

**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 March 15, 2011.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

George Nolan- Counsel to the Legislature  
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - DPW  
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer - DPW  
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office  
Catherine Stark - Aide to Chairman Schneiderman  
Paul Perillie - Aide to Majority Aide  
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk - SC Legislature  
Eric Kopp - County Executive's Office  
Dot Kerrigan - AME  
Lance Reinheimer - Interim Director of the Vanderbilt Museum  
Ernie Fazio - Maglev  
Dan Williamson - In-Pipe Technologies  
William V. DeCandido - In-Pipe Technologies  
All Other Interested Parties

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

(\*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 1:11 P.M.\*)

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Good afternoon. I'd like to call the meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee to order this 15th day of March, 2011. All rise and join for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Muratore.

**SALUTATION**

Please remain standing for a moment. I often don't begin these meetings with moments of silence, but I think one is certainly in order now as we often talk at these committees about infrastructure and seeing the devastation in Japan between the earthquake and the tsunami and now the threat or nuclear meltdown. We are already hearing the amounts of people who have perished, they're predicting over 10,000 and growing. If we could take a moment of silence for all those who perished as well as send our thoughts and prayers to the survivors.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE**

Thank you. I have one speaker card. If someone here other than our presenters and wish to be heard by the committee, you do need to fill out a yellow card which you can obtain from the table where the representative from the Clerk's Office is. The only card I have at this point is Lance Reinheimer speaking on IR 1238. Lance, you have three minutes to make your presentation.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Thank you very much. I'm the interim Director of the Vanderbilt Museum. I'm here to speak on two resolutions; IR 1201 and IR 1238. IR transfers two vehicles to the museum from the County, transferring one maintenance van, full-sized maintenance van and one minivan. Maintenance van would provide covered transportation for our maintenance men to ferry materials, go to the store, without having them exposed to weather. They have no van, they have a dump truck which exposes materials to the weather. So this will provide an enhancement to their job to do maintenance around the museum.

The second vehicle, a minivan, is going to be used for visitor transportation. The museum currently have three trams that are exposed to the weather. One of them was really crushed in the building collapse, so we have two running trams, but they expose people to the weather, they're really not friendly for people that have limited mobility, senior citizens. We're going to use the minivan which holds about the same number of people as the tram, seven people, to do visitor transportation on the property. Both of those are surplus vehicles.

The second resolution, IR 1238, transfers one surplus County printer to the museum. Museum's computer equipment is old, and we are working with printers that are breaking down and are actually home versions or printers rather than commercial. So this will help us with our productivity in the office. Thank you very much. Any questions, I'm here for questions.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you. We have two presentations this afternoon. One was rescheduled from the last meeting. We had to move it because we believed at that point we were having a Special Meeting on that date on Foley, and then that got moved. So that's why we have two today. I have asked our first presenter, Mr. Fazio, to limit his main portion of his presentation to 20 minutes. And then In-Pipe Technologies also needs I think 12 minutes for their presentation. There maybe obviously from the committee as well, so. Our first presenter, Ernie Fazio. Mr. Fazio, if you will step forward.

I think some of the committee is probably familiar with high-speed rail, Maglev, and other infrastructure types of improvements, the speed rail. So it's certainly that would benefit, in my mind, the County to get people around faster. Mr. Fazio, I know you are an expert in this area. I'll turn it over to you.

**MR. FAZIO:**

It's amazing how fast you become an expert, because you become an expert once you know a few more things than everybody else. But I have been working on this for a number of years, so I guess I am. I want to thank you for this opportunity to be here. I also want to compliment you on the opening. I thought it was appropriate. And most of us might not have thought of it, but it was very good, and I thank you.

A few years ago, I got involved with the people who I know invented the Maglev Train, that would be Doctors Gordon Danby and Powell. And what they did was they created a system back in the '60's that was patented back then. And the Germans and the Japanese came here and they kind of made camp on Long Island, and they interviewed them for days. It was a couple of months they were here. The Germans went back and built the system that was finally built in China, and it was very, very expensive. The Chinese tell us it was -- I was in China two years ago. They told us that it was \$60 million per two way mile. My guess is that it was actually more.

The Japanese built a system that was somewhat different. More like the one of the second generation that Powell and Danby later created. And that was very expensive too because of the way they designed it. So Danby and Powell saw how important it was to make this thing less expensive. And what they did was -- when the Germans built this system, they built everything in the field. And there's only about three-eighths of an inch to half an inch clearance on the rail for the magnetic field that's on the train. And as a result, you have to build a pool table that's 100 miles long to make it work. And that takes really -- you know, some really good on-site engineering and work.

So they realized that the answer to this was superconductivity, because superconductivity would allow them to have a higher lift. They have about a six inch lift on the new system. And the six inch lift gives them the opportunity to operate in all kinds of weather. In fact, some of you may have read my editorial that I put in, the OpEd page I put in Long Island Business News. I'd like to go to the screen -- and I hope you can hear me. Do I have a microphone over there.

So what I'm going to do is I'm going to show you -- I'm being very -- okay. We were going to do some really fancy stuff, but your system doesn't support the videos, so we're going to have to do what we can. One of things that we can do that no one else can do, not a high-speed rail -- by the way, conventional high-speed rail uses tracks and wheels just like they did in 1860. We do not use anything that has wheels on it. It's levitated off the track.

One of the things that the Germans and Japanese were not able to do is to create a system that could lift heavy loads. What that means is we can now have heavy truck traffic. I want to show the trucks being loaded on there. On this screen here where I'm showing here, we can actually lift two 50-ton trucks on one vehicle and move it in an aerodynamic envelope at 300 miles an hour. That means we can ferry trucks across the nation, let's say from Newark to California, in one day as opposed to four and a half days.

Now, each of these trucks use \$3000 worth of fuel -- that was last year -- and tolls. We don't know what it is this year. We can do this for \$1100 worth of electricity at ten cents a kilowatt. Now, ten cents a kilowatt is low here, but around the country, industrial electricity is around five or six cents. So we thought ten cents was a favorable reasonable price. And what that means is that you're not going to have any pollution and you are going to be able to move high-valued freight, which cannot

move across the country in convention freight, because -- freight rail, because that takes about 28 days. And we can move, for example, produce and things that are perishable and hospital supplies and medicines and everything else that would otherwise have to be taken in by plane or some other -- or even truck, which is, you know, quicker than rail freight.

As a passenger line, there is a break-even point, but it's way out there, it's about 30 years. The break-even point for moving freight is about five years. Now, the idea here is that we can subsidize the passenger rails by use of having freight run on the same rails. And we do electronic switching, which is not possible by any of the systems that have been created so far. The Germans and the Japanese have switching systems that are mechanical; in other words, they have to move the entire track. We can move from one track to another by electronic means. Nothing is moving. There's nothing to get iced up.

One of things that you'll notice when you're on the Long Island Rail Road is sometimes in the wintertime, if you're going through the switch yards over in Jamaica, is you will see flames coming out of the tracks flames. And those flames are propane and natural gas. And they're there to keep the ice from out of the switches. We don't have any of these problems. In fact, we can run on about two inches of ice here, because ice and snow is both magnetically transparent. So we don't have any problems. So this is why we can operate in all kinds of weather.

The first -- this is really the first mode of transportation since the airplane. It was invented in 1966 by Powell and Danby. And the US has failed to develop it. Senator Moynihan appropriated \$750 million in 1990 to get this thing going, and it was killed in the House of Representatives by the representatives that were listening to the air transport people and also the automotive people. The truckers and the automobiles companies and the airlines, they coalesced and they made sure that this thing never saw the light of day.

And I was on the one in China. And we were doing 274 miles an hour. And at 274 miles an hour, it was quiet. It was as quiet as it would be in a luxury automobile. And it was smooth. There's no noise, there's no -- you know, variation in the way the thing carries itself; there's no rocking or shaking. It's like a bullet. And the Japanese design is based more on the Danby-Powell invention of today in as much as that it has high lift.

But the problem with the one the Japanese built is that it's built in a trough. We don't use a trough, we use an eye beam -- a box beam. And we can also adapt it to run on conventional rails. I might be able to show you that.

This would be an enormous infrastructure thing, and we could build this here on Long Island. I have no, you know -- nothing tells me that we could build the road beds here on Long Island, because those things can be built in factories. Unlike the ones that were built in China or Japan that had to be built on the spot, these things can be built in factories, and we could build out the system. But most of the stuff we could build right here, because all the of the electronics and the peripherals, like the door openers and the air conditioners and all of the things that need support systems can all be built here, much of it right here on Long Island, but certainly New York State. I think we ought to think in terms of that.

You know, 150 years ago, we built the railroads across this country. By the way, we used Chinese workers. Today, they'll be building the trains it looks like if we don't get ourselves together. And, you know, we will be the guys laying the tracks, and they'll be building the really high end stuff. We can't let that happen. We have the technology, and it happens to be better than what they have.

The nice thing about it is it doesn't use oil. It's electrically powered. We get many ways of providing

electrical energy, including, you know, solar and wind and other things. So we don't -- we don't need to use any oil on this. Zero pollution, zero greenhouse gases. Now, that's a little bit misleading, because no matter how you produce electricity, you're going to probably produce some kind of pollution, but there is no on-site pollution. And whereas, when you have trucks going on the road, you do have, you know, right there, the pollution.

Now, this system is much cheaper than the Japanese or Chinese Maglev and any steel-wheeled HSR trains. You know, one of the things that I've been very critical of this administration in Washington is that they seem bent on building a system that is not going to work very well. We can't have a system that's going to need subsidies forever.

Now, what makes us unique is that we can actually make a profit. And particularly in the area of freight, we can make a profit in five years. These systems that are not compatible -- and, you know, we have the Chinese -- we have Germans, we have the Italians, we have the French, we have the Spanish all have a high-speed rail system, and they're all trying to sell it to us. And if that's built anywhere else or it's used in those technologies, they are not necessarily going to be compatible. Moreover, they're using catenaries to feed them. Catenaries are those lines above the -- power lines above the rail. They're vulnerable to weather, they wear out, and they're costly. It costs about \$40 million a mile to build a European-style high-speed rail. We can do this for about \$25 million a mile. Now, to put that in perspective, if I was going to build the Long Island Rail Road, it would cost me between 18 and \$20 million, and you wouldn't have the efficiencies of operation that you would have under this.

Now, I can take the skinniest guy in this room and put him next to a Maglev that's elevated and let him push down the track by himself, because there's no rail resistance, and that's why it's so efficient. Once the permanent -- the superconducting magnets are energized, this thing sits above the rails. I had a wonderful, you know, piece that showed that. But this is configuration on the -- what you do call it -- the passenger compartment, and this is the configuration on having the truck ferry. It has tremendous -- as I said, tremendous lift capacity, and it has high-speed electronic switching. By the way, the switching can be done at 300 miles an hour. We don't even have to slow down for the switching. And it's compatible with the existing rail. It's low cost to fabricate the narrow beam guide rate.

We can have -- we had one being built that was 72 feet long, they made one for us over in New Jersey and brought it down to Florida when we were down there. And that beam cost \$40,000. The manufacturer says I could do that for less than half if I was building all day long. All the electronic -- you know, all the coils and everything that we need, the loops, are all built in there. And when they put them together, it's like putting together an erector set, you just plug them in together. So it's lost cost fabrication in the field.

Now, here's an illustration of how it would work on a conventional rail. If this was the Long Island Rail Road over here, the magnets would be operating off the base here rather than off the sides of the box beam over here. And we have a top speed of about 160 miles an hour on this mode, and we have a top speed of about 300 under this mode. But the beauty of this is that we can pull into, say, Grand Central Station or Penn Station using the convention rails. Because the convention rails would be in between here. And they could be -- we could ultimately run conventional trains.

Now, you know, if we did anything like the German's Maglev or the Japanese Maglev, we couldn't do that. We'd have to do a very disruptive rebuilding of the terminals. That would never happen, it's not workable. You'd have to build entirely new terms. With this system, we could use the terminals that we have. And if you were going to build a new terminal in New York, I'd like to know where you're going to put it.

This shows the same idea with the track showing the tracks in between. And by the way, if you don't run this thing at top speed, it doesn't matter. It works very well at low speed. In fact, it would be a very good thing for subway systems, because a subway system has to stop every eight blocks, and what they are doing is they're building up a certain amount of kinetic energy in the car itself. And when you step on the brakes, you make that thing stop, you're burning up your brake pads and steel. And when you go into the subway and see those smudges on the wall, that's what that is, it's the brake dust from the steel and from the brake pads. Not very good to breathe, but it also takes a lot of energy. It ruins a lot of energy. You build up all this energy, and then you throw it away. When we stop this, we don't use mechanical -- we don't use mechanical means, we use electronic counter flow so that you're really pumping the electricity right back into the tracks. How much you put back in the track is very substantial, it's about 90% as opposed to a Prius where they have about 35%.

Where are we going to put this? We can put most of it on real estate that is already owned by railroads, either by Amtrak or by private. One of the things about the Eisenhower Interstate Highway or what they then at the time called the Interstate Defense Highway was that trains were supposed to be part of that. And we have a design, which I'm not able to show you now, that shows that we build the dedicated rails on the outside of the highway. And the reason why it's on the outside of the highway and not the inside of the highway is because the one in China, when we passed another train at 274 miles an hour, we were only 15 feet apart, and you could feel the puff. And we would avoid that. We could actually run it at high speeds, because there would be no interference from the others.

We can't afford to subsidize the high-speed rail. We need to have something that is going to pay for itself. Now, one of the things we're looking for is \$600 million for the test track from the government, from -- they are putting \$8.4 billion into high-speed rail, and none of these things are ever going to be self-sustained. We know that if we can show this on a test track -- and that test track we are looking at is from Grand Central Station to Stewart Airport. If we can get to Stewart Airport -- I met with the managers of Stewart Airport, and I said, "Where do you get -- what is your catch basin," which is where they get all of their people, and they showed me a radius that did not include New York City. I said, "It doesn't include the City," and they said, "No, it's a little too far." I said, "What if I can get you people from New York City to here in less time than they can get LaGuardia?" And they said, "That would put us on the map."

So here's the proposition to you. I went to Steve Levy, the County Executive, and I asked him for his support. We need partners. We need partners, not because we need, because the money is going to be coming from the grants from Washington. The real money to build out this system is going to be coming from private investors. And the people who make the grants told us we need municipal partners, we need other railroads, we need all kinds of partners, and those partners have to state that they want that sort of a system built in its -- for the demonstration purposes, and that's why I'm here today.

I'd like to answer any questions. Let me see if there's anything I should have covered. Oh, I just wanted to show you one more thing. This is the Japanese design. It's a trough. It's very good. It's an extremely good system. It fills up with snow, and that makes it not workable for this region. Our system does not. Snow would blow off of something like this. Even in a heavy snowstorm, it won't stay on that track. This might be a little bit more problematic, but it's not as bad as this where it just catches in there. And this design can't work at all in foul weather. It's pretty much done.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Sir, do you see the future for this technology on Long Island along the Long Island Rail Road or along, let's say, the Long Island Expressway?

**MR. FAZIO:**

Ideally, it would be along the Long Island Expressway. But I want you to know that I think it's a perfectly workable solution to higher speed to New York City. Here's one of the things that people don't realize; a train -- a Long Island Rail Road goes from zero to 60 in about 34 seconds. We can do that in 11 seconds. That's as fast as your car. And that means that we can get up to higher speeds faster. So let's take that straight line to, say, 85 miles an hour.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So then would a system, let's say it was on the Long Island Rail Road, from Manhattan to, let's say, as far as Riverhead, how long would a trip like that take on that system?

**MR. FAZIO:**

Well, we would not achieve -- first of all, we don't have the top speeds of 300 miles an hour. At best, it's about 160 miles an hour, but that's pretty damn fast. That's moving. And we can make a lot of stops in between because we are throwing away energy all the time.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

My next question is about stops. But in terms of time wise, currently the train would take a couple of hours to go that distance.

**MR. FAZIO:**

Yeah, we'd do that in 45 minutes, with all the stops. We decelerate at the same rate as we accelerate.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Because I would have imagined there would be very few stops to do that, but you're saying that you could have more stops.

**MR. FAZIO:**

We could have subway stops.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay.

**MR. FAZIO:**

I mean, that would not -- the system would be enhanced in any case.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Have you met with -- has your company met with the Long Island Rail Road?

**MR. FAZIO:**

Yes, we have. Here's the problem with the Long Island Rail Road; this is all very political, you know. What happened was they were our partners, and then they withdrew. And then it turns out that somebody in the MTA has a relationship with Siemens who wants build their system. So they will never admit to that, but I don't care what I say, because I know I'm telling the truth. But they backed out. And they said, "You know, we have reasons." You know, it was a lot -- but I found out through my own sources that they have somebody on the board there that has a relationship with Siemens.

That's the problem. This thing is so political. We need to, you know, assert ourselves and show

that we have the will to say, "yes, we want this done." And I think we are suffering from so much -- by the way, the oil costs us a trillion dollars a year of unpatriated money that goes out of this country. If we can reduce that by any amount, and we would be able to reduce it considerable, because trucks use a lot of fuel, we would be -- we would very much better off.

But beyond the wonderful things that it does, it's jobs. It's not a 100,000 jobs, it's millions of jobs. And it's not jobs for Long Island alone, it's jobs for Minnesota, it's jobs for Alabama, it's jobs for California, it's jobs all over the place. But we could be the leaders because we have the technology here, and we'd be probably building most of the electronics at the high end.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Have you talked with the State about the Long Island Expressway? Are there conversations in that regard?

**MR. FAZIO:**

No, but in the Eisenhower Legislation, high-speed rail was part of the system -- not high-speed rail, they just said rail.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

In terms of the Legislature, because there's no bill before us that relates to high-speed rail, you are looking for, what, some kind of letter in support of promoting high speed Maglev or high speed -- I'm not clear.

**MR. FAZIO:**

It's a little unclear --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Certainly it's been very educational, and I suspect my colleagues may have questions.

**MR. FAZIO:**

Mr. Chairman, I think it's unclear to me exactly how you can be useful. But here's how I think you can be useful -- here's how I think you can be useful. Mr. Levy has said he would write a letter on our behalf to the administration. He hasn't done it yet, but he's given me a promise. If you send him a letter and say, "We've listened to this. We think there's potential, and we would like to be part of it, and we'd like to support you on this," I think that would be useful to us.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any questions from committee members? Yeah, Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

You indicated you had some dialog with the Long Island Rail Road. And maybe you can expand upon as to why they had pulled out in terms of any sort of an agreement, because as I take a look at this as a layman, you know, I'm not so sure how applicable or superior this system would be over what we currently have with the Long Island Rail Road. I mean, you take, say, the Babylon line and go from Seaford, Massapequa, Massapequa Park, Amityville, Copiague, Lindenhurst, Babylon, what does high speed do with that kind of system in place where you would get up to 55 or 60 miles an hour and have to decrease your speed because these stations are only a couple of miles apart? I mean, I can see the exception where you have, you know, Babylon to Penn Station, straight run, but most of these trains are local trains, and the hamlets are only a couple of miles apart.

**MR. FAZIO:**

Well, let me address that. First of all, even if you made every stop that you're making now and you can go from zero to 60 in 11 seconds instead of 34 seconds, you're going to decrease the time, even if you don't increase the top speed at all.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I understand that. But is it worth the hundreds of millions of dollars that this system would cost over what we have just to save a little time?

**MR. FAZIO:**

I think that this would be a situation where the hundreds of millions of dollars would not be there. First of all, to convert Long Island Rail Road is only \$4 million per two way mile. That's cheap. That's taking the existing. So it's not hundreds of millions of dollars -- well, it probably will be hundreds of millions of dollars, but it's not the same as building the system from scratch and building it Upstate or something like that.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Well, your trains would have to be replaced, right? I mean, your system here has a different methodology.

**MR. FAZIO:**

No, your trains wouldn't have to be replaced. What you'd have to do is buy new trains as you need them, because in the mean time, you can use the regular trains on the same tracks.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So you're saying this would not cost hundreds of millions of dollars to implement.

**MR. FAZIO:**

Let me say this: Hundreds of the millions of dollars in railroad speak is not money. That's not money. That's really not money.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

The problem we have is that it is money, because the MTA, in the end, a lot of us have to pick up the fee associated with the cost of running the MTA, as many of us have seen in the last couple of years with the MTA surcharge.

**MR. FAZIO:**

Let me back off for a minute. I don't think we are going to put it on Long Island Rail Road. What we want is a system that would go across the country. All I am saying is it's possible.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

All right. So what is the point of coming before this Legislature if it's not applicable for Long Island?

**MR. FAZIO:**

Well, what is applicable is jobs. If we were putting 150,000 people to work building the peripherals on this, I think it's important.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Your assumption is the peripherals are manufactured here on Long Island, is that where the jobs come from? Because you have indicated that as far as the system goes, it would not apply to Long Island. You'd be building this stuff for someplace else.

**MR. FAZIO:**

Is that okay with you?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Well, I mean, you're saying the jobs come even though the actual work is not going to be done on Long Island, it's going to be implemented someplace else.

**MR. FAZIO:**

The design work and the manufacturing -- you know, we used to build planes here too. I don't think they all just flew on Long Island.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Well, that's the main theme here. You think the jobs -- the manufacturing for this particular project, a lot of it would come from Long Island, even though the actual system will be built someplace else.

**MR. FAZIO:**

The actual system could be built someplace else or it could be built here too. If the system is attractive to private enterprise and they build it or some kind of government/private enterprise compact, it could be built here. But the design work is worth hundreds of millions of dollars. The design and the -- of the basic -- you know, we know how to do this already, but once you start building something, it's a lot of peripherals that come into place.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

And your assumption is that the peripherals, the design work, much of it will be done on Long Island?

**MR. FAZIO:**

I do make that assumption, because we have Brookhaven National Laboratories, we have a lot of people who know how to build small electronic equipment, we have the universities producing the engineers that we need. We have a lot of good reasons to believe that a lot would be built here.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

All right. I guess I'm being critical, but I've seen --

**MR. FAZIO:**

I'm fine with that.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

You know, I have seen proposals like this in the past, you know, the Lighthouse Project, the Wolcoff Project, the Regional Transportation Project, the Yaphank Project, lots of talk, lots of discussion and zero happens.

**MR. FAZIO:**

Yeah, I know. That's a problem. But, you know, this is not something where we are coming to this body asking for money. That's not the point. And since we are not asking for money, there should be little objection to making this something that we would want to happen on Long Island. Even if it's all built somewhere else, I think eventually, as a nation, we become better equipped to compete in the world. When we built the Panama Canal, when we built the Erie Canal, when we built the railroads across the country, we became more efficient and we were juggernaut. Without having this juggernaut mentality, we're not going to be the juggernaut. We have to think big.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Mr. Fazio, just to move things along, because we do have a busy schedule, I'm happy to continue

the conversation with you. As Chairman of the Committee, perhaps I will send a letter to the County Executive asking him -- or at least informing him that you presented here. If I can play a positive role in helping move this forward, I have no problems with that. But we can have that conversation after this meeting as well.

**MR. FAZIO:**

All right, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. And I want to thank everybody for, you know, your head's up on listening.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I appreciate it. It's a very informative and interesting presentation. Thank you.

**MR. FAZIO:**

I wish I had my full presentation, but most of it had to be words under the circumstances.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I want to move to the second presentation. Thank you, Mr. Fazio. In-Pipe Technology, Dan Williamson. We're going from high-speed rail to another favorite subject, particularly of Legislator Horsley's. In-Pipe has a particular proprietary technology that they believe will save the County, or at the least sewer districts, a significant amount of money, and they wanted an opportunity to present their technology; how it would work and the benefits to Suffolk County. Without further ado, Mr. Williamson.

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

Thank you very much. My name is Dan Williamson. I am a cofounder of In-Pipe Technology and also Chairman of the Board. We are based in Wheaton, Illinois, about 30 miles due west of the Sears Tower. And we have been active here on Long Island for about seven or eight years.

We'd like to shift to high-speed sewers and how we can transform the infrastructure that's currently in the ground and make it more efficient for treating sewage and provide economic value to the County. So I'd like to very quickly bring you up-to-date on our history, where we have been, how we got here today, and also the specifics of IR 1209, which is before you.

First of all, for those who don't know, wastewater is treated with microbiology. At the different treatment plants, the operators retain large amounts of biology in the big concrete tanks, and that is what is used to treat the dirty water to produce clean water. Energy is one of the single largest line items, primarily because the biology that comes in in the sewage is not beneficial to treat wastewater. And a lot of energy, especially aeration energy is added to digest the bad bacteria, break them down and produce clean water and bio solids. All of this costs money.

If you look at your facility at Bergen Point, I like to look at as there are two main inputs. The first input is raw wastewater in the upper left corner. One of the facts in the world is that more and more wastewater is produced every single day by the human population. The second input is money. And the money takes form of new construction, energy into the aeration basins. And a very large line item is the sludge production/bio solids production and the disposal of the sludge. All of that comes out of the Operating Budget with the exception of expansion. When you need to capacity, you need a Capital Budget to build another large concrete facility and put new state-of-the-art equipment in, much of which requires more electricity.

So what In-Pipe Technology has done, we have developed a process, and we provide this as a service so that we take responsibility for performance, we own the assets, we perform the services so there's no additional burden on County staff, and we provide economic return to the County; potential increase of capacity where we are in discussions with the State DEC to increase capacity of

facilities here in Suffolk County; put off postpone upgrades, because if capital's difficult to obtain, perhaps more users can be added without expending capital dollars; most importantly, extending the life of the existing infrastructure, and doing it with cost reduction.

The original technology was developed to stop corrosion and eliminate odors in the collection system about 18 years ago. Back in '95, the first application of In-Pipe was developed, again, to replace the use of nitrate salts currently sold by Siemens to control odors and hydrogen sulfite corrosion. We have patents that were issued in '86 -- sorry, '96 and '98 and then again in '02 in Canada. We formed a company about 12 years ago in 1999.

Our first paying client, the City of Lakeland, Florida, for odor and corrosion control remains a client today over ten years after they first signed with In-Pipe. We have over 40 clients throughout the US, Canada and overseas. And it is a well documented and proven technology and as listed. And we'll talk about history here in Long Island. Back in '03, when Patchogue Treatment Facility was overwhelmed in producing out-of-specification water, we demonstrated we could bring that facility into compliance in a very short period of time. The engineering community at that time went ahead and recommended an expansion of the project and the capital dollar investment.

Westchester County demonstrated nitrogen removal in '04. That project is now terminated with Westchester. We're looking at two other facilities. However, the city of Rye, which was part of the Westchester County demonstration, is still a client today for FOG, fats oil and grease control and odor control.

Under a NYSERDA Grant, Suffolk County DPW participated with In-Pipe two demonstrations here in Suffolk at the Plant 118 - Industrial Park, the old ITT facility, which is a rotating biological contractor plant, and also out at Leisure Village. Both of those were intended to demonstrate nitrogen reduction in the effluent, which is a concern out here on Long Island with the aquifer.

The data from those presentations convinced DPW staff that, indeed, there was merit to the technology, which has led us now to propose to expand to the Bergen Point facility. In addition, the nitrogen data has been reviewed by the Suffolk County Department of Health Services, and we have been referred as a potential solution to nitrogen compliance issues. We are installed in our first plant at Homestead Village under the watchful eye of the Health Services, potentially to eliminate the need to spend capital dollars to upgrade that facility.

So going back over ten years, Lakeland, eight MGD, eight million gallons a day, about one-third the size of Bergen Point, and they have saved net over \$8 million working with In-Pipe. They did not have a compliance issue. Jackson, Mississippi at 40 million gallons a day since 2003, very good resolution of problems that they faced; FOG, fats oils and grease and odor issues as well as sludge for disposal, which, again, is a very large cost for them. And the Louisiana DEQ funded a project to demonstrate that parishes in Louisiana after the hurricane could handle more wastewater without capital investment, similar to our discussions with the DEC here on Long Island.

The benefits add up. These are line items in the current Operating Budget which is how we got to the proposal state with DPW; decreased sludge production is mentioned, one of the largest line items, and the associated cost for the sludge handling; improved effluent quality, while Bergen Point does a very good job meeting compliance, in the future, regulations may require more stringent discharge limits. Other smaller STPs here on the Island can benefit because several are struggling right now with the Department of Health Services.

Odor and corrosion control, this is a big one because corrosion of the infrastructure continues throughout the network, and it's very difficult to stop. The final, of course, reduced operation and maintenance costs, which is how In-Pipe gets paid.

This is the dosing panel that we are talking about delivering our technology. This is battery powered. We have one here on display. As you can see, it's a very small, self-contained certified safe. It goes underground, hangs in the manhole, out of sight, out of mind. Here you can see it below ground. Inside is a one-liter bottle of our microbial solution that we produce, and that lasts for a period of 30 days.

Our intent is go out, as we have elsewhere, and install approximately 200 of these units throughout the entire collection system that feeds the Southwest Sewer District. Here's the plant down at Bergen Point. We go out as far as we can away from the facility into small tributary lines and install these dosing panels. With 200 units out in the County, every pipe downstream from that dosing location then has lower solution sulfite levels and lower rates of corrosion. That's where the major savings in the infrastructure lifecycle comes from.

But meanwhile, all of those pipes become part of the treatment process, so when the sewage gets to Bergen Point, it's partially treated, the biology is more beneficial to plant operations, and it basically costs less to treat, lower dollars per gallon to treat the water.

Here are the main items that we have identified with DPW staff: Cleaning up the system, reducing the odors and corrosion, decrease the sludge production, which is again, one of the two largest line items in the budget; energy reduction as well, and bottom line, the proposal and the resolution in front of you projects first year saving of \$0.6 million with no dollars at risk by the County; in the second year period, \$1.2 million net with no money at risk to the County; and then every year thereafter, the savings from the baseline become greater as efficiencies build in. And hopefully, much like Lakeland, ten years from now, we have a very large number in accumulated savings in Suffolk County.

So the specifics to IR 1209: The RFP was issued in July of 2010 -- actually in March with a due date of July, 2010; we were the sole respondent of our patented technology; final terms negotiated and agreed to with the Purchasing Department; a resolution has been drafted; there's a draft bottle contract complying with the County Regulations; no upfront investment, no money from Suffolk County put at risk; we have had agreed with DPW that we will hire at In-Pipe's expense a Long Island Suffolk County engineering firm to be the referee to certify the results prior to invoicing the County; documented savings prior to any fees being paid; and lastly, it's a win-win-win.

We focus mainly on the financial aspects here. Bergen Point produces clean water, but the effluent leaving the treatments plants where we are installed produce cleaner water, use less energy, less greenhouse gas, so there's a win for the environment as well. The matrix that we started with -- and this is available in the handout that you have -- sludge is the big number for the annual expense of \$3.5 million; energy for aeration alone, \$2.4 million; and then the other chemicals.

These are the principal numbers that are in the baseline calculation to be uses to judge against. And the contract states the first implementation work product is the agreement with the Suffolk County and the third-party engineer of those baselines, which will not differ very much from the numbers already provided by DPW. Monthly evaluation of performance, but in order to smooth out the noise, if you will, and the seasonal variation and the weather events in the Spring, quarterly audits and invoicing. So we'll do three month moving averages as part of the baseline against the average from previous years. If there's growth in the basin of increased flow rate due to development, that will be accommodated and so on.

So for the first six months, we are -- agreed to 10% of the savings to Suffolk, which allows us to recapture our investment. And if you go back for a moment into month one, you can see we're

projecting zero savings in month one during implement. So there's no money to pass hands there in month one. And then we escalate up. Full efficacy of the system at about month six due to the size and the geometry of the collection system.

After the first six months, then a 40% savings of the documented amount to Suffolk with a cap on a monthly payment to In-Pipe. And our mission with DPW then is to maximize the savings to the County, because after that level, every dollar goes to the County. We have a one year extension in the contract. Again, I hope that ten years from now, In-Pipe is a valued supplier here to Suffolk as well as we are in Lakeland. And the key, no contingent exposure to Suffolk County.

The graphs from the numbers that are projected within the first year, starting out very low on the monthly savings. Up at month 12, about one hundred -- \$120,000 net savings to the County, which gets you to your \$1.2 million a year thereafter. And over a multiple year periods, the numbers start to add up, which is how Lakeland is now in the \$8 million net savings plus after then years.

So concluding, the technology has been in the field running since 1995. We've been here in Suffolk County demonstrating and working since 2003. There's no financial risk or investment by the County. We additionally will protect the infrastructure against corrosion. That with be modeled, that can be monetized, and that is coming with the package. We have no financial return to In-Pipe for that infrastructure protection.

Potential to increase capacity, as I mentioned, due to work -- in discussion with DPW and with DEC here on Long Island for Sewer District 11, we have the DEC agreed to evaluate data with In-Pipe on this system and potentially re-rate the plant for an 18% capacity increase in their permit. That work has not started yet, but we hope that that begins here in the next couple of months. And improve effluent quality, for those areas that have trouble complying, we can bring them into compliance very, very quickly. And again, certified savings prior to any payments to In-Pipe.

Calculations are in preparation. Again, whatever the format we agree to, gets hammered by DPW, by the third-party engineering firm and In-Pipe. So with that, I thank you for the opportunity. We've worked long and hard to bring this to the committee. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for your support. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have either now or after. And hopefully, we can start accruing real value and financial savings to Suffolk.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you, Mr. Williamson. I know there are questions. We're going to start with Legislator Cilmi to my right.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome. And thank you for that presentation. I've been aware of your company and services that provide for about a year now and have been talking about the different ways that we could all benefit from those services. So I'm glad to see that this is finally coming to fruition. I do have three, I guess, sort of unrelated questions to each other.

In the process by which you establish a baseline to determine how much the savings are to the County, can you just review for us what that process is, because clearly, that's a very important part of the -- of the benefit to the County is if that base line is improperly calculated, then obviously, the savings is skewed and our outlay could be affected, so.

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

Correct. First and foremost, it is jointly developed with DPW From the actual budget and expense that they have from a historical perspective. So we take te real numbers that they've spent based

on the tons of sludge that are produced, based on the kilowatt hours consumed and the chemicals that are paid for, the truck weigh bills that are leaving the facility with the bio solids. That then gets modeled over the 12 month period to take care of seasonal flows, increases and improvements. In summertime, there's more indigenous digestion, sludge production may be lower since it's a very large seasonal crowd like we see in Florida. So that baseline is very well defined and approved by DPW and the engineering firm.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. And in addition to the savings, it seems to me that this would also create excess capacity; is that correct?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

We have a verbal agreement with DEC in writing that they will review the data at a facility and potentially rerate for increased capacity.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. And the third question is does your service and does this micro-technology have any application to traditional septic systems?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

Yes, it does.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Could you elaborate on that a little bit. As you know, about 75% of Suffolk County is not sewerred, so.

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

Correct. Yes. We have previously involved in a very long study with a disposal company that wanted to verify that micro addition and disposers on septic tanks, there's no negative impact. We also are in discussions with Health Services to address some of the small package plants, chromo glass is one that comes to mind as being problematic as far as nitrogen. The technology will work the same. We currently do not market into the septic arena, however, several of us do use the product on our personal septic tanks. We are looking forward to working and demonstrating the improvement in effluent from septics, and that could be done here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you. Next on my list was Legislator Horsley.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Good afternoon. Good seeing you again. It's been a long haul. I appreciate you guys hanging in there. And as you know, government takes it's time. It's working through. And I want to also congratulate the DPW for going out and looking at new issues and new solutions that may make sense. So I do thank Gil and Ben and the whole gang for taking a chance and looking at new technologies.

I just want -- one of my concerns right from the beginning, and I just wanted you to address this is my concern was your putting microbes into our system, which may get into the Great South Bay or may get into the water, our drinking waters and stuff like that. Can you address that question; you know, what these microbes could -- could we be introducing new a new element into our -- into our environment that may be negative? I just wanted to you first address that.

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

Early on in the presentation I did not go into the details, but the bacteria that we are using and introducing are all natural soil bacteria. So they are found in Suffolk County already. They are already going into the water in smaller quantities when rain events wash them out of soil and into storm sewers or into collection system sewers. Over the 15 years, all of our clients continually need to run their wet -- their whole effluent toxicity testing. There's no negative impact on the particular organisms going into the environment. We discharge to Tampa Bay through our Lakeland facility, one of the most protected waters in the US, and there are no negative implications from that discharge.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

And the DEC is taking a look at this issue as well?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

So we're not going to, 15 years down the road, find out that, oh, boy, look what we just did?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

No.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Good. I'm glad to hear that. I wanted to also ask quickly, sludge itself, does this reduce sludge, which means the amount of sludge that we would transporting off the Island?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

Yes. Up here on the savings model, the sludge production is the largest line item in the budget. Through the conversion and getting into the science of our facultative organisms that can transform carbon in the collection system, in the piping, under low oxygen conditions, there's a lower sludge yield, lower bio solids produced per pound of COD consumed that's transformed out in that collection system.

Second of all, the plant operates a little differently when there's a lot of autolysis of the biology, which really becomes more food and it gets burned up through the normal operation of the plant, so there is a less -- a lower sludge yield to be trucked away.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

So we would be reducing our trucking costs and the impact to the environment of the trucks leaving -- going back and forth to the plant.

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

Yes.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Nice. I see Mr. Jones out in the audience. He grabbed me at one point -- and I don't know if he's a lobbyist for you, but he was one of our Executive Director over in the Water Authority, and apparently he has said that this is a good approach and something that makes sense. So I just wanted to point that out. I see Mr. Jones here. I'm done. Thank you. Again, thanks, DPW, for looking at this.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Lindsay.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Quantitatively, how much does it reduce the sludge?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

In the particular model for Bergen Point, if you go the far right, I know it's very difficult to see on the slide --

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I couldn't see that in my best day.

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

It is listed in the blue package. We are projecting 20% reduction, and that is lower than in a traditional facility, because of the large amount of scavenger waste that gets trucked into Bergen, because about half -- rough numbers -- half of the solids come from the small STPs throughout the County that trucked in, so our overall impact will be lower. If we were proposing this to a plant that had 100% sewage coming in the piping, that number could be as high as 40 or 50% or more.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you and welcome. Legislator Cilmi before had asked about applicability to private -- to home -- you know, to residents. It's something that you said even members of the company utilize. I was wondering what would be, briefly, the benefit of the technology to a private home, is the technology available for private consumers to purchase, and what would be the approximate cost for this technology in a typical home?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

I can't address the approximate cost, because as I mentioned, we do not have a residential product we currently market. So from that angle, I can't tell you, because I don't know. If we look at the impacts -- when we were providing the work for NFS certification, National Sanitation Foundation out of Ann Arbor, to show that there was no negative impact on the septic tanks, by adding microbes with additional food load, we were looking for increased water quality, lower BOD, lower COD in the effluent from the septic tank.

Unfortunately, when we went back, because we were asked this question by one of the engineering firms here in Suffolk County for this specific reason, that experiment back in 1990 did not track nitrogen, that wasn't a concern. But what we did is that the microbes going into the leach field are very active for digesting fats, oil and grease, that's one of our benefits in the collection system, so that the drain fields can be alleviated, they can work longer and not need to be replaced.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Your unit -- you said it's about a month before the battery wears out or before the --

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

No, before the bottle goes empty.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
How long would the battery last?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**  
The batteries last roughly about 12 to 15 months even in cold climate.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Okay. So every month then you have to go and at least change the bottle?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**  
Correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Okay. And knowing that these would be in -- well, not catch basins, they'd be in cesspools, you'd have to go then and open up, I guess, the cap, is that how it works, in the middle of a road?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**  
The manhole.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
The manhole.

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**  
Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
So you have to open the manhole cover on a monthly basis. So would that interfere at all with our highways? Is it going to be on County roads and State roads? Is there any concerns in terms of pedestrian vehicle safety?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**  
There's always a concern for safety. And we follow our client's published safety manuals, whether it be warnings in the street, cones, yellow amber lights, etcetera. When we picked the location for dosing, again, we wanted to go as far from the plant as possible into small diameter pipes. So the idea would be we would locate these out of traffic zones into neighborhoods where they're, you know, up in a cul-de-sac perhaps or out of the traffic flow.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Then I would ask are there concerns about odors that might emanate if you're opening up these manhole covers into those neighborhoods?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**  
No. Usually the odors are much further downstream, then the odors would be alleviated after the first couple of months of In-Pipe treatment.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Those roads are going to be town roads in general or -- probably, right? So do you need special approvals at the town level to do this maintenance?

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**  
Yes. We would solicit approval. What we have done in other contracts, upon award of contract, a single -- a document, single page from DPW or the County, whichever appropriate, identifying the program. And we never had a satellite community say no to participating in the In-Pipe Program. Most of time, it's because there's no financial burden to them and they're getting the ancillary

benefits.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any other questions from the committee? Well, thank you. It's a very promising technology. It's before us because you are the sole bidder and our rules require when an RFP has only one respondent that it has to be approved by the Legislature. I appreciate you taking the time to educate us on your technology. Thank you.

**MR. WILLIAMSON:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and committee members. And if you have any other questions, you have contact info, feel free. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. So we can move to the agenda. Why don't we take that one out of order while these gentlemen are here.

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion to take it out of order.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to take IR 1209 out of order by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Horsley. All those in favor? Opposed?

**1209, Requesting legislative approval of a contract award for implementation of a Collection System Treatment Process Improvement Project for Sewer District No. 3 Southwest. (Co. Exec.)** is now before us.

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There's a motion. Legislator Horsley making a motion to approve IR 1209, seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? Questions? Comments? Hearing none, all those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**TABLED RESOLUTIONS**

**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.)**

I will -- I know Legislator Romaine who had been very vocal on this issue had asked this to be tabled. I don't know what the status is.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Could I ask Budget Review's opinion on this? The dispute seems to be whether we can move that impact money to another Capital Program or do we have to use it to pay off the debt on this program.

**MR. LIPP:**

I believe George had spoken to Bond Counsel on this, so he would be best to answer it.

**MR. NOLAN:**

You may recall at the last meeting, Legislator Romaine's legislation had been vetoed by the County Executive. In the interim, there had been an opinion from Bond Counsel stating that we should use the money to pay down the debt on the project rather than move it to do additional work on that roadway. And Legislator Romaine did not move to override at our last meeting. While he still does have an opportunity at our next meeting to move to override, I'm not sure what his intention is. This is the other resolution that would apply it to debt. So it's the pleasure of the committee.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I guess I want to follow up on Mr. Lindsay's question. Do you have an opinion as to whether or not this should go for continuing the Capital Project, or must it go to retire the debt?

**MR. NOLAN:**

What I said at the General Meeting was that Bond Counsel relied on a statute that was not directly on point. There's a section of State Law that says if you get State or Federal aid, you have to use that to pay down the debt on the project. That's what they relied on. They said it was an analogy. And what I said to Legislator Romaine is that while it's on point, you know, generally in matters of bonding monies, I look to Bond counsel, they are the experts, and I think that's what Legislator Romaine is doing in not moving for the override.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I will make a motion to table. I don't think this is pressing. We can wait for Legislator Romaine to conduct his review. I'll make a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Lindsay. Commissioner, do you want to add on anything to this? I don't know you're in communication with Legislator Romaine on this issue.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No. I mean, obviously, we stand in favor of the legislation that we're looking at right now and feel that the money should be used to pay down the debt rather than --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's not time critical.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. Is there any other motion before us, any other discussion? All in favor? Opposed?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Abstentions? Legislator Barraga, opposed to tabling. Tabling prevails. **TABLED (VOTE: 5-1-0-0; Opposed, Legis. Barraga).**

We'll move on to **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 will make a motion to table this one, seconded by Legislator Stern. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**TABLED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

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

Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Tabling is fine.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is there something you want to -- tabling is fine. Okay. Motion to table by Legislator Stern, seconded by myself. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I may. I believe you're questioning whether we have heard anything. We haven't. I will follow up though.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

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

Has this, Legislator Stern, been through the Naming Committee?

**LEG. STERN:**

Mr. Chairman, we have -- it has not gone through the Sitings Committee, but it is scheduled to immediately following this meeting. If I can make a suggestion, perhaps we can approved without recommendation and send it through but pending approval until the Sitings Committee comes back with a recommendation.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I don't like putting the cart before the horse here. I feel like they should vote before we have sent a signal. Is there a rush or any particular reason? Or at least is there reason to believe that there will be no issues in terms of this naming?

**LEG. STERN:**

This is not my resolution, so I don't know what issues might come up until, yes, we have had opportunity to have that meeting. I have -- as far as timing goes, I mean, that's a question better posed to the sponsor.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The individual's birthday is coming up. And what I'm being told is the fire department in the area is looking to have an event. So I will support the discharge without recommendation. So there is a motion by Legislator Stern to discharge without recommendation and a second by myself. Any discussion? All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**IR 1014, Approving renewal and extension of ferry license and fares for Tony's Freight Service, Inc. (Pres. Off.)**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Table for a public hearing.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Has to be tabled for a public hearing. There's a motion to table by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Horsley. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1134, Increasing County Bus Fare on two routes for the implementation of limited Sunday Bus Service. (Schneiderman).**

I will make a motion to approve. Do I have a second at least for discussion purposes?

**LEG. HORSLEY:**

I will second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator Horsley. Okay. On the motion. So after the last attempt to provide Sunday bus service, which we did pass as a body but we did not override the veto, there were a couple of concerns that were brought up by my fellow colleagues. One was that under the proposal, it wasn't clear which routes would ultimately get Sunday service, and some Legislators felt that they did not want to impose a fare increase on their constituents or their bus riders without knowing if they would actually get Sunday bus service. Legitimate concern. Also, their other main concern was that some people would be paying a higher fare and would not be getting Sunday bus service.

What this first bill does is it increases the fare only on two routes; the S-92 and the 10-C. They are both located on the East end. One goes from orient Point to East Hampton. That's the main one, the S-92. And the 10-C connects East Hampton out to Montauk. It would be a limited Sunday service primarily in the summertime. Only those lines -- only the S-92 would actually have the higher fare. And I know BRO has been crunching these numbers.

The bill doesn't say -- you know, it brings in Sunday service to the greatest extent practical. We believe -- I believe it would be significant in the amount of Sunday service that would be generated. And this does it in time for this summer so that by July, we would have Sunday service. There are tremendous amounts of businesses there that rely on a workforce that is dependent upon public transportation. So I am hoping that we can move this one forward. It does address all those issues.

The other bill, which we will talk about when get there, is more of a critical artery plan throughout the County. They don't compete with each other. This basically could be looked at as the early implementation of just this one particular -- I guess the S-92 and the 10-C route. Mr. Lipp, I know you have been looking at the numbers here and you have done some financial analysis. If I could turn things over to you.

**MR. LIPP:**

We looked at 2010 data from DPW, I believe it was, and we found, based upon those data, it was approximately break-even. It was hard to say exactly because we didn't have numbers for Sunday SCAT revenue. That being said, what we are talking about here is a close to break-even number based upon 2010 data. And in return, you wind up with an increase in service provision. That being said, our understanding also is that DPW has more updated numbers that we're not aware of.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I know, Commissioner, you have been busy with lots of things, but this is one bill that I did ask if you could try to do some analysis prior to today's meeting. Have you been able to do that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes. Our staff, as I had mentioned to your staff, is fully concerned with the triennial review of the FTA. So I asked them to make the time and go through and crunch some numbers. Essentially looking at -- including SCAT in the provision, which we would be mandated to do on those two routes, we're looking at about an \$80,000 a year deficit running that -- you know, that program the way it's outlined here.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm not proposing to run it year-round, I'm only proposing to run it to the greatest extent practical. Are you figuring the same hours per day year-round as the S-92 currently runs, because that is not what the proposal says?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I believe it was only the 10-C was going to be during the summer, not the -- unless we misread it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The S-92 too as well. It allows for seasonal variations and to the greatest extent practical.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

So then essentially, it would be a \$40,000 deficit rather than an 80,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How are you determining that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Basically taking the number that we -- taking the ridership annually and getting what would be the anticipated revenues on that annually, and then take -- developing --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you have the ridership figure in front of you?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can you state what that is?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Ridership would be -- hold on one second -- total passengers, 3000. Based on 2010 actuals for the two lines it was 351,290.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So 351,000 all paying 50 cents more, so that's --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

So that would bring you --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It's 170,000 some odd in additional revenue. Okay. And then the Sunday revenue at two dollars a ticket.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The Sunday revenue, revised revenue for that full fare, again, was 600 -- I mean, it would have been \$633,024.58. Again, that's one of the reasons I asked for this to

be tabled. I realize the urgency in it, but -- so that we could sit down with --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Somewhere we're in the neighborhood of new revenue in the \$300,000 range?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, no. That's not new revenue, that's total revenue. The new revenue would be the difference between the two. I mean, effectively you're talking about a net gain of about \$113,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Just an increase in 50 cents over the number of tickets sold is more than that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Okay. Your revised revenue --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'll tell you what, because I have crunched these numbers, I have given DPW my number -- I've given to Mr. Lenberger my numbers. I know he was away or whatever it might be. I expect that he will respond back. I've given Mr. Lipp my numbers, which I think are fairly detailed. Besides the fact that the bill has the flexibility of reducing it, there's no way that there is a negative based on the numbers on S-92 since you can control how -- the frequency of that service under this bill. So I'm going to ask that at least we discharge this without recommendation since it's time sensitive. You and I can meet before the General Session, and we can go over the numbers. Happy to do that. But I built the flexibility into this to account for that, so. And, Mr. Lipp, if you want to be part of that conversation, I would love to have you there too.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I think he should be there.

**MR. LIPP:**

Definitely.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So I'll amend my approval to a discharge without recommendation.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Commissioner, I just want to make sure it's clear in my mind, your openings comments indicated that your projections indicate either an 80,000 or a 40,000 deficit, annual deficit.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

And your projects are predicated on a request made to you by the Chairman?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

In reviewing the legislation, this is what we came up with.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

So your position is if we do what the legislation intends, there will be a deficit of either 80,000 or 40,000 annually?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I will present to you that the tickets sold Monday through Friday as presented by your office were 349,000 in 2010. My calculations, the additional revenue -- and I'm willing to share this with anyone who wants to see it -- year one \$258,756.19. And the additional revenue in year two is \$321,565.54. Now the full expenses are going to depend on the extent of the service. We have some expenses that your department has provided me in the past. I work off of those, and there's no deficit, unless you are going to run it the same hours as the S-92 currently runs year round, and that is not what I'm asking here for. So again, I just would ask the opportunity to have that discussion with you before the General Meeting. It is time sensitive.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

I would support discharging it without recommendation pending a discussion between yourself and the Commissioner. I don't think any of us can afford to buy into a program that's going to run a deficit in the horrible economic times. And I think Legislator Schneiderman, you agree with that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes. Absolutely.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

And I understand the time sensitivity in trying to get this up and running. I would view this as -- you know, the original legislation that was vetoed was for raising the fares across the whole system and putting in Sunday bus in multiple areas. I think this is an excellent pilot program, to see if it works in the one area. And if it does, I think it would be smart to implement it slowly in other areas.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I obviously don't want this to run up any additional deficits for the County. I have worked quite hard in crunching these numbers. I believe when I sit down with the Commissioner, he can present anything he wants, I will take a look at that. If any information is different -- I did work off the DPW's own numbers.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I don't mean to interrupt, but if you see the way we formulated it, I think it will explain where we got our numbers from.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm looking forward to seeing it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Absolutely.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm looking forward to seeing it. But remember, there's the flexibility. And if you're factoring year-round service at, whatever, a 12-hour day, I'm not asking for that. Okay. Year-round rate increase, but the Sunday service would be to the greatest extent practical based on the seasonality of the need.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I understand, that's why I welcome the sit-down-and-talk.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. I revised my motion to approve to a motion to discharge without recommendation, I have a second by the Presiding Officer. On the motion?

**LEG. STERN:**

I will support the motion to discharge for the reasons put forth by the Presiding Officer.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I appreciate that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Opposed.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

One opposed, Legislator Barraga. **DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION (VOTE: 5-1-0-0; Opposed, Legis. Barraga).**

**1165, Increasing the bus fare and implementing limited Sunday Bus Service. (Schneiderman)**

This is more a critical artery plan. I have said I would allow DPW more time to review this, so I will make a motion to table.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern. This is not as time sensitive as the other as it would go into affect in 2012. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions. So **TABLED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1168, Authorizing the conveyance of County-owned surplus unused right-of-way fronting a parcel of land, having Suffolk County Tax Map Identification Numbers of District 0200 Section 977.60 Block 04.00 Lot 021.000 and District 0200 Section 977.60 Block 04.00 Lot 022.000, pursuant to Section 125 of the New York State Highway Law. (Co. Exec.)**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by the Presiding Officer.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Seconded by Legislator Stern. Commissioner, any additional information on why this is being conveyed?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes. This resolution authorizes conveyance of land of an used portion of right-of-way to its abutting

landowner which is National Grid at fair market value. The conveyance is a result of realignment of Conklin Street at the intersection with County road 80 in East Patchogue, which we recently reconstructed in our project to rehabilitate this section of County Road 80 from New York State 112 out to County Road 101.

The resolution is required by New York State Highway Law Section 125. And basically what happens -- we realigned Conklin coming into County Road 80. And the lands that are outside of the necessary right-of-way, we no longer need, and therefore, we've negotiated with National Grid to give it to them.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any questions? There's been a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1169, Amending Resolution No. 877 of 2007 in connection with improvements to North Highway, CR 39, Town of Southampton (CP 5528.111, PIN 075736). (Co. Exec.)**

I'll make a motion, seconded by Legislator Stern. Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This resolution amends funding allocation for this project due to the inclusion of New York State Marchecelli Funding that we recently received in the amount of 375,000. It realizes the apportionment to the Federal share at \$2 million, New York State share at \$375,000 and the County share at \$425,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. That's good to hear. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1170, Amending the 2011 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Construction Inspection Services (CP 5568). (Co. Exec)**

Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This resolution appropriates \$800,000 for construction support and inspection, services currently underway or schedule to begin -- currently for projects currently underway of scheduled to begin in 2011. This resolution and this project will allow us -- allow our highway engineering division to be able to complete the massive capital program it currently has underway.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Lindsay, seconded by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1171, Amending the 2011 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the County Share for participation in the reconstruction of CR 11, Pulaski Road from Larkfield Road to NYS Route 25A, Phase 3, Towns of Huntington and Smithtown (CP 5095). (Co. Exec.)**

Any motion?

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Same motion, same second. Any questions? Same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1172, Amending the 2011 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with safety improvements at various intersections (CP 3301). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. Everybody okay with that? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1173, Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of CR 17, intersection improvements, Carleton Avenue (Wheeler Road), Phase Three, Town of Islip (CP 5097). (Co. Exec.)**

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Same motion, same second. Any questions? Same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1174, Appropriating funds in connection with safety improvements to CR 21, Main Street in Yaphank (CP 5138). (Co. Exec.)**

If anyone has particular questions about the project, let me know. Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1175, Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of culverts (CP 5371). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1179, Appropriating funds in connection with the rehabilitation of parking lots, drives and curbs at County facilities (CP 1678). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1180, Appropriating funds in connection with strengthening and improving County roads (CP 5014). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0)**

**1181, Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of drainage systems on various County roads (CP 5024). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1182, Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Public Works Highway Maintenance Equipment (CP 5047). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second. Commissioner, any particular equipment that we're talking about on this one, 1182?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes. Actually, with this funding, we intend on purchasing a number of dump trucks, a couple of spreaders, you know, snow plowing equipment, a semi-tractor, some spreaders bodies, skid steers, mowers, a number of mowers, tractors, chippers, snowplows and a small dozer.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1183, Appropriating funds in connection with the improvements to County Environmental Recharge Basins (CP 5072). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second. Commissioner, the types of improvements -- is this filter medium?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, this is basically for cleaning outside, scarifying recharge basins. This is a program we have to basically rehabilitate our recharge basin throughout the County.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So we have the same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1184, Appropriating funds in connection with the reconstruction of CR 11, Pulaski Road from Larkfield Road to NYS 25A in the vicinity of Old Bridge Road to the vicinity of Gull Hill Road (Phase I), Town Of Huntington (CP 5095). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1185, Appropriating funds in connection with construction of sidewalks on CR 35, Park Avenue, CR 76; Townline Road, CR 79, Bridgehampton-Sag Harbor Turnpike; CR 85, Montauk Highway; CR 92, Oakwood Road; Towns of Huntington, Islip, Smithtown and Southampton (CP 5497). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1186, Transferring assessment stabilization reserve funds to the capital fund, and appropriating funds for chemical bulk storage facilities for sanitary facilities in Suffolk County Sewer Districts (CP 8178). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1187, Adopting an order extending the boundaries of Sewer District No. 18 - Hauppauge Industrial (CP 8126). (Co. Exec.)**

Maybe we could have some information on this one.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. This is a project that we have currently underway to expand -- actually, currently, at the present time, we're expanding the existing treatment plant in Sewer District 18. With that expansion, we will now be able to provide sewers for the entire industrial park, the Hauppauge Industrial Park. This is a requirement of State Law. We have received the approval of the State Comptrollers to do what we are doing. This is a formality. We have to authorize the Clerk of the Legislature to have a certified copy of the order recorded at the County Clerk's Office.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Any questions? Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1188, Transferring funds from the Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund, and appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 23 - Coventry Manor (CP 8149). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I may.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yes, of course.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I believe this is a duplicate -- this may be a duplicate. I mean, we can approve it and I can get back to you. I think this was already -- in the last cycle, it went through.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We could table it.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There's no urgency, so if you want to table it, then we can get back to you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Duplicating it doesn't hurt either, there's no affect. We're not transferring the funds twice. So I would say let's just approve it. If it turns out to be duplicate, we can just remove it from the agenda. Have the County Executive withdraw it. All right. Same motion, same second, same vote.

**APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1189, Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Sewer Facility Maintenance Equipment (CP 8164). (Co. Exec.)**

Same motion, same second, same vote. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1190, Authorizing "Project Spot Light" the illumination of the H. Lee Dennison Building in support of National County Government Month "Serving Our Veterans, Armed Forces and Their Families". (Co. Exec.)**

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1200, Authorizing the transfer of 160 surplus blackberry mobile devices to Suffolk County Domestic Violence Agencies. (Co. Exec.)**

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Muratore, seconded by Legislator Stern. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1201, Authorizing transfer of surplus Suffolk County Vehicles to the Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum. (Lindsay)**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Lindsay, seconded by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1223, Authorizing public hearing for approval of rates for Roncalli Freight Company Inc. (Pres. Off.)**

This is for the -- authorizing the public hearing. Motion by the Presiding Officer, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1224, Approving rates for Roncalli Freight Company Inc. (Pres. Off.)**

We have to hold a hearing first, so we'll have to table that. Motion to table by Legislator Stern, I'll second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1225, Approving the extension of the license and franchise of Davis Park Ferry Co., Inc., for Cross Bay Service between Patchogue, New York and Fire Island Communities of Davis Park and Watch Hill. (Pres. Off.)**

Has to be tabled, I make a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Stern.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**

While we are on that, just a discussion while Counsel is here. That isn't exactly what I had in mind with that bill. It's a full extension to 2016. This provider has been less than stellar. I don't think they've lived up to terms of the contract from the last time we extended them. It is not a time of the year to deny them some kind of limited extension, otherwise we would cut off all service from that community, but it's something that I would like to put them on a short leash and see if there's anybody else interested in the service, because the last I heard, I mean, I don't think they renewed their lease with the Town of Brookhaven for their landing site in Patchogue. So there's a lot of problems here. I would be -- like Budget Review to really delve into it. And I'd like to keep them on a short leash. If we extend them to 2016, you know, it would really be problematic. Can.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I would just say that bill was put in the way it came in from the ferry company. Tomorrow at our Special Meeting, we are actually going to set a public hearing date for next Tuesday for this ferry company. And in conversations with Legislator Eddington's Office -- he represents the area that's mostly served by this ferry company -- you know, we're going to talk about those issues in terms of the length of the extension and a possibly amendment to the resolution. But we've been holding off on that pending the public hearing. I will add I believe that the ferry company has submitted some documents in the last week or so. So it's a little bit in flux, but that's where it is right now.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Go back to 1225. We had a motion and a second to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstention? **TABLED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**1231, Authorizing public hearing for approval of Ferry License for Davis Park Ferry Co. (Pres. Off.)**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**  
Motion.

**MR. NOLAN:**  
We should table this particular resolution because I imagine tomorrow we're scheduled to do a Procedural Resolution to set the public hearing for next week. So this should be tabled.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Motion to table by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

Last item **1238, Authorizing the transfer of one (1) surplus County printer to the Suffolk County Vanderbilt Museum. (Pres. Off.)**

Motion by Legislator Muratore, seconded by Presiding Officer. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0).**

**P.O. LINDSAY:**  
Just before we adjourn, Mr. Chairman.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Absolutely. Mr. Presiding Officer.

**P.O. LINDSAY:**  
I would just like to say to the Commissioner, welcome back, we missed you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**  
Okay. We are adjourned.

**(\*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 2:51 P.M.\*)**

**{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY**