this too loudly perhaps, but as bad as February and March were in terms of record water -- rainfall levels, we are about two inches below normal rainfall for April. Of course, that could change very quickly. But some of the areas that are hardly ever wet are starting to dry down.

As far as staffing levels, we actually did have some vacant positions filled, and we should have nine field crews out there larval control instead of eight as we had last year. So relatively speaking in our economic climate, our staffing levels are as about as good as can be expected. You should keep in mind that the prevention doesn't just start in April when we start doing larval control. The crews have been out there doing our winter work; clearing ditches, clearing pipes and culverts and those sorts of things. I have had the crews working some overtime work to try to do what we can to help this water drain off in areas where that's possible to minimize the impact as we get into the actual breeding season. So we certainly are still doing prevention.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Besides the ditch maintenance, when do you normally get into the -- you know, when is the beginning of the mosquito breeding season, and when would you typically be using some of the other means?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

Well, we'll start controlling mosquito larvae at the end of this month. We have to put out a public notice for two weeks as part of the permits from the State. That's been done. We have all our permit applications in place. For some areas, we can operate under last year's permits. For some of the State lands, we're waiting for this year's permits, but I'm not expecting any problems with that, because we're basically doing what we did last year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But you're not starting earlier? You're starting at the same time you did last year, or is it a little bit earlier?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

There really is not that much of a benefit to starting the larviciding earlier. I think it's more beneficial in the long run for the season to have the crews out there doing the ditch maintenance, the clearing, you know, and getting rid of the water as quickly as we can, you know, rather than just

putting larvicide in it. I think, you know, overall it's more beneficial to do it that way this early in the season.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Clearly some areas, the water is because the water table has risen up. You can't drain it. It's impossible to drain. And I don't know if you are identifying those areas. But I guess my concern is not only just a public health concern with -- with the potential for West Nile, but also the chemicals that used to control the adult populations can have much more harmful affects on the environment, non target organisms. That's why I kind of raised this caution that I want to make sure that we keep up what appears to be an enormous amount of new areas of standing water so that we can avoid using the harsher chemicals. Are you saying that you believe we can? Is that what you are saying, with the current staff levels and the current chemicals levels, whatever is needed, supply levels, you can do that?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

What i'm saying is that it's too early to tell. We don't really start treating for adult mosquitoes until we get into June. So we have some time yet for water to drain off. We will be treating areas. We may be doing some additional overtime to try to keep up with this. We do have some bacteria, for instance, now that once you treat an area, you don't need to go back for several weeks. So we may be able to keep up that way. There are some areas, I know Beachampton out in Amagansett is a problem in these kinds of conditions, and the crews are aware of that and, you know, we will be keeping an eye on those situations.

So it's basically too early to tell. It's also -- the virus season doesn't also get going for another few weeks into months -- a month or two. So even though there might be some initial early spring species, generally at this time of the year, the biting problems are not that severe cool, because it's in the evening and because the virus activity is not going -- it's not as severe a problem as it would be if we had these conditions in August.

Of course, you know, if we -- if we end up with nine inches of rain in June and July, you know, then all bets are off. But at this point, we are working hard to keep up with this as best we can given the situation. And I'm basically not ready to hit the panic button just yet.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So you're going to continue to monitor and take larval counts, etcetera. And I just want to make sure that if it turns out that we are seeing a lot of new mosquito breeding areas, that you have a contingency plan; whether it's overtime or, you know, you have the supplies on order, whatever you might need so we can avoid that situation where we're using the harsher adulticides.

MR. NINIVAGGI:

We have all our materials in place. And we will be doing additional overtime if that's what we need to do to keep up. One of the things that we did over the winter was clearing the way into some of these recharge areas to make it easier for us to do our work with the summer. So we've tried to do things over the winter as best we can given the terrible winter weather to be prepared and make it easier on ourselves when the summer comes up.

As far as having the municipalities help out, the main thing that they can help us out on is doing things like clearing their drainage areas, their road drains, culverts, those sorts of things, because in terms of applying pesticides, they generally don't have the proper licensing and they wouldn't be covered under our permits. So it really wouldn't be a practical thing for them to be applying pesticides. But whatever they can do in terms of clearing out their storm drains and those things, that's the way they can be of the most help.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Anybody else have any questions for Mr. Ninivaggi? Thank you, sir. Our next presentation is Suffolk County Comprehensive Bus Route Study, the Cherwony Study. Walter Cherwony is here.

We've been holding some public educational forums and hearings lately. I think there's two scheduled for later today. And I want to give Mr. Cherwony an opportunity to address this committee with any questions. A fast overview of the plan, its recommendations and implementation, and then we will go right to the questions.

MR. CHERWONY:

First off, let me thank you for inviting me. What I thought I'd do is run through very briefly some of the study tabs and spend most of the time getting into the plan, the essence of the plan itself. And the copy of the slides I have, you have a copy before you. And just sort of say we're at sort of the closing phases of the study. We basically have a recommended plan, which is a document of about eighty page. It discusses what happens to each of the routes. As a side feature of this project, we acquired computerized scheduling capabilities for the County, and that is being installed as we speak.

In terms of developing the plan, we've actually sort of prepared maybe about three inches thick of all sorts of documents looking intensively at the County, its characteristics, looking at the bus system, there's various strengths. One thing we did do that's kind of unusual was every single bus route was ridden at least once. So we know for instance how many people are on a particular route at eight o'clock, nine o'clock. And not only how many people ride that route, but where they get on and off. So you have a very detailed picture of the existing system.

And what you see on this chart is sort of maybe a dozen things that we analyze to sort of figure out what the changes should be over the route. Now, let me just say this in terms of the changes; we have a plan here that really extends over a ten year period. But there are pieces of this plan that could be done immediately, then there are pieces of this that are rather ambitious, and we would expect those to be the later phases of the next decade. In fact, given the current financial conditions, maybe the ten year plan would actually be something that gets done in a longer timeframe. But in any event, it's a plan that sets sort of that target, that strategic vision for where the bus system should be in the future.

These are sort of some precepts, and I'm not going to go over it, because I realize time is limited, but generally the kinds of things that we need to know about in Suffolk County and the bus system to make our plans sort of responsive. So if look at it, clearly density is an issue. Transit works best when density is greater. But we also recognize that we need balance the supply and demand characteristics of the bus system. And the idea is that if we provide service in one location, that sort of implies less service in another. So we try to be judicious in how we make those tradeoffs.

The plan itself, if you look at this, we basically sat down, developed some initial proposals. I think several months ago we came up with something called a search for proposals. We went through a refinement process; getting inputs from various people, getting comments, we're going to still get some comments this afternoon and this evening. We had comments given to us yesterday out in Riverhead. And that will sort of, in essence, be the final plan. But it's not a plan that you either accept all of it or none of it. There are very discreet proposals that are being made. So you can accept those that you think are most reasonable, the ones that have the largest payoff in the next year or so, do those first. And then the other things can sort of be timed or staged as appropriately.

The other thing, of course, is how you implement the plan, it's not like you decide to do the whole in one fell swoop. You actually implement the plan incrementally basically in each budget cycle where there's various proposals that should be done, then the identification of sort of what the cost and all the various features that go into that plan.

The various proposals, a wide range of things; basically increasing how often certain bus routes run, when they run. And I think one of the things that sort of has gotten a lot of attention is we are recommending that the bus system should operate on a Sunday. And I think that's something that people can very carefully relate to. The other thing is that we've said that the system has transit centers, and we think that should be continued. This is a low-density area, it makes sense to have

specific hubs where buses come together. The other things get into sort of small minor things that need to get done, things as minor as changing the running time from one location to the other from maybe eight minutes to ten minutes or possibly ten minutes to eight minutes. But those are things that all need to get done to make this a plan.

What we've proposed is that the system now runs primarily 30/60 minute service -- the bus runs every 30 or 60 minutes. That's kind of user-friendly. We think that should be maintained. But there are some routes because of overcrowding or ridership potential, we think more frequent service should be provided. Examples would be the S-1 as well as the S-92. And then in some places we've said that we should -- when we lengthen the span of service, is also provide service where now there is none. I'll just skip over this a little bit.

There's a great many numbers here, and you have the handout and also the report. It gets into specifics. But generally what we're saying is there are certain routes that should be offered more frequent service throughout the day, there are other routes where we're going to lengthen the service and then instead of maybe running 30 minutes as it does currently, maybe in its later hours only run every hour.

The last bullet there gets into something as I mentioned before, attracts a lot of attention, and that's the Sunday service. Our view is that a County of this size given the ridership potential, should have buses operating on Sunday. We're not saying run the entire system. What we're saying are there are certain routes where it makes the most sense to operate service, and based on our analysis, these are the routes that we think should be operated. Once again, this is a route proposal, you can make some provisions, but from our analysis, these are the routes that make -- seem to be the ones that should be done first.

What you see on the next chart is just a series of locations. Many of them -- for instance, like the Walt Whitman Mall, are already centers, and they should be maintained. Other ones, you know, perhaps we would strengthen them, make them more of a focal point. And not surprisingly, the railroad stations are also a hub for transit services. There are some other things that we considered. We are recommending that there be some feeder bus routes, but not widely applied throughout the County to feed people to the Long Island Railroad. We talked before about making running time adjustments. And we think the times tables, their format should be changed, make them a little bit easier to read and also to make them larger so they can accommodate Sunday service. And then sort of the numbering system of how the routes work, some minor changes in that area.

What you see on this chart is really about a half a dozen of things that could be done to routes. Many routes, we recommended more than a single change. Other routes in fact, we think they're doing quite well, they're serving the needs, and we haven't made any changes. And then we have a series of new route proposals. I think a lot of these would be in the back end of the plan, and the reason is some of this requires some development to take place before they would make any sense to run buses to try and serve that development.

Let me just say this about the staging. We have staged this plan over a ten year period starting in 2011 to 2020. Obviously, these are bus routes, so you can make changes as you see fit. In the early portions of the plan, what we try to do is remedy the current efficiencies in the system. In the middle portion, these we've said these are places where there's an opportunity that should be exploited. And then longer term, longer range, we think there are new routes that should be provided. As I mentioned before, you implement the plan as discreet actions as opposed to all or nothing. How long these things take, I think is certainly subject to funding availability and the desire of the Legislature.

The next few slides, and I'll go over these, if you sort of look on the left column, what that shows is sort of the routes going across, or the years. In the initial years of the plan, the existing routes get changed, we drop down to sort of the feeder routes. You can see they generally also get turned into sort of the middle portion. And then if you look at the lower right, you'll see all the new routes

generally tend to get done in the later phases of the plan.

Now we get to sort of a lot of numbers, and I apologize, but I think they're probably of interest. If we look at the system over the past several years where we think it should be going, right now the system operates about 380,000 hours. If you go ahead with this plan, we would see 580,000, so it's a very substantial increase. The other thing is if you look at it in terms of vehicles going from about 138 vehicles at any one time on the street to nearly 177. And what this chart shows you is sort of the gain. And if you look at this, what you're going to see is sort of a modest increase in service, and then it builds quickly in the middle portion, and then continues on in the later portion. So we're talking once again, a very substantial increase in bus service.

If you go back and you look at sort of where was the system maybe in the prior ten years, you can see the system hasn't gained substantially. It went from about 2001, about 367,000 hours of service to about what we think 2010 will be is about 380,000. So a rather modest increase, certainly in comparison to what we're proposing for the bus system.

If you look at passengers, you can see that notwithstanding the fact that the system is kind of stable in terms of the level of service, ridership had increased in 2001 to about 4.6 million; 2008, which was the last complete year -- I think the 2009 numbers are now available -- it went to 6.3 million. If you go ahead with this plan and our estimates are right, we'd have as many as 8.4 million riders in a given day.

We made a lot of assumptions about what need -- you know, what would happen to cost, what would happen to revenues over time. All the costs you see in this report are escalated to reflect inflation. They start out in 2008 dollars, and then they were escalated up to current year dollars. Right now, the system has operated at about \$97 an hour. 2010, the budget is at \$103 budget an hour. And generally, we're using an escalation of three or 4%. In terms of the fares that riders pay, that number is about \$1.08 now. And while we're not talking about a fare increase, we do think that the fares will escalate in some small fashion. And what we've done is we've try to take it into account.

The last time the fares were changed in the system, I guess, was in 1992. So that's about eighteen years ago. We look at the deficit. That's the difference between what the riders pay and what the system costs. Right now that ratio, what the riders pay is about 18 to 20% of the cost of the system. With our numbers, that relationship won't change. But we haven't made any allowances for ancillary revenues; things like advertising, which nonetheless are relatively small.

We have prepared estimates of where we think the money will come from and basically prepared estimates for New York State DOT which provides funding, the Federal Transit Administration. And our estimates here reflect only the bus system. So we have made an allowance that says about 75% of the cost that the State will pick up in term of operating assistance, 75% of that will go to the bus system, 25% to the para-transit system. For the Federal Transit Administration, those number are about 85% plus 15% SCAT service. We have made those points.

Looking at sort of where we end up, and I guess this is the place where maybe you might get some sticker shock, maybe the ten year plan needs to get extended, but nonetheless, it's a very optimistic vision of public transportation. The deficit in 2001 was about seventeen million dollars. It's expect to be thirty two million in the year we're currently in. And with this plan, it would go to about seventy one million.

If you look at, you know, where do you get the money? This bar chart, what it tries to show you is sort of where the money has come from. You can see that the deficit is increasing. The level of funding needs to be increased. This very small red band, that's the money that the Federal Government provides. And so you can see in terms of operating assistance, the Federal Government is not a major player.

The next sort of lime green number, that represents what the State puts in. And then what you see here is these gray bars, those represent that amount of money that's coming from Suffolk County. So that's the local share of it. We also then sort of gave you some numbers just to see going back to 2001, the funding went from about -- local funding went from 10.9 million. To 2010, it's estimated to be 14.8. Once again, let me stress these are only the bus system. The County puts money in for SCAT, it also pays for a portion of the cost of the Long Island Railroad. With this plan, the numbers would increase to about thirty six million.

The other thing we did is we developed a Capital Program. We see over the next ten years the need for about \$55 million. The bulk that money, 52 million or so is associated with buses. And once again, these numbers are all escalated into the current year of expenditure. And what you see here is sort of, you know -- the capital cost generally tend to be lumpy. You go out and you make a large bus order so it occurs in a particular year, in this case, 2018.

What we are doing is we're increasing the number of bus to expand the service, and then we're replacing buses that reach their useful life. If you look at the capital assistance, you get a little different picture. The Feds which were a relatively small participant, they will pay 80% of the capital cost, the State will pay 10%, and the balance, the other 10%, paid for by the County. So that very briefly is the plan, it's impact and consequences. And I'd be pleased to answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. I'll pass for now, because I went to hearing yesterday, and I monopolized your time for almost an hour. So I'll defer to my colleagues. Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Thank you and good afternoon. Let me just ask you a question. Based on the charts and graphs you've shown, the more we increase service, like Sunday service, don't we also increase the debt associated with that service? If we are running deficits and they keep on growing year after year, if you go to Sunday service, that increases the deficit even more for the County, doesn't it?

MR. CHERWONY:

Exactly.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Thank you.

MR. CHERWONY:

The deficit -- basically there is nothing here that will -- we don't have a plan that will reduce that situation. Basically the revenues that the riders pay will continue to be a small portion of the cost of the system. And since we are proposing Sunday service, for instance, Sunday service will not be as productive as weekday service when we have people going to work and people going to school. So it has to be viewed in the context -- I use the analogy of the library. You don't like at the library to make money, but yet it's a public service. You're right, in terms of financial commitment, we expand service that requires an expansion of the deficit that has to be paid for by the State, Federal Government and Suffolk County.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Thank you.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Would we end the entire deficit if we shut the bus system down?

MR. CHERWONY:

If there was no bus service, yeah, there would be no additional --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you. That's the logic.

MR. CHERWONY:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Other questions? Maybe you could point out one thing. You know, since the Feds don't help us out very much in the operational cost, but they do help us out in the infrastructure cost, August comes our new fleet, we've got I think 35 new clean diesel buses coming in with Federal stimulus money, the Federal cost share is about what, 90% in -- of other potential future buses and things like that, is that what you said? Eight to ninety?

MR. CHERWONY:

It would be 80%.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Eighty Federal and maybe ten State?

MR. CHERWONY:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And we are in for ten. It seems to me like a logical way to help offset our expenses if we invest with infrastructure using Federal and State money, but infrastructure that will save us money elsewhere, like buses that require far less fuel to run so that we see our fuel costs go down.

MR. CHERWONY:

You'd want to do that for two reasons. One is it would be hopefully cost effective; you would spend a little more money to buy the bus, and then you subsequently get cost savings associated with buying fewer gallons of diesel fuel in heavy economies. The other reason you would want to do it is because when it comes to sort of paying for the fuel, the Federal Government is not a major participant, but when it comes to buying the bus, they are.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If we looked for those types of opportunities, there might be ways to help reduce the cost. You know, on the Sunday bus issue, I know that that is something that you said was an early implementation issue. I believe early 2011 we are on course to begin Sunday bus service in May of 2011 paid for through fare changes potentially, minor, hopefully, fare changes. I'm looking forward May of '11, seeing that go into place. I know that was -- Sunday was one of your main recommendations, was it not?

MR. CHERWONY:

There is great many recommendations. I don't want to just say the report really revolves around Sunday. I mean, that's just one element of it. But I think that something that has sort of grabbed the more attention, because it's somebody that people -- if we talk about making a change to the S-1 that's a very esoteric thing; the bus goes down one street then another. That will benefit people, but it's certainly not something that's widespread. In terms of major widespread improvement to the system that would affect the entire County, I think the Sunday bus service falls in that category.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

If you go to Sunday bus service, who picks up the cost associated with that? I mean, there's been some talk and discussion in the past about the ridership right now that uses the system six days a week and going through a fare increase. I mean are they ready to have a fare increase to offset the cost associated with Sunday bus service? Aren't many of these people lower income individuals that do not have automobiles that would find it very, very difficult to be paying more for a bus service? Wouldn't they be the ones asking some other element, some other level of government to pick up the cost as opposed to the rider? Why would they be any different than a subway rider or a Long Island Railroad rider? I'm asking him.

MR. CHERWONY:

We had this discussion yesterday. I think we're not recommending a fare increase, that's the prerogative of this board. What we are saying though is that if you raise the fares what you will find is you will lose riders. It's just an elasticity that applies to any price. You would lose riders, and that would be something you would have to weigh.

LEG. BARRAGA:

So if there are added costs associated with the Sunday bus service and you're not recommending a fare increase, what are you recommending? How do we pay for this?

MR. CHERWONY:

Really when it comes to fares, we haven't made any determinations. We haven't really looked at that.

LEG. BARRAGA:

So you've got half the loaf. You're advocating Sunday service, but you don't have any means of paying for it. There's no recommendation from your group.

MR. CHERWONY:

Well, the means of paying for it, we don't expect the riders to pay a substantial portion of the cost of the system today.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I understand that. So if that be the case and the riders are not going to pay, who is going to pay?

MR. CHERWONY:

There are only three sources; it's the Federal Government, the State and Suffolk County.

LEG. BARRAGA:

It's the taxpayers at the Federal, State and local level.

MR. CHERWONY:

They're all taxpayers, that's exactly right.

LEG. BARRAGA:

All right. That's your Plan B.

MR. CHERWONY:

Well, it's not Plan B. Our recommendation is that this is the service expansion. If the board -- you know, if the County choose not to put additional monies into the plan, then many of the improvements we're suggesting could not be funded. There are certain suggestions that we make in this plan that are sort of cost neutral. We take an existing hour of service and it gets operated in a

different matter. When it comes to Sunday service and expansion of service, yeah, absolutely, we're not trying to --

LEG. BARRAGA:

I mean, I can see your point of view with reference to advocating Sunday service, and not even advocating that, you know, the ridership of that service should not pay for. But the answer of, you know, let the Federal, State and local government pay for it, that's pat answer. You know, I hear that on just about every issue that involves additional cost no matter what the proposal is and what the topic is. And that's really in my mind not the appropriate answer. It should be a specific solution you have, and obviously you don't.

MR. CHERWONY:

Right now, the system covers 18% of its cost from the riders. We don't think that that equation would change dramatically. So if you want to make the changes and improve the services, like any public service, it has to be paid for in some fashion. The thing that's kind of unique about public transportation versus the library example is when you board the bus, you have to pay a fare. When you enter the library, you don't pay to get into the library. But once again, that's a public issue that we can only share with you what we think it appropriate for the bus system. The policy decision of what you want to do as well as how you're going to pay for it, that rests with you on this board. I think that's pure and simple.

LEG. BARRAGA:

It certainly rests with the Legislature if we're seriously considering this. But, you know, you're sort of the experts. And, you know, we'd like to hear some specific recommendations on how to pay for something as opposed to spending more money and not having a plan to really pay for what the added expenditure is.

MR. CHERWONY:

Well, when it comes to public transportation, the way of paying for it is basically to increase the subsidies at the different levels of government. The only other way is to raise the fares. But you'll find that that at the expense of raising the fares, you're going to lose riders. And you're right, people who are on a limited income, most riders are -- many bus riders are on a limited income -- they're going to be faced with having to pay higher fares.

LEG. BARRAGA:

And I agree with you, in normal times, in normal economic times, maybe those subsidies might be available from the local, State and Federal Government, but you know something, they are all broke.

MR. CHERWONY:

Right. Well, let me say this. We recognize that we're coming -- this study started some time ago. We're coming to you at a time when the economic climate is certainly -- hopefully it's getting better, but it's certainly not at a robust time. So that's why I made the point that we're not suggesting that -- if we say something happens in 2011 or 2012, it has to happen then. And in fact, in many cases given, if we don't come out of the economic malaise we're in, what it would mean is that maybe this plan gets done over a longer time period. But we think when we say something should be done in one year versus another, that at least is sharing with you our priority as to when things should get down and what should be done first.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Maybe the ten year plan should become, like, a 30 year plan.

MR. CHERWONY:

It could very well be. Or that the plan that we recommended -- remember again, it's a great many pieces to it. Those things that are sort of cost neutral that would benefit riders, they would get done first. Those things that would require additional funds, maybe those are things that might be delayed. Once again, you have to balance the benefits of the bus system's increased mobility versus

having to pay for it. We recognize that we're only looking at the public transportation system. There are other needs that come before this group that you have to weigh and balance this to where you want to put your money.

In terms of where we are with the Federal Government, the current Surface Transportation Act has sort of been extended this year, each time frame it gets extended. But there will be a need to reauthorize that. I don't want to be overoptimistic, but I think when the Federal Government, they reauthorize the Transportation Bill, I think public transportation will be getting a greater funding level. So I think in terms of what happens to the Federal Government, I think that probably is a more favorable prognosis. What would happen in Albany? I think --

LEG. BARRAGA:

Based on the Federal Government's actions in the last year and a half, what the hell is the difference if we go from a \$12 trillion deficit to a \$14 trillion deficit? Because that's the rationale of thinking there; just extend everything and spend more money and somewhere down the line, 40, 50 or 60 years from now, somebody will have to pay for it.

MR. CHERWONY:

I don't want to get too far afield of this. The Surface Transportation Act basically is funded by the gas tax, a good portion of it. Right now actually, people, because of the economy, people are driving less. And, in fact, there's a deficit in that fund. So, in fact, the general revenues are actually being used to pay for certain highway projects.

What I'm saying is -- and I don't know how Congress will eventually take action or the President, certainly it's something I'm not privy to -- but I think in terms of funding infrastructure, I think, and Federal Government, I think I would be more optimistic as to this County being able to get those funds. Of course, if that doesn't come to pass, then, you know, you're not making a commitment right now to do something and then -- with the hope that the Federal Government will provide more funding.

If that doesn't happen, then you can hold off. If it does happen, then the equation changes and you might say, well, maybe now we can do this, because we'll be receiving more State and Federal aid and the County's participation will be less. The other thing, like I said, is the planning gets implemented in each year. Each year Bob will be coming to you and saying, "This is what we propose to do with the system, these are the changes we're planning to take," and then what is the impact of that, what are the benefits to the riders and what are the costs to the County of having that plan be implemented. So that's when it actually does get implemented, at each budget cycle.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If I may, because I was speaking before Legislator Barraga, and I wanted to respond back to some of the debates about the fares. You know, certainly I think it would be a terrible mistake to try to raise fares without increasing services. Although, I think we also have to recognize that the fare, the \$1.50 fare, is 18 years old, was never adjusted through time for inflation. And if you had, it would be significantly higher than even what the MTA charges for a bus. Nassau's bus is twice what our bus is. So I think -- I think we have to -- at some point, fares are going to go up. And if they are going to go up, to me, it's a lot easier to explain it in terms of an increased level of service; better buses, expanded routes, expanded times.

I've talked to people who ride this bus about the -- there's a woman out who works in the Clerk's Office, Lisa, who rides the bus. And not having a bus on Sunday is very expensive because they have to take taxis. A 50 cent increase, which I believe is enough to pay for this service, is a lot cheaper than that 10, 15, \$20 taxi ride. Not to mention all the disabled individuals who on Sunday are trapped because SCAT service does not run. So if these people want to go shopping, they need

to get out of their house, they don't have that opportunity. So to me, you've got a million and a half people in this County, we have no public transportation on Sunday, that's a vestige of the Blue Law that are long over. Sunday is an important day.

So, you know, we are going to hold a public hearing. We'll get to hear from the riders about -- actually, it's Public Works who's holding the hearing. We're going to hear about how they feel about potential increases and the expansion of Sunday service. Do we have a date yet, because the resolution we passed asked for as soon as possible?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We have no date yet.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Did anybody have a sense of when the date is going to be, because the implementation of Sunday service is May of 2011. That's what the bill called for.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. Before the next cycle, we'll have a date established for you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. I would appreciate that. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I did want to follow up on the point that you started to raise, Mr. Chairman. As we start the process of really taking an in depth look at Sunday ridership. I was wondering if after the process, if you were able to get a feel for who our Sunday riders would be, what their various needs are, and how we best go forward in determining what, if anything, type of Sunday bus service to provide. But during the course of public hearings and, you know, ongoing discussions, I was wondering if at this point you were able to get a feel for who we are talking about.

MR. CHERWONY:

One of the unfortunate things, while we had a lot of information about where people get on and off buses and how long it takes to go from one place to another, the one thing that was not conducted was a rider survey. But I think if we were to conduct a survey, we'd find that most people don't have an automobile, they're captive riders, so it's either make the trip by bus or they don't make it or possibly get a ride or pay for a taxi. So we would expect that. What we'd expect on Sunday with maybe an eight hour service, some people could use it to get to work, but others couldn't, their shifts would be longer. But I think what we did look at is not necessarily, you know, who would ride it necessary, but we looked at those routes that were strong on weekends, relative to weekdays.

For instance, certain routes would serve let's say the Hauppauge Industrial Park. I think, you know, those are routes that would be strong on a weekday but would be very light on a weekend, where something going to Walt Whitman Mall might be very strong on a Saturday. So we looked at those routes that were strong, but we didn't specifically identify who the riders would be. But I think knowing who does ride the system, I think, we would assume it would primarily be people without an automobile.

LEG. STERN:

I would have to believe that that would be a very important aspect to all of this, because I would agree with Legislator Barraga, if you raise fares even a token amount, I don't know if we're talking about trips to the Walt Whitman Mall, you know, whether or not anybody is going to be willing and or able to pay that type of a fare increase. But for someone who is desperately dependant on public transportation to get to work on a Sunday and there is no bus transportation on a Sunday, then certainly even in the increased fair for Sunday bus service, it's going to be exponentially less than a private taxi ride. So I would have to think that we would need a good idea as to not only the infrastructure that we need to put in place and the cost that would go along with it, but who is doing

the riding.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's also a reduced fare too, so senior citizens -- and I don't think there's any effort to raise those reduced fares. Are those income qualified fares too or are they just senior citizen -- reduced fares.

MR. SHINNICK:

No, the seniors are age, and the people with disabilities are just that, they have disabilities.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And the student fare as well.

MR. SHINNICK:

The student fare is an age factor.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. Is there any income-related lower fares?

MR. SHINNICK:

There may be. We sell tickets to non-for-profit agencies, and they distribute them to their clients. So depending on who their clients are, they may have those kind of criteria.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other questions?

LEG. STERN:

Just to follow up on the comment, Mr. Chairman. So I guess going forward, as far as rider surveys and getting a better feel for who would be doing the riding and for what purpose, you know, what kind of plans do we have going forward? I know Legislator Schneiderman is going to be holding public hearings. But my understanding is that's really for a geographic area for the most, or are those hearings going to be held County-wide?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There are hearings today on this bus study. Mr. Anderson -- DPW will be holding hearings on Sunday bus and the potential at increased rates to provide that Sunday service.

LEG. STERN:

That's meant to be County-wide.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think the resolution called for two; is that right, one east and one one west?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. I just wanted to make a statement. The meetings that are going on now aren't formal public hearings, they're really really public information meeting. You know, basically to get this report out to the community, get their feedback so that we can finalize this report and, you know, release the final product.

MR. SHINNICK:

We've done a wide distribution among the bus riders announcing these meetings just to get their feedback as to what they think of the plan. We have done surveys. It was not part of the this

particular study, but as best as we can tell now, about 80% of our riders are individuals without cars available for their trip that particular day. That doesn't mean they don't have a car, that means for their trip making, there was no car available. That also means 20% of our riders actually decided not to use an automobile, to use the bus.

What Walter said before, the major of our riders are in the lower-income spectrum. And the majority of them also are going to and from work or school. Those two categories make us over 75% of our riders, and they are commuters. And that's basically the bread and butter of our ridership during the week, the people who do repeat trips on a daily basis.

LEG. STERN:

I guess then the follow up question is of that ridership, what percentage of those users would also be dependent on bus service and would utilize bus service on Sundays?

MR. SHINNICK:

We don't know that for the Suffolk County system yet, but based on other systems, there's still a strong contingency of people going to and from work, that's primarily in the retail sector, as we as people more so making casual trips; they're going shopping and visiting others. And there are people who have outdoor labor-type jobs that do exist on Sundays as well as during the weekday. So that would be the mix. It would be less so, obviously no school, and it would probably be less dependent on workers though.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other questions? Okay. Thank you. All right. We're going to move to agenda. I wanted to take one resolution out of order. I'd like to take 1353. Legislator Romaine came here specifically on this bill. So I will make a motion to take 1353 out of order, seconded by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

1353, Amending the 2010 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with preparing a skewering feasibility study for the business district of Center Moriches (CP 8191) (Romaine), is before us. Legislator Romaine, I'll turn it over to you.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. We had -- looking to break this project out from the County project, we put \$50,000 aside. Mr. Anderson then told me they had actually had \$200,000 budgeted for this in the County overall study, if I'm not mistaken, Mr. Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And as a result, he asked if I would add additional money into it so that they would have sufficient funds to undertake this study. This resolution does that from an account that this Legislature maintains for this purpose. And therefore, the resolution is before us for that purpose. And it will simply be done as a separate study as opposed to the overall study, which is I believe, moving forward as well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Absolutely. We're moving forward with the larger study. We have received proposals, and it is in the review process. You know, this funding would allow us to do a more complete, you know, feasibility study for this area, which was intent under the larger project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Where is the money being shifted from?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

1755, infrastructure improvements .

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The projects that aren't going to happen this year, or is this a general offset account?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is the general offset account.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Just quickly. I just wanted to note that I never understood -- I'm going to support this motion, but I never understood why you, Legislator Romaine, took it out of the larger study. And since it's going to be same dollars anyway, it's going to be done approximately the same amount of time. I just wanted to note that, should that it have been included in the beginning. That's what we were talking about right from the beginning. We're all in this together, Legislator.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes, we are. This is a much smaller project you're talking about, approximately one mile, straight run, Main Street, that's it. It really -- to be incorporated into a larger sewer study, it's a much smaller limited project -- I mean, the study area, much smaller limited type of thing. The other -- the larger studies dealt with larger areas, larger projects. This is just a small simple project, straight run.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It would be nice to see things grouped together. I'm coming forward with one for the Flanders/Riverside area to do a sewer feasibility study. And I'm also being told it's some 250,000, \$300,000. But I would love that included in this larger section too. I don't know, how do we get to that point where we do it all as one?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Unfortunately, the Flanders wasn't one of the areas identified by the Waste Water Task Force, which the other 13 areas where, the original 13 areas where. We invited all the local municipalities to come in and speak, and nobody brought this one forward, otherwise I'm sure it would have been part of it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there any way to make it part, you know, to go back? Maybe if anybody had raised it at that time --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At this point, I would strongly recommend against it, because we are in the process --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. So we're going to have to do it separately then.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's just the way it will be. But I will be looking in the next Capital Program for some money, 2011, to do that feasibility study as well. I think it's important. I know Legislator Horsley is a big advocate of increasing sewerage. But if you want to see economic development in some of these areas, that's really the only option.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, I think at the end of the day, I think the biggest tickets you're going to find or the biggest problem you're going to have to overcome is how we fund these. And that's really where -- you know, I mean, certainly, originally the original intent or idea was to, you know, way back when, was to sewer the entire County. You know, that ended when the clean water money ended, you know, from the Federal Government. Hopefully, the Federal Government at some point gets their act together and starts to be able to fund these things again. Otherwise, it's going to take some clever -- and that's part of what we're looking for with the overall report, is that other firms or consultants who have done this type of work outside of this area that have come across this, how have they been doing it for the past 30 years. You know, there's been no manner from heaven. So somebody has had to have been able to be able to figure out how to progress sewers. You know, we're the only area that seems to have been relatively stagnant, although, we have moved ahead.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I thought the reason we set out on this path is a couple of basic things. Number one is if we do this in multiple areas at once with one consultant, we certainly cut down on all the paperwork and the letting and all the other stuff, and there's some economy of scale. And the second thing was to look for ideas or we were looking for areas that could lend itself to innovation a little bit, where we could tap into an existing sewer plant that's there that might be there as owned by a municipality or a developer might be building a sewer plant, and what if we partnered with him and didn't have the whole -- that's what I thought we were looking for in the overall sewer study.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And that is part of the what we're looking for. We're looking at where existing sanitation districts can be combined or connected to, you know, really trying to think outside of the box. But similarly, we're also looking at -- you know, we're hoping to look at how this has been done elsewhere; you know, areas in New Jersey, up in New England.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Was Center Moriches part of the 13? Where they one of the 13?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, they were originally identified under the waste Water Task Force as one of the 13.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I guess to Legislator Romaine, why do you want to break it out? Aren't we losing our economy of scale? What happens if the other --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Presiding Officer, it's already been broken out. We approved it last year as a separate study. It's already been broken out.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We reissued it when we reissued our proposal.

P.O. LINDSAY:

So what does this do? This funds it as a separate --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes, that's correct.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. But are we losing the economy of scale that we were looking for?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, because they'll probably use the same consultants that they use for the sewer study for this, if I'm not mistaken.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. We will send out a separate RFP for that.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, will likely ask for a waiver to use the same pool of consultants the reapplied to the RFP, you know, and had provided proposals.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. And it makes sense to do that waiver in this particular case.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Legislator Romaine, I know it's already -- it was just explained to me that it's already -- why did you want to go that route? It seems --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Unfortunately, Mr. Presiding Officer, without throwing aspersions, I waited for four years as a member of this committee for bus study and was told whenever we were bringing up things regarding buses, "No, there's a bus study, it's coming, it's coming." And it took four years to come. I was concerned that a larger sewer study, when you take this -- this is by far, because you're talking about one mile, straight mile, Main Street -- you're taking a very small area and throwing it in to a study with all much, much larger areas, that somehow it would get lost in that shuffle. And this is the only sewer study right now that is advancing within the First Legislative District. I thought this would be a very simple thing. It's a small straight run, one mile to take a look at, just a commercial area of a small downtown. And to incorporate it into a study that had 13 other areas that were much, much larger, to me, I thought this would be the best way to get some of the attention that it might get.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'm not opposed to what you are doing. It's just -- I just didn't understand the rational behind it.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That was the rational behind it. And, by the way, I hope I'm wrong. I'm hoping that the larger study moves ahead quickly, but I've watched other larger studies be delayed in the past and dragged on. And the study dealt with much larger areas of concern. This was one mile, straight run, Main Street, Center Moriches. I didn't want it to get lost in the shuffle.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And I hear you.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I mean, that's the only reason why.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I mean, the bus study, when we started it, we had money. Now we have the study, we don't have any money.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Maybe we should keep on studying things. We'll have no money to do anything soon. Anyway, that was the explanation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

To add on to the Presiding Officer's comment, and I'm not going to beat you anymore, Ed, on this -- I got the reason why you want to do it -- but what the Presiding Officer said was absolutely on the mark of the reasons why we're going towards that study. But there's also -- the issue was when we started the Sewer Task Force, we were looking in the face of stimulus monies. And one of the things that the stimulus money criteria was is that things had to be shovel-ready. So we are getting ourselves to that point. Whether the studies get you there or not, but they get you certainly closer to being shovel-ready. And we're ready to go as soon as we can nimbly go in one direction or the other to sewer Suffolk County, which it strongly needs.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I understand, too, what Legislator Romaine is trying to do by peeling this out. I do think that this Flanders/Riverside area is worthy of a study as well too. It's unfortunate I can't team up and have it so we do one RFP for those two areas. I'm going to end up having to come forth with a separate study as well for that area. I don't really see any other choices. Do you, at this point?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Not unless the Legislator is willing to wait a little while, you know, until yours can pass.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm not sure the offset is there for mine until next year. I don't think there's another 250,000 to offset. What's left in that fund, do you know?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

According to the legislation, there's one million three hundred and fifty left in the fund for construction.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So there is money to offset.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would check with Budget though.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So if I introduced a bill, perhaps by the time you ready to RFP this, the two bills could be both at the same level. It's possible. I mean, they could be combined. Okay. Any other discussion? I'm going to make a motion to approve IR 1353, seconded by Legislator Muratore. Anyone on the motion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1353 is **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Let's go to Tabled Resolutions. **1005, Directing the Department of Public Works to add a stop on the 3C Bus Route. (Montano).** Any motions?

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1026, To implement Sunday bus service and extend weekday morning and evening service in Suffolk County. (Romaine)

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

We did 1102. **IR 1238, Creating a "Share the Road" signage program in Suffolk County. (Eddington)**

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by Legislator Stern.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table on request of the sponsor.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Motion to table by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

IR 1292, 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.)

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion?

LEG. MURATORE:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something. Yeah, some comments on this. What happened was back on 16th of March, I asked that it be tabled. And you along with some of my other colleagues came and said to me, "Are you sure you want to do that?" And I said at the time, yeah, I was because I didn't know anything about it and I wanted to do a little bit of research and find out what the project was about.

And with being new and pleading a little bit of ignorance, I said, "Well, let me just try and find out about it." Subsequently, I gave to all my colleagues here, what you have in front of you is something that was sent throughout to some of the Elections Districts that are adjustment to this project.

And, you know, I just want to clear it up for the record that, you know, I am not blocking improvements in the neighborhood. I did not vote against this. You know, Mr. Anderson did come and make a comment, but that was the first I heard about the comment that, you know the community was behind it. I have spoken with the civic, the civic is supporting it. I am still waiting to speak to the chamber. I just got a copy of the project. Because I don't know what a bold-out is. You know, there are a lot of things here that I don't know yet.

So until I'm really happy with it -- and a lot of my colleagues on this committee have also said, "When you spend a lot of money, you should be making sure it's spent the right way for your constituents, that the project is deserving and it's right for the people." So I want to do a little bit more of that. But someone out there, without courage or the courtesy to call me and say to me, "Tom, you made a mistake here," they sent this out. They spend about 1800 -- this is a really nice piece, it was in color. It went to about 1800 different homes, including my own block. All my neighbors came to me and said, "Keep it up, you know, don't spend our money. I don't want you to spend our money."

So what's happening here, the public now is telling me, "Maybe we don't want to do this project." Maybe they want to save the million. But they also say on this, this project is already funded by the County budget and would not -- would have no impact on our taxes. But we haven't funded this yet, have we? We haven't appropriated it. And this is a plan. Have we spent this money? So, I mean, maybe I'm doing the right thing for the people, because they are coming to me; I have envelopes, I have e-mails, I have phone messages from the people saying, you know, maybe we don't need this project.

I did have one from one lady who said, you know, "Go forward with the project, you don't care about our community." And it's not true. I didn't do anything that's on this flyer. All I asked is that it be tabled and give me an opportunity to research it. So I just want my colleagues to know and I wanted it for the record. I mean, even Mr. Lindsay came to me and said, "Are you sure you know what you are doing here?" You know, and I thought I was, because I just want to find out a little bit more about it. So if the person who did send this -- they probably had to be in the audience the last time, because it got out -- by the 24th my constituents had it, and this happened on the 16th. So, you know, if you want to come and speak to speak with me about it, but I ask that we can table it one more time so I can do a little bit more research on it and then ask that, you know, we try to move forward with it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is your district, you are elected to represent those people. They've put their trust in you, and you have to make those decisions. I just have one question. I don't know, maybe Mr. Anderson, is there any risk in delaying it in terms of is there Federal or State funds that could be lost or is there -- is there a problem, you know, time wise, staging wise, season wise?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At this point, no.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Fair enough. So we have a motion by Legislator Muratore to table, seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

We had voted to table 1238, and I had made the motion to table at the request of the sponsor. I'm told that the resolution was to be tabled because of an amendment, but the amendment has been made. I just took a look at the amendment, so I'm familiar with it. If everybody would take just a few moments maybe to review the amendment, then perhaps I can make a motion to reconsider.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Why don't you go ahead and make that motion to reconsider?

LEG. STERN:

I make the motion to reconsider 1238.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I will second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would ask that it stay tabled only because we haven't had a chance to look at. And, I mean, we had some significant concerns, which we've had discussions with the sponsor about. Certainly one more cycle, I can't believe would be an issue. I know that the sponsor met with the Traffic Safety Board and he's been trying -- you know, we have issues with the signage, we have issues with the locations. And certainly, you know, we weren't aware that this was being amended, so if we could ask for one more cycle.

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I will second that motion. So we have a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed? It's **TABLED** again (**VOTE: 5-0-0-0**).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Introductory Prime. **IR 1305, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and keyboards to RSVP (Kennedy)**.

We get a lot of these from Legislator Kennedy, don't we. I'll make a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1307, To amend the required concentration of bio-diesel fuel to be used in the Suffolk County fleet (Losquadro). Commissioner, what are we doing here?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We're reducing the percentage of bio diesel mandated in our fuel. The original legislation called for B-20 or 20% bio diesel. We have had -- over the past two winters, we've had issues with our filter systems during cold weather. The 20% basically clogs in the filters, shuts down our equipment. We are going to 5%. We're going back down to 5%. There's also issues with warranties. We can get warranties on equipment with 5% -- you know, B-5, whereas with B-20, we lose our warranties from the manufacturer. We've discussed this with the sponsor. And, you know, we've done a lot of

research on it and beyond that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I believe you. And it's a little sad because it's so nominal in terms in the amount of bio diesel that's being used.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. But that seems to be enough that, I guess, the fats or what not in there --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So what would it take to actually move in a bio diesel direction, we'd need all new equipment, equipment that's built for bio diesel?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The only thing that seems to work when you get up to a B-20 level if you're in an area that there's cold weather is you have to add an additive. Basically, you know, I don't want to say watered down, that's not the right word, but there's an additive that has to be added to the fuel that basically breaks up the bio diesel.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And there's probably environmental concerns from that additive, I guess.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That much I don't know.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Like MTBE.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It takes away from the, you know, effort though.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't have a problem with it, it's just a little sad that, you know, we had hoped that we were moving in the bio fuel direction.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The legislation, for what it's worth, does direct, you know, Suffolk County DPW to continue analyzing other -- encourage and implement, you know, other alternative fuels wherever possible.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do we have a motion on this one?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approved by Legislator Horsley. Do we have a second.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).

1339, Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, and

appropriating funds for the improvements to the Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest Wastewater Treatment Plant (CP 8170). (Co. Exec.)

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley, seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1340, Authorizing the execution of an agreement between the County and the New York State Department of Transportation for Federal and State Aid funding for the continuation of the HOV Bus Service on the Long Island Expressway for 2010 (Co. Exec.)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Same motion, same second. Okay. All right. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1342, Amending the 2010 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with energy conservation at various County facilities (CP 1664) (Co. Exec.)

Maybe we could get a little bit more information, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This legislation authorizes appropriating 732,900 in ARRA funding specifically through the Us Department of Energy's Efficiency and Conservation Block Grants or EECBG Funds. Funds represent \$443,500 for planning and \$289,400 for construction projects. There are five projects involved. The first one is construction for 185,000, replacement of 286 metal halide and high pressure sodium fixtures with new LED fixtures. These will reduce the energy usage by 47,169 kilowatt hours which translates to about \$14,719 in savings annually.

The second one is the installation of 16 solar powered LED fixtures on 15 foot poles. This pilot program will result in a savings of 10,862 kilowatt hours in the annual electrical usage, which translates to a savings of \$1358 annually and reduces our carbon footprint by 5.2 tons annually. Just to step back, the previous project reduced our carbon footprint by 24.4 tons.

The third project is to engage an energy expert to provide energy modeling services to evaluate the energy use at Suffolk County's 500 buildings making recommendations that, you know, have the most impact. Work will supplement the building upon ongoing carbon footprint assessment by ICLEI, Local Government for Sustainability. This is a planning project for \$27,900.

The four one is sponsoring LEED accredited programs for professionals to gain knowledge in green building LEED rating systems and process allowing municipalities to meet LEED goals and earn LEED credits without extra cost and identifying means of offsetting expenses. This is a planning cost of \$40,000.

And then the last project is a planning grant for \$375,600 in which we will be working with one or two small local consulting firms within the County to hire a mechanical and or electrical engineering graduates on a two year basis, a trial basis. These new employees would work at Suffolk County DPS facilities overseeing and implementing approximately \$9 million worth of energy efficient capital programs, which will result in an annual energy savings of \$985,687. And all those projects, that \$9 million that I mentioned are funded within the adopted Capital Program.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But there is an offset here, right? So we're amending the program.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe it's only one. One where it's a small portion of an energy projects that we were going to spend anyway, so this becomes our match.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So in general. This is just an appropriation resolution for something that's in the Capital Budget. And there is a significant amount of outside funding in these projects, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, this is primarily outside funding. It's a very small amount. I think it was 64,000 of engineering, you know, capital project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And everything else through grants.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Through ARRA. Yeah. It's the EECBGT, the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant that DOE is actually administering.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So it's all federal. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. Gil, I'd be interested to hear more about the LEED Certification Program. Is this a program that we would implement that would train County employees or is this something larger that that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It would be open to professionals; professional engineers and architects who would be interested in learning about the program, certainly, you know, municipalities, their engineering staff and architectural staff would be welcomed to attend as well.

LEG. STERN:

Would the amount that we're allocating to the program provide a limitation for who might participate. Is there a possibility that we would be able to extend invitation beyond municipalities to local professionals in the private sector to participate?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe that's the intent. Yeah, it is to -- you know, those -- I mean, you're asking would we also --

LEG. STERN:

In other words, if these are the courses that are going to be given locally to allow professionals to attain the certification, is this something that can be extended to those not employed at any other level of government, but to private sector employees as well if we're offering the training?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay. Joe Schroeder just advised me that Department of Labor has been running programs for the private sector. This is primarily for municipal and County employees.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other discussion? All right. I would call the vote. Actually, Tim, if you could lift me as cosponsor on this one. I'd like my name associated with this. 1342, I make a motion to approve, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1359, Amending the 2010 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with CR 31, Old Riverhead Road and CR 104, Quogue-Riverhead Road, Intersection Improvements (CP 5572) (Co. Exec.). I make a motion.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1360, Amending the 2010 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for the Yaphank County Center Wastewater Treatment Plant (CP 8158) (Co. Exec.)

Same motion, same second. Commissioner, did you have any additional information on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This provides funding -- essentially we have to meet certain levels of nitrogen going out in our effluent. Currently the plant is an older plant. It's able to do that. We are very concerned that it will not be able to do it for too much longer. We're -- this project will allow us to build denitrification facilities, which will lower the nitrogen limit.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's paid for through the sewer district, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, it's not.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Oh, because it's the County Center.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's not sewer district, that's why this was one that came before the committee last year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there an offsetting project? Wicks Road?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is using some funding that was for the Capital Program 5539, County Road, Wicks Road corridor study improvements. These are construction funds. We are not ready for construction this year, and we are going to reissue the money needed into next year's Capital Program.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other questions? We did a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Abstentions? Legislator Barraga opposed. **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-1-0-0 - Opposed; Legis. Barraga).**

1362, Requesting legislative approval of a contract award for transit bus in-plant production line inspection (Co. Exec.) I'll make a motion to approve. Is there a second?

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Stern. Again, Commissioner, if we can get a little more information.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We're in the process of acquiring 85 new transit buses through Federal and State funding, including the ARRA Funding. The Federal Transportation Administration requires pre and post delivery audits and in-plant inspections during manufacture of the transit buses. We went out to RFP, we send the RFP to 11 potential contractors, we only received one proposal. Upon review of the proposal and review of the qualifications, the firm's name is TRC, Transit Resource Center. After review of its qualification and their proposal, we found its quality of work, experience and costs proposed within the industry standards and found it to be satisfactory. This legislation will authorize TRC to complete in-plant inspections during the manufacture of the buses.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions? Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Commissioner, this is no County funds utilized?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Federal and State funding.

LEG. STERN:

Federal and State funding. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. We made a motion and a second, so I just need a vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions. 1362 is **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

Before we do the very last resolution, I had one question for you or maybe Mr. Hillman on County Road 58. I noticed that the two lane traffic circle is now up and running.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

As of yesterday, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

As of yesterday. So how is it working? I mean, I drove through it a little bit. I seemed to get through it fine. I've never seen one like it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. There may be some -- I mean, we found --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's a double-lane round-about.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's a double-lane round-about. I haven't been in my office today, I haven't heard anything. And I didn't hear anything yesterday. But certainly maybe Bill can add.

MR. HILLMAN:

I went out yesterday at about lunchtime, which I've been told is somewhat of a peak period on 58 because all of the facilities along 58 to go for lunch. It operated, I'll be honest, better than I thought it would. I had some concerns with Roanoke Avenue making the -- now -- to go around the circle to go head -- so if you're heading north on Roanoke to go west on 58, you're in a left lane and you

have to cross two lanes of the circle to go -- to proceed around the circle. I didn't explain that very well, but hopefully you can get it. I anticipated that to be a very difficult move.

My first observation yesterday was that it very well. We only have a limited distance of two lanes approaching the circle on 58. So when that gets extended, we will experience higher speeds and increased traffic flow. When those things occur, we may start to see some issues. I'm hopeful that we don't. But once the -- probably midweek next week or towards the end of next week, those conditions will be upon us and we'll be able to make some better observations. But as of right now, it's operating very well.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's good. I was surprised too. I've been nervous about that round-about too. And I couldn't really understand how that was going to function. But it seemed like people were slowing down in the right places.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There is a learning curve we found with traffic circles. Certainly, there was one existing before. So, you know, people are generally aware of what needs to be done. It's really just the extra lane in there that might throw a wrench. As long as the volumes aren't too high.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If you're trying to go from one side of Roanoke to the other side of Roanoke, it's a bit of a challenge. We will see how people navigate it.

MR. HILLMAN:

Is it -- however, it was a challenge before it was converted, when it was a circle. And I think it's still a bit of a challenge. But like I said, it operated better than I thought it would on the first day. You know, I did see -- I observed some minor things; people are not tracking in the lanes as well as they should as they go around the circle. So someone might be on the inside lane, and as they go around the circle, they end up on the outside lane.

As the Commissioner said, that's learning curve. I'm hopeful that as they continue to drive through this on a consistent basis that they learn to stay in lanes better. The other issue that I saw, the trucks on the inside lane generally are concerned. There's a trucking apron and it's designed so that their rear axles actually go up on the truck apron. And they're concerned -- the truckers are concerned to do that, so they're actually swinging wide and moving into the other travel lane also. So I'm hopeful that these things clear themselves up through time. We will see.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We will see. Hopefully no one gets hurt.

MR. HILLMAN:

I would like to just say that when you do a round-about, speeds are definitely slow. So although there may be some issues that we hope will alleviate themselves, speeds are low. I don't anticipate -- if there are some fender benders, that's what they'll be, fender benders. You know, it's not like we're going to have right angle accidents at 50 miles an hour where people are putting people are -- we're putting in potential injury out there. That's not the case. These would be minor fender benders is the way I would classify them. Speeds are very low, so that's a good thing.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I hope you are right. I did notice driving on 58 as I approach it, because it's -- you know, roundabouts that I've seen often are more dramatic. And this one, it's almost like you are going straight across. There's a little bit of a curve. That's my one fear, that people will just think they can drive straight through it. There's no light or whatever. And then they could hit somebody going around, and that would be a right angle collision .

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The information we have from historic roundabouts, they are very few and far between that you have right angle turns. You know, you do have rear-end accidents, things like that. But again, once folks learn, you know, how to get around it and they become accustomed to it, they've found that it moves very well. I would state this, you know, as we're sitting here defending this, it was the Town of Riverhead that basically forced the issue of the circle. You know, we wanted a signalized intersection. If the circle doesn't work out for whatever reason, we have the right-of-way to create a signalized intersection. But at this time, you know, we feel so far it's working.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So we will move on to the last resolution. **1369, Amending Resolution No. 1246-2009, a resolution making certain findings and determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 7 Medford (CP 8129) (Co. Exec.).**
Commissioner, brief explanation.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This resolution simply amends the findings hearings -- the hearings findings statement that was issued last year. And to state that a million dollars is what the cost will be to construct waste water sludge process facilities at this sewer district.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Any questions? We need a motion and a second. Motion by Legislator Horsley, seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

That concludes the agenda. Thank you for coming. We are adjourned.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:37 P.M.*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY