

CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING

of the

PUBLIC WORKS and TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The Public Works and Transportation Capital Budget Meeting was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday, May 18, 2010 at 9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:

Legislator Jay Schneiderman
Legislator Tom Barraga

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Legislator Tom Cilmi - 10th Legislative District
Legislator Kate Browning - 3rd Legislative District
Legislator Edward Romaine - 1st Legislative District
Gail Vizzini - Director of Budget Review Office
Lance Reinheimer - BRO
Rosalind Gazes - BRO
Gilbert Anderson - Commissioner of Public Works
Lou Calderone - Deputy Commissioner of Public Works
Ben Wright - Sanitation Department - DPW
Bob Shinnick - Transportation Division - DPW
Bill Hillman - Chief engineer - DPW
Delia McKernan - President Smith Point Beach Property Owners
Susan Wischhusen - Save the Forge River
Robert Debona - Mastic Beach Property Owners
Lee Zeldin

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 9:51 A.M.*)

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the Public Hearing on the Capital Budget of Public Works. I ask everybody to please rise and join in the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Cilmi.

SALUTATION

Please remain standing and join us in a quick moment of silence for the men and women overseas. Let's keep them in our thoughts and prayers.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Thank you. Welcome, everyone. We will begin with our public portion. I do have some cards. If you are here and would like to speak and not yet filled out a card, please do so. The first speaker this morning is Delia McKernan, President Smith Point Beach Property Owners. Welcome.

MS. MCKERNAN:

Thank you. Good morning, Legislators. I'm here this morning to speak about money, I think approximately three million if I'm not mistaken, that our Legislator Kate Browning has set aside in hopes of the communities of Mastic, Mastic Beach, Shirley and Smith Point getting a sewer district.

It is my understanding that this money is in jeopardy and has been removed from our district. As explained with me, without this money in place and secured for our future sewer district, we will not be eligible for Federal funding to help make this endeavor a reality. I've come before the legislation (sic) many, many times and always for the main purpose to fight to improve the quality of life in my district. I don't understand why we're never important enough to get what we deserve. We need this money for the purpose it was intended for.

In order to become an economic and viable community, we must move forward and improve our quality of life, our waterways and our downtown. Montauk Highway to some may be a vast improvement, but the reality is we have improved our corridor minimally at least. Without sewers, who are we looking to attract? What businesses will come to the quad hamlet and invest when most of the potential investors will be rejected due to lack of sewers? I really want to make sure that this money is put back in place for the purpose it was intended. And I would hope that any decisions that are made in our district, you would take into account that we are a community that cannot move ahead and become economically viable because we don't have the foundation to do that. We're being back, and that really has to stop. So consider, you know, fighting to get this money back to where it was so that we can move ahead as a community and we can also be proud of the community that we live in. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Thank you, Ms. McKernan. Next is Susan Wischhusen.

MS. WISCHHUSEN:

I'm going to echo a lot of the same sentiments that Delia brought up. In the not so distant past, I asked our County Executive to invest \$3 million in varying dry sewer lines along Montauk Highway. He said he couldn't waste money on a maybe. I didn't ask him to spend money on a maybe. I asked him to invest money in a community.

This community needs sewers. The Mastic/Shirley community has become a flush and flow community. We flush our toilets and it flows directly into the Forge River. The result is that the Forge River is one of the most polluted rivers on the planet. That's scary. Sewering only goes to address part of it. The pollution is more than just sewerage. But the other problem is our economy.

There is no way that the Mastic/Shirley area can be revitalized without a sewer district. We are a very dense community, and we have virtually no -- no commercial industry. We can't get any retail in because we don't have the infrastructure to support it. Without this \$3 million you are basically condemning a community to be depressed forever. So you can do what you were elected and represent all of the people in Suffolk County and fight to get this put back in the budget, or you can condemn it. And that's really the bottom line. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Thank you. The next speaker is Lee Zeldin.

MR. ZELDIN:

Good morning. My name is Lee Zeldin. I live the Shirley/Mastic community. I grew up in Shirley. I'm here today to support Legislator Browning's efforts to restore the \$3 million to the sewer district. I'll echo the points that were made prior to me. The community definitely does need a sewer district for the purposes of getting a revitalized downtown. We need sewer districts on Montauk Highway, on mastic Road, Neighborhood Road in order to get businesses in, to reduce our property taxes, to create jobs, to get our peninsula out of the rut that it's in right now.

The money is essential. And there are a lot of priorities, of course, all over Suffolk County, but with the over-saturation of sober homes and sex offenders and Section 8 Housing in our area, now more than ever, our community needs this really to get ourselves out of the rut that we are in. So this does cross political partisan lines. It doesn't matter whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. I happen to know everyone of all parties that live in the Mastic/Shirley community are supporting Legislator Browning's efforts to get the sewer district. And whatever you can possibly do to get it back in the budget will help us for many years and decades and generations to come. Now, more than ever, you need to rise up and do this for us, all the residents of Mastic and Shirley. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Thank you. I don't have any other cards. Is there anybody else with us this morning who would like to speak? Anybody else? Anybody else? Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

First of all, I'd like to say thank you to the residents from my community who did show up today to speak on the sewer issue. I placed \$3 million in the Capital Budget for the dry sewer lines, which clearly we didn't get the support when the Montauk Highway project was moving forward. But the reason why I want to keep that money in the budget is that we have Federal earmark money that we do expect to get next spring. And it's a \$1.7 million project. It's for planning and design for the engineering project.

I will probably be taking money out and putting it in the 2111 for the County's match to the Federal money for the planning and design. So I just want to say to thank you for you. You know, our Federal earmark money is so important. And if we don't get -- you know, if we don't have the money to match, we don't get the Federal money. So it's very important that we get that.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Gail, on this issue, this is money that we had approved as a Legislature, was that last year or the year before? I do recall that there was a vote on this issue, and I do believe it was approved. Can you just talk a little bit about the procedure and what happened and where we're at?

MS. VIZZINI:

Yes. We included the \$3 million in subsequent years in anticipation of the needs for the sewerage.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Gil.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The three million was included in the Capital Program last year. Originally it was intended for the dry sewer program which we took exception to as the department, because -- you know, we've been through this, I think, publically enough. It wasn't included as part of our Capital Program and our recommendation, based on the fact that we thought it was for the dry sewer program.

Again, you know, I would still have to make the statement as far as the dry sewers, until there is a plan in place, we do not recommend it for that amount. It it's a place-keeper, certainly we're not going to object.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm sorry. That's exactly what we want to do, is we want to keep it. I think if you pull it out of the budget completely, it's no longer on the radar. And you know how much we've worked on doing the sewer study. We've completed the sewer study. And now we're working on the planning and design. I know you met with Senator -- sorry -- Congressman Bishop's Office, Senator Gillibrand and Schumer's Office. We have met with all of them, and they are very supportive of it.

I know we are on top of their list, so that's why it's important that we keep that money. And I did speak with BRO about putting our portion of the match in next year for 2011, and the rest can go in subsequent years, because I know it's going to take us eight to ten years to actually get that district. But if we don't keep moving, I think it's really going to set us back. And if we don't get this money next year for the planning and design, we might as well just forget it and walk away.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Hi, Gil. Just so I understand the dynamics of this, Congressman Bishop has put in a million-seven, is that as an earmark in the Federal Budget.

LEG. BROWNING:

It's 55%.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Fifty five. We have to come up with 45. What is the dollars on that, how would that work out?

LEG. BROWNING:

1.7.

LEG. HORSLEY:

So it's of 1.7? Okay. And that would be for design purpose only. What's the \$3 million issue then?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, I think in my brain that we were still -- I'm still thinking of the older \$3 million that was in the Capital Program last year or the year when we had our discussions about the dry sewers.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Maybe I just need an update, because you know I'm a sewer man. So I just want to make sure I can understand this.

LEG. BROWNING:

Don't we love that. What happened was going back to the Montauk Highway project, we couldn't legally bond the \$3 million for the sewer line because we don't have a sewer district. So what we're

doing currently now is we've done the sewer district study -- we've done the study, and now we're working on creating the sewer district. So the 1.7 is for planning and design, and that's the total amount. And the Federal Government will only -- I think it's 55%, we have to come up with 45. I'm going to take portion of that three million, put it in next year to match the Federal earmark. And the rest will go in subsequent years.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Now I understand. So the difference, the \$3 million difference, from the one point -- the 45% of the 1.7 will go to outlying years for further sewer development in the Mastics.

LEG. BROWNING:

Right.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Got it.

LEG. BROWNING:

We are good.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

At what point -- when you say that you are in the process of creating the sewer district, where is that process at right now?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right now -- if I may. We've internally prepared a map and plan. The map and plan itself will be added to under the overall sewer assessment RFP -- project. And once we have that, then we can go to a public hearing, see what the community's, you know, take on it would be; whether they approve it or not and then we decide if we have to go to a referendum.

But the first thing we need to do is part of this overall sewer assessment report is to complete -- or, you know, just make sure that the report that we're prepared is complete, and then we can go to public hearing. That just starts the process. Right now, we've had talks with Brookhaven about locating the plant. You know, there's a ways to go.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If I may, Mike Monaghan, our Chief Engineer of Buildings and Facilities has a function at his kid's school. If I could, if I could ask if any questions about buildings, facilities and design -- if you have any questions on those topics, otherwise I can let Mike go and take care of business.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Legislator Cilmi.

LEG. CILMI:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Gil, do you have -- or Mike, thank you for coming. Do you have any information for us as to our building usage in the County in terms of the efficiency of utilization of our facilities? And I know there was something developed some time ago with regard to that. But has there been any updates?

MR. MONAGHAN:

Legislator Cilmi, are you referring to efficiency -- energy efficiency or --

LEG. CILMI:

No. Occupancy efficiency.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Lou Calderone will speak on this.

MR. CALDERONE:

Good morning. I'm not prepared to give you actual facts and figures. I could follow up with that. But just in general, we don't have extra space in the County if that's where you're going, in County Buildings. You know, there's a Space Committee. We're constantly monitoring who's coming, who's going, who's downsizing, who's upsizing. And I can give you all those statistics on who's in rented facilities and who's fixed -- you know, County-owned facilities.

LEG. CILMI:

Okay.

MR. CALDERONE:

If that's what you are looking for.

LEG. CILMI:

But in terms of -- in terms of an actual comprehensive analysis of how effectively we're utilizing the spaces that we're in, has there been -- does the Space Committee work on that?

MR. CALDERONE:

There hasn't been a comprehensive plan for the entire County. We have done bits and pieces. What I mean by that is, for instance, right now, we're tackling one for the Health Department. Basically, Health Department, Vector Control, Medical Examiner Building, the labs, we're doing like a consolidation to see what makes sense if a future -- you know, for the future; do we combine labs, not combine labs. So we do those kinds of things, you know, kind of as needed.

LEG. CILMI:

On a departmental basis?

MR. CALDERONE:

Correct. On a departmental basis, correct.

LEG. CILMI:

I suppose the way we are structured in terms of what departments are where, it makes sense to do it that way as opposed to an overall --

MR. CALDERONE:

Yes. Because -- here's a for instance; you know, the Police Department doesn't really impact Social Services, you see where I'm going with that? So they're kind of all their own fiefdoms. But we do look at -- in this particular case, this study involves us, DPW, because we control Vector and its labs and the Health Department. So as needed, if the study has to be done between two departments, we do do that.

LEG. CILMI:

Thanks, Lou.

MR. CALDERONE:

You are welcome.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Anybody else?

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No. That's okay. Good luck at your school function.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah. Just a quick question to Ms. Vizzini. I put in a request for a phase two on Wellwood Avenue. I sent you a copy of it. Was that given to the capital group?

MS. VIZZINI:

We have not gotten to that yet, but we will.

LEG. HORSLEY:

All right. I just wanted to make sure it was on the register.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Can you repeat the question? I apologize.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

All I said was Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'm back.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Anything else? I do see DPW is well represented today to answer any questions. Is there anybody from your department, Commissioner, that would like to speak on anything? Are they here to speak on anything in particular?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. We just wanted to make sure we were here to --

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Available to answer questions?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, sir.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Okay. Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes. I had discussed this with Gil outside, on the record, because we had discussed this at a working committee, a working capital committee which I'm on, I want to raise the issue the issues of Senix Creek. As you know, all the drains along CR 80, Montauk Highway, in Center Moriches flow in -- many of them flow into a common drain that spills unfiltered into the Senix Creek. And that is somewhat disturbing.

I've raised this issue with you guys before, whether we use 477 Funds or whether we put this in or we look at this, obviously this is a DPW obligation. And for years, this has polluted, without question, Senix Creek. I mean, I stood there recently during the heavy rains in march and watched

it flow out like a torrid from all of the drains that fed in to this common big culvert that poured right into Senix Creek at the head of Senix Creek. Maybe you could address some of your thoughts on how you could deal with that issue. That is an issue, by the way, that is common to both myself and Legislator Browning, because at that particular location, that's the boundary line for both of our districts.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The Department of Public Works and the County has been committed to installing what I would call swirl separators or devices which remove sediments and pollutants prior to outfalling into adjacent creeks. While I would acknowledge that we haven't done Senix Creek yet, it is part of a project -- a project that we're working on right now to do those. I believe the project is in design. And, you know, we anticipate putting in the swirl separator drains that we -- you know, we recommend and install.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I appreciate the fact that it's part of the plan. I appreciate the fact that you anticipate to do this. I'm very basic. I need a schedule, I need to know a time, I need to know a plan, I need a timeframe. And I'm going to push on this and push on this and push on this. The County should not be in the position of polluting our waterways, and we clearly are in this. This is something that needs to be addressed yesterday, well before yesterday. So as far as being willing for you to develop a plan or anticipating a plan or anything of that, I'm not into that. I'm into when are we getting this done. When are we getting this done?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay. At this point, we anticipate submitting permit applications this summer, early this summer, and then -- I mean, I wish I could give you a timeframe after that, but we can put together an anticipated timeframe --

LEG. ROMAINE:

And you have to submit permits to the DEC?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

DEC, yes, sir.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Will you let me know?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Obviously, you know, some of us are familiar with the regional director. I'm going to do what I can to expedite those permits. Wherever I have to do, including when you tell me they're there, going over there and sitting with them so that you get them back, because I want to know the turnaround time once those permits are approved to you undertaking this function, because I am very interested in moving forward with this at all deliberate speed. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Very good.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Hi, again. I just want to go back to the outfall pipe that hasn't been discussed in a while. I know that I was promised many, many moons ago that there's going to be pipes repaired if there's ever a

break or whatever. And I can see that -- in fact, I recall Mr. Zwirn saying, "Oh, they will be there within the next month or so." I keep a monitor on that place pretty closely, and I haven't seen any pipes coming our way, repair pipes. I just wanted to see where we're at this year to make sure that the -- we've in the past put 50,000 -- 50 million, 50 million, 50 million into the budget. And I just want to make sure that that's still in place. Where is the County Executive on this issue?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The program for the replacement of the outfall, we're still waiting for the completion of the report. The final report on that outfall based on discussions with the DEC, you know, what would be the most -- best option to do -- you know, to replace that portion of the outfall.

We anticipate that relatively shortly, sometime I would guess over the summer. And then at that point, we'll see -- you know, where we're taking it. Without having it in hand, I'm a little reluctant to say, you know, where we think it's going to go, because, you know, without that, they may turn in something different. But we anticipate -- you know, we'll get the report this summer, and then we'll be able to advise, you know, the Legislature on their recommendations and where we take them.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. I appreciate that. But let me just ask you as far as a budgetary issue, the 50 million that we put, I think it was in '011, wasn't it? It's been a couple of years now, '011, '12 and '13?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Is it still in the budget?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. I just wanted to double check to make sure there was no slip of hand here or something.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's still there.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. Then what about the replacement pipes? Have we gone away from them or have we decided that we don't need them anymore?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'm going to let Ben answer that.

MR. WRIGHT:

No. We have the specification for it. It will probably be a few months before that's issued.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I've heard that one before, Ben. We're talking about the replacement pipes in case there is a break that's going to be located somewhere on the facility?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yeah. We're going to buy four or five sections of pipe that's compatible with what's there.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. Because we haven't talked about this for a couple of months, a year and a half or so ago,

whatever it may be.

MR. WRIGHT:

Everything takes time.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I love you. I love your dramatics. So it is coming. It's still part of the plan to have the replacement pipes there in case of an emergency.

MR. WRIGHT:

It's an element of the emergency response plan, and it's something we've met with DEC about. You know, it will be a few months. You know, we'll keep you up-to-date on it.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I was just getting a little worried because after we did our last testings and they said that, well, it doesn't look like it's going to break, that, you know, maybe we were getting a little complacent. That's not the case?

MR. WRIGHT:

No. You know, the main -- the critical item is pressure in the pipe. And even when we've had the heavy rains, the pressure, we've been able to keep it down. We did do a dye test not too long ago, no problems.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I heard of the testing. So I just wanted to make sure that we don't get complacent just because our testing is more positive than we may have thought. Okay. I just wanted to check.

MR. WRIGHT:

Just on the report, I agree with Gil that this summer we'll have a final report. We do have the draft of the final report in our office. We're going through comments. When we get it final, then we have to sit with DEC to make sure that they're on board with the recommendations.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I know you don't want to prejudge the report, but are we still looking at the tunneling? Is that still, what, our number one option?

MR. WRIGHT:

Yes, it is. And that's really based on DEC's restrictions and their guidance basically. The only option that they probably would approve.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Anything else for Commissioner Anderson and his staff? Anybody for Commissioner Anderson and his staff? Commissioner, thank you. And thank you to your entire staff at DPW for all that you do. Thank you.

Before we go to BRO, I do have one more card, Robert DeBona.

MR. DEBONA:

Good morning. I'm Robert DeBona, President of Mastic Beach Property Owners Association, an area where we're struggling for better things. And one of the main concerns we have is when are we going to get our sewers as Patchogue has received large funds for doing things like this? And we feel that the sewer systems are holding us back.

We're unable to develop our Neighborhood Road, which we've spent some money in redoing our sidewalks and a matter of pride items such as new lights and signs and trash cans and other things like that. But we're unable to progress forward with buildings, doing any type of stores because we really have no way of getting rid of our waste.

In the past couple of months, the stormy weather that came into our area had just totally flooded out all of Mastic Beach. We have probably 50-100 people that lost their boilers because there's nowhere to go. The Property Owners does what they can by allowing the sewers to drain into our marinas which we pay for and we dredge when it's necessary. And we're asking the Legislature to put the funds back and to get started and let us progress and let the town of Mastic Beach grow. So just for your concern, I want to thank you for this opportunity and hope you'll consider putting the funds back in. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Thank you, Mr. DeBona. BRO, you are up.

MS. VIZZINI:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a brief highlight of the report we prepared for you each year. It includes an analysis of the Capital Program in terms of the authorized unissued debt and the debt that we project will be incurred as its schedule in the Capital Program.

We have sections talking about the stimulus money that the County has received and will have to manage a section on returning to pay-as-you-go; an update for you on the land acquisition programs; a discussion of the infrastructure assessment that SUNY has just done, which is a quantitative ranking of all their infrastructure, more appropriate for the Education Committee, but I just want to bring your attention to the sections of the report. And we also have the individual project by project write ups, so if you have specific projects you're interested in, it's a somewhat different format. We think it's easier to read and the information is a little bit more consistently presented.

Other than the projects that we've already discussed and that had been highlighted by the speakers, there's just three or four I wanted to bring to the attention of the committee. One of them, of course, was the sewerage project in Mastic Shirley. The others are the Smithtown and Kings Park Main Street commercial area sewer expansion. The Capital Program did include \$40 million. That funding has been reduced in the proposed program to ten million. This again, is a situation where we need some lead time for a district to be established and created. However, based on the consultant's report, the estimate is closer to 40 million now than the ten million that's included.

The Port Jeff-Wading river Rails to Trails Pedestrian and Bicycle Path, the project is 5903, that was predicated on receipt of \$8.9 million in Federal funding. It has come to our attention through the Department of Public works that those funds are no longer available. So it is unlikely that we will move forward without the Federal funding.

The intersection improvements on CR 48 at Middle road Cox Neck Road, there's a scaled down version of this improvement project that involves roundabouts at the location. In our opinion, we need at least an additional 500 to a million dollars to implement the design. And last project I wanted to highlight -- just one more comment -- the pedestrian bridge over CR 4, Commack Road in the vicinity of Nicolls Road and Julia Circle, we would recommend that money be added for that. The funds are no longer included in the Capital Program.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Thanks, Gail. Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Let's go back to the roundabouts, Cox Neck Road, how much is budgeted currently?

MS. VIZZINI:

There's 1.5 between the money in 2010 and 2011.

LEG. ROMAINE:

So 1.5, 2010-2011. And that's to do the project, that's for planning and design or for both?

MS. VIZZINI:

That for -- that's to complete the project. However, as we discussed in the working group, the design would require additional funds.

LEG. ROMAINE:

The design would require half a million dollars in additional funds?

MS. VIZZINI:

In construction, yes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

In construction. So there's enough money to start the design. So you anticipate between planning, design and construction, \$2 million for this project?

MS. VIZZINI:

There's a million dollars in 2010.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. But no money in 2011?

MS. VIZZINI:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And when has DPW indicated they are being to bid on this?

MS. VIZZINI:

If the project was ready to move forward, I think they would go to bid in 2010 since that's where the money is scheduled.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. I would ask your office to do me the favor of contacting DPW and tell me when they're placing this project out to bid, because clearly, they have enough work to start the planning and design; is that correct?

MS. VIZZINI:

There is no money in planning, so I'd have to assume that the planning is completed.

LEG. ROMAINE:

So the planning is completed from previous years?

MS. VIZZINI:

Or maybe the design is being done in-house.

LEG. ROMAINE:

My understanding is that the planning and design was done in previous years, and they never moved forward with it, because they couldn't make a decision of how they were going to acquire the land to do the roundabout that they wanted to do.

I'll tell you what. Rather than hold up with the committee, do me a favor, contact my office later today or tomorrow or some day this week about this, coordinate with DPW. My understanding is the planning and design was done in earlier years. But now they're talking about a different design where they might do a double-roundabout.

MS. VIZZINI:

Correct. That's what our report indicates.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Which I don't know if that was part of the original design that they did. They did that original design about four or five years ago. So the original planning and design was done. If there's a change to that, one, I want to know; two, I'd like to see the difference between the two plans; three, I'd like to get the information in terms of cost estimates; and four, I'd like to know when DPW is planning to put this to bid for actual work to start construction.

MS. VIZZINI:

I'll ask Mr. Hillman to call your office and brief you in terms of your questions. Normally, they would not go to bid unless they had enough money. So, you know, if they were going to do --

LEG. ROMAINE:

So what is the recommendation of Budget Review in terms of 2000 --

MS. VIZZINI:

If we're going to proceed with the current design, we would need more money in the project, at least five hundred.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I assume there aren't offsets in 2010?

MS. VIZZINI:

There may be offsets in 2010. We'd have to look at what's not moving forward.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Could you give me a list of those projects that aren't moving forward?

MS. VIZZINI:

We can reach out to Public Works.

LEG. ROMAINE:

If you could do that, because clearly, someone has to come forward to amend the Capital Budget this year is this budget is going to move forward. And this is something that is desirous by the Town of Southold and certainly would help the flow of traffic at this location. Thank you.

MS. VIZZINI:

You are welcome.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Okay. Gail, Lance, anything else from BRO?

MS. VIZZINI:

If the committee has any questions, we are here.

VICE-CHAIRMAN STERN:

Gail, Lance, thank you to you and your staff. Outstanding, as always thank you. Anybody else? Anybody else? Very good. We are adjourned. Thank you.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:37 A.M.*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY