

PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE
OF THE
SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

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, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on Tuesday, July 26, 2011, at 1:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Jay Schneiderman, Chair
Legislator Steven Stern, Vice Chair
Legislator Tom Barraga
Legislator Wayne Horsley
Legislator Tom Muratore

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Presiding Officer Bill Lindsay, Legislative District No. 8
George Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Barbara LoMoriello, Deputy Clerk, Suffolk County Legislature
Bob Doering, Budget Review Office
Catherine Stark, Aide to Legislator Schneiderman
Debbie Harris, Aide to Legislator Stern
Paul Perillie, Aide to Legislator Cooper
Gil Anderson, Commissioner, SC Department of Public Works
Jim Peterman, SC Department of Public Works
Bill Hillman, SC Department of Public Works
Eric Kopp, Count Executive's Office
Dot Kerrigan, AME
Jeanne Anzalone, Ombudsman PCA SCAT
Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Lucia Braaten, Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary

(The meeting was called to order at 1:09 P.M.)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Everybody ready? Good afternoon. I'd like to call this meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee to order this 26th day of July, 2011. If you all will rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Horsley.

(Salutation)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Have a seat. Welcome back, committee. Hope you had a good July for the most part. Our first speaker -- I only have one yellow card. If you wish to be heard by the committee you need to fill out a yellow card. I have one belonging to Jeanne Anzalone. Jeanne, if you will step over to the podium. You have three minutes to address the committee.

MS. ANZALONE:

Good afternoon, gentlemen, and everyone in attendance. I'm Jeanne Anzalone. I live at 311 Ockers Drive, Oakdale, New York. I am PCA for my husband, Richard T. Anzalone, and I am standing on behalf of my husband. I would like to state the reason that I am here is to support I.R. 1165. My husband and I have taken -- participated as riders of the SCAT system. I had a wonderful occasion last Saturday evening. My husband and I went to dinner in the Village of Sayville, and we returned at 8:30 to Affinity Nursing Home. And I have to say, my husband in a wheelchair, I walked him through the Village of Sayville. If it were not for the SCAT system, I couldn't afford to do this. So I would like to place in record of this committee accolades to the workers of this system, and especially accolades to the drivers.

So I will not take too much of your time, but I am here in support of I.R. 1165. I will be here to hear this possible legislation be placed in effect. I hope when I stand talking to you at that time I will have this auditorium filled with the residents of Suffolk County. I thank you, and I thank you as a wonderful body, you do a wonderful job. Again, thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you. Your husband has an excellent advocate for him. That's the only speaker I have from the public. So I guess we can move to the agenda. And the first bill actually is the one that she was speaking about. Commissioner Anderson, welcome.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Thank you.

Tabled Resolutions

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I.R. 1165, Increasing the bus fare and implementing limited Sunday Bus Service (Schneiderman). Commissioner, before I make a motion.

COMM. ANDERSON:

I would ask to table this one cycle. I submitted a table to the members of this committee, but BRO pointed out an error that I made in the table in that I only accounted for revenue from those lines that are going to provide the services. The resolution requires that all routes would have an increase of the regular fare. So that would thus increase the revenue. So I would ask one cycle to revise my table. I will get that out to everybody next week and then everybody will have time to digest it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You counted revenues from ten lines, and this critical artery plan is funded system wide through 50 plus lines. So the revenues, yeah, are much lower that you're projecting than the reality that the bill would provide.

Can I say a thing or two on Sunday service? It's been standing room only, Legislators, standing room only on that Sunday bus that's running on the East End. You can't even get a seat, it's that well used. It's off to a really -- a very, very strong start.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Mostly witness, Jay?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes. It's primarily the early bus that brings the workforce out is packed, as well as the later buses. So that's good. We saw just in the -- from the first week to the second week a 50% increase in ridership. It went from I think 400 riders the first week, up to 600 the second week. I don't even know what it's up to now. Gil, do you have those numbers?

COMM. ANDERSON:

I don't have last weekend's numbers but the weekend of the 17th it plateaued off. We had the same -- basically the same number of riders.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Around 600?

COMM. ANDERSON:

Well, it was a little over 700 for both routes, but one route went down, the other one went up. So they basically came out to the same number.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, those numbers are higher daily passenger count than a lot of the lines that we're running on the weekdays, so that's pretty strong ridership numbers.

You know, I don't have a strong objection to tabling it just because we're meeting again in two weeks. I know there are a lot of people who are really hoping for this bill, particularly the disabled community, for those SCAT lines. And I think on the East End I haven't seen the SCAT figures, but my understanding is that the SCAT is also being used on Sunday.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Correct. The weekend of the 10th and the 17th there was ridership; four on the 10th and seven rides on the 17th.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And I'll remind the committee again that there's no tax impact to this, that the riders themselves are covering the cost of the added bus service. And hopefully we're going to see a benefit to the County in terms of the sales tax that gets generated from people who do -- for the businesses as well as those who go shopping, but the businesses who have employees who are available now to serve customers. Legislator Barraga, you had a question?

LEG. BARRAGA:

Yes. In reference to that bus line where we currently have Sunday bus service, the Chairman has indicated that the buses have been packed. Yet, correct me if I'm wrong, I thought I saw a memo that was put out by you indicating that for the four Sundays, the first four Sundays, our average

cost per Sunday is \$6,000, but the bus service was generating only \$1,000. So we were losing \$5,000 for each of those four Sundays. So you could have, for example, 600 bus riders, but at two bucks that's 1,200, but if it costs you 6,000, you're 4,800 in the hole. Am I correct in terms of what I read based on what you sent out?

COMM. ANDERSON:

Correct. Based on the information that I gave you --

LEG. BARRAGA:

So fiscally for the first four Sundays this thing isn't working financially.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Well, again, there is revenue information that I still have to add to this, and I am only getting that in the next day or so, which would be the revenue from the daily rides, the weekday rides. And that, again, this is an incomplete picture. There will be information on the revenue that comes from the weekday rides on those two lines with the increases, but there's also going to be SCAT costs, and those right now, all of that has to be added together.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Well, why does it have to be added together? It seems to me that if you have Sunday bus service and the average cost is \$6,000 to run the Sunday bus service, are you getting enough ridership to offset the 6,000 without going back to doing the week kind of ridership. It looks to me like if you take a look at --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

If I may.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Let me finish, please. It looks to me like if you take a look at Sunday you know exactly what it costs to put a driver there for the day. It's \$6,000. And for four Sundays if you're only generating roughly 12 to \$1,500 each Sunday, you're losing money on Sunday bus service. The County is losing money on that day. You're saying you're trying to offset it by additional revenues coming in during the week. It's like apples and oranges. This is Sunday bus service.

COMM. ANDERSON:

But the program -- the resolution that created this increased the standard fare for those two lines during the week. So Monday through Saturday, those two lines, rather than 150 --

LEG. BARRAGA:

So what you're saying is that we expect it to lose money on the Sunday bus service and we're going to offset it with the generation of revenues during the week throughout 12 months of year. I mean, my impression listening to different speakers, was that if we instituted Sunday bus service, we're going to make a profit on Sunday. People really wanted this. They were going to go out there. They were going to generate it. If it is going to cost us 6,000 we were going to get eight or 10,000 because everybody is on this bus. That's not the case.

COMM. ANDERSON:

That's why we're running this as a pilot program.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Excuse me. We never said we were going to make money off of this thing. We said that it wouldn't cost the taxpayers --

LEG. BARRAGA:

I think you gave the impression that there was a great demand for Sunday bus service on this route. There was never any indication from the sponsor that somehow we were going to lose money on Sunday bus service.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Tom, you're not -- this program was not misrepresented in any way. I said there was a demand; it turns out that there is a demand. I always said Sunday alone, if you just increased the fares on Sunday it wouldn't pay for the provision of Sunday service. You had to do it every day of the week on the main fare. It went up 50 cents all year and we would get six months worth of Sunday service, and the riders overwhelmingly said they were willing to pay that 50 cents all year so that they could have Sunday bus for parts of the year. Eighty percent of them did.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I take a look on the face of this, taking a look at the Sunday service right now, for that particular day we're losing \$5,000 every Sunday; for first four Sundays anyway.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And how much are we making during the week by that extra 50 cents on every main fare? Enough to cover that. That's how this program was designed. It's working exactly as it was designed.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I never had the impression that somehow based on the sponsor's rhetoric that we were going to wind up losing money on Sunday bus service. That there was this huge influx of people, that there was a tremendous demand, that we were going to generate enough dollars to pay for this, at least on Sunday. Even though, you know, we would have to charge everybody a two dollar fare for the rest of the year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are we losing money, Commissioner? Overall as a whole, is this costing us anything or is the riders covering the cost of the Sunday service. Plain and simple.

COMM. ANDERSON:

I'll tell you next week when I get all of the information. I don't have all the information.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. But you know that the bill is designed only to have the riders cover the additional cost. Is that correct?

MR. ANDERSON:

The riders -- the bill itself, as we stated from the beginning, was that it would only -- this fare increase would only pay for a partial service increase.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. And your department is to determine the extent you can provide for that additional revenue that's generated. Is that correct? That's what the bill does, it tasks you with providing the greatest extent of Sunday service that you can with the additional money.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So does it cost the taxpayers anything, sir?

COMM. ANDERSON:

Hopefully not. And again --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, you're in control. If it does it's because you've miscalculated and provided service beyond what the bill tasks you with.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Correct. That's why we're trying to track it on a weekly basis, so that we can keep track of it and if it does start to go to that point where it's costing the County money, we will shut it down, which was as per your legislation, which was the greatest extent practicable.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Exactly. Commissioner -- oh sorry, is there somebody else who wanted to speak? Oh, Robert.

MR. LIPP:

Just as a point of the information. Clearly, it remains to be seen if it could be run all year-round. Perhaps it can't, and therefore the determination will be made by DPW. But at the end of the day, it's public knowledge, you know -- for instance, if you look at the economics literature, that public transportation needs to be subsidized to decrease in cost industry. There's no way you could make a return, revenue greater than the cost is not going to happen. So overall you will need to subsidize in some form. Just look at the MTA, for instance. The question is whether or not the service is worth it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is being subsidized for fare increase, not through any other source. It's fare increase, and MTA didn't want to raise the fares. We felt there was some room to go up in the fares from \$1.50 to two. The riders supported it, there's not much more you can do. But it's serving a lot of people at this point and a lot of businesses are taking advantage of it.

So you're asking for two more weeks. I believe you already have the revenue numbers. You developed them from the last time we had a bill that looked at County-wide -- a County-wide fare increase. Your department was to develop the best plan based on certain factors. So you have in the past developed a revenue projection based on a 50 cent increase County-wide. It shouldn't be so hard to plug that in, that number based -- you've done the revenue side -- the expense side now already for these ten lines, so.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Well, like I said, give me two weeks and I will revise my table accordingly and get that to everybody.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. I'll make a motion to table.

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All in favor?

MS. LOMORIELLO:

I'm sorry. Who seconded?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Tom Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled. *(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)*

IR 1488, Authorization of alteration of rates for North Ferry Co., Inc. (Pres. Off.)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This has to be tabled for Public Hearing. I make a motion to table, second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled. *(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)*

IR 1530, Authorizing the conveyance of County-owned surplus unused right-of-way fronting a parcel of land, having a Suffolk County Tax Map Identification Number of District 0200 Section 663.00 Block 03.00 Lot 001.000, pursuant to Section 125 of the New York State Highway Law. (Co. Exec.)

Commissioner, this was tabled last time. What was the issue here again?

COMM. ANDERSON:

I don't honestly recall what the issue was at the last committee, but I can tell you that this was a parcel or parcels of land that were used to create County Road 101, Sills Road. Their surplus lands, they'll never be developed and we'll never need them. The adjacent landowner has requested, you know, that we convey them to him. And as you see, we feel that these lands are surplus and feel it's a good move for the County.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The question was that from last time there is actually two lots, but only one of the lots were listed in the resolution. Has it been amended to include both of the lots? Legislator Horsley?

COMM. ANDERSON:

I don't have an updated resolution on it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It was amended on the 19th of July, so let's just see if we can see how it was amended.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Gil, can you tell me a little bit about this property?

COMM. ANDERSON:

The property in question is effectively a transfer site. Materials are brought out, stone, things like that, by train, and then our -- I believe that's what the site is for, it's the --

LEG. HORSLEY:

Is it right on the LIE? Right off the LIE?

COMM. ANDERSON:

Yes, it is in that vicinity, it's just to the south.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The 136,000, is that going into the General Fund of the County?

COMM. ANDERSON:

Legislator, it is the transfer site.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It is the transfer site.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Yep.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. I just want to -- I got a couple of quick questions, maybe at the end.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And how do you want to dispose of it now though?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Oh, get it out of the committee.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You want to make a motion to approve?

LEG. HORSLEY:

You guys are ready?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Jim, do you have something you want to add?

MR. PETERMAN:

Yeah, I think one of the issues the last time was where to put the money, in the General Fund or the Highway Fund. We had to check to see if the bond was paid off from the original roadway construction and it was, so it can go into the General Fund.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Are they going to be using it for a transfer of property, the new owner we're selling it to? Or do we know anything about the --

MR. PETERMAN:

Basically it expands their property.

LEG. HORSLEY:

It expands their property on the transfer business itself.

MR. PETERMAN:

That's correct.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. So they're already existing there and they're just buying the adjoining lot.

MR. PETERMAN:

That's correct. It's unused County right of way.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You don't see any future need for it.

COMM. ANDERSON:

No.

MR. PETERMAN:

No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Is there a motion to approve?

LEG. STERN:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)**

IR 1534, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 Southwest (CP 8181). (Co. Exec.)

MR. NOLAN:

The next two have to be tabled. We have to -- there was a mix up with the public hearings. We're rescheduling them and those have to be held first.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right.

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled. **(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)**

IR 1535, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 Southwest (Outfall Final Effluent Pump Station) (CP 8108). (Co. Exec.)

Same motion, same second, same vote. So that's tabled. **(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)**

Moving on to Introductory Resolutions.

Introductory Resolutions

IR 1570, Approving a County-wide "Adopt-A-Spot" Program. (Stern)

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by the sponsor, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Tabled. **(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)**

IR 1584, Appropriating funds in connection with Sagtikos Corridor Construction (CP 5565) (Stern)

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by the sponsor, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed?

Abstentions? Tabled. ***(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***

IR 1586, Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of considering proposed increases and improvements of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 Southwest (CP 8170). (Co. Exec.)

Is there a motion?

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion by Legislator Horsley to approve.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. ***(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)***

IR 1602, Amending the 2011 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with dredging of County waters (CP 5200). (Pres. Off.)

Commissioner, the amendment here?

COMM. ANDERSON:

The amendment adds 50,000 into our program to begin the development and study of the dredging the Grand Canal in Oakdale. It was approved a number of years back by the Dredge Screening Committee because -- and it was attached to the adjacent wetlands. And we have been in discussions with the DEC and getting closer to an agreement on that, and I believe that's why the Legislator put the money in to begin, you know, the design of the project and then eventually the permitting and hopefully construction.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is this that one that we're putting through as environmental dredge program, the one that had all that surface material?

COMM. ANDERSON:

No. This is one from probably -- well, it was approved by the Screening Committee before I came to the County.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Where's the 50,000 coming from?

COMM. ANDERSON:

1755.

P.O. LINDSAY:

The money is in the capital program budget.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Do we have a motion? Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Presiding Officer. Do you want to second, Bill?

P.O. LINDSAY:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Lindsay. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. *(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)*

IR 1603, Authorizing transfer of surplus blackberry mobile devices to The Retreat, Inc. (Schneiderman)

I'll make a motion, second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. *(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)*

IR 1607, Requesting the conveyance of a certain unopened right-of-way commonly known and referred to as Nicolls Road, Town of Babylon, Suffolk County, New York, for Public Highway improvement purposes and requesting approval from the Town of Babylon for conveyance of same pursuant to New York State General Municipal Law §72-h. (Co. Exec.)

LEG. HORSLEY:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion by Legislator Horsley. Second by Legislator Stern. Commissioner, anything -- any additional information for us?

COMM. ANDERSON:

This conveyance provides or turns this paper road over to the County, which we then can turn over to the cemeteries in the vicinity of the intersection of Pinelawn Road with Long Island Avenue. We're looking to realign that intersection. This will, you know, allow us to give property to the cemeteries and in turn they will give us property, again, so we can realign the intersection.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. We had a motion and a second. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. *(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)*

IR 1608, Authorizing the conveyance of County-owned surplus unused right-of-way fronting a parcel of land, having a Suffolk County Map Identification Number of District 0200 Section 663.00 Block 03.00 Lot 001.000, pursuant to Section 125 of the New York State Highway Law. (Co. Exec.)

COMM. ANDERSON:

This is that second lot that we separated from the previously discussed legislation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator Stern.

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)**

IR 1611, Creating a Long Wharf Advisory Committee. (Schneiderman)

This sets up a committee to look at possible revenue sources and uses for the Long Wharf. If you recall, the body decided, at least initially, not to give this parcel to the village with the thought that maybe it could generate some -- be more self sustaining as a County asset. So this committee takes a look at some of the potential in coordination with the village so that we're not looking at revenue sources that the village might find objectionable. Commissioner, do you have any comment on it?

COMM. ANDERSON:

I'm sorry?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Do you have any comments?

COMM. ANDERSON:

No, we're fine with it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions? I'll make a motion to approve, second by Legislator Muratore. On the motion, Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Mr. Chairman, my only comment is that certainly, Mr. Chairman, you are persistent, and that's a very positive quality. But I'll be persistently no on the vote.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All in favor? Opposed? One opposition so noted, Legislator Barraga. So approved. **(Vote: 5-1-0-0 Opposed: Legislator Barraga; Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)**

IR 1615, Authorizing transfer of surplus blackberry mobile devices to SEPA Mujer. (Montano)

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion by Legislator Muratore. Second by -- I'll second. We have a motion and a second. I won't call the vote yet. Is there any discussion or questions?

The address is Touro Law Center. It's a nonprofit. The County has surplus blackberry phones. I believe that this is being transferred. I'm not sure how they're using them. There's a motion and a second. Any further discussion?

LEG. STERN:

I would just say that from the resolution it appears as though this is an agency or a program that

works in conjunction with Touro Law Center. That's the information that's provided in the resolution.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:

Not on this, before you adjourn.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Before I adjourn. Anyone else on this? All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. *(Vote: 6-0-0-0, Presiding Officer Lindsay is included in the vote)*

That concludes our agenda. Legislator Muratore wanted a moment to address the Commissioner.

LEG. MURATORE:

Just before we close I just wanted to comment to the Commissioner. I want to thank you and your crew for the great job you did on Patchogue-Holbrook Road between the Expressway and Portion Road. I'm getting very popular in my neighborhood and it's thanks to the great job you guys are doing, so I wanted to thank you and your crew and whoever helped get that done. Thank you.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And, again, before we adjourn Legislator Horsley has a question or comment.

LEG. HORSLEY:

I have a comment to make to the Commissioner. Since you got one attaboy, I might as well put -- and I appreciate that and it was a good attaboy and thank you, Tom, for bringing it up prior to my question.

As we know that we've been working on an agreement between the Administration and the Legislature involving the sewers and the Sewer Stabilization Fund. And one of the concerns I've had that I wanted thrown into the mix was that the -- that the Southwest Sewer District that we have for the outfall pipe, that if there is a breach or a failure, a leak, that we have repair pipes on grounds, ready to go, prepared, like the Boy Scouts, you know, in case there was a problem, since we know, you know, it's likely at some point that that may happen. And, of course, we're working to reestablish the outfall pipe, etcetera.

I have been asking for those repair pipes, and I remember Ben Zwirn saying, oh, it's coming next month, and then it would be next month. This goes back three or four years ago. And every month I went on and then finally I just got worn out and I let it slide. But I'm back again saying where are those pipes, and you're telling me that the RFP is just going to go out next month.

COMM. ANDERSON:

The bid documents, correct.

LEG. HORSLEY:

The bid documents. When will we have those repair pipes on site. So, you know, we're playing Russian roulette with the general public here and the Great South Bay. You know, Gil, give me some confidence. I'm looking for an Administrative comment that yes, we will have them by a certain date, maybe the fall or whatever.

COMM. ANDERSON:

I would have to get you that information. I don't have that information. The thing I can tell you is we're confident that as long as we can maintain the low pressure on the system there will be no breach of the outfall pipe.

LEG. HORSLEY:

You'll promise me there will be no breach on the outfall pipe, that's what you're saying.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. HORSLEY:

That's a promise.

COMM. ANDERSON:

That's a promise. But I will get you the date when we would anticipate getting those pipes in place.

LEG. HORSLEY:

Okay. For the record, Mr. Chairman, he is committed to the fact that there will be never a breach in that --

COMM. ANDERSON:

I never said never, but I'm saying --

LEG. HORSLEY:

In our outfall pipe going through the Great South Bay. Thank you, Gil. Please get it.

COMM. ANDERSON:

Absolutely. If I may, Chairman. I'd like to just advise the committee at the next General Legislature next week we have requested that a number of CNs be submitted. The CNs are necessary because of Federal funding. It turns out there's -- just to give you a brief overview. The CNs are for improvements to County Road 38 -- I mean 39, from North Sea Road to Montauk Highway. Engineering and construction, reallocation of funds for construction, which is what we just said, hybrid electric vehicles, CNG vehicles, CNG fueling facilities, and then lastly there will be a request for a public hearing. The reason we have to go to CN for that is because of the time frame in dealing with an agreement with the MTA. It's for our ability to go in and expand the grade crossing at Brentwood Road and Suffolk Avenue. And each of these, they are time-sensitive, and that's the reason for the CN.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can you just tell me that CN on County Road 39, what it is, what is it doing again?

P.O. LINDSAY:

To remove the road.

(Laughter)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's for the widening, that last section?

MR. PETERMAN:

This is phase three. It's from County Road 38 to Montauk Highway. Our latest estimates came in at about 5.1 million. I believe a resolution we had last year appropriated 4.9 million. We were

able to get more Federal aid for the additional funding we acquired so it is an 80-20 split again. So we're just asking the funding required to bid the project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And then when do you perceive that work going -- we've got all the State approvals now that we're waiting for?

MR. PETERMAN:

As soon as the money is in place we can advertise and let it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So this is a fall project this year?

MR. PETERMAN:

That depends on when we get the money. Typically after a letting there's a two to three month contract stage. We'll get what we can done in the winter, you know, the drainage and stuff done. Hopefully we can have it done before, you know, next summer.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Thanks. Any other business? All right. We're adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 1:42 P.M.)