

PUBLIC WORKS 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 May 4, 2010 at 2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Presiding Officer Bill Lindsay, Legislative District No. 8
Legislator Ed Romaine, Legislative District No. 1
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz, Chief Deputy Clerk, Suffolk County Legislature
Meghan O'Reilly, Legislative Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Linda Bay, Aide to Minority Caucus
Paul Perillie, Aide to Majority Caucus
Gail Vizzini, Director, Budget Review Office
Lance Reinheimer, Assistant Director, Budget Review Office
Craig Freas, Budget Review Office
Debbie Harris, Legislative Aide to Legislator Stern
Michael Pitcher, Legislative Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Robert Calarco, Legislative Aide to Legislator Eddington
Jessica Proios, Legislative Aide to Legislator Muratore
Ed Hennessey, Intergovernmental Relations
Ben Zwirn, County Executive's Office
Pat Kerrigan, AME
Patrick Lespinasse, Verizon
Tim Mooney, President, Fire Island Ferries
Ray Dean, Steamfitters LU 638
Mario Mattera, Plumbers Local Union #200
John Guadagno, LU 25 IBEW

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Alison Mahoney, Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:09 P.M.)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good afternoon this fourth day of May, 2010. If you all would rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Muratore.

(Salutation)

You may be seated. If you wish to address the committee you need to fill out a yellow card. If you haven't already done so you can obtain one at the front. I have three speaker cards now. I will call upon the first speaker to come up to the podium, identify yourself for the record and you will have three minutes to make your presentation. The first speaker is Tim Mooney followed by John Guadagno. I'm sorry, I'm having trouble reading it, but you know who you are, on topic 1511.

MR. MOONEY:

Good afternoon. My name is Tim Mooney. I'm President of Fire Island Ferries and Fire Island Water Taxi. Before you today you have two resolutions, one for a license renewal for Fire Island Water Taxi and the second being a fair relief for Fire Island Water Taxi. I'm here in support of Lance from the Budget Review Office is, you know, going to be talking about the proposal that we've submitted to the County for our fare increase, and if there were any questions or comments that needed to be fielded by Fire Island Water Taxi, I'm here to support that. So I think we've had -- I have been in front of you guys a couple of times so far so I'm not going to waste any more time doing that. If we have any questions I'm going to be here for the duration and we'll be able to help you out.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Thank you. Any questions? Lance will be making a presentation in a short while.

MR. MOONEY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm sure there will be questions at that point. Our second speaker is John -- you'll have to help me with the last name, speaking on 1511; followed by Ray Dean, a name I can pronounce. Sir, what is your last name?

MR. GUADAGNO:

I'm John Guadagno.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can you spell that?

MR. GUADAGNO:

G-U-A-D-A-G-N-O.

CHAIRPERSON SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you.

MR. GUADAGNO:

Yeah, I'm speaking on behalf of 1511. My name is John Guadagno, from Local 25, it's National Brotherhood of Electric Workers. I see there's a resolution on the table to add a traffic light in Riverhead on 58 near the proposed new Lowe's. I know there's some discussion outside to see what they're going to do with that, but I would hope this committee would curtail at least moving it forward to the general body of the Legislature and give them a few weeks to see if they can come to some sort of resolution. If it comes down to a traffic light compared to a few hundred jobs, permanent jobs in Riverhead, I would hope this body and the full Legislature would be in favor of a

traffic light that's maybe not necessary, but if it's important to keep a business staying on Long Island, I would hope you would considerate it. So thank you very much. I appreciate Ed Romaine's work on this and I'm sure it will work out in the long run. We just want to stress our concern for a traffic light to be added. To lose a store like Lowe's is kind of hard to believe. So thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, sir. All right, the next speaker is Ray Dean followed by Mario Mattera.

MR. DEAN:

Yes, good afternoon. My name is Ray Dean. I'm a Business Agent for Steamfitters Local 638. I'm also a Suffolk County resident. I'm here to speak about IR 1511. You know, right now sitting there with this traffic light as proposed is a derelict building, the old Suffolk Life building. From what I understand, Lowe's is asking for a light to be right in front. It's easier access back and forth coming both ways. I really feel the County DPW might have made a mistake when they were replanning some of this work on Route 58 out there, because they didn't look to see what was going to happen with this property in the near future. It's been a derelict building.

Lowe's is asking for a traffic light there. The light would go direct across to the other shopping center across the street. I think it would be a good move. It would create maybe two, three hundred construction jobs and probably four or five hundred permanent jobs for the Town of Riverhead out there. As we know, with our experience in the past with Lowe's on Long Island, they are a good company. They are a company we would like to see and we can use them on the East End. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you.

MR. MATTERA:

Good afternoon all Legislators. My name is Mario Mattera. I'm the Business Agent with Plumbers Local 200. Thank you very much for letting me speak today on this important traffic light. And I commend Ed Romaine. Thank you very much for bringing this to a head. I just wish the both parties, DPW, the Town of Riverhead, you know, get together, Lowe's to get together, and have a little communication here to fix this, and this is pretty much an easy fix. You have Best Buy across the street, Suffolk Life building everybody knows is a big white elephant that needs to be fixed. Jobs, absolutely. Construction jobs and permanent jobs.

All I can say is I just feel the communication between the parties can get together and this can be fixed right away and not let this -- expedite fast. They're ready to go. The Town of Riverhead already has everything in place, this project can go. To say that this light is going to hold up a big project like Lowe's would be really sad for our community. You know, 80% of my membership lives in Suffolk County. I'm proud of that. I live in Suffolk County. I'm out in Riverhead a lot lately. Riverhead needs a huge jump start, everybody knows that, and especially with that Suffolk Life building sitting there doing nothing out there is a real shame, especially with a company like Lowe's. I just heard --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Mario, just make sure you have your finger on that button because you are cutting in and out on us.

MR. MATTERA:

Is that better? I'm sorry. I have a big enough mouth as it is.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's more for recording purposes.

MR. MATTERA:

Oh, is it really? Okay. You know, like we say, you know, we're having a problem with like the lights, you know, there's too many lights and everything like that. I feel what about Manhattan. How many lights are in Manhattan that have to go in sync in Manhattan. I mean, you know, green to red, you know, they're all in sync with each other. So, you know, we have great engineers with the DPW that could fix this. I just think that the DPW and Lowe's engineers really need to sit down and let's get this thing fixed right away, please, and not let this continue and go on and on and on forever. Okay? Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you. Anyone else? That's it for my speaker cards. Is that it? Speak now or forever hold your piece. All right. I think I want to take that one out of order because it's the last one on the agenda and a bunch of people came down for it. But there's also the taxi one, the Water Taxi. So I think at this point --

MR. NOLAN:

The taxi will have to be tabled for a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Both of the taxi ones. The light too?

MR. NOLAN:

No, not the light.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Not the light, the licenses. Okay. Why don't we let Lance make his presentation on the Water Taxi and then we'll take the other one out of order if that's okay with everybody.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Budget Review has completed the review of the Fire Island Water Taxi petition for license renewal and for rate alteration. Our report was issued April 22; all of you should have gotten a copy. If you didn't, we can make a copy available for you. I would like to give a brief summary of their petition and our findings in the report. There's two related resolutions, 1413, which is for the renewal for license, and that public hearing is set for May 11th. The second resolution is 1414, and there's a public hearing set for June 8th for rate alteration.

Fire Island Water Taxi, as most of you know, is a wholly owned subsidiary of Fire Island Ferries. Fire Island Ferries purchased South Bay Water Taxi in 2004, and at the time they purchased the Water Taxi, Fire Island Ferries was in the ferry business, but had little experience in the taxi business. A taxi is like a regular car taxi, it's on demand service. You call, they respond and transport you. It's clear from the financial information that Fire Island Water Taxi gave us that the current fare structure doesn't provide sufficient revenue for the taxi to meet all its current business financial obligations.

After reviewing the financial statements, the proposed passenger fares and service changes are reasonable for the ridership, and I'll summarize those changes in a couple of minutes. Fire Island Water Taxi provides Cross Bay service and lateral service to Fire Island, stretching 14 miles along the barrier beach. Based on 2009, they provided service for 65,000 passengers. They're seeking a four year license renewal through March 15, 2014, and a projected 17.2% gross revenue increase based on the fare increases and ridership over the past three years, average ridership. The last fare increase was granted in 2005. It's been five years since their last increase.

The petition also proposes to change the current zone system to a point to point fare system which is based on distance traveled. The lateral fare is increased -- base fare is increased from six to seven dollars, which is 16.7% increase. The current maximum fare of \$22 is proposed to increase to \$30, which is a 36% increase. The change of fares and the change from a zoned system to a point to point system has a dynamic change, where 81% of the passengers will experience a 10%

increase based on the ridership. The remaining 19, 20% of the passengers will increase a fare -- will experience a fare increase of 26.6%. Cross bay service is increased by \$25 based on six passengers for the -- it's a six passenger minimum so it increases from 125 to \$150. Taking all the fares, weighted average, as the passengers use the system, the average increase is 9.52% increase. That's taking into account lateral and cross bay fares.

The petition also includes a new discount rate for lateral service. It's a promotional rate. It's envisioned that the ferry water taxi would enter into a business agreement to provide discount rates for people to patronize certain local establishments, retail establishments, on Fire Island. The promotional rates are for posted dates and times, would be at least one dollar off the posted lateral passenger fare service, not to exceed a discount greater than 25% from the posted normal fare.

The petitioner is also requesting institution of an in season scheduled and unscheduled lateral service and departing from the on demand service in season. The petition also includes expansion of cross bay service from Sayville to Fire Island, provided the petitioner can find or secure a landing in south -- in Sayville. At the point of the writing of this report, they hadn't secured a landing, but I was assured that it's in the process and Mr. Mooney believes that he can find a place in Sayville for a landing.

It's the opinion of the Budget Review Office that scheduled -- the use of scheduled and unscheduled lateral service should result in efficient use of vessels, resulting in lower operating costs and shorter waiting times for the riding public, rather than the public waiting for on demand service times. The petitioner is also proposing to use unscheduled service to augment the scheduled service in the busy season time depending on weather and ridership.

Although this petition provides rate relief in an estimated amount of \$145,000 annually in increased revenue, it's still the opinion of the Budget Review Office that this is not sufficient for Fire Island Water Taxi to meet its current financial obligations. The situation is primarily due to the accumulation of \$1.8 million debt with Fire Island Water Taxi. This reflects approximately \$775,000 investment in equipment, the purchase of two new boats for \$425,000, and also the repowering of the six original boats that were purchased from South Bay Water Taxi.

It's our concern that being that Fire Island Water Taxi is a subsidiary of Fire Island Ferries, that our concern is that in the future the ferry riders may end up subsidizing the taxi riders because the Fire Island Water Taxi receives large subsidies from Fire Island Ferries in order to meet its debt service.

That concludes the summary of our report. Budget Review Office is here to answer any of your questions.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So are you suggesting the rates aren't high enough that they are asking for? Because I'm on the side of the ratepayer here and I would like to see the rates as low as possible.

MR. REINHEIMER:

That's correct. Looking at the financial papers, the financials from 2004 through 2009, Fire Island Water Taxi as a stand alone basis has never posted a profit. During that period of time their debt has increased significantly --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They're a corporation, right?

MR. REINHEIMER:

Right, they are a subsidiary of Fire Island Ferries.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. It's not unusual for a corporation to not post a profit. Probably why they incorporate it.

MR. REINHEIMER:

I can't comment on that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. But that's not unusual.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Right. We looked at the consolidated financial statements, we looked at the individual financial statements for Fire Island Water Taxi. As time goes on, the debt associated with Fire Island Water Taxi is increased to pay for new equipment, repowering equipment and for the original purchase of the business. On a stand alone basis that entity of the business is not supporting itself. Fire Island Water Taxi -- Fire Island Ferries is paying the debt service for Fire Island Taxi.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Their Directors -- do you know what the compensation on the Directors of the company are?

MR. REINHEIMER:

We have -- in the financial statements we have the office and administrative costs, which are a small part of the costs for the business.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I just don't know if it's -- I know you want to see the company be solvent, but I'm not sure that that's our role is to suggest higher rates so that they have, you know, more viability as a business entity.

MR. REINHEIMER:

Well, we have a number of --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They largely have a monopoly now, right?

MR. REINHEIMER:

They're the only taxi service that's providing lateral service along the beach, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. So I don't see that their fiscal health is going to be our primary concern. I think --

MR. REINHEIMER:

No, and if you'd let me -- our concern is concern about economics of Fire Island, which you have to provide a good transportation system given the nature of the area. The viable transportation system is the water taxi system and water ferry system. Our concern is that we strike a balance for the fare users, for the passengers, and that the fare is sufficient for these businesses to be a going concern to provide reliable, safe service. And it's part of our report that we really looked at the economics, we looked at the point that you should look long-term --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So one fare might be -- one fare -- in other words, you are talking about maybe restructuring the fares.

MR. REINHEIMER:

What I'm saying is that if you look at that them as -- you know, originally there was Fire Island Ferries and there was South Bay Water Taxi; two separate entities. We did have a concern during our last report that one entity is controlling both ends of the water transportation system. Our concern is that if the Fire Island Taxi isn't sufficient to support itself, somebody has to support the

deficit that this portion of the business is generating, which is the ferry side. There's a danger that the ferry could change its rate structure in order to subsidize the taxi. Our concern is that the ferry riders could in the future end up subsidizing the taxi users. That's a concern that we don't want to see happen.

So what we're saying in our report is that if you look at a stand alone basis, given that they invested \$775,000 in equipment improvements and enhancements along with purchasing the business, and not being able to meet those obligations, as those debts are paid by Fire Island Ferries that growing debt is shifted to Fire Island Taxi.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other questions for Lance? All right. We're going to have a public hearing on this. We're not going to be able to dispose of this today anyway. It's going to have to get tabled for public hearing. Lance, thank you for your work and reviewing this. I look forward to a healthy debate on this.

At this point I would like to go out of order so I will make a motion to take IR 1511, Directing the Department of Public Works to install a traffic signal on County Road 58 in Riverhead. I would like to make a motion to take that out of order. Do I have a second?

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay, 1511 is now before us. ***IR 1511, Directing the Department of Public Works to install a traffic signal on County Road 58. (Romaine)***

We're going to, I think, hear from DPW. Also the representatives of Lowe's are here. At least for the purpose of discussion let's get a motion and a second to approve. I will make a motion to approve.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Barraga. On the motion? I guess, Gil, we'll start with you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Gil Anderson, our Commissioner of Public Works.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you. We have -- as I'm sure you have anticipated, we have issues with this legislation. The Department of Public Works does not feel that as a signal this signal meets the warrants that are required under the Federal and State guidelines. There are a number of exits -- I'm sorry. There is a secondary exit from the site that would lead to Pulaski and lead to the eventual intersection with Mill. There are two other intersections to the east and west within a quarter mile of that as well. So there are a number of signalized intersections at this point.

Having said that, lastly we would make the comment that we question whether Lowe's would really not develop the site if the signal is not provided. We met with Lowe's, the gentlemen representing Lowe's, prior to coming into this meeting. We have a meeting scheduled for Friday to discuss this, to hopefully resolve this matter.

The recommendation that we came up with was that -- and the request is that this be forwarded without recommendation. If we can resolve it before the next general legislative meeting, hopefully that puts this to bed. If not, then we'll have to take this up at the Legislature.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I know this site well. I drive past it a lot. It's been, frankly, you know, it's kind of a sad story. It's been sitting there, this giant, empty parking lot for many years and it's exciting that we have somebody who is looking to move in, and Lowe's is a very reputable business. I have been to many Lowe's. We know how crowded that parking lot will be. And if you didn't have a light there, you could only make that right, you are going to end up forcing all these people to go down and turn around somewhere at another light. It just seems intuitively, forget about whether they build this or not, whether there's a light, that volume of traffic -- I can't imagine a Lowe's without having a traffic light in front of it, just on the sheer volume of traffic going in and out of a place like that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If you look at across the street where there are a number of other big box stores, if you will. There is, you know, there's Home Depot, there's a number of others.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And maybe Home Depot wouldn't want them to have a light because it gets harder to get in and out but --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, Home Depot doesn't have a light where it's requested. They have to go down through the intersection -- what's the name of the road?

MR. HILLMAN:

Mill.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Mill Road and make that right to go into their site and come out of their site. So the issue of a light, and one of the points that we've tried to make is that if there was no other secondary option, yes, we would agree that it may be warranted. But there is a secondary option of going on to Pulaski and coming out at the intersection of Mill. Otherwise you have a number of signals within a short distance of each other.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

How many square feet is that building?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I have no idea.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

How many cars are going to be in that parking lot, a thousand?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I doubt that many cars would be there at any one time, even with a big sale.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But can you imagine a store of that size without a light in front of it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

But you have the point of being able to egress on to Pulaski, which is behind it, and then come out to, you know, another signal.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But most people would think you are going to exit out on to the main highway there, so that's where they're going to go. Then they are going to find that they can't make the left.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

But there will be signage. It could be fully developed so that you had an avenue through that, you know, through that development, that between signage and proper site design you could make it so that it could come easily, anybody wanting to leave and heading westbound could come down to, you know, down to Pulaski Road, head west on Pulaski, north on Mill, come to the intersection, and they're out. It all can be done quite easily. It's a very short distance.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't agree, but you guys are the engineers.

LEG. STERN:

Question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

It wasn't made clear to me, Gil, is this light being suggested by the town? Was it part of the permitting process? Is some other level of government requiring that this be done, or this is just an idea as to what may make the traffic flow in the area a little bit better? Is there a requirement on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. This was a request by the development to gain a light at their front entrance, which we denied because it did not meet the warrants, again, under State and Federal guidelines for a traffic signal.

LEG. STERN:

Did the town do any analysis?

MR. HILLMAN:

The town has no regulatory authority. Their resolution that was passed is essentially meaningless as far as the County is concerned. They have the same traffic study that was provided to the County, has been provided to the town.

LEG. STERN:

So the town, and forgive me because I'm not familiar with what the town did or did not do. The town -- the town made a resolution saying that they are requesting that the light -- what exactly did the town do or not do on this?

MR. HILLMAN:

The town passed a resolution identifying that they would like a traffic signal installed.

LEG. STERN:

So they are taking a look at the same traffic analysis that was done that you have, and they're saying they want the light.

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes. And I would just like to note that the Town of Riverhead does not have a Traffic Engineering Department. They do not have one traffic engineer on staff.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, I'm not an engineer, but I do occasionally go shopping.

(Laughter)

Across the street there is a Best Buy, which is pretty popular too, and I'm often coming, probably too often, coming out of that parking lot there and you are forced -- because there's no light you have to go right and I want to head left. So I have to go down and I have to cross busy County Road 58, two lanes, to get into that left hand turning lane so that I can turnaround and come back in the other direction. So there's actually --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If I may. There is a means of getting out of that site through a signalized intersection to the west.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. You can drive through the entire parking lot, way down past Home Depot and get out there, if you don't get into an accident in the parking lot. But it just wouldn't -- it would be a heck of a lot easier if there was a light there to make that left.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It might be easier, but you can't have signals every 200 feet.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And safer, I think.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I disagree, that's why we try --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

How many feet is it from that signal to the other signal?

MR. HILLMAN:

Within 2,400 feet there would be four traffic signals. And let me just also --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can they be synchronized, Bill?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes, but that's not the point. The point is safety, and you keep bringing up safety. Again, a traffic engineering technique that we've all discussed and said is a good idea, and when push comes to shove, we all bail on it. Limiting access on a highway like this is a traffic engineering technique that dramatically increases safety. You are limiting the conflict points. When you have free access on driveways it dramatically degrades the safety of the roadway and dramatically degrades the capacity of the roadway. When you can get a large number of vehicles -- agreed that Lowe's is going to generate a large number of vehicles -- but when you can get them out to an intersection and cross them safely it's going to make the entire road safer and also increase the capacity along the entire road.

From the layman's position I can understand that it makes commonsense to put a traffic signal there. But with 20 plus years of traffic engineering, it is not the right thing to do. From a traffic engineering standpoint, from the safety of the motorists who travel on County Road 58, it is not the right thing to do.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I would like to defer for a moment to the sponsor, Legislator Romaine, and then Legislator Muratore

will follow.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'm going to defer. I respect Mr. Hillman and everything he has said. He's correct theoretically, but in theory everything looks good. Let's talk about practice. Anyone that is driving west coming from the east on 58 that wants to go to Lowe's is going to make a left turn. They are not going to go down to Pulaski, turnaround and come in the back way to Lowe's. In fact, unless you have extensive signage, they will attempt to make the left. Fifty-eight is not a divided highway. It does not have a median. There is nothing to restrict them from making a left. They'll stop, probably cause rear-end accidents, then they'll attempt to make the left, probably causing right angle accidents, and that is a problem.

If you had a divided highway, if you had a median, if you had extensive signage then maybe they'd be willing to travel the other quarter of a mile, turn on to Pulaski and then come in and find the back way into Lowe's. But those if's don't exist. What does exist is an undivided highway that people are capable of making a left in which they are going to get injured. You are going to increase not only rear-end, but also right angle accidents as people turn into Lowe's from the east turning south into Lowe's. That is a problem. The Town of Riverhead has passed a resolution asking for this traffic light. The town safety, and I understand they're not professional engineers, the Town Safety Board has asked for this light.

I know this area. Long before it was Suffolk Life it was Billy Blakes. I used to live in Calverton, used to shop there, I am very familiar with it. Fifty-eight is a nightmare. There are three lights within 2000 feet that was installed by your department. And you are talking about degrading a road? Well, they were necessary. One of them is by Panera Bread because there's a subdivision on the north side of 58 and a senior subdivision, Glenwood Village, on the south side. The other is Mill. That light has been there, and the other is the light that was the old Krispy Kremes, now Chase Bank. So we're going to put a fourth light within 2400 feet. If we synchronize those signals that's probably the best way for traffic flow.

The other option is to tell Lowe's no light, and I have spoken with the Lowe's representatives, and unless they have changed their mind, they've told myself and the Town of Riverhead that light gives them an opportunity to attract customers, because if they have to go around the long way, they won't. But there are two lights, one on Mill further up from 58 and one on 58 by the Chase Bank for the Home Depot, their natural competitor. They will be at a competitive disadvantage, and the site will not have the attraction that it holds. It will not get built. The Suffolk Life building is something of an eyesore because it is abandoned and vacant. This will create jobs, this will build Lowe's, and this will allow people on 58 to make a left turn into Lowe's for those traveling west.

So for all those reasons, and again, I'm not a professional engineer. I understand, but guess what? Unfortunately sometimes progress is messy. Sometimes buildings get built where they shouldn't get built. We don't control zoning. Town of Riverhead has agreed to allow what was a discount store, Billy Blakes, now Suffolk Life, to be knocked down and a new building, a Lowe's, added to their tax base and to help the Town of Riverhead. We're confronted with how do we move traffic. If you honestly think that people traveling west, coming from the east, are going to go down to Pulaski, turnaround and then come in the back way on a town road that we don't have control over, by the way, I don't think so. I think they're going to attempt to make the left where they see the curb cut openings for Lowe's that are already there for Suffolk Life, and when they do so they'll be stopping short, rear-end accidents. They'll be turning left, right angle accidents. I think the traffic light is the best way to go. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Ed, wasn't that originally a Grants? That's what I remember as a kid. Is that your recollection, before Billy Blakes?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, Grants is where Wal-Mart is further down. That was Billy Blakes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Billy Blakes. All right, Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:

Just a couple of comments. I mean, from what I'm reading from the resolution, Lowe's is going to be paying for construction.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's correct.

LEG. MURATORE:

Riverhead is going to paying for maintenance. The unions tell us people are going to go to work, we're getting an eight million dollar project here in Suffolk County, and we can't install a light? I mean, you talk about four lights in 2500 feet, come to Middle Country Road and my office. There's six or seven lights in that same span and traffic moves. So, you know, I concur with Legislator Romaine. I mean, to go behind Lowe's to get into it is going to be ridiculous. It really is.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Bill, I think we all understand, you know, you are obviously a professional. You believe, based on your professional experiences that this is not a good place for a light. We are all lay people and we may have a difference of opinion. I just don't want you to think this is any way a slight on your credibility. I think we all respect --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The problem that I'm having with this is the fact that yeah, in fact, you are. You hire us as technical staff, we have made an opinion. Certainly I know the area Legislator Muratore is speaking about. That's not something I would attain to. I understand the fact that, you know, Legislator Romaine is trying to help, you know, the business and get established, you know, bring jobs in. As I asked before, you know, we're looking -- this wasn't brought to us other than an application made, which we denied. Nobody came to us and said, "Hey, we got a problem with your application" -- or your denial. All of a sudden now this is being mandated through legislation rather than us trying to be able to sit down at the table with Lowe's to discuss this. That's where I think the bigger problem is, is the fact that this isn't an issue that should -- certainly you are going to do what you are going to do, but this isn't an issue that really should be legislated. This should be handled by the technicians where they can -- we can work out a solution. Otherwise, you know, what's to stop every business from basically forcing our hand in this way.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Just point of information. My office has been in touch with DPW. I believe Bill has spoken with both of you, Bill Faulk on my staff, about this issue.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

But certainly -- but this was certainly only in the recent -- in the immediate past. This wasn't -- you know, this has been something obviously that's been happening for some time. We haven't had Lowe's come in and say, "Okay, can we meet with you?" Nobody has reached out to Bill, other than Bill Faulk, and myself.

MR. HILLMAN:

Let me also just clarify something. The section of road that Legislator Muratore is referencing is consistently identified in Newsday as one of the most dangerous sections of highway in all of Suffolk County. So if that's the section of road that we want to base this on, you know, and emulate County Road 58 after that, you know, again, from a traffic engineering standpoint this is not the way to go.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. I have two Legislators who have questions and then, if I may as privilege of the Chair, I would like to actually bring Lowe's representatives up if they'll give me that courtesy, and then to be able to answer some questions and give that perspective as well. But I'm going to start with Legislator Horsley and then Legislator Stern.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Hi, guys. Just quickly. The light that Lowe's is proposing, is that going to have a turning arrow? Is it going to have -- what does the light look like? You know, what is the proposal that's on the table?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They're paying for it.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I understand who is paying for it, they are paying for it, but as far as is it going to be a turning lane, is there going to be, you know, turning arrows, you know, left and right? You know, what is it going to look like?

MR. HILLMAN:

County Road 58 has a left-turn lane on it so that would not -- they would be able to safely get in the left-turn lane.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It comes in the east.

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't have the details of their proposal, whether it would have a left-turn arrow or not. I would imagine we would start with just a typical four phased intersection without left-turn arrows. It doesn't meet warrants right now for a traffic signal, and I highly doubt it would meet warrants for a left-turn signal, which are even more restrictive.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Would it make it safer, though? I mean, would it solve some of your concerns?

MR. HILLMAN:

No, installing a traffic signal has safety issues also.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I understand that, but I mean to making -- if you put the turning arrows and things like that does it make it more safe than what you were originally concerned with?

MR. HILLMAN:

No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What I'm envisioning there would obviously have an arrow because of all the people who potentially will be going into that shopping center. But I guess that's a discussion for later on.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I know maybe it takes a little bit longer to get through an intersection like that and that may slow traffic, but, you know, there's a lot of people who typically come in out of a Lowe's. Again, I'm going back to my recollection of other similar, you know, Wal-Mart's or Home Depots or Lowe's, and that's typically what you would see. It sounds like you are looking for something that's atypical here.

MR. HILLMAN:

Actually it -- we do not, as a policy we do not typically allow traffic signals at driveways for shopping centers, so this is actually atypical. Our position is very consistent with the policies of the department.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

In front of Wal-Mart, though, what's the signal there? Does it have a green arrow to get in and out of the Wal-Mart down the road?

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't know.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Legislator Stern?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yeah, there is.

LEG. STERN:

Is the suggestion now that the light be installed but that there wouldn't be a left-turn arrow? If there's not going to be a left-turn arrow, I just don't understand what the point of the traffic light would be. But I'm just asking that rhetorically.

What is -- what's the timing here? I mean, this is before us now. Legislator Romaine, I assume that this is before us now because there's some time element here? Are you aware of any? Is DPW aware of the need for speed here or not? What's the story.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

In my discussions before with the representative from Lowe's, time is of the essence, and that's why, you know, we made the recommendation to discharge without recommendation so that we'd have an opportunity to discuss this. According to the representative from Lowe's, and certainly he can speak for himself, you know, waiting through the next cycle would be unacceptable.

LEG. STERN:

And because, I guess, there is that need for speed I appreciate, you know, Legislator Romaine introducing it as legislation, although I'm troubled by it as a policy and a precedent. I mean, as you point out, Commissioner, we have the technicians, we have the specialists in this area. It would be difficult to pursue it, I think, as a general rule that every time one of us wants a traffic light someplace that we are going to introduce a bill to make that happen. I don't know how long these ongoing conversations have taken place. I don't know what progress, if ever, if any was ever made, but appreciating the need for speed here, you know, I would like to see an ongoing discussion.

The reason why I say that is because without, you know, putting any kind of a judgment on this particular proposal, I have seen situations where the department has said pretty forcefully that a traffic light in a particular area could actually have an adverse impact on solving the problems that we think something is going to cause, and they have gotten pretty creative in the past coming up with alternatives. So yes, as the Chairman points out, we as lay people might think that the clear solution is something, the professionals in the department can many times come up with an alternative that could be viable. Again, without suggesting that that could be the case here, and believe me, I appreciate that what the traffic engineers might see as, you know, being a viable alternative might not necessarily coincide with what Lowe's or any other company believes is in its best interest from a business standpoint, but I would like to see that conversation continued because usually there is a solution in there somewhere.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

At this point I would like to bring up one of the representatives or both from Lowe's, if they're willing

to -- you don't have to speak, but I would like to give you an opportunity. Sir, if you will identify yourself. Push the button to speak.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You have to hold it down.

MR. COTILLA:

Hi. My name is Raul Cotilla. I'm with Lowe's. I'm the Senior Site Development Manager for this region.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Why does Lowe's feel it needs a light in this location?

MR. COTILLA:

Basically for something that the Legislators have been saying, and I don't think you realize what you have been saying, that the way to access our site other than with a signal on 58 would be to bring the traffic through a secondary road. It puts us in a very significant handicap against Home Depot, which has two traffic signals, one of which is directly on a driveway into their shopping center. Traffic coming from the east to enter the site would have to pass Lowe's, they will see Home Depot; why should they go to Lowe's? Obviously we're the better store and we hope that that's why they come to Lowe's, but it's very easy for them instead of making the left at realigned Pulaski to instead make the right and enter Home Depot.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You see it as competitive disadvantage basically.

MR. COTILLA:

Extremely -- yes, very much so.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What kind of light are you thinking about? Would it include the green arrows for the left turns?

MR. COTILLA:

That is what our traffic engineer is envisioning, yes, or whether it's a delayed green. I mean, those details I really don't know.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Mr. Chairman, just one point.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Romaine.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That secondary road is a Town of Riverhead road. It's a narrow, two lane road. It's called Pulaski. We would be putting a lot of traffic on that road. And when they got on that road, that is not a direct access to Lowe's. They still would have to make a left turn from Pulaski into Lowe's. So there's no getting away from the left turn, because if you put them on to Pulaski they still, which is a secondary town road, a lot of traffic on that town road, you still would have to make the left from Pulaski into Lowe's. So you are not going to escape that. You are going to just shift the problem from the County to the town.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, I believe a solution can be worked out if we sit at the table and go through it with Lowe's and I think it's relatively easy.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

To me the only difference right now is whether it's going to get discharged without recommendation or just discharged with recommendation. Either way you get to sit down and talk about it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, I mean, if it's discharged with approval, I mean, at this point, you know, it's --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It still has to get approved on Tuesday. It could get tabled on Tuesday, who knows? I mean, you have an opportunity either way and it is something we are going to have to discuss. Right now the only motions are to -- a regular approval.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, the fact, though, if it comes with a recommendation it carries a little more weight. It certainly gives us a harder argument, you know, come two weeks from now when we're sitting in front of the General Legislature.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other questions? Legislator Stern, you have a question?

MR. HILLMAN:

If I could for a minute? Can I open up an aerial and show the Legislature and --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's what we're here for. Absolutely.

MR. COTILLA:

May I just add one thing?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I am correct. It is next Tuesday when we are meeting with the General Legislature, but we do have a meeting scheduled right now for Friday morning.

MR. COTILLA:

Just the one additional item that I wanted to add was that as part of our approval that we have from the Town of Riverhead is that we provide access to properties to the east and to the west in order to address the County comments of reducing the number of curb cuts on 58. So those two businesses are already envisioning a traffic signal where they will be able to bring traffic through our site, and we will be constructing driveways to those property lines so that they can connect, come through our site. Those details have already been worked out with the Town of Riverhead and our site plan.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Mr. Hillman, you have an aerial to show.

MR. NOLAN:

Come closer, Bill.

LEG. ROMAINE:

We have the same one here.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Why don't you put it down, we can gather around it and everybody can see it.

MR. HILLMAN:

Here's the Home Depot, here's the Lowe's. The competitive disadvantage I don't see because if I'm coming from the east to go to Home Depot, I either have to enter this traffic signal, circuitously come through this parking lot, and someone has already mentioned that if you don't get into an

accident going through the parking lot, or you need to pass -- essentially pass it and come down a secondary roadway, which is similar to Mill or Pulaski I mean. Come down a secondary roadway and come in here. What we're recommending for Lowe's is very similarly someone coming from the east would make a left turn here at this realigned Pulaski, which is now a cul-de-sac, so there will be no conflict here. They could come right around and within a --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Make a left turn.

MR. HILLMAN:

It's not a left turn because there's no one coming from this direction anymore. It's closed off. So then they would come around and then make a left turn into the site.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is this one way?

MR. HILLMAN:

No, it's not one way. It's two way, but this connection is no longer there. It's been closed off.

LEG. ROMAINE:

They could be going to the Mobile, they could be going to Hitman Collision. They could be going to any of those --

MR. HILLMAN:

And that very easily could be a stop sign and the right-of-way could be made --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Because this is for Hitman Collision there.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. And by the way, as you know --

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes, there is a light there.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Or may not know -- I'm sorry. At the extension of Pulaski that you are building there is a diner owner that is interested in developing a diner on that property that will only add to that traffic on Pulaski.

MR. HILLMAN:

Again, very easily a stop sign could be here, the right-of-way could be given to this movement. This is the primary roadway; this is a secondary roadway. You put a stop sign here and that becomes a free flow condition. Very easy to solve.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I think there's also other options available.

MR. HILLMAN:

There are definitely other options. We'd like to sit down with them. But to say that this is a disadvantage, it mirrors very similarly the Home Depot condition. Very similarly.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Let me ask you. If I'm at Lowe's and I shop, I have to come out this way, go back up and make this turn to go east?

MR. HILLMAN:

No. You would be able to make rights in and rights out.

MR. NOLAN:

I would love to read this record.

LEG. STERN:

Is there anything that would prevent traffic from making the left?

MR. HILLMAN:

Under the proposed condition, yes, we would install what we call a pork chop which would restrict someone from making this left turn in.

P.O. LINDSAY:

What's a pork chop?

MR. HILLMAN:

Essentially a median, a curb median. It looks like a pork chop. This right here. This would be emulated on the other side.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Would you run that median the entire length of Lowe's because as you know, there are other openings, curb cuts, there not only at the far end, but anyone that's visited Suffolk Life, some of us have in our career, knows that they had multiple curb cut entrances onto his property.

MR. HILLMAN:

The site would be completely redeveloped. All the curb cuts existing there would no longer be there. It would mirror the entrance across the street, which it's not a median on 58; it's a median within the entrance and exit of Lowe's.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Question here. Isn't this traffic light for the sole purpose of going into that shopping center?

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

But this road --

P.O. LINDSAY:

But didn't we just say that we don't normally put traffic signals to get in and out of a shopping center?

MR. HILLMAN:

That's our policy.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But we did it there.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And you did it -- there's Mill. If you go a little further they did it for the Panera Bread subdivision.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

In cases where there is no other alternative, yes, we do. We would consider putting in a signal, but

the intent of this since I've been here, is to basically get rid of this five leg intersection and create this intersection here so the signal made sense to us. This is -- this takes Pulaski away from Mill and brings the intersection up to here.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And Pulaski is a town road and we would be putting all that traffic on a town road. Once they got on Pulaski -- they'd have to go down to Pulaski for Lowe's and then make the left turn.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Who's paying for that?

MR. HILLMAN:

We put the same traffic on Mill, which is a town road, for Home Depot.

MR. NOLAN:

Guys, one at a time, please.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's Subaru Volkswagon dealership.

MR. NOLAN:

We have to make -- we're making a record.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Why don't we all go back to our places everyone. I think we all understand the situation here, so. The only question that remains is whether we discharge without recommendation or we just discharge regularly, and the motion before the committee is to discharge it in a normal fashion. Are there any other motions? I'm just asking if anybody is going to make a motion to discharge without recommendation.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yeah, I will do that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Horsley is making a motion to discharge without recommendation.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And Legislator Lindsay, discharge without recommendation.

LEG. STERN:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

On the motion, Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

I'm going to support the discharge without recommendation. I'm going to do it because I think that the message here should be let's get everybody talking. We can always approve it at the General Session, but I think that's the important message here, that you need the pro's speaking with the pro's. That's how the best solution is going to be found.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other discussion? Ultimately it's --

LEG. HORSLEY:

It's courteous.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's courteous. It gets it to the floor on Tuesday either way, so.

LEG. BARRAGA:

No guidance.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

With no guidance. Okay. Any other comments? All right. So we're going to call the discharge without recommendation first, so all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? I'll support it without recommendation and we'll get it to the floor, okay, and we'll have everybody sit down. Any opposition?

LEG. HORSLEY:

We're a civil group, Jay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So we're unanimous. We're discharging it without recommendation. Good luck in your conversations. Approved. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. We can go to the beginning of the agenda. We are going to begin with our tabled resolutions.

Tabled Resolutions

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

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

Is there a motion? I'll make a motion to continue to table this.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So tabled. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

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

We do have a public hearing coming up on Sunday bus service. Do we have a date yet for it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I know I told you by this meeting; I will have it by Friday. I dropped the ball on this one. I'll make sure it gets taken care of.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

By Friday you'll call my office and tell me the date?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, I will.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do you promise?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I promise. It's on the public record.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I got you on the record now. I'll make a motion to table 1026, second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So tabled. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

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

As you know, we have been working with Verizon on this and so far the progress, I think, is significant. I'm certainly going to support tabling it for now until we don't see the progress.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Where is the significant progress? I haven't seen any.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I will get you the chart.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. The chart is wonderful. I don't see any in the district. I don't see -- I see double poles all over the place.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

They did over 600 of them in the month of March.

P.O. LINDSAY:

They must have done them all out east.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, not that many; maybe 50 out east. Their argument was it's all seasonal and they're not going to be in the east much longer because of the traffic concerns in the summer, but they are on a percentage basis doing the entire County based on the amount of double woods in each legislative district. There is no favoritism. So I'll -- motion table. Is there a second?

MR. NOLAN:

I also should point out that Legislator Eddington, I think, is working on a different approach. I believe he wants this to be tabled so he can do that.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I don't necessarily object to the tabling. I would just like to see more production done.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm going to make sure that you get the list for each town.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Because I do not see the production, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. We're going to get you a list. Verizon provided us a town by town breakdown, in some cases hamlet by hamlet breakdown.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The other thing that bothers me, and I know the Verizon representative is in the back of the room, I just heard the other day they're moving more people to Buffalo. I don't know how -- I mean, they must have the same formula as our County Executive of doing more with less, because I don't know how you do that by keep moving people out of this County.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Sir, in the back, I'm not going to ask you about moving people to Buffalo, but if you have that, a copy of your progress report, if you can provide one to the Presiding Officer I'd appreciate it.

MR. LESPINASSE:

We did.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do it again. Thank you, sir. Okay, Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:

I concur with the Presiding Officer. I see more and more poles, double wood, than I do being taking down in my district. Can I also get a copy of the list so we can see what's going on? Is it by address or is it by location or is it just by town?

LEG. BARRAGA:

By hamlet and by town.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's by hamlet, town. Legislator Muratore, we'll -- again, to the Verizon rep, we've got two now, okay, two copies that you'll provide. Okay. So was there a motion and a second on tabling? I know I made a motion.

MS. ORTIZ:

I didn't get a second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Didn't get a second. Who has got a second? Can somebody second it?

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. We have a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)**

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

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by who? Legislator Stern?

LEG. STERN:

On the request of the sponsor.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Stern at the request of the sponsor.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Seconded by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)**

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.)
Commissioner, refresh my memory on why we were holding this up?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At the request of Legislator Muratore, he had asked to table it to review it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Thank you. Legislator Muratore, are you good to go?

LEG. MURATORE:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Very good. Okay. So I think we have a motion then by Legislator Muratore and I will second. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1292 is approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)**

Introductory Resolutions

Going on to our Introductory Resolutions, ***IR 1411, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to SeniorNet at Family Service League. (Browning)***

LEG. STERN:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve by Legislator Stern. Second by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)**

IR 1413, Approving ferry license for Fire Island Water Taxi, LLC. (Pres. Off.)

This has to be tabled for public hearing. I'll make a motion to table, second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)**

IR 1414, Approving rates established for Fire Island Water Taxi, LLC. (Pres. Off.)

Same motion, same second, same vote. That's to table. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)**

IR 1443, Authorizing the filing of a grant application for Federal Fiscal Year 2009 Section 5307 Formula Funds for mass transportation projects for Suffolk County Transit. (Co.

Exec.)

Commissioner, do you have any additional information on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This authorizes the filing of a grant for Federal Section 5307 Formula Funds for mass transportation capital assistance. The funding is from -- the Federal and State sources will help DPW purchase hybrid diesel electric transit buses, paratransit vans for SCAT, bus shelters. It will help us supplement funding for purchase and installation of the automatic vehicle locator system. It will supplement funds for maintenance of the Suffolk County transit buses and paratransit vans, and will also supplement funds for the ADA complimentary service for Suffolk Transit, which is part of the SCAT Program. The total cost for all these is \$8,864,661, with the Federal share at 80% equaling 7.091729 million and the additional 10% by the State.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions? All right, I will make a motion to approve.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

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

(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)

IR 1455, Amending the 2010 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with dredging of County waters (CP 5200). (Co. Exec.) Again, Commissioner, if you can give us some more detail.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Sure. This is -- under our normal process we would be moving forward with 150,000 to continue to develop, you know, applications to dredge County waters, but it also includes the \$200,000 offset from the Wicks Road project that we have postponed because we're not ready for it. We will be doing it next year so the money is not needed for that project. But the issue at hand for the \$200,000 is that the DEC is now requiring that we do cores of all the material that we will be removing from the waters. Where in the past we were allowed to do grab samples, which is basically a guy going in there grabbing it, we now have to physically hire somebody to take core samples of the material. That cost is around \$2500 each and generally each project has four, so now we have to go back and not only do the ones that we plan on doing in the future, but also the ones that we have submitted. Many of them they're requiring that we have to do cores now and this is a new requirement. So that is what the funding is for.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Another unfunded mandate?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Pretty much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So that's \$200,000 additional to the 150.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct, bringing it to 350.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. Any questions?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Does that include Frederick Canal? We have to redo the core samples there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We haven't received guidance on that yet. No, wait a second, no.

LEG. HORSLEY:

We did all the core samples.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That should be fine. That was all core. That isn't an issue.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Or we are going to have to recore it, cost us 85 grand.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I can't speak for the DEC. Logically we've done the coring. That's what they're looking for. You know, the material is not going to wash away and come back. This is the same material, it hasn't moved, so logically I would say we're good.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1455 is approved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)**

IR 1456, Appropriating funds in connection with County-wide Highway Sign Management Program (CP 5196). (Co. Exec.) Again, Commissioner, any additional detail?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is for -- appropriates \$250,000 for engineering in connection with completing an assessment of the current County signage throughout all County roads to make sure that they -- our signs meet with the Federal Highway Administration's mandates, which include retroreflectivity sign placement compliance plus the inventory of other roadside appurtenances. Just so you know, because I asked, retroreflectivity is basically how much light comes back to you from the sign, because I asked I know what that was.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And so we have to comply with the Federal --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. Yes, there is a mandate now.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions? All right. I will make a motion again on this.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

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

(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)

IR 1457, Appropriating funds in connection with moveable bridges needs assessment and rehabilitation (CP 5806). (Co. Exec.) This is our drawbridges?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is specifically the Quogue bridge. We have done -- we have completed a report and this will allow development and final design of the, you know, the replacement and rehabilitation of that bridge.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. I will make this motion as well. Second by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1458, Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of Shinnecock Canal Locks (CP 5343). (Co. Exec.) This project isn't finished or this is a new phase?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is part of our maintenance program. There are tide gates. Essentially these are -- this would allow us to clean and paint the three tie gates at Shinnecock. These are not the ones that are mechanically controlled. They move with the tides. Basically, you know, this will allow us to continue our maintenance of this. It's very important.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What kind of number are we looking at on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Five-hundred thousand.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This was in the budget, Capital Budget?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, I will make the motion. Second by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1458 is approved. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1482, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to Family Service League WorkPlus Program. (Cooper) I will take a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar. Do we have such a motion?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I will take that as a first, and second by Legislator Stern. I think we should probably put these on the Consent Calendar, that's why I said it that way. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1484, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to Pronto of Long Island, Inc. (Montano)

We'll do the same motion and second. Same vote. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1485, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to Urban League. (Montano)

We'll do the same motion, same second, same vote on that. ***(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)***

IR 1486, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to the Central Islip Church of Christ. (Montano)

Again, this is a motion to approve and place on the consent calendar. We'll do the same motion, same second, same vote. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

Okay, so the vote is slightly changed because the Presiding Officer stepped in. So on 1486 it was 6-0.

IR 1487, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to the Central Islip Historic Preservation Society. (Montano)

Same motion, same second, and the same vote as 1486, 6-0. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

IR 1488, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to the North Amityville Senior Center. (Gregory)

Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

IR 1493, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to the Suffolk County Auxiliary Police. (Muratore)

Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

IR 1494, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to the Sunshine Prevention Center. (Muratore)

Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

IR 1495, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to the Selden/Centereach Youth Association. (Muratore)

Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

IR 1496, Authorizing transfer of surplus County computer systems and hardware to RSVP. (Kennedy)

Same motion, same second, same vote. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

IR 1497, Authorizing Estee Lauder Breast Cancer Awareness Program at H. Lee Dennison Executive Office Building and Cohalan Court Complex. (Kennedy)

We just need a regular motion on this.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

A motion by Legislator Barraga, second by Legislator Stern. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

Abstentions? Approved. ***(VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - Including Presiding Officer Lindsay)***

We have already done 1511. We have reached the end of our agenda. If there is no further comment, Mr. Anderson, then we are adjourned. Thank you.

(THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:18 P.M.)