

PUBLIC WORKS
and
TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

of the

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

A regular meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday January 25, 2011.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Jay Schneiderman - Chairman
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chairman
Legislator Wayne Horsley
Legislator Tom Muratore
Presiding Officer William Lindsay - Ex Officio Member

MEMBER NOT PRESENT:

Legislator Tom Barraga - Excused Absence

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan- Counsel to the Legislature
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - DPW
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer - DPW
Legislator Ed Romaine 1st Legislative District
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office
Catherine Stark - Aide to Chairman Schneiderman
Paul Perillie - Aide to Majority Aide
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk - SC Legislature
Ben Zwirn - County Executive's Office
Dot Kerrigan - AME
All Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

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

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good afternoon. I'd like to call the meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee to order this 25th day of January, 2011. If you all will rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Horsley.

SALUTATION

You may be seated. We have no presentations today. Commissioner Anderson, I will ask you to step forward. For the record, Legislator Barraga has an excused absence. Commissioner, did you want to apprise us of anything before we begin the agenda?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, I am good to go. Thank you, though.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions for the Commissioner on things that are not on the agenda? The Presiding Officer has the floor.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Commissioner Anderson, I just want to publically commend your department for the wonderful job you've done so far with the snowplowing. I have gotten nothing but compliments in my district. And I know it's been a bear of a winter so far, and you have guys have really done a good job.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you very much. I know my staff takes the snow as their prime task. And they're really proud of the effort that they put in and so am I. Thank you. It's good to hear.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I would like to add to that, actually, the help you've given East Hampton as well as the erosion in getting materials out there to secure the parking lot by Gosman's and the road in that area.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Just right in time there too, because the storm moved right in. I don't know how much of the material you put out there is left, but it was needed when you did it. Okay.

So we are going to start with Tabled Resolutions.

IR 2127, Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest and Westbrook Village (IS-1432.1). (Co. Exec.)

Commissioner, this was tabled for what reason, do you know?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The applicant wanted to come back and ask for some additional flow -- capacity. They did come before the Sewer Agency in December. We have prepared a revised resolution, and it was just recently forwarded. We expect it to be laid on the table or whatever you do to revise legislation -- amend it, thank you -- in the next cycle. So I would ask that this be tabled until the next cycle.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. Gil, do you know offhand what the additional request was for, how much?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It was for 2900 gallons per day, 2900 additional gallons. So it would bring it up to a total of 77,000 gallons per day is what would be the total request from these folks.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I make a motion to table, second by Legislator Stern. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions. So **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-1; Not Present - Legis. Barraga).**

IR 2139, Appropriating funds in connection with bulkheading at various locations (CP 5375). (Schneiderman)

I believe I sent an e-mail to withdraw this. Would the Clerk note that I am withdrawing this. It was based on a 2010 appropriation, so it's no longer valid.

IR 2205, Authorizing the County Executive to enter into an agreement with Heritage-Riverhead Retail Developers, LLC and accepting a payment of money in lieu of performance of certain mitigation measures, constructed under Capital Project 5529, Old Country Road, Riverhead, and placing this payment into a debt reserve account to pay down the debt service on Capital Project 5529. (Co. Exec.)

And I believe that Legislator Romaine has a competing proposal in IR 1000 of '11; is that correct, Legislator Romaine?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This bill basically takes, what, \$1.9 million and uses it to pay down debt associated with a project. Myself and Legislator Romaine are looking to finish the road, I think others as well. 58 is a major corridor there and I think important to the economic health of the County. We're trying to get it widened all the way to 25. I think there's been some debate about whether there's enough money available to finish the project. Do you want to comment on that? Then I would like to give Legislator Romaine an opportunity to comment as well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would. Thank you. The department negotiated the funds in question with the intent of using them to offset the cost of reconstructing County Road 58 in the early implementation project. The issue at hand is whether these funds are going to be used for -- to offset the existing construction that was just recently completed or future construction.

We are moving ahead right now with completion of rehabilitation of the remaining portion from -- effectively from Ostrander out to 25. We began the work after the early implementation project was completed, and we expect it to be finished at the close of this year. The work will provide for construction of two eastbound lanes, a center lane, as well as a single westbound lane. Further expansion beyond this is neither warranted nor easily completed at this time due to the current width of the existing right-of-way.

The Department of Public works monitors our roads, and at this time, we do not feel that the additional lane in the westbound direction is warranted. In 2007, we completed a report which showed that the following levels of service under the 2013 no-build scenario, which means that if we did nothing in 2013, the westbound peak would still be at a very good level of service, a Level B.

Using this analysis, we justified the construction for the second eastbound lane similar to the next phase of County Road 39. In addition to this, the widening of the road for the additional lane will involve lengthy New York State DEC permit process due to disturbance of wetlands to facilitate the road widening, a lengthy design time, a lengthy and costly utility relocations, a longer construction timeline and additional funding beyond that of the existing funding and the expected impact fees. We are confident that the single westbound lane in this direction is adequate to provide an acceptable level of service, and therefore, we urge that the committee approve 2205.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me ask you some questions. So you're saying basically the rest of 58 is all going to be two lanes in both directions and a center turning lane, except for this one portion, which would be only two eastbound lanes and one westbound lane?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is that because it's not warranted or because you don't have enough money to put the westbound lane in because eminent domain and other associated costs?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The money is one factor, but the factor that's important to us is that at this time, based on the studies that we have been done and based on no improvements to the westbound direction, there is no need for an additional lane. We have a limited right-of-way. If we go to expand that right-of-way to add the additional westbound lane, we're going to have, you know, regulatory issues that have to be met. It's not like we can just go in there and widen the road because there is -- there is a wetland adjacent to the road in this portion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You mentioned in defending this County Road 39 where you have in the new plans you're going to be expanding one of the eastbound lanes, but not a westbound lane from the North Sea Road down to where it reconnects with 27. And I feel actually quite strongly that you do need that -- if anything, if you're going to add an additional lane, it should be the other direction, because that's more predictably a backup there in the afternoons as all the construction traffic leaves.

But certainly, you know, you need the extra lane in both areas. And I was told then we just don't have the money to do it. Because we are discussing 58 and we're discussing potentially having a greater amount of money available by taking this impact of \$1.9 million and using it towards this project, it seems like you could achieve that two lanes in both directions, which might be prudent. Did you follow that? I know you're having a conversation with Mr. Hillman while I was talking.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I get the gist of what your question is. In somewhat simplistic terms, effectively what you have -- both 39 as well as 58 -- is you have two lanes eastbound and -- coming into a single lane; whereas, westbound, you have a single lane. So the additional lane in both -- on both roads in the eastbound direction are going to improve the flow in that eastbound direction. The additional lane -- like I said, I can't speak on 38 -- sorry -- 39 -- 38 -- 39, sorry. I can't speak on 39 right now in the westbound direction, but I do know that there is, again, a single lane coming out similar to 58; you have a single lane westbound coming from the east.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I can tell you from experience, and I'm sure Mr. Zwirn would say the same thing, in the afternoons, there is traditionally a back up in that section on 39 going west from the 7-Eleven back to where the Pier 1 or the Princess Diner is, in that single lane, because you have a lot of the construction traffic all -- they all leave around four and five o'clock, so traffic tends to appear at the same time. The eastbound traffic is a little less predictable. You know you have it in the morning for certain.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, we have, obviously, a history of eastbound, you know, on 39. Again, while --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Certainly -- if there was a storm and you had to evacuate the area, you certainly would want that extra lane, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Maybe we could save the 39 discussion for offline. You know, I think the issue with 58 here is that we feel that the additional lane at this point is not warranted. While we know the area is growing, you know, at this point, we are moving ahead with the four lane section; you know, two eastbound, one center --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Forgive me, but until this meeting right now, I was not aware that it was a smaller section. That road was only going to two lanes -- only one lane on one side of that in the westbound direction. So I thought when we were debating Legislator Romaine's bill that we were -- you know, there was ample money to do the project, which I believed was two lanes in both directions all the way through. Now I'm finding out that there's ample money to do two lanes in one direction and one lane in the other, and we might actually need the additional money if we were come to the determination that we needed two lanes in both directions, which to me changes everything.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

When we spoke about the original legislation, we advised you at that time that we were doing two lanes in the eastbound direction, a center lane and the single westbound lane. The question that came up was did we have enough funding in hand to do -- to provide the section of roadway that we were speaking about, which I sent that e-mail about and I gave the table, which, you know, detailed the funds that were available.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me just ask the Legislator from the district, because maybe this is a non issue, maybe the Legislator agrees that you only need one lane heading west. But can you comment on that?

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'd like to comment on all of this. First of all, this is a capital project to do five lanes, unfortunately, no shoulders, no bus cut-aways, but five lanes; a turning lane in the middle and two lanes east and west that were supposed to run from the Long Island Expressway east to 25.

This project had a lot of debates about it. It was probably the best solution at the time, not the optimum solution. The project got underway, both -- and I have great respect for Mr. Hillman -- and Commissioner Anderson and I attended a press conference with Steve Levy where he declared the project completed last June at the Hilton Gardens Hotel, and yet, the project stops at Ostrander Avenue, one block east of the traffic circle and about a mile and a half before State Route 25.

Now I said, "Okay. There probably isn't enough money to complete this." Then I find out that the

impact fee that was supposed to be used for this is going to be paid by Costco which has yet to be built, and that was a little more than \$1.9 million. For those who don't know County Road 58 -- and Catherine and I -- Catherine comes from Riverhead -- we were chuckling at the thought that we only have one westbound lane. I mean, anyone in Riverhead would tell you, "What are you thinking?" Okay? Because we know we need that -- that's where traffic starts. That's where it really starts, and that's where it backs up. And we know that Riverhead is growing.

Just so you should know, besides this massive Costco that's going there in shops in Riverhead, I think it's like 500,000 square feet, the old Suffolk Life Building will become a Lowes. And we'll get an impact fee from that. And in case you're questioning, they're going to build a massive Walmart just west of Costco, and we're going to get an impact fee from that. Yes, they're closing the old one and building a brand new one. They just got approval, Head River, LLC, if I'm not mistaken. So we are going to get even more impact fees.

But the last time I looked, the County Executive said the project was finished, it's done, announced it with great fanfare in June of 2010. Oops, you left out a piece. But I understand money is tight. But now we have money. We don't have to go into debt, we don't have to ask the taxpayers, money is right here; \$1.9 million. Now they say, "oh, we can finish the road." Really. How come you stopped in June when the County Exec said the project was finished? All of a sudden it's alive again. Wow. Boy, I'm happy I introduced this bill, brought the project back to life. We're going to have a road. We're going to finish this project.

And you know what? You want to pay off the debt? So do I. I want to pay off the debt too. But you know what I want to do? I want to pay off the debt when we close out the capital project, because if you say to these guys, "You want to pay off the debt? Let's pay off the debt with whatever is left when we close out the capital project," just like we do when we close out other capital projects. But you know what that makes them do? Actually has to make them finish the project that they said they were going to do to begin with.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

May I say something?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Adding the additional lane in the westbound direction, how much would that cost?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Probably about -- roughly -- I mean, at this point, real cursory, about \$4 million, \$5 million.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So I guess with this impact fee plus the other impact fees, you got it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would make the statement that the -- you know, the stores that the Legislator states are all west of this section, they're not east. So as they improve, you know, they are not -- the traffic mitigation is going to be less in that section. Again, we are --

LEG. ROMAINE:

But you haven't hesitated to charge them the impact fee.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, because that was intended to offset the cost of construction of the early implementation project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The people who are trying to get to those shops though, many are coming from the east, and

they're going to be driving along that road to get to those stores. So the question is are they going to be stuck in traffic or are they going to be able to get there in a reasonable amount of time. That and I think that really is the question.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That was the intent of the early implementation project, which, if I may state, was originally we did look at the five-lane section all the way through, but it was determined at the time of the planned development that it was not warranted -- the easterly end was not warranted; that westbound lane was sufficient for the traffic that was running through there. So that's why we have the section now. Now we're going with --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

At the time, or the future traffic when you have all these giant -- you know, these big box stores go in? That's going to change the amount of traffic on the road, I would think.

LEG. ROMAINE:

About a million square feet of new projects.

MR. HILLMAN:

As the Commissioner said, the developments that are being discussed are all the to west. So that means they're going to be fed from State Route 25, which is a one-lane road. State Route 25 which feeds County Road 58 is a one-lane road. If the State had some intention of widening their road to two lanes in each direction or even two lanes in the westbound direction, I would concur with you that the -- we would need to have additional capacity. However, the State has no intentions of widening 25 to two lanes in each direction or two lanes in the eastbound direction.

So for the foreseeable future, this section of roadway will be fed by one lane. So having it fed by one lane and no major generators east of that, what we're saying is our analysis is a solid analysis. And I don't see how one lane feeding it, when you widen it out to two lanes, you're still going to have one lane of traffic --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Where 25 hits -- I'm going to try to pull up a map -- there's also 105, right? It's County Road 105 at that point.

LEG. ROMAINE:

About a half a mile to the east is 105. Don't forget --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And 105 is two lanes -- I'm sorry. So there's two lanes of 105 in each direction.

MR. HILLMAN:

That runs north-south though.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And you have 25. But let's say you're coming from the South Fork where my district is, you would go down 105, and then you'd make that left on to 58. So you're coming off a two-lane highway.

MR. HILLMAN:

Yes, but it's one left-turn lane feeding it, and then it's one straight through from 25.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, there's two lanes.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It's two.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, right. Is it two left-turn lanes that feed it? Plus you have all the traffic from 25 on the North Fork.

MR. HILLMAN:

Double left-turn lanes on 105?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So you have all the North fork traffic --

MR. HILLMAN:

We just lengthened that because we didn't have the storage. It's one lane. We just lengthened the storage capacity on CR 105, the left turn storage.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But you have of all 25 and all of 105 feeding on to that.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Don't forget, a lot of people from the east take Sound Avenue to -- help me out -- Northville Turnpike, thank you. They take Northville Turnpike south and that hits right where you would be improving the roadway, okay? So you've got feed in there. Okay.

Riverhead is not shrinking. Riverhead is growing. We more commercial on County Road 58. This is something that is needed. This is part of this project. We have the money. We will have the money through impact fees to finish it. Even if all you could do this year with how much you have in the budget -- now, did you show me?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We have a half a million left over after completing construction.

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, how much do you have to finish from --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You mean after the early implementation project is complete? We had \$2.1 million remaining.

LEG. ROMAINE:

You had \$2.1 million remaining.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And if we gave you this 1.9 in change, you would have \$4 million left; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, because we have already cut work orders to do the work that I've been discussing.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Okay. So even if you could get this to Northville Turnpike, and then the next impact fee comes over -- I'm sure you're charging -- you must be charging Lowes and Walmart an impact fee -- and

that money was applied until this project is finished, no taxpayer money, no going into debt, and we finish the roadway, and we don't have to go back and look at this roadway again for a number of years. We provide capacity on this roadway.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

While you will provide additional capacity, as I've stated, we don't feel that it's warranted at this time. We are doing the project that will widen the eastbound direction, will provide a turning lane. After it's completed, we would then review the road at that time, given enough time for people to kind of get the kinks out of the traveling -- you know, traveling through the area, and then make a determination whether it's warranted to go ahead and add an additional lane. At this time, we don't feel it's warranted.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

For somebody who drives that a lot and we don't have -- that Costco is not there yet and we don't have the Lowes there, that's already a bad problem in that section. You have a lot of people now who come out to the East End -- big tourism engine -- and, you know, they stop at Tanger Mall and other attractions to the area. That's the way they are coming often and doing some shopping and then hit -- so that section has got to now go through to reach that 105 street. Or to go to the North Fork on 25, they've got to drive through that section. So maybe theoretically you don't need it, but I'm telling you, in practicality, you definitely need it. Anybody who's been there knows that you need that. I respect you guys as well as traffic engineers, but I can't deny what my eyes see. I'm in that area a lot. You do need that extra lane, I believe.

MR. ZWIRN:

Mr. Chairman, if I can just interject. Whether you need the extra lane on County Road 58 -- and I drive probably as much as anybody who doesn't live in the district --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So you know what I am talking about.

MR. ZWIRN:

From a practical point of view, if we don't pay down this, on the debt service of this project, the taxpayers are going to pay it out of the General Fund. I mean, it's going to be -- the taxpayers are going to pay for it. And if this project doesn't manifest itself for the next year or two, then this money is going to be sitting somewhere, not in -- in a reserve account or in some account when it could be used to pay down the project.

And what could happen down the road is that if you have impact fees on any project, and say one of the Legislators has a project in their district that they think is warranted to have extra money, then we're going to be attacking the impact fees instead of paying down the debt service on a project where it was intended, we're going to start fighting over, you know, this cash, and where does it sit?

If this project doesn't get done, as well intended as it is, it sits there for two or three years -- the Commissioner tells me it could take four years to do this -- this money is going to sit in an account somewhere for the next four years and not -- and the taxpayers in the meanwhile are going to be paying debt service, \$2 million additional debt service on a project that could have been closed out.

So, I mean, I understand as a Legislature, it's a project that's needed in a particular district, and even one that I'm pretty familiar with, I think the best course would be to lobby and to get support for the project to be done in its entirety and any impact fees from that project also be used to retire the debt if there's anything left over.

I just think as a policy, it's just a better way to go, because this could take a long time with money just sitting there. And it's going to be -- you know, in tough economic times, if you have \$2 million

sitting in an account that's not dedicated to something, you know, it's going to be awfully tempting to go take it for something else, and then there will be a fight at that time. I just think it's better policy if we just close this out, move forward and then, you know, move to try to improve County Road 58.

Let me just say one thing about the press conferences. We had a press conference on County Road 39 when that project was done -- the project that was designed was done. It was not completed for the entire length of County Road 39.

LEG. ROMAINE:

You were there, Mr. Chairman, weren't you?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't think I was at one --

MR. ZWIRN:

The Chairman was there. I was there that day myself.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Which one?

MR. ZWIRN:

County Road 39.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Of course I was there.

MR. ZWIRN:

But that wasn't completely done either.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I thought you meant on 58.

MR. ZWIRN:

It's going to be extended even further. So that's just, you know, a first step so we have a chance to have a second press conference, which I'm sure you will be at.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I may be at that one.

MR. ZWIRN:

You may not be invited.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I may not be invited but I'll show up anyway. First of all, I loved your argument. And given the facts you had and the cards you held, good argument.

Here's the deal. The deal is that this project was supposed to run through State Route 25. I'm not looking to do anything. I'd love to pay off debt too. Let's finish the project. I would understand if even with the budget that we got, we couldn't finish it, and that's why I didn't raise the issue. But now that we have extra money coming in, let's finish the project. Let's do it now. This project was supposed to be finished.

And someone said it's going to take four years. Not with the Levy skill and determination of

engineering. Look what he did so quickly on 39, look what he did on 58. This is only a mile and a half to 25. I can't believe that the magic touch could not be applied and we could not speed that project along and move traffic so efficiently with a little investment. And then I think of all my friends who would love to have work; the contractors, the building trades, those guys who are out of work that could be put to work. And I'm saying at no expense to the taxpayers. And if we want to pay off the debt, why don't we do what we do at the end of every capital project? Close the project off. And if there's any balance, it can either go the General Fund or it can pay off debt then, but it's incentive to get this finished.

I was told this project was finished last year. And it's one of those oops moments where I didn't say anything because I didn't think we had the money. Now we have impact fees rolling in, oops, we can get it done. We can put people to work. We can actually finish this project, and we may not have to look at this section of road for another 20 years. This is the opportunity to do it. This is the opportunity not to have taxpayer dollars involved, not to go into debt and to do it.

And for those who are worried about debt, they don't want to sit with me in this Legislature, because I am going to remind you every time we go into debt. We went into debt today to pay off some lawsuits, because -- you know, I said, "Why don't we -- we have a little money in pay-as-you-go. It's the beginning of the year, why don't we use pay-as-you-go?" "Oh, no. Oh, no. We have cash flow problems." That's what they told us this morning. You heard me. So I won't worry about debt. I want to pay off the debt too, but I want to do the project. What I'm asking you guys to do is to look at this, table IR 2205 of 2010 and approve IR 1000 of 2011. Let's start off the New Year right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I went to look at that left turning lane on County Road 105, and you're right, it is a single lane. But when I pulled up the aerial, it shows the traffic backed up, not only the entirety of the left turning lane, but into the remaining lane. You might actually want to look at two left turning lanes, because it's so congested there, plus it's being fed in all these other directions too. I still believe that you really do need that additional lane there. So we're not just talking about whether we should bond this project -- you know, pay off the debt or, you know, expend this impact fee, I really think we're going to need to take some of this additional funds, these impact fees, and use it to finish this road, which is a different position than we had going into today's meeting, but I personally wasn't aware there was only one lane. And I do believe you need two. Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, as I stated before, just to respond to one of the Legislator's comments, the reason that we were able to move so quickly on both 39 and 58 in these sections of roadways were that we had sufficient right-of-way. We had sufficient width to do the section that we intended.

Right now, if we do what the Legislator is proposing, adding the additional westbound lane, we are going to have to acquire land, we are going to have to go before the regulatory agencies, because we are going to be eliminating portions of a wetland on the north side of the road, and it's going to take time. What I would suggest is, again, you know, allowing us to use this fund as pursuant to our resolution. And we will look at the traffic flow once the construction is finished and we can make a determination of what's going on in there; if it's needed, if it's more -- if there's additional work needed at 105 and 25, maybe that's the answer. But, again, you know, at this point, we can take the funds and make use of them and pay down what we have.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Presiding Officer Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I don't know. Whether Legislator Romaine or the Commissioner, help me out. We have a two-lane

highway now, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And the construction that you are talking about is to add an additional westbound lane, so we will have two lanes going westbound and two additional eastbound lanes? So we have three going eastbound?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right now, no. What we're doing is we're currently in the process of constructing two eastbound lanes, a center turning lane and then a single westbound lane.

P.O. LINDSAY:

In addition to the two lanes that you have now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. In place of.

P.O. LINDSAY:

So you're not getting any more flow westbound.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Right. You're not getting any flow westbound. Right now, when you go where the project stopped, where it wasn't supposed to stop, it was supposed to go to 25. If you read the original capital project, it was supposed to go to 25. They stopped about a mile and a half east of 25. When you go east, you get a two-lane road with a turning lane in the middle. What they want to do is add one lane going east, but no lanes going west. And I am saying that's a mistake. If you're going to improve the road, let's improve it. Let's improve the road.

And as Bill knows, Bill Hillman, if you are traveling west on 25, it doesn't go from two lanes -- it doesn't go from one lane to two lanes as you travel west. It becomes two lanes in 25 before you hit 58, as you know, Bill. That's correct, for a short period of time. So you make the adjustment on 25, not on 58.

This is needed. Anyone that's traveled -- I mean, Catherine is a resident of Riverhead, Jay travels through Riverhead, anyone that knows anything about Riverhead knows that 58 is one of the most congested -- can't believe it in the middle of, you know, farmland -- but it's one of the most congested roads in Suffolk County. We are putting up three new stores on 58, none of which have been built yet. The Costco itself and the stores associated the Costco is close to 500,000 square feet. Then there's going to be brand new WalMart, and then Lowes is going to take over -- knock down Suffolk Life and put a big store there.

So what I'm saying is travel capacity on that road -- and, yes, this is directly to the west of where this project is going to take place. It's not where the project is, it's just to the west of there. But if you don't think it's going to affect travel from the east from, the South Fork where Jay comes from, up 105, from 25, and from Northville Turnpike, you're kidding yourself. The roads are already congested. I travel these roads all the time.

This is money that should be applied to the project to finish the project. At the end of the project, if

there's money left over, let's retire the debt. Right now, we don't have to go into debt to do this, will which we will at some point if we don't use this money, because it's either now or shortly thereafter that we will have to do this. Let's not go into debt, let's not hit the taxpayers up, let's use the impact fees and put people to work. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Ed, I think quit while you're ahead here. I think I'm going to call the vote, because I think you've got most of us convinced.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I still have a question, all right?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

If you don't have enough area, if you don't have the right-of-way to add this other lane that Legislator Romaine has all convinced us that we need -- and I agree with that -- but if we don't have --

LEG. ROMAINE:

We own it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Huh?

LEG. ROMAINE:

We own it.

P.O. LINDSAY:

We own it? But Commissioner Anderson says that we have to go through all kinds of regulatory stuff to add that other lane.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It's an old duck farm that we own and we purchased. We own it. It's County owned.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. But the wetlands are going to have to -- you're going to need regulatory approval to eliminate the wetlands. Whether it's a duck farm or not, there is a process, and it's going to take time.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'm sure there is, but you won't have to do acquisition, which I know you gave that impression. That's County owned.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But does it make sense to go forward with anything -- I mean, if we do what you would like to do, Legislator Romaine, does it make any sense for us to go forward with the additional lane eastbound and the turning lane and then have to go back to the same spot when we get the regulatory approval to add the other lane westbound? Would we be better off waiting, what do you think, a year, six months, how long will it take to get the regulatory approval?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would easily say a year.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Would it make sense to hold the thing up for a year and do it right once and for all?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, because you probably could do work -- instead of the project -- the project went from Ostrander Avenue east to the Long Island Expressway. If I had my druthers, I would have taken it west from the Long Island Expressway for a variety of different reasons which I've discussed with Gil in the past. But now, you had Ostrander. You can proceed from 25 west now while you work to get the DEC permission to go on to County wetlands and do what you have to.

At some point, you're going to have to do this or acquire land from, I guess, BJs there or whatever, which is on the south side of the road, you can acquire that which may be even cheaper and faster and easier than using County owned wetlands which used to be a duck farm, which we own. But either way, at some point, you're going to have to do this. This is not an option. So either you regulate the road to swing south and take some land, or you continue on its path and you work with the DEC. But either way, this way road now runs through this wetlands and it was built, and all we're asking to do is add a lane. And you know, I'm not an engineer, I don't know the right-of-ways, but I know that this work will eventually have to be done. So maybe we bite the bullet.

MR. ZWIRN:

If I might.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

One second, Mr. Zwirn. First of all, Presiding Officer, does that answer your question?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah. The whole thing is getting clearer to me, but -- well, if we held up to do the work, I'd be suspicious of holding the money, because someone is going to use for something else, you know. So if it's going to hold up the project, I'd rather pay down the debt and rebond it when the project comes out again, because surer than hell, if you have \$1.9 million, somebody is going to grab it if it's just sitting around.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's a whole separate issue of how to protect the money if we don't pay off the debt.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Just to make it, you know, clear, the road right now needs to be repaved, and that's why we're moving ahead with the project that we've detailed; the two lanes easterly, single lane westerly. It doesn't have the ability to wait.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. I'm looking at an overhead picture here. Part of the property that you think potentially has a DEC issue, is that -- is that west of 25 or east of 25?

LEG. ROMAINE:

It's east of 25 -- it's west of 25.

LEG. STERN:

West of 25 coming towards the circle.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is that in the area of Northville Turnpike?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

So I'd be interested to know, before we heard four years and then we're talking about the magic of the administration being able to push it forward, I mean, realistically, what kind of a time period do you think we are looking at?

MR. HILLMAN:

If we were given funds for design -- we will not be designing this inhouse, we would go to a consultant. If we were given funds to go to design today, by the end of the year, we would have the consultant on board and starting work. So that's -- 2011 is shot. He would start the design in 2012, immediately run into the regulatory issues, and we would begin the regulatory discussions. That would probably take the majority of 2012. He would then finish up his design in 13ish. And we might -- '13 could run into '14, but probably '13. And we might be able to build in '14.

That's as quick as it's -- that's everything going very smoothly. Any delay in that, you push your schedule back. We don't have money sitting here right now for design. So, you know, when we get that, it's about four years from when we start -- from when we get money and go out to an RFP for a consultant, roughly, could be five.

LEG. STERN:

And Gil, what intervening time period do you think that you will have received all of the impact fees that are projected to come in from these other large scale projects in the area?

MR. HILLMAN:

In all likelihood, yes.

LEG. STERN:

You will have receive that by then? Again, I'm looking back at the aerial, and from the overhead, it looks like the area that we're talking about, whether that was a preserved farm or a County -- owned property --

LEG. ROMAINE:

It was a duck farm years ago.

LEG. STERN:

It looks -- from the computer image, it looks pretty green. So I guess my question to you, Legislator Romaine or Legislator Schneiderman, is what, if any, plans do you know about? Has there been any talk for future development along the side of the road that we're talking about right here? I mean, is this an area where the town plans to continue its economic development efforts?

LEG. ROMAINE:

North or south, that's County preserved land.

LEG. STERN:

So no development north.

LEG. ROMAINE:

There's already development there. There's a bank on the corner. There is a bank at the corner of

Northville Turnpike and 58, and then as you move west, there's a K-Mart and a BJs, and then as you move west, there is a huge shopping center where the current WalMart is, and then you get to Ostrander.

LEG. STERN:

And east of Northville, southeast, which also appears to be relatively open right now, do you know of any development plans?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No. That's undeveloped -- there are no plans at the current time that I'm aware of.

LEG. STERN:

But as far as you know, it's buildable at this point?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No, I don't think it's buildable, there's wetlands in there. It's all wet. So, I mean, that's what I see from the road as I drive along Northville Turnpike, as I'm approaching 58, it's all wet along that section. So I don't know if the interior is buildable, but there have been no plans about that.

LEG. STERN:

Now, that's the area southeast that is already planned to get two lanes heading east under the current plan.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's correct.

LEG. STERN:

So I guess my question to DPW is what, if any, DEC issues were there going into that area, because it would seem that DEC regulatory issues that you have in this areas would be the same coming back the other way westbound north.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We were able to build the section that we're building now because we're effectively building it within both curbs. We haven't widened the road in any way. If we add the additional westbound lane, there's that wetland right next door, and that's going to cause us to go to the regulatory agencies to get permission to relocate it.

LEG. STERN:

So you're saying, Commissioner, that is would be a different process for the westbound than it was for the eastbound?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. STERN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Mr. Zwirn, you wanted to make a statement.

MR. ZWIRN:

I was just going to suggest that, you know, this isn't going to happen immediately. So, I mean, you could put this in, I think as Mr. Hillman said, we could put it in the 2012 Capital Budget and fund it properly and let this money go down to pay down the debt service on this so that the taxpayers

would pay the General Fund property tax. They will be a little bit relieved of their burden next year, to put this money into a reserve account. To let it sit there for several years just doesn't seem to make any sense in these tough economic times when we go out and borrow the money. Let's go out and borrow the right amount to do the project correctly and just not nickle and dime it hoping they're going to have enough impact fees from the next project and hopefully enough impact fees from the next one. Because what happens if you don't? Then you're going to have three sets of impact fees, then you're going to have to go out and bond more money. Meanwhile, that money is just going to be sitting there. It just seems that the process -- I understand and I think Legislator Romaine has made an excellent case for a capital project to be done in a different in a way than may have been suggested, but I think this would be the wrong way financially going forward to handle it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Presiding Officer Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And I guess it would be to Budget Review or to our Counsel, can we appropriate money for a project that doesn't exist yet? Is that what we're doing?

LEG. ROMAINE:

No. This is a capital project. This is a capital project.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay.

LEG. ROMAINE:

We are putting an impact fee in there because there is not enough money to finish this capital project.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But the extra lane is what you're talking about.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Not the extra lane, the --

P.O. LINDSAY:

But the extra lane is going to become a capital project in itself, because it isn't the --

LEG. ROMAINE:

No. It's part of the original capital project. It was supposed to go from the --

P.O. LINDSAY:

But it hasn't been designed.

MR. HILLMAN:

No. This section has not been designed. But what Legislator Romaine is saying is that the capital project presently exists -- 5523 is ringing a bell, but I wouldn't bet on it. But there is an existing capital project that -- it's probably noted in here -- 5529. It's going into 5529. It exists --

P.O. LINDSAY:

Again, this is could confusing to me. We went out and we've already bonded this project that you're about to embark on, right?

MR. HILLMAN:

It has two phases. We bonded and completed phase one. Phase two would be from Ostrander east.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The additional lane and the resurfacing in the center lane.

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct, correct.

P.O. LINDSAY:

That's already bonded, right?

MR. HILLMAN:

No, that's not bonded yet.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Oh, it isn't bonded.

MR. HILLMAN:

That's correct.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And what you're saying, Legislator Romaine, is take the impact fee and pay for that cash now instead of going out to bond.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's correct, as opposed to going into debt.

MR. HILLMAN:

I stand corrected. It is bonded already. The project that we are going to be moving forward is bonded already. I apologize.

LEG. ROMAINE:

It's not fully funded.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Okay. Ms. Vizzini, could you shed some light on this murky tale?

MS. VIZZINI:

Sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The last phase isn't funded or bonded, which is the additional lane.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah, I know, but it isn't a project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It is a project. It was part of the original project. Somebody along the way decided to shrink the original project and make it a smaller project by eliminating one of the lanes. And what the Legislator is saying, and I agree, that project should have never been reduced. It should have been two lanes the entire distance, and how do we get it back there? The capital project already exists. One way to get it back on track is to put the money in place.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Mr. Chairman, at the thought of beating a dead horse, I just want to say, we didn't know this project shrunk. Anyone get told that? I know I didn't. By the way, did you get told that the hangar that you appropriated a million and a half for got built? It never got built. They spent eight hundred grand.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And the steel is rusted.

LEG. ROMAINE:

And the steel is sitting on the tarmac. But we went out and bought a new hangar. But did anyone tell you that that project was cancelled? Did anyone tell you that this project was shortened? They just stopped. And the County Exec declared victory last June. "The project is finished." The project is finished? There's a mile and a half to go. What happened? Oops. I figured, okay, I don't want do fight with the guy, you know, maybe there isn't the money. But now -- well, maybe I lied about that.

MR. ZWIRN:

Somebody's nose is growing.

LEG. ROMAINE:

But now we have impact fee monies coming down the pike that will allow us, without going into debt, without paying interest, without taxing the taxpayer to give DPW the necessary resources to finish the project. And this project, this money is needed. And if someone went to steal this money in the future, I'd be upset. I don't know if I'm going to be the Legislator. I mean, for the rest of this year I will be, next year it might be different. But whoever the Legislator is, he would be obligated to watch his capital project in his district as we all watch ours. And you're going to have eyes on that. And they're going to want that project done and the Town Board wants that project done and the Chamber of Commerce wants that project done.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can we -- can I interrupt so we can hear from Gail, because I think she was about to educate us?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Please.

MS. VIZZINI:

I just wanted to dispel the myth that there would be \$1.9 million out there available for any other purpose. The County Executive's resolution determines that the money will be transferred to a reserve to pay off debt service. We bonded -- or at least authorized to be bonded about 13.3 million. The debt service on that is about a million dollars a year.

Legislator Romaine's resolution takes the 1.9 million and transfers it, amends the Capital Program, puts it in the existing project, where it can remain safely until such time as it is necessary to bond it -- that's true, it's cash, no bonding -- until it's necessary to spend it. And the only thing that could change that would be if there's absolutely no activity in there and the project closed out. So there's two cupboards it could go in right now; reserve for debt or the project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Gail, if it goes into the project and it's in the Capital Budget and we are back here a year from now, and for some reason, things are not going well with DEC, something comes up with the project, if

there are other issues, is it possible at that time to amend the Capital Budget to do something with those monies then?

MS. VIZZINI:

Well, once -- the way this resolution is written, we've locked this money into this project. So the only way to do anything different would be closing this project out and then, by our own laws, it would be applied to pay off debt service.

LEG. STERN:

If a resolution is introduced at some later time to close out the project, that would be the automatic result, that the monies remaining would then be used to pay off existing debt?

MS. VIZZINI:

That's the intent of close-outs.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Or it could meet the fate of an offset. It's possible too, right?

MS. VIZZINI:

Not the way this is constructed. In other words, not only have we moved it into the Capital, but the cash is appropriated specific for this project and this point number. So it's in the bank for this project when we need to spend it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Do we have a motion yet on 2205?

MS. ORTIZ:

No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I will make the motion to table. Do I have a second? All right. Legislator Muratore seconds. I don't think we need any more discussion. Let's vote up or down on tabling. So all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

P.O. LINDSAY:

You wore us down, Ed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. 2205 is **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga).**

IR 2241, Directing the Department of Public Works to hold a public hearing on establishing a transfer fare from Long Island Railroad trains to County buses. (Romaine)

I fear to ask, but, Legislator Romaine, while you are here, do you want to tell us what this bill does?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Very simply, it allows you to use a transfer of fee from Long Island Rail Road to County buses. The purpose is to encourage people to use public transportation; so that there is a discount if you're using train and bus together. It's an incentive to use public transportation and to try to tie our buses to train use on Long Island.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Basically they get a free ride if they get off the train and they get right onto our buses? There's different bus --

LEG. ROMAINE:

They pay the transfer rate. They pay the transfer rate.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The 25 cents?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Yes, that's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, do you know what the impact is financially?

LEG. ROMAINE:

I don't know what the impact is, but I -- it's one of those situations that you don't know until you try that out. That's why all this resolution does is hold a public hearing where we can gather information and put that type of expert testimony on the record. And at the end of the public hearing, there will be a report issued to the Legislature, then we make a decision if the resolution would be forthcoming recommending this. This is only to call for a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What concerns me is you have two different systems; you have Long Island Rail Road and you have Suffolk Transit. And they're basically getting a free ride on our system and paying full fare on the other system.

LEG. ROMAINE:

Well, that's something that at the hearing you could make that suggestion. We could then go and beat up on Long Island Rail Road, and they would pay less of a fare on Long Island Rail Road and the complete fare on our bus system. But the bottom line is I want to have a public hearing to talk about taking two disparate systems and trying to do something that we haven't encouraged people to do which is to use public transportation; to tie our trains into our buses.

This is just to call for a public hearing. Out of that public hearing will come a report. That report will make recommendations to the Legislators. I dare say what you just commented on might be -- we might be better off having both the Long Island Rail Road and Suffolk County Bus take a little bit of a hit to encourage that connection between the two. And then the onus would be on us as well as Long Island Rail Road to bring that about.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I believe the transfer fee is 25 cents and the full fare right now is \$1.50, possibly going up to \$2. So there's a big difference dollar-wise. I know there's been some concern about the timing of our buses and trains and that, you know, one improvement might be better scheduling so that when you got off the train you get right on the bus. But I don't know that --

LEG. ROMAINE:

I certainly would hope that this public hearing would cast light on the fact that our train and bus schedules don't always synchronize well and that there's a need to do that and encourage multiples uses of public transportation so people have a more reliable way to get around other than cars.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me -- Commissioner, did you want to weigh in on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. I think this resolution is premature. We don't really have a plan. I mean, I understand that

they're saying that they're going to just take the transfer fee and use that to it. But before even hearing that, the questions that came to my mind were, you know, what -- if we haven't discussed with the MTA, are they going to take a portion of the hit, or is it all going to come out of the -- you know, the transportation budget? You know, how do the -- how do the drivers of -- you know, barring everybody accepts the fees -- and to be honest with you, who isn't going to want a free ride? I mean, right now we stop every -- stop at or near every train station, you know, in Suffolk County. The schedule may be an issue, but we do provide services to the train stations. I just think --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Do you know how many transfers, Commissioner, there is between the train and buses now?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, I don't.

LEG. ROMAINE:

On a daily, monthly or yearly basis?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's why I would ask to table this so we can talk about this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Romaine, since this is the first time we're seeing this and we don't have an impact, I would actually before I voted on this, I'd like to get an sense what the economic impact to Suffolk Transit is, if you don't mind, that we could table it one cycle.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I would be happy to table this for that purpose. I hate to put another burden on Budget Review, which is straining already under many research projects, but maybe they can do some research on, not only the economic impact, but how many people currently, currently get off the train and get on to a bus, because I have to tell you, that number is a rather small number on a daily basis, and it doesn't grow that much by the month or by the year. And I want to examine that number for the purpose of public policy. And you know what I'm trying to do here. I'm trying to create a sense of urgency.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I see where you are going, but you have to also understand that they're getting off a train that probably had a six, seven or \$8 fare, getting on a bus with a \$1.50 fare. I don't know that the impediment right now is that \$1.50 as much as it is the bus isn't there when they get off. I'm happy to look at that with you.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I'm happy to table this if Budget Review would do some work on this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And maybe a counter proposal might be not to drop down to the 25 cent fare, but maybe offer a small discount, maybe a 25 cent discount.

LEG. ROMAINE:

This doesn't do any of that. All it does is have a public hearing.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right.

LEG. ROMAINE:

That's all it does. It doesn't make that --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm going to move if you don't mind --

LEG. ROMAINE:

Sure. Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- to table.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second to tabling. And further discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga).**

And, Gail, if you can work up some of that information for the next meeting.

MS. VIZZINI:

The best we could do is reach out to Public Works or Planning or the Rail Road to see if there's an existing data. If there isn't, the raw legwork to, you know, do a sample, you know, is -- I'd have to think about it.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I can help. There's no one getting off the train on Saturday or Sunday at any one in the North Fork that would take a bus. We have no trains on Saturday or Sunday.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And we have no buses on Sunday.

MS. VIZZINI:

First person I am going to reach out to is Gil and his transportation people to see what we have that we can extrapolate.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. We will work with Budget.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Moving on to even more interesting subjects, the burning of waste at Bergen Point Sewage Treatment. This would be **IR 2243, Banning the incineration of waste at the Bergen Point Sewage Treatment Plant. (Horsley)**

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I will second. Commissioner, I'll give you an opportunity here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. Thank you. We were going to request that it be tabled. We feel it's redundant. The Department is in the process of preparing bid documents for the sludge program at Bergen Point.

The bid will reflect the decision of the Sludge Management Committee which evaluated 46 alternative processes and recommended that the County pursue a program that provides beneficial reuse of the sludge as a treatment process.

The Committee was created as a result of direction from the County Executive and the Legislature subsequent to public hearings that took place in 2006 for various Bergen Point projects, of which the incinerator reconstruction was included. At that time, community opposition was adamantly opposed to incineration as an option. We would assume that is still is.

Therefore, I would request that the sponsor table this resolution until such time as the new beneficial reuse project is let and the selection process is awarded. While I don't expect any type of on-site incineration to occur as part of the proposal that we will receive, I'd prefer to keep all options open[.]. [.]

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'd like to remove burning waste from the table, but I don't how that would appear in the transcript. Legislator Horsley.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Yes, with all due respect, I will not take it off the table. Let me just first make a basic -- my motion to approve stays. Let us first just talk about the possibility. First of all, going back years passed, there was an incinerator at the plant many years ago. And the reason why it closed down was because DEC closed it down. It was harming the quality of life of the neighborhood. And so many years passed to just several years ago in which the County Executive made the proposal that he was going to privatize one half of the plant and privatize the incineration portion of the plant so that the County can make monies on it.

This body -- this body voted, I believe unanimously, to say that incineration is the wrong public policy. And then -- then we had to decide well, what do we do with the waste right now? We truck it offsite. And we went through a process in which cost us \$510,000 to study what do we do with it. As the Commissioner mentioned, there's 46 possibilities. So there's many alternatives to incineration. And we whittled it down. Now, understanding that members of the Public Works Department were on this selection committee as well and voted on the possibilities. So at that point, we went through all 46. What becomes dead last, dead last of the 46 was the possibility of incineration.

So several weeks ago, what brought this to my point -- and I must -- I've got to tell you that everyone knows here, every person in this room that's dealing with the Legislature knows that I am a proponent of sewers. So this is not act of NIMBYism, this is an act to fight bad public policy.

The Bergen Point Plant is on the Great South Bay. And what we're asking for, the possibility, even if it is a remote possibility, is to say that we are going to burn human waste on the Great South Bay which is within 100 yards of a town park that has a town park that kids play football in, they play -- they've got a concession stand. It is a park that the Town of Babylon has put tons of money in to make it better. You go there on Friday nights now and you'll see hundreds of people at the concession stand. And it's just a wonderful, beautiful place.

Right next to that, to the north, is the Bergen Point Golf Course, which is a County-owned facility. And across the street from that -- the canal, we have a residential community. And we're going to tell those residents that we're going to leave out the possibility, as remote as it may be -- and the Commissioner, with due respect, says that this is redundant, but several week ago, the Commissioner said to me, "Well, you know, there is a consideration of incineration. We'll have a smaller stack, and it might be all right." He's since backed off that comment. And I do appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If I may, that's because I was talking about --

LEG. HORSLEY:

But it came up.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It did come up.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, but we were talking about something completely different. We weren't burning waste, we were talking cogeneration.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Cogeneration, right. So whether it was a misunderstanding or whatever the point is, this is something that the community -- and by the way, we have supported, this body has supported the expansion coming up in the next couple of years of increasing the size of the plant from 30 million gallons per day to 40 million gallons per day. We have approved all sorts improvements to the plant. And so this is not a matter of NIMBYism, this is a matter of public policy. I say we cannot allow in Suffolk County burning human waste on the Great South Bay under any circumstances. I believe it's not healthy. And I know that the Commissioner may question this thought, but the Whereases stand, and I vote to approve this.

LEG. ROMAINE:

I can't cast a vote, but whatever you are for, I'm for. Quick question for the Commissioner. Are we dumping any sludge from Bergen Point at the Brookhaven landfill?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Look, I certainly understand that the people in that area are probably scared to death of even the possibility of the burning of human waste in their neighborhood. So that they can sleep well, and knowing that it's at the very bottom of the list of 46 potential alternatives, I'm with you, Wayne, all right? So I second it. Any other discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga)**. Nobody here is for the burning of human waste?

LEG. ROMAINE:

Light them up.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

IR 2259, Requesting the conveyance of a portion of a parcel of real property, having a Suffolk County Tax Map Identification Number of District 0100 Section 045.000 Block 01.00 Lot 008.000, for a public highway purposes and requesting approval from the Deer Park Fire District, Suffolk County, New York, and from the State of New York, Office of General Services, for conveyance of same, pursuant to New York State Public Lands Law §34. (Co. Exec.).

Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is the first step in -- essentially, we're looking to build sidewalk along the west side -- I'm sorry, the east side of Commack Road in the vicinity of the fire department. There is no room on the side of the road to build sidewalk. We've reached an agreement with the fire department to convey enough land so that we can land build a sidewalk. And this is the first step.

LEG. STERN:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is the one -- the sidewalk we recently saw build -- we're taking this money out of the capital project for the road in that area, is that right? This wasn't a separate bond?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Say the question again, I apologize.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The money for the sidewalk -- I know this bill is not for the money for the sidewalk, but the money is coming out of the -- there was a capital project for the road in that area; is that right? It's not coming out of the sidewalk money that we had approved.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes, it's coming out of the road money.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. There was a motion by Legislator Stern, do I have a second? Second by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga).**

IR 2260, Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 7 Twelve Pines, and Intercounty Associates II, LLC (BR-1445). (Co. Exec.)

Commissioner, any more information?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is an agreement to allow Twelve Pines to provide 1700 gallons per day of capacity to the Intercounty Associates. It's been approved by the Sewer Agency, and we recommend it be approved.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there a motion?

LEG. STERN:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor?

Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga).**

IR 2270, Directing the Department Of Public Works to study improvements to deter wrong way driving. (Cilmi)

There is a motion to approve by Legislator Muratore. Do we have a second for the purposes of discussion? All right, I'll second for the purpose of discussion.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'd like to hear what the Commissioner has to say.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Commissioner Anderson, do you have an opinion here?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If I may give my opinion. We understand and are acutely aware of the concerns that were raised in this legislation. However, the verbiage leads one to belief that these wrong-way accidents occurred on County highways and are strictly due to the drivers using the exit ramps incorrectly. Many of the accidents reported in the local press took place on State highways. This issue hit press on November 15th of last year. And of the 18 incidents that have been reported, 12 occurred on arterial highways, non-limited access highways, such as Montauk Highway. Of those remaining, four occurred on limited-access highways, and out of these, only one accessed the wrong direction from an existing interchange.

In most cases, these occurrences happened when drivers had simply crossed over into oncoming traffic to potentially deadly results. This is the case of the two incidents that occurred on County roads recently; Montauk Highway and County Road 105. We're acutely aware of these matters and monitor them closely. We have very few interchanges on County roads, and most interchanges are actually controlled by New York State DOT as they go over State roads.

We take the protection of our traveling public as one of our highest responsibilities and when needed, create or rehabilitate our roads in the most beneficial manner to meet the current industry standards. As New York State Department of Transportation is currently studying this issue, I feel our time could be more efficiently spent elsewhere, and we do not need to recommend approval of this resolution.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can I ask, because there was obviously a lot of publicity. And I realize that -- I think in most cases there were drunk drivers involved, right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And, you know, drunk drivers often go down one-way streets in the wrong direction or run stoplights or stop signs. But can you just give me some information in terms of what your department did kind of in the wake of this spate of wrong-way driving. Did you look at some of these onramps or interchanges? Is there anything more we can do with signage or reflective lighting?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Most of the interchanges that are within Suffolk County are controlled by DOT. To their credit, they do above and beyond what's required as far as signage. Most of the signage you see where it says "One Way," you know, "Do Not Enter," that's only recommended by the Manually Uniformed Traffic Control Devices. They do that as part of -- that's their stand procedure.

We've had internal discussions ourselves as to what could be done. We've discussed it with the State DOT officials as well. Like I said, they're doing a report right now. There is not a lot that can be done. It's really an unfortunate issue. Unfortunately, as you mentioned, in most cases, it's intoxicated drivers that are traveling down the wrong entryway or they're crossing over undivided highways, you know, single lanes and into oncoming traffic.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It just seems with technology being as it is, there ought to be a way to trip some kind of flashing light if a car is moving in the wrong direction down an exit ramp or something like that that would provide one more level of a warning.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

What happens then is if you have that happen, somebody has to be able to verify it. And, you know, certainly the call could be made to the police, but, you know --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's probably too late.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Something just to alert that driver that you're entering a one-way ramp in the wrong direction heading into high-speed oncoming traffic.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's the signage that's --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Because you had said before that there's nothing you could do. It's hard for me to believe that there's nothing that we can do. Maybe we have done enough. That's kind of why I'm curious as to what you guys have determined based on and to what extent you've investigated it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'll bring Bill up. He may be shed a little bit more on this, but for the most part, we have talked about it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are there are things being done in other areas? You know, I'm not saying the County is at fault in any way here, but we have had a series of these things. Is there something more that can be done to prevent these kind of head-on collision situations?

MR. HILLMAN:

It's a difficult issue without a doubt. I would not want to say there's nothing else that can be done, but we have to start with the facts, and I think you highlighted them in the beginning of your comments.

The majority of these people are intoxicated. I'm going to take two different scenarios; an exit ramp where someone uses it as an entrance ramp and they would be heading in the wrong direction. You have large "Do Not Enter" signs, there's "One Way" signs. And they're typically on both sides of the entrance ramp and large. If someone is intoxicated and misses those, a flashing light, in my estimation, they will miss that also and they'll continue down the road.

So as an engineer, it's difficult for us to engineer things for people who shouldn't be on the road and

are intoxicated. I mean, you know, Legislator Muratore was a Police Officer for many years. I'm sure he can attest to, you know, they get tunnel vision and they don't see a lot of these things. So it's difficult to try and engineer something that would do anything like that.

The second scenario I'd like to address, the Commissioner has already eluded to. The majority of these accidents are simply someone is traveling on Montauk Highway and crossed over the double yellow and is heading in now the oncoming lane. Again, as an engineer, even though technology is definitely advancing, it's -- other than putting up a jersey barrier, guide rail, those types of things, it's almost nearly impossible to stop someone from doing that. The best approach is to have a campaign to stop people from driving while intoxicated. I think to expect engineers to solve that problem, is just beyond what we can do.

I'm not saying that I think the State DOT -- again, the Commissioner has said, the majority of the interchanges are under their control. They are doing a study. I would look to their study for guidance for County roads. And if we can implement any of the things that they suggest -- but all in all, it's a very difficult issue and hard to improve upon.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are we somehow different in our design than other areas? Are there other areas that have done -- is there a successful Stop Wrong Way Driving Program somewhere that we know about? Another state?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You know, it's an unfortunate circumstance that we had the number of head-on's that we did. You know, certainly it can't be attributed to really anything other than the drunk drivers. You know, I know that wherever feasible, you know, barriers are put to protect one lane of traffic from the other lane of traffic, but short of putting devices in everybody's car, there's limited we could do with, you know, drunken drivers.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me ask you, the resolution, Gil, is -- let me just read the Resolved, because it sounds like a lot of this you may have already done. So you're authorized and directed to conduct a traffic and engineering study on County roads and the entrance and exit ramps thereto and determine which improvements can be made to reduce the incidents of wrong-way driving. So you kind of have done that informally already, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. We do it on a relatively daily basis. I mean we monitor our roads.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You'll seek input from local officials including but not limited to town, village, State Public Works Departments and local law enforcement. You have kind of done that as well?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. We do that on an ongoing basis.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And that you'll issue a written report containing a description of the options available, their corresponding costs and the department's recommendations. That you haven't done. Tell me the harm in passing this resolution.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, besides -- with all due respect, besides having other things to do, you know, certainly we could do this. I would state that we would want to wait for the State's report to come out to get the

benefit of, you know, whatever -- if they come up with any determinations. Beyond that, no, it's just we have a lot of other things to do.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

More work for what you've already looked at. Look, I don't want to burden you either, I know how busy you guys are. Legislator Stern, then Legislator Lindsay.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. There's a New York State effort -- I believe there was legislation introduced at the State level. Do I remember something about Senator Marcellino leading some type of effort at the State level to do this very analysis? Does anyone recall if there was any kind of a time period placed on that effort? Do we know is the State under a particular time requirement to do their analysis and report back to the State Legislature because when we say, you know, let's utilize the State's analysis, that could very well be, but we don't know if that's going to be soon or much, much later?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't know, but in speaking with the regional traffic engineer, he did say that they were working on it currently and he's pulled some of his staff -- - you know, a number of his staff is actually working on completing this.

LEG. STERN:

So they are currently working on something as we speak?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. STERN:

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

When would that be done, because this bill gives us, not six months -- 180 days, five months whatever that is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Effectively six months. Theoretically, we should --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It gives you a fair amount of time. A lot of the work you have already done. It's just basically putting a report together. And you probably would have, at that point, the benefit of the State report to work on within that 180 day period to work from.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. But then, you know, the justifications -- you know, putting together a report, I mean, it's not just, you know, a two-page high school report. We want to do it professionally. You know, that's going to take some time, get all the background documentation, you know, the traffic reports, the traffic, you know, counts, everything else. It's going to take some time.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Unfortunately, with a bill like this, if you don't approve it, it makes it look like we are not serious about the issue. So we're put it that dilemma of, you know, a Legislator saying, "You guys should file a report." We did have a whole series of accidents, though most of it were not on County roads.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

From our side, if I may, it implies that we are not doing our job. And, you know, I would argue

strongly that we are. And we do monitor every road on a daily basis, and we do look at these situations.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Lindsay.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The resolution seems to be directed to limited-access highways. Aren't the vast majority of the County roads, you know, a normal two-lane highway or maybe a four-lane highway without any barriers or anything like that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

P.O. LINDSAY:

And on that type of road, again, without us spending tens of millions of dollars to put guardrail on every two-lane road in Suffolk County, how do you prevent someone from crossing over the yellow line?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You really can't.

P.O. LINDSAY:

You can't.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Bill just pointed out a very good point to is if we did go that route and started putting up barriers, you know, most of these roads are local two-lane roads. The businesses, you know, on the opposite side are going to be impacted as people aren't going to be able to jump over --

P.O. LINDSAY:

No. You would have to go to a total redesign like, you know, Legislator Romaine was talking about County Road 58. God, I don't mean to get him started again, but, you know, your turning lane in the middle would be useless if you have a guardrail down the middle of it. I mean, I read with interest in the paper a preliminary from the State with the 10 hot spots of where they think there could be some remediation or some confusion. I know of one in particular, Connetquot Avenue getting on to Sunrise Highway, you could easily get in the westbound -- you can get on the wrong ramp there very easily. You could get on the exit ramp, because the exit ramp and the entrance ramp, they're side by side. But, again, I don't know what we would -- you know, we have to do with that. That's really a State responsibility, you know?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I'm going to make a motion to table. I really don't see the -- where we're involved. I would like see what the State has to do before we enter down this path.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Commissioner, all right, since this, I guess, is limited to those one-way areas, can you maybe by the next meeting just give me a list of which roads that this would actually apply to, because it sounds like there might only be one or two. Bill, maybe you know that now.

MR. HILLMAN:

I don't.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. We can get you that information.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Limited interchange.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

They're very few.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is that the language in the bill?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Legislator, what Resolved is that?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm not actually seeing limited access highways in here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. That was a term that I brought up my discussion, that, you know, we do have limited access.

LEG. HORSLEY:

You need a second, Jay?

MR. ORTIZ:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, based on what the State --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So this bill is basically broad in terms of looking at all County roads.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

MR. HILLMAN:

Four hundred fifty miles.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Four hundred and fifty miles. So at the least, if you are going to do this, I think you should be limiting the scope of the work to those types of roads where these incidents have occurred.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If I may, I think, as the Presiding Officer stated, it may be worth -- I would certainly go along with it, let's see what the State comes up with before, you know, we push anything out ourselves. I mean, let's -- they may come back and say that there's nothing else that can be done.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We made had a motion to table by the Presiding Officer, is there a second? Second by Legislator Horsley. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

On the motion, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with the Presiding Officer. There's a study that's already underway. This is a critically important issue, and it's important not just for a State road, a County road, a local road or federal highways. It's a tremendous issue. And I don't even know if it's prudent to proceed in a piecemeal way. And what might work on County roads, maybe that works for State roads and vice versa, perhaps not, but DOT has already undertaken this separate. And so I will support the tabling motion to see what they come up with. I'm sure that if DOT does not come forward with an analysis that we can all take a look and go from there, we'll revisit the issue as it is critically important to all of us who use the roadways. But maybe let's see what DOT comes up with.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, if I may. We do monitor these conditions. If there was a specific road that was having, you know, an abnormal high number of head-on accidents, certainly that would indicate that you want to put the barriers in. But just to put the barriers in, you know, it would be an exorbitant cost on every County road. It would be huge and then you have impacts on either side. So I would hesitate until you see the State report.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Public safety is the first --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- you know, obviously the most important thing even if there's additional costs --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- associated with increasing public safety. Maybe perhaps, you know, if this is tabled that you could reach out to the sponsor and work on limiting the scope of this so you are not -- you know, so it's not overburdening the department studying roads that either this is not -- has never been a problem in the past and it's not likely to be a problem in the future so you can limit your review to just those roads similar to the types of roads where these accidents have been occurring mostly at the State level. All right. So we have a motion and a second to table. Any other discussion? There was a motion to approve and a second to approve, and there's a motion and a second to table. The tabling would come first. Voting on the tabling, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. MURATORE:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. There's one opposition to table, Legislator Muratore. The tabling is **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-1-0-1; Opposed, Legis. Muratore; Not present - Legis. Barraga)**.

IR 2275, Renaming Main Street in Yaphank in Honor of Herbert W. Davis. (Browning)

I don't believe this has been through the Naming Committee yet.

LEG. STERN:

I'll make a motion to table as it has not been through the Sitings Committee. It is on our agenda

for the next upcoming meeting.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. There's a motion to table. It must be tabled. I'll second the tabling motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? IR 2275 is **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga)**.

IR 1000, Authorizing the County Executive to enter into an agreement with Heritage-Riverhead Retail Developers, LLC and accepting a payment of money in lieu of performance of certain mitigation measures, constructed under Capital Project 5529, Old Country Road, Riverhead, and amending the 2011 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the reconstruction of CR 58, Old Country Road, Riverhead (CP 5529). (Romaine)

We debated this at length earlier.

MR. ZWIRN:

Mr. Chairman, if I just might after you are done.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let me get a motion and a second on the table. There's a motion to approve by Legislator Muratore, I will second that motion. Mr. Zwirn.

MR. ZWIRN:

The only thing that I would like point out is that the fiscal impact of this, by not reducing the debt on that original bond of \$13 million by two million dollars in the impact fees, over the cost -- -- over the life of the bond, it's going to cost the taxpayers an additional million dollars in debt service on this in the General Fund. And it's something that I think should be considered, because when the fiscal impacts were done, this wasn't -- they weren't compared, one resolution versus the other. But Gail was kind enough to do some quick numbers, and I think that's correct, right, there was -- over the 20 years?

MS. VIZZINI:

What did you say?

MR. ZWIRN:

A million dollars.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We're not talking 20 years, we're talking approximately four years to complete the larger project.

MR. ZWIRN:

I'm talking about the project that was completed and these impact fees would have been used to reduce it. That debt service is paid out of the General Fund. And over the life of that, by not using that money to reduce that debt -- that debt, will costs the taxpayers a million dollars over the life of the bond. Instead of being a \$13 million debt, it would have been reduced by two million dollars to be eleven. And that two million dollar difference over the life of the bond is a million dollars.

MR. ROMAINE:

If I may.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Gail, on that -- if we made the two million dollars available -- well, no, because it would be used --

MS. VIZZINI:

What Ben is talking about is, you know, we -- you know, the debt service is half as much again as what you're bonding. So you would reduce the debt service by the 1.9 million. If we bonded that, that would be about a million dollars, which is about \$50,000 a year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If we're not talking about adding the extra lane that we discussed earlier, just the project as DPW has contemplated it, if you use this money to finish it rather than the bonded money, you will have money left over, right? Because they're both -- taking saying it's roughly 1.9 million or something like that to finish this project? I can't remember the number.

MS. VIZZINI:

I don't know that we have estimates in terms of completion of the project. I defer to Gil.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We do. I've seen them, because DPW printed something.

MS. VIZZINI:

The costs are offset by whatever the traffic benefit is to incurring those costs.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The cost to us to complete our project that we have currently underway would be 1.67 million --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

One point six-seven.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

-- for that work beyond Ostrander.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So if you did it without using the bonded money, then we'd have money left over that we could use -- we could then lower the debt payments that way as well, would we not? So let's say we use the cash from these impact fees instead of the borrowed money just to do the project that you guys have contemplated -- does this make any sense?

P.O. LINDSAY:

No. No, it doesn't make any sense. Whether you pay debt --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The financial impact that is being tossed around is incorrect. It's not a million dollars.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But if you do what Legislator Romaine wants to do or whether you bond the whole new project, you're still bonding the same amount of money. It might be a lapse of a year or two.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Apples to oranges. What Mr. Zwirn is basically saying is if you just do the project -- this is I think what you are saying -- that DPW envisions -- the way Ed did it, wants it done, which is to take the impact fees and do that project or the way DPW wants it done which is to just take it out of the bond, you are saying it's going to cost a million dollars more to do it this way.

P.O. LINDSAY:

But you missed what my point is. If you do what Legislator Romaine wants to do; take this money and apply it towards that additional lane that he wants, that's that much less money we would have

to bond to do that project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Agreed.

P.O. LINDSAY:

So either way, you are reducing the amount of money that you are bonding.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If you are doing the larger project. I think you're saving doing it Ed's way, because you're not --

P.O. LINDSAY:

If you are not going to do the larger project, that money is going to go to pay down debt anyway.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Gail, are you following this, because a statement was made that this is --

MS. VIZZINI:

Yeah. And that's why we didn't address it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

-- a million dollars more expensive, and I don't think that's the case.

MS. VIZZINI:

Depending on how many variables you look at, it becomes a wash. If you want to stop now, you have 1.9 million to pay down debt you have already incurred. But if the objective is to complete the larger envisioned traffic safety improvements, then you have cash instead of the necessity to bond.

MR. ROMAINE:

Right. Either way, it's --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So it's not fiscally irresponsible.

MR. ROMAINE:

No. It's perfectly fiscally sound.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's the point.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Just chiming in, Ed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Help. We had a motion to approve and a second, correct?

MR. NOLAN:

Yep.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any other debate? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-1 - Not Present - Legis. Barraga).**

Congratulations, Ed, you can go home now. Okay. We are adjourned.

P.O. LINDSAY:

Wait. Before we adjourn.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We are not adjourned.

P.O. LINDSAY:

I just want to find out if Legislator Romaine intends to come to this committee meeting all the time. Because if he does --

MR. ROMAINE:

No. I'm just here to fight for my district, that's all.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Now we are adjourned.

(* THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:45 P.M. *)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY