

PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

The Public Works and Transportation Committee Meeting was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, New York, on Tuesday, June 15, 2010 at 2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Presiding Officer William Lindsay
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk
Paul Perilli - Aide to Majority Caucus
Kara Hahn - Presiding Officer's Office
Mike Cavanagh - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Catherine Stark - Aide to Legislator Schneiderman
Deborah Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern
Jessica Proios - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Gail Vizzini - Director of Budget Review Office
Lance Reinheimer - Budget Review Office
Craig Freas - Budget Review Office
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office
Ben Zwirn - Deputy County Executive
Ed Hennessey - County Executive's Office
Gil Anderson - Commissioner of Public Works
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer/Department of Public Works
Ben Wright - Sanitation Division/Department of Public Works
Gail Lolis - Suffolk County Attorney's Office
Dot Kerrigan - AME
Tim Mooney - Fire Island Ferries/Fire Island Water Taxi
Tracey Edwards - Verizon
Bob Morrow

VERBATIM MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Lucia Braaten, Court Stenographer

[THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:38 P.M.]

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good afternoon. I'd like to call this meeting to order, the Public Works and Transportation Committee, this 15th day of June, 2010. If you all will rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance, led by Legislator Tom Muratore.

(*Salutation*)

Remain standing for a moment. I don't do this at every meeting, but although, you know, we never -- we always try to never forget all the individuals who are fighting for our freedom abroad, this meeting is maybe a little bit different for me, because just a few days ago, last Friday, we laid a young man from Shelter Island to rest. He wasn't in my district. He spent quite a bit of time, though, living in Sag Harbor in my district. He was in Ed Romaine's district, a guy named Lieutenant Theinert, Joe Theinert. And a young man who in attempts to defuse a roadside bomb, something went wrong, he wasn't successful in defusing it. He signalled his -- the men in his crew to back off and the bomb did explode and he lost his life. He was beautifully eulogized at the funeral, if anybody was there, by his high school coach and his two brothers. And it's a real loss, a tremendous sacrifice. And perhaps we could have a moment of silence for him and prayers to his family, thank him for his service. And, also, send our thoughts and prayers to all those who are in harm's way and fighting for our great nation.

(*Moment of Silence*)

Thank you. I have a couple of speakers. If you wish to be heard by the Committee, you do need to fill out a yellow card. They're available at the front table. I have three such cards. The first one is Tracey Edwards from Verizon. Tracey, if you'll step forward. I'll ask that you identify yourself just for our record and limit your comments to three minutes, if you will.

MS. EDWARDS:

Thank you, everyone. I was at the hearing last week and I advised all of you that I would return today to give my comments in reference to the proposed I.R. 1578, also to give you an update on the current status of the double poles. I respectfully oppose the proposal of this bill. I don't think that it is -- I think it has less of a need today than there even was before, and I'll be able to share that information with you.

The concerns that I have in reference to this bill is the criteria, the notification period, the tracking of the notification period. I think it is much better served in us to remove the double poles in a strategic manner and not chasing the clock. I also still respectfully do not think it applies to all of the attachments that are on the poles, and, respectfully, we believe that if it does not apply to all, that it should not apply to any.

So what I'd like to do, with your permission, is to hand out the information that I had mentioned last week. Thank you, Renee.

Chairman Schneiderman, when I spoke last week, I had mentioned that when we started and I first appeared in front of you in April, I gave you a status of the double poles as of January, 2010, and I've been working with my team and my engineering partners to put together the plan, as promised, to remove on average 250 poles per month. We are on plan, but what we have discovered when we were going out to survey those jobs and to remove the poles, many of those poles that we showed in the database as being there were no longer there. So our Engineering Department did a field survey on all, 100% of the locations, of the 11,994 poles that were shown in the database, and we have determined that 59% of them had already been removed. There was a database issue where the manual work and the engineering systems and the operating systems were not married together, so as we went and took down the poles and updated our records, the Engineering Department and the Operations Department databases did not -- do you want me to stop?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Keep going.

MS. EDWARDS:

They did not align. So we have since put in a system fix, so that as -- when we take down the double pole conditions, it would automatically take down and correct the engineering system. So the engineering system is the system of record, so I gave you that information. So you will see that the judgments that we made were 6,862. There were -- when we went out to the system, there were not -- the double pole condition didn't exist, and in some cases we found double pole conditions that did exist. So once you go back and forth with the ins and outs, the database adjustments were 6,862. We also removed 2,409. Last two weeks we reported that number as 2,211, in case you have the prior document. We've moved another -- removed another 198 over the last couple of weeks. So, currently, right now, we have 2,723 double-wood conditions, and of which I would say about fifteen hundred of them are on County roads.

So I was in opposition before, that I didn't think it was necessary, that I am very engaged. As you say, every time that you have this bill up and asked for me to come, or if I come because of the resolution. I just don't think it's necessary for you to go forward with this bill. And I'll be able to answer any questions that you'd like.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me start. I'm just looking at the numbers, and I appreciate this adjustment, and I'm also sure that there's probably new double poles that are entering, you know, based on all the accidents I seem to see around with broken poles. But just in terms of where -- how you're approaching the numbers, I see some areas like Sag Harbor, it's a, you know, pretty small geographic area, 220 poles. I think that was the -- one of the highest counts. Southampton looks like the highest count with 252. Hampton Bays I think is probably next with 171, sometimes -- maybe there's -- and Shoreham is next. But a lot of the East End areas which are heavily touristed, enjoyed by all the County, I know you had said you were making some effort to try to address some of those errors before it gets packed for the summer. Any positive development there?

MS. EDWARDS:

And we are. We were out there this week, we were out there last week. And we have -- what I tried to do is address the need for the East End, but I also had made a commitment to try to hit each of the Legislative Districts, and also to try to go by the percentages that the double poles existed. So you'll see that -- I'll use Huntington for an example. In Legislator Stern and the other Legislators, we had believed that we had 905. So that was, we believed to be, a larger number. But when you take a look at it after we have the adjustments, they have one of the smallest number of double-poles. So, when we went out, our plan was to address all of those needs. Right now, we're going to be spending the rest of the time out in the East End to try to adjust it, because now, the current conditions, those percentages are up.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It seems it's out of whack, so --

MS. EDWARDS:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Well, I appreciate that. Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Hi.

MS. EDWARDS:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Good afternoon.

MS. EDWARDS:

Good afternoon.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Certainly, this report is a dramatic improvement over the numbers that you gave us the last time we met, because those numbers didn't have the database adjustments.

MS. EDWARDS:

That's correct.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Now, you're down from -- if I recall those numbers, in terms of the double-poles that were out there at the time, it was better than a 9,000 figure. So now you're down to twenty-seven-twenty-three. Year to date, if I'm reading this correctly, you've removed twenty-four-0-nine.

MS. EDWARDS:

Yes.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I guess in the first 5 1/2 months. Well, you've got twenty-seven-twenty-three left. What kind of a time frame are we talking about here? Can you do this by the end of the year, remove the remaining poles?

MS. EDWARDS:

I think I could do it by the third quarter of next year, because what I had explained before, Legislator Barraga, is I can do a lot of it now because it's good weather, and also because we have more of a complement of force. So as the force -- we have a voluntary offer, so we have some folks that are leaving the business and there's also vacation period. So I wanted to make sure that we got off to a very good start, and especially because of the East End, it's more difficult to get out of the East End because everybody else is going out to the East End, so the traveling back and forth, so -- and the -- Riverhead did work with us and find a pole lot for us to dispose of the double poles. So I think that I'm going to be able to beat the commitment of the 250 on average per month. I don't think I'm going to be able to do the twenty -- the full twenty-seven-hundred and twenty-three (sic) this year, but I think that my commitment to you last year, that I thought last time was we were going to be able to do this in four years, I believe that we're going to be done next year.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Very good, because, obviously, the gravity of the problem really has been reduced when you take a look at these numbers.

MS. EDWARDS:

Right. So we're going to keep going. I mean, I don't want to just go the two-fifty per -- average per month and stop, we're going to keep going. So I would think that, you know, it's -- if we're at twenty-four-0-nine, I would believe that we're probably going to take about another 800 at least down off of that number and then continue to keep going. In the winter months, it's a little bit difficult to do that, too, so this was the prime period for us to get started.

LEG. BARRAGA:

So you think probably around August, September of next year; do you think that's reasonable?

MS. EDWARDS:

Absolutely, yep.

LEG. BARRAGA:

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you.

LEG. MURATORE:

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Oh, I'm sorry, one -- another question. Legislator Muratore.

MS. EDWARDS:

Yes, sir.

LEG. MURATORE:

Ms. Edwards, this form you gave us, I notice some towns are missing such as in my district, like Centereach. So what would the poles in Centereach be included in?

MS. EDWARDS:

Centereach is a municipality of what Town, sir?

LEG. MURATORE:

Brookhaven.

MS. EDWARDS:

So I would have to --

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, there's a whole bunch, I mean, Amityville, Centereach, Lake Grove, Medford, Northport, Brentwood, Shirley.

MS. EDWARDS:

Yeah. I think it's -- you know what it is, we go by wire center. What I could do for you is I could look at your particular area and lay it out, because how the -- how the database goes is by wire center that we have and sometimes it crosses over. So we have all of the numbers in there, it's just I'm not particularly sure where Centereach is located. Let me ask, because the Engineering Department is here. So, if you want, let me just ask them.

LEG. MURATORE:

Right next door to Selden and right next door to Lake Grove. It's it between Lake Grove and Selden.

MS. EDWARDS:

So it's in -- so it could be in Selden, it also could be in Smithtown.

But, if you want --

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, it's in the Town of Brookhaven, though.

MS. EDWARDS:

If you want, I'll be able to lay that out for you.

LEG. MURATORE:

Yeah, please, because, like I said, there's so many here that, like villages or towns -- you know, not towns in the sense of Brookhaven, Smithtown, like that, but there's so many other hamlets, some are included in here and some are not.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay. So what I can do is, because I have a document that lists all of the wire centers which would probably get to that point, I just did not think that I should -- wanted to bring all of that. But if you want it, I can provide it. So I think that you'll be able to see the hamlets in the full document. This is the summary that rolls all of that up.

LEG. MURATORE:

Okay. Yeah, I'd like that, please.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay, sure.

LEG. MURATORE:

Thank you, Ms. Edwards. Thank you.

MS. EDWARDS:

I will get that to you tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other questions? Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. How are you?

MS. EDWARDS:

Hi.

LEG. STERN:

I understand what we would be discussing and the progress that's been made if we were discussing 1102, but we're talking about 1578.

MS. EDWARDS:

That's correct.

LEG. STERN:

Correct? All right. So, I mean, as I take a look at 1578, it breaks down into a couple of parts. Number one, there has to be a determination made by DPW as to whether or not there's an actual threat.

MS. EDWARDS:

Yes, that's correct.

LEG. STERN:

All right. There's a threshold issue. And second, then it's one of a duty on the part of the department to notify the appropriate company that because there is a threat now that's been identified by the department, that the equipment has to be removed within a certain time period so that then, because there's an identified public threat, that there's every opportunity, then, to remove that dangerous pole within a certain amount of time.

MS. EDWARDS:

That's correct.

LEG. STERN:

So my questions is, how do you find that this does not differ significantly from 1102? And I understand the progress that's been made, and I think myself and all of my colleagues appreciate the progress that's been made. But here, I mean, aren't we talking about something very different? As I read this proposed legislation, you know, the intent here is way beyond just removing poles.

MS. EDWARDS:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

This is identifying what is a real perceived -- not just a perceived, but an actual public threat that's been identified by our professionals at DPW. I was wondering if you could speak to that.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay, sure. What I would say is, whenever we receive a call, we do exactly that anyway, so you don't need the law; that's number one. Whenever I have received any notification from any of you on -- it didn't even have to be a threat, it could have been a constituent that has notified you that they have what might not be a threat, but it could just be ugly. So, you know, I think the determination of threat is one that I think that we need to define what that -- you know, what that is. The second thing is we're definitely going to do it anyway. Also is the notification period; I still believe, respectfully, that it doesn't apply to everyone that you believe it applies to. I think it's going to apply to Verizon, I don't think it's going to apply to the municipalities, I don't think it's going to apply to LIPA. So that's one that I'm sure, you know, Counsel Nolan will be able to work through that. But we believe, our legal team believes it does not apply to them.

Secondly -- and then there's also the notification period. Are you giving all parties 60-day notifications. Is the clock starting and you're just giving everyone 60 days to do that. What is -- and if it doesn't apply to, say, LIPA, what motivation are they going to have in order to do it in a timely fashion if the 60-day clock and the fine will not apply to them. And then, at the end of the day, we may get two, three days notification and then the fine will hit us. So I just think that there's some things in here that still have to be worked out, but, again, I would say you still don't need it, because whenever you call, we're going anyway, threat or not.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Anyone else? Thank you, Ms. Edwards.

MS. EDWARDS:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Next speaker is Tim Mooney, Fire Island Water Taxi.

MR. MOONEY:

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Tim Mooney and I'm President of Fire Island Ferries and Fire Island Water Taxi. And in front of you today you have I.R. 1414, which is fare relief for the water taxi system. We reviewed this at one of our last meetings and I'm here to answer any questions or help you out any way to help get this moving along so we can try to get it in place for the Fourth of July weekend.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions at this point for Mr. Mooney? Apparently, there are none.

MR. MOONEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Next speaker is Robert Morrow.

MR. MORROW:

Good afternoon. I want to thank Chairman Schneiderman and the Members of the Suffolk County Legislature who serve on the Public Works Committee for giving give me the opportunity to speak before you today. I am here to speak about Resolution 1578, which is a revision of Resolution 2010. The bill would require utilities to remove their plant off the broken and damaged poles that have become a plight on our neighborhoods in Suffolk County for far too long.

Utilities like Verizon and Cablevision have been neglecting to remove their cables and terminals, which has resulted in a proliferation of double-poles in our communities. This failure to act in a responsible fashion to us and the residents of Suffolk County has left a mess that presents safety hazards to our families. The PSC has changed their focus from safety and service standards to competition in the telecommunications industry. These corporations saw that there was no longer any oversight, and instead of self-regulating themselves, they turned their backs on us here in Suffolk County.

I wish it was not necessary for me to speak before you today. I wish that it was not needed for my Union to look to protect the residents of Suffolk County and the hardworking men and women of CWA. If Verizon had any concern for the safety of our children who play in the very streets that are littered with these poles, Verizon would not allow the number to grow to 4,000 poles. Unfortunately, we've been down this road before with Verizon.

Back in 2006, when there was 8,000 double-poles, they gave their commitment then to remove 150 poles a month, but somehow we ended up with nearly 12,000 in January of this year. Next, we hear that they went from 10,000 poles to 5,000 poles in a single stroke of a pen, this mysterious accounting error. It's funny how these poles can magically disappear when someone starts watching. Is it 12,000, 8,000, 10,000, or 5,000, or as low as 2,000, as we just heard?

It seems that there are some serious credibility issues here with -- Verizon has not shown the residents of Suffolk County that they have their best interests at heart. Verizon got involved with FIOS build-out and didn't want pole replacements to get in the way of the corporate profit. What's the next project which will cause Verizon to walk away, what new commitment? Even with Verizon's new commitment of 250 poles a month, it will take four years to remove all the poles that they forgot about. They could promise to remove 1,000 poles a month, but if they won't live up to their word, the number is meaningless, that is unless they take their magic pen and change the number from 5,000 to 1,000. They obviously need some oversight to make sure they take responsibility for the condition of their plant. Verizon has shown they chose dollars over safety, Wall Street over Main Street. The fact remains that Verizon did not show an interest in this issue until there was a threat of legislation. Let's take away the threat, let's make it a reality.

The safety of our families must always be the concern of the utilities that share the roads with us in Suffolk County. Someone needs to take a watchful eye on these utilities, and I am hopeful that you will pass this resolution. It will keep our families safe and our neighborhoods beautiful. Can I answer any question?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions? Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:

Mr. Morrow, I thank you for coming and spending time out of your day to help us with this. The report I have in front of me says there are left, as of June 11th, 2,723. So, in reality, is there really

less than 3,000 poles in Suffolk County, double-poles left up, or is there significantly more?

MR. MORROW:

I believe there's much more, sir.

LEG. MURATORE:

Thank you.

MR. MORROW:

One only has to drive down our roads. I spoke to some of you gentlemen in the past and brought it to your attention, and later on talked to you and you told me since I spoke to you, just drive down your streets and see how many poles there are. LIPA takes care of it. It gets hit, LIPA makes sure. Fortunately, LIPA does their thing, because if that was the power lines that were hanging low or in that -- we would have a lot more problems out there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, sir.

MR. MORROW:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's all I have for yellow cards. Was there anyone else who wanted to be heard by the committee? I have no presentations scheduled, but if I could have Commissioner Anderson step forward.

All right. I'm sure we're going to be turning to you quite a bit throughout the agenda to provide additional information. But, Mr. Anderson, in a committee I was at earlier, it was the Finance Committee and we were talking about budget projections and such, and one of the things that had been budgeted was revenues from the red light cameras that we got permission from the State to install. So I know that they originally were supposed to be in by April or so, April, May. It's now June, they're not up. Can you update us on the progress of those red light cameras, where they may be going and when we might -- when we might anticipate some revenues?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The -- actually, the first one, the first site actually comes online this afternoon. The back office isn't completed, but the actual operation at the site is in place. We have 20 more locations that we have approved and the contractor is working on. The remainder I think has to be installed by October? Let me get Bill up here.

MR. HILLMAN:

As the Commissioner said, we have permits from New York State DOT for twenty locations. These are about ten that are in the contractor's hands. We very shortly will have the other ten, so twenty locations will be approved and in the contractor's hands probably by the end of the month, early July. There is no written schedule. We're working on that with the vendor for completion of the entire fifty locations, but we have a tentative schedule right now to have 85 cameras up and operational by the end of the year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Eighty-five cameras, 50 locations. You say there's more than one camera at -- per location, is that how it works?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yeah. On average, there's about two-and-a-half cameras per location. Obviously, you can't have a half a camera, but some have four, some have three, some have two. So, it, in general, averages about two-and-a-half. The 85 cameras will not be all 50 locations up and operational by the end of

the year. At the moment, that's the schedule. We're working to accelerate that, but there are difficulties in manufacturing the cameras. That's what the vendor is telling us.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are we letting people know where the cameras are, or is it more secretive?

MR. HILLMAN:

That's a decision that will be made in consultation with the County Exec's Office and the Law Department. I don't know that that decision's been made at this moment.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I mean, it might be more of a deterrent people not knowing, knowing that there are at least one red light camera up now at some intersection somewhere in the County. The authorization we got from the State was -- I believe it was for State road intersections, either with County or Town, and I'm imagining that all 21 of the 20 permits that you're seeking, plus the one we have, are all on County-State intersections; is that right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It would either be State-State or County-State, correct.

MR. HILLMAN:

Well, let me just clarify that all 50 locations will be State-State intersections. We do not -- if it's a -- or I stand corrected. You're absolutely right, Commissioner, County-State. The signals will be maintained by New York State DOT, that's the criteria.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But they're on roads, State roads that intersect with County roads. And the revenues from these cameras, are they shared with the State or is it entirely us?

MR. HILLMAN:

No, that's -- it's all to go to Suffolk County.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Now, if -- so we have permission for 50, and you've talked about 21 locations. So there's an additional, I guess, 29 we could add to it. Has there been any thought to include the Towns, which are also financially strapped? Because there is authorization for State-Town roads. So, are we just keeping it all to ourselves, or are we going to give them a shot at this? And if we are, are we notifying them that they may -- can make an application for this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At this point, we've been focusing on what we can readily control, you know, under the auspices of the County. Individual Towns mean we would have to go to the Towns, negotiate separate contracts with them, as well as separate contracts with the vendor, because there's a shared, you know, revenue agreement between us. So, you know, at this point, under this first -- under this first contract for the first 50 cameras, we felt it best to work within what we could control, which are the State -- State-State or State-County intersections. Hopefully, if we get another 50, then we can go to individual Towns.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You're saying, basically, of the 50, all of them will be revenue -- will provide revenue to the County?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And none to the Towns.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At this point. If we come, you know, at the end of the contract, or, you know, later on this year, we determine that we're not going to get any revenue from, you know, five of them, then maybe we would go after -- you know, go to Towns to talk to them, but --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The authorization went to either County or Town. So, if a Town wanted to compete to be one of those 50, it would have to what, get its own vendor to install the light?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, they would -- well, first, I believe they would need legislation that allows them permission to do that. I think the legislation from the State, you know, allowed us to establish the red lights, and then, you know, depending on where we decided to put it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So we could establish a red light at an intersection that was a Town-State intersection, didn't -- but the revenue, then, would be shared with the Town. No? How does that --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. At this point, we're just working really on State-State or State-County intersection, that's really --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. But the authorization did include Towns. It was either State and Town or State and County, that's what I recall. So there's no effort right now to include the Towns, and doesn't seem to be a mechanism for the Towns to take advantage of that authorization.

MR. HILLMAN:

That's correct, the authorization was for Suffolk County to do 50 locations and for Suffolk County to get the revenue. There's no mechanism for the Towns to get the revenue.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So, even if the light were at a State-Town road, the money would still come to the County?

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And that money is going into the County's General Fund, or is it going into into the Police District?

MR. HILLMAN:

We don't handle -- we're part of getting the signals up and operational. I don't know the revenue end.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do we have an answer, maybe, from BRO? Can somebody answer that question. The question is, let's say the red light is within Suffolk County P.D., on a road patrolled by Suffolk County P.D. Is the money going into Suffolk County P.D., or is it going into the County's General Fund? Normally, a ticket that would be written by a Police Officer at that intersection would not go into the County's General Fund, but I think for some reason that this money does go through the General Fund.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Yeah, this money is all budgeted in the General Fund, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Is that going to represent a loss of revenue from ticketing at these intersections by patrolmen. And, normally, if they would write a tick, it would go then to the Police District itself.

MR. REINHEIMER:

This is budgeted as additional revenue, so, by installing cameras, it's assumed that there'll be additional tickets and revenue, so it wouldn't be a loss of the normal tickets that are normally written. So it would be additional revenue to the County, so it shouldn't have an adverse effect to the Police District or special districts.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Jay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

To BRO, what is the fine? How much is the fine?

MR. REINHEIMER:

The fine is \$50.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Fifty dollars? And it only concerns itself with running a red light, it has nothing to do with making right-hand turns on red?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, my understanding is that a lot of the revenue is generated from people rolling through the red on rights. You have to come to a complete stop, so if --

LEG. BARRAGA:

So, what we're talking about does involve making right-hand turns on red lights, rolling through them, or is it just running a red light straight?

MR. HILLMAN:

No, it's --

LEG. BARRAGA:

It's both?

MR. HILLMAN:

Right-hand turns on red, if you do it illegally, you will get ticketed.

LEG. BARRAGA:

These other communities have done that and they've had a lot of problems making that right-hand turn on red, because sometime the cameras go off too quickly or people stop, and it's really played havoc in a lot of other communities with that right on red.

MR. HILLMAN:

It has, but I can tell you that it's not faulty equipment. People are not obeying the law. They are

rolling through the stops and it is -- you know, it's like being pregnant or not pregnant, you either broke the law or you didn't.

LEG. BARRAGA:

All right.

MR. HILLMAN:

So --

LEG. BARRAGA:

Okay, I understand. But let me tell you something. If this law applies to making a right on red with people rolling through and not stopping, all hell's going to break loose. You're going to get such negative feedback from this. Every other community has done that and they've changed the law. If it's strictly going through a red light, then fine them and fine them big, but as soon as you get to the point where people are supposedly not stopping, they're rolling through and making a right-hand turn, there are problems associated with that in every community that's tried it. And some communities have really changed the law to just limit it to right on red. Because the big money is not running the red light, the big money is making the right-hand turn at a red light. And communities have tried to do it and the backlash has been just terrific.

MR. HILLMAN:

With communities, some people -- some communities or some agencies, municipalities have backed away from that, but many others have taken the position of -- which this County is taking, you've broken the law, you deserve a ticket.

LEG. BARRAGA:

That's the position of the County now because you haven't implemented the program. Give it six months and you may be back here with a whole different attitude if you proceed with this.

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't set the policy.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I know you don't.

MR. HILLMAN:

We install them.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I'm just making a public statement, because in other communities there's been a tremendous backlash. You're going to find the same thing here in Suffolk County. With everything that people have to contend with, they're going to be saying, "I did stop," or "It's wrong," and a lot of elected officials are going to get a lot of negative feedback. If it's strictly a straight running through a red light, that's one thing, but there's no money in that. There's no money in that, there's only money on making a right-hand turn illegally on a red light and it doesn't work.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Anyone else? All right. Any other questions for the Commissioner before we get started with the agenda? Fair enough.

I.R. 1005 - Directing the Department of Public Works to add a stop on the 3C Bus Route (Montano). I believe this is getting withdrawn or stricken. Maybe it is stricken at this point from the six-month deadline. I'll just make a motion to table just in case.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1005 is tabled. **(VOTE: Tabled 5-0-0-0)**

1026 - To implement Sunday bus service and extend weekday morning and evening service in Suffolk County (Romaine). I think it's also stricken or at the end of the deadline.

MS. STARK:

It will.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It will be stricken. Okay, thank you. So I will make a motion to table this one as well.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? All right that was tabled. **(VOTE: Tabled 5-0-0-0)**

I.R. 1414 - Approving rates established for Fire Island Water Taxi (LLC) (Presiding Officer). Do we have a motion?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

A motion to approve by Legislator Barraga, second by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(VOTE: Approved 5-0-0-0)**

Tim, that will go to the full Committee now -- the full Legislature on Tuesday.

MR. MOONEY:

Thank you. We'll see you Tuesday.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. **I.R. 1555 - Adopting a Local Law to amend the County's Clean Pass Parking Program (Muratore).** I think that -- did we close the Public Hearing on this, Tom?

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes.

LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:

We did, okay. You want to make a motion.

LEG. MURATORE:

Please, motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll second for discussion. Can we get an explanation again on this, how you're amending the program?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This legislation revises previous legislation which allows handicapped parking in stalls where -- which are marked as Green Pass stalls when there is nobody parking in them. So somebody effectively with, you know, the appropriate stickers can use the Green Pass stalls.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It's a great idea. All right. This --

LEG. HORSLEY:
Yeah, just a quick question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
On the motion, Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:
Yeah. So I got it right, because you know the Green Pass is mine, so that's --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Pride of authorship.

LEG. HORSLEY:
Pride of authorship, right. So it's -- if the Green Pass -- the Clean Pass is not being used, then a handicapped person could park in it, and it just gives more handicapped parking.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. HORSLEY:
Okay. All right.

MR. NOLAN:
The law says that if all the -- if there's no handicapped parking spaces available, then they can park in the Clean Pass spot.

LEG. HORSLEY:
Okay. So it's even -- okay. It's even more clear than if there's no handicapped spaces.

MR. NOLAN:
Right.

LEG. HORSLEY:
I can't argue with that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
The only confusion might be, is, you know, if somebody comes along who's handicapped and there's no handicapped spaces and then they park in the Clean Pass spot, and then later somebody pulls out of the handicapped space when an officer might come along and -- it seems to me it would be -- to me, it would read better if those were either/or parking spaces, those Clean Pass or handicapped, give the handicapped individual the option of parking. And I'm assuming they would pick the closest spot, which it would typically be closer than the Clean Pass, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. I mean, but then how would you designate that? And the signage right now I don't believe is going to be changed. This just effectively allows people to park there.

LEG. HORSLEY:
Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We don't have the --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You have to have some kind of dual signage.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Are the Clean Pass spots, are they being -- they appear to be being used more often than they were initially.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. HORSLEY:

And it's growing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Is at that your assessment, too?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yep.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So there was a motion and a second. Any other discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(VOTE: Approved 5-0-0-0)** Would the Clerk list me as a cosponsor on that one?

MS. ORTIZ:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

J.R. 1578 - Adopting a Local Law to regulate utility poles on County road right-of-ways (Eddington). We closed the Public Hearing on this. I'm going to make a motion to table. I believe Verizon is working in good faith to address this situation. I don't see the need right now to force it through. Is there a second on the tabling motion?

LEG. STERN:

I'm going to make a motion to table for purposes of discussion and for a different purpose other than what the Chair has made the motion on. It's really directed to Counsel, but I would like to discuss it with Counsel.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Fair enough. I'll take the motion to table, and on the motion, we'll have Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

I don't know if I necessarily share the views of yourself, Mr. Chairman, as to why this might not be necessary. Maybe I'm reading it a little bit differently. I had started that discussion with the representative of Verizon. I think it accomplishes something very different. But I would like to ask Counsel, as far as applicability here, I mean, I think that the substance here is pretty clear, but the underlying applicability question that was raised, as far as who this would apply to and who it would not, is something that I would like to discuss. So I'm wondering if you have any take on that?

MR. NOLAN:

Well, I think this is a more narrowly crafted bill than the original bill that Legislator Eddington put in. It is only going to apply where a pole is damaged in such a way that the Department of Public Works determines that it poses a threat to public safety. So the initial -- and, by the way, the law is going to apply to all utilities, public utilities that have a plant on a pole, on a damaged pole. So, in the first instance, the Department of Public Works is going to have to make a determination that there is a dangerous situation. Once they do that, then they're going to have to notify any utility that has plant on that pole that we need you to remove your plant within 60 days. And only if a utility fails to remove their plant within 60 days from a dangerous pole, then the possibility of penalties would kick in. And in this case, under this law, it's a civil penalty that the County Attorney would seek in court at the request of the Department of Public Works where a utility just is not reacting to a request to remove plant from a dangerous pole. So the original bill was broader, it applied to all -- you know, any double pole situation. This is -- just applies to dangerous poles in County road right-of-way.

LEG. STERN:

Gil, in your experience, maybe this is a question for you, maybe it isn't, but the 60-day time period that this legislation would require each of the utilities to remove, you know, their equipment, I mean, how do you look at that as far as an industry standard goes? Does that -- does that speed up the process in your experience? Is that plenty of time that's being allocated here? Do you have an opinion on it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. I mean, I don't know that 60 days is an unreasonable request to have, you know, something removed. Given their current workload and everything else, it may be an issue, and, you know, it really depends on how you would prioritize some of these. But, I mean, in defense of the telephone, you know, company, they seem to be making a concerted effort to push it. I'm certainly not looking for any more to do, but, you know, we would -- you know, we would do what we can to make this work.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah. I would just add, Legislator Stern, that, you know, we did discuss this with the Department of Public Works. And, really, I think we're talking about the egregious situations, whereas it's, you know, a clearly public safety issue, and that's what would -- that's when DPW would go into action.

LEG. STERN:

Well, that's my understanding of this legislation. And then I agree with your take on it, that this appears to be much more narrowly tailored than what we had spent months discussing. And so I agree with the Chairman, that there seems to be progress being made here, but I just don't know if this legislation speaks to that type of progress. To me, this is -- it's more of a public safety type of an issue and require removal of equipment so that, ultimately, it could be removed. I don't see anything in this bill that requires any of the utilities to actually remove the poles. It's about removing the equipment so that that work can then come about, but only on ones that have been identified as really being a public threat.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think it would be helpful to know -- I mean, Commissioner, are you aware of any dangerous poles on County roads right now? Is this a problem? And what would be your protocol if you did have one? Have the utilities not been responsive to requests by you to take care of a dangerous situation?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, this was based on the original double pole, you know, and there was more, I believe, an aesthetic base, but now this is talking towards public safety.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Now it's just dangerous public safety issues, you know. Are you aware of any --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

In most cases -- no, I'm not aware of any specific location where there is a public safety issue out there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. So this is -- now, if -- in the past, I know you haven't been there that long, but had -- you know, have you had occasion to contact the utilities over a dangerous situation like a pole that was, I don't know, maybe falling or cracked, or something like that, and had they been responsive?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

My understanding of these situations is, you know, the utility company is notified of a safety issue, and in most cases, my experience has always been they've moved in a timely manner. The double pole, you know, the aesthetic issue, that's another matter, but any real safety issues, they've always moved.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Doesn't seem to be really a need, per se. I mean, there certainly is a need on the double pole issue, whether it's 11,000 poles or 5 -- 6,000 poles. I mean, it is an aesthetic nightmare to have that many double-poles. But, from a public safety perspective, you're not aware of any problems arising from any of those double-poles or any other poles that are presenting immediate hazards to traffic, or pedestrians or public safety and --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. And in the past, when we have -- you know, our Highway Foremen have become aware of a situation, they've contacted the utilities, the utilities have been responsive.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Maybe tabling it, or maybe the sponsor is aware of some things that were not. It would give us an opportunity to talk to Legislator Eddington. Legislator Horsley, and I think, Legislator Stern, you may have some more.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah, I just have a quick question. I'm thinking 60 days on a dangerous pole, that sounds like a lot of time.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Me, too.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I would hope that they'd have it in six hours rather than 60 days, you know, with something that, you know, is a public safety issue.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, my understanding of this is, you know, we're not looking at imminently dangerous poles. I mean, there are issues where, you know, there is concern.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Well, you're either declaring it a safety problem --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. HORSLEY:

-- or you're not declaring it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good point.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It's kind of like the pregnant thing, I think.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Stern?

LEG. STERN:

Yeah. You know, I mean, I share that concern. By definition here, if your department is going to declare a dangerous situation, 60 days certainly sounds like a reasonable, a more than reasonable amount of time to rectify a dangerous situation. But, at the same time, that's an awful lot of time to rectify a dangerous situation.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Agreed. I mean, in most instances, any really severe -- you know, any real public safety concerns are generally addressed by the utility companies right away. I mean, their own -- they don't want to be liable for anything sitting out there. So any time I've seen an accident occur where, you know, it's been unfortunate enough that a utility pole has been damaged to that extent and it's a public safety issue, they've been very responsive.

LEG. STERN:

And to -- Mr. Chairman, to our Counsel again. The way this bill is drafted right now, you see it applying to all of the utility companies, everybody that has use of the pole, that it doesn't single out one company --

MR. NOLAN:

No.

LEG. STERN:

-- or one type of utility over the other?

MR. NOLAN:

No, it doesn't.

LEG. STERN:

General applicability.

MR. NOLAN:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Wouldn't we have other avenues to -- maybe this is really for Counsel. If our Public Works Commissioner were to contact the utility and say, "Look, there is a hazard being caused," and let's say they're not being responsive, we have other remedies, don't we?

MR. NOLAN:

Another remedy?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Other than putting it in writing and making them aware.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Could we fix this situation, send them a bill? I mean, is there actions we can take, legal actions?

MR. NOLAN:

You don't want to be taking plant off a pole.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, there's two options. We have --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We could compel them?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We do have road-opening permits that they do -- you know, there may be some mechanism there. But, in most cases, if there was an issue where there was a public safety -- you know, a serious public safety threat, we would make the appropriate phone calls and work our way up the ladder until we found somebody that could, you know, remedy the situation. As long as I've been in this business, I've never come across that and I've been doing this for, you know, some time.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The County has emergency powers, too. If it had to, I think it probably could rectify or remedy a situation, if it was a public health hazard.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Not really. I mean --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

No?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We have no means of -- I mean, we don't mess with -- you know, the electrical lines, you don't want to go near.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But if a pole is lying in the middle of a street and it's on a County roadway --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We block the roadway and --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You block the road.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. I mean, we make sure nobody could travel it. But, you know, again, that's --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So we wouldn't touch the pole, but we would divert traffic.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. There's a motion and a second to table. Is there any other discussion?

LEG. STERN:

Mr. Chairman, if I may.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

LEG. STERN:

You know, I'm mindful here that this piece of legislation attempts to take what could be determined as -- what could be considered as an unsafe situation and implement a standard here which requires the utilities to rectify an otherwise unsafe situation. My question to you, Commissioner, is it's a concern, and I think Legislator Horsley voiced the same concern, that in an attempt here to rectify quickly what could be an unsafe situation, are we essentially, with a 60-day time period, potentially going in the opposite direction? That's my concern here, and I would ask you for your expertise. I mean, is the 60-day requirement appropriate here? We have an industry standard? I know what you had said before in that utility companies have always been pretty responsive when it's a dangerous situation. We're not talking about aesthetics as we've been for months here. But is 60 days the right amount of time here? Should it be 45, should it be 30, should it be a week? I'm sure it would also depend on the nature of the dangerous situation. So, if there is going to be standard here that we're going to implement, number one, it has to be across the board, it has to apply to all utilities, and number two, I think it has to be reasonable under the circumstances. The challenge, though, is that we don't know what those circumstances might be and it might be different for different utilities. I was wondering if you have any guidance there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I agree with what you're saying. I think that this seems like an outside limit, especially if it's a dangerous situation. Certainly, if we were looking at what we would consider public safety, we'd want to have a less number. I think that, you know, we would have to do further discussions with Legislative Counsel to determine when -- you know, what is that level of public threat, and then, you know, how quickly do we meet it? I mean, if we give it -- I'm just going to ask a question. If we give something a level of a threat, are we then taking responsibility for that? I don't know.

LEG. STERN:

The Commissioner raises I guess what was going to be my next point, and this is to Counsel. I mean, we are essentially, through this type of legislation, creating a standard, are we not? And I don't know, to tell you the truth, if that complies with the already existing industry standard. I don't know what that standard is, but I don't know if -- by implementing this type of a time period, are we creating one?

MR. NOLAN:

Well, I think we're setting an outside date, at which point penalties kick in. But, certainly, I think the point is a valid one, that maybe the time period is too long, 60 days is too long, and I'll speak to the sponsor about perhaps reducing that.

LEG. STERN:

And we're being told by -- now, this is only one company and one type of utility that that's being met, but I don't know whether that is or is not being met by other utilities and other companies within those utilities. But I think it would be important to have a feel for what industry standards are across the board and to develop legislation that actually works.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right? I don't know how you're going to draft this, frankly, because even if it was 30 days, that's too long in certain situations.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I'm thinking a day.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm thinking even a day might be long. It depends on how much of an immediate hazard it is to public safety. You might want to respond as fast as possible, might be hours. So I don't know. I don't know how you're going to do it. Let the sponsor figure that one out.

LEG. STERN:

Well --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's a motion to --

LEG. STERN:

I think it would just -- just one more comment. I think, because of the questions that are raised, which I think are important questions, that a conversation with the sponsor is important. And maybe the sponsor has some type of idea as to what industry standards are, and maybe he's had that conversation with others. I don't know. But I think that that would -- I think that that would be important.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Also, you guys, some of you guys are lawyers, but I don't know how the civil penalty works with a corporation and who gets the ticket. And is it individuals within the corporation or --

LEG. STERN:

Tracey gets the bill.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Tracey gets the -- sit, you don't need to come up.

MS. EDWARDS:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So I don't know how that would work, but all right. There's a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1578 is tabled. **(VOTE: Tabled 5-0-0-0)**

INTRODUCTORY PRIME

Moving on to Introductory Prime. **1646 - Approving the purchase of one vehicle in accordance with Section 186-2(B)(6) of the Suffolk County Code and in accordance with the the County vehicle standard (Co. Exec.).**

Commissioner, it's one vehicle?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is, yeah, a heavy duty van that will be used to facilitate our underground storage tank and, you know, fuel storage tank maintenance crew. We have two men now that on a daily basis go from site to site over the, you know, numerous County sites and basically make sure that our equipment is up, it's running, it's, you know, up to code.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is -- we don't normally approve individual purchases of vehicles, but there is a section of the code, I guess 186-2(B)(6) that requires certain vehicle emission standards or fuel efficiency standards; is that it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right, right. And because this is being purchased as heavy equipment --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So it doesn't meet the fuel efficiency standards.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And so you're -- it's an exception to the rule as a heavy van. All right. Any questions on it? Is there a motion to approve? Legislator Muratore making a motion to approve.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(VOTE: Approved 5-0-0-0)**.

14 -- I'm sorry. **1648 - Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Public Works highway maintenance equipment(CP 5047) (Co. Exec.)**. More detail, if you will, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This provides or allows us to appropriate 1.8 million dollars for various forms of heavy equipment for our highway fleet, which would include, you know, six-wheel dump trucks, ten-wheel dump trucks. What else do we have in here? We have spreaders and guide rail trucks, mowers, rack trucks, you know, various equipment that we need for our normal maintenance operations.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Any questions? All right. I want to take the same motion and same second, if that's all right. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(VOTE: Approved 5-0-0-0)**

1650 - Appropriating funds in connection with the County share for participation in the installation of the Closed Loop Signal System at various County roads. Again, Commissioner, a little more explanation.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This appropriates 1.25 million for construction and installation of traffic controllers at 43 intersections through six different corridors. These controllers will be implemented through a centralized traffic signal system which report back to DPW Headquarters in Yaphank, and it's a federally funded project. Recent changes to procedures are for obtaining Federal funding authority, require that the County pass a resolution and have local and state contracts in place prior to final authorization.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions? Can I get a motion and a second?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

A motion by Legislator Barraga, second by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(VOTE: Approved 5-0-0-0)**

1651 - A resolution making certain findings and determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 5 - Strathmore Huntington (CP 8115) (Co. Exec.). Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This just -- again, as the resolution states, it makes certain findings and determinations in relations to a public hearing to do some construction within the sewer district, sewer District No. 5 - Strathmore Huntington. It's an upgrade of the system.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's all been approved by the Committee, the Sewer Agency?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. I'll make a motion, second by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved.

(VOTE: Approved 5-0-0-0)

1652 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 14 Parkland and LA Fitness - Patchogue (BR 0910.1) (Co. Exec.).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This provides a -- this just authorizes a connection agreement between LA Fitness and the Sewer District No. 14, which is Parkland, for 12,194 gallons per day of capacity. The site does have the excess capacity, and the Sewer Agency has approved this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Any questions? Same motion, same second, same vote.

(VOTE: Approved 5-0-0-0)

And 1658 - Approving a voluntary land reconfiguration between the County of Suffolk and Lucia Cenzoprano, Life Tenant, and Anthony Cenzoprano, Jr., Remainderman (Co. Exec.).

Okay. Can we get a little information on this one, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. This is a -- basically, it's a voluntary land swap. We have an easement running through the Cenzoprano's property about one-third of the way in. We're doing roadwork on County Road 80 in front of their house and we want to replace the -- it's an outfall that, you know, goes down into the bay. We're going to take that storm drainage line and move it to the edge of their property. They're going to give us that easement. They will then take the abandoned easement land, and it allows them to do an expansion on their house, or put in a pool, or whatever they want in that area. Right now, they're kind of stuck on that side of the yard because you've got this pipe running through it, and this will move -- you know, allow us to move the line away from where it is and to the side of the property.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. We'll do same motion, same second, same vote.

(VOTE: Approved 5-0-0-0)

That gets us to the end of the agenda. Is there any other business? All right. We are adjourned.

[THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:38 P.M.]