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, June 12, 2012.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Legislator Jay Schneiderman - Chairman
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chairman
Legislator Wayne Horsley
Legislator Tom Muratore
Legislator Tom Barraga

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
George Nolan- Counsel to the Legislature
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - DPW
Phil Berdolt - Deputy Commissioner - DPW
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer - DPW
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office
Catherine Stark - Aide to Chairman Schneiderman
Paul Perillie - Aide to Legislator Gregory
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk - SC Legislature
Ben Zwirn - County Executive's Office
Rich Myer - AME
All Other Interested Parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:
Donna Catalano - Court Stenographer

(*THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:07 P.M.*)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Good afternoon. I'd like to call the meeting to order this 12th day of June. Please join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Stern.

SALUTATION

Please be seated. We have no presentations, no yellow cards. This is a good sign.

1345, Authorizing license and setting rates for Hampton Jitney, Inc. (Pres. Off.)

I'm going to make a motion to approve if I have a second, and then I'll explain where we are with this. Seconded by Legislator Stern. Actually, let me change the motion to a discharge without recommendation. Sorry about that. Can I have a second? Legislator Stern is changing to a discharge recommendation. The Hampton Jitney has gotten all the approvals from the Village of Greenport. Sag Harbor Village is voting tonight. I understand that they're going to approve Sag Harbor's piece of it. Everything is falling into place, but we have been advised not to approve it until the village has formally approved it. If we don't get it to the floor by next Tuesday -- tonight they will get their Sag Harbor approval -- then they won't be able to start the service in July. So it's critical that it gets to the floor so that it can move forward. So if there's no questions, I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1400, Authorizing alteration of rates for South Ferry Inc. (Pres. Off.)

I will make a motion to approve. We've closed the hearing, right, Counsel? We've closed the hearing on this one.

MR. NOLAN:
It was recessed.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh, that's right. We recessed it for -- we wanted to have one on the East End in Riverhead -- actually, Riverside. All right. So this has to be tabled. I'll make a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

Mr. Clark, you don't have to stay for the rest of the meeting. I appreciate you coming here, Bill, but -- is there any questions for the ferry owner? All right. Thanks for coming out. It's going to be eligible for a vote -- well, first we'll finish the hearing at the Riverhead meeting next week, and then it has to come back to committee, right? It's back in committee in August.

MR. NOLAN:
I think there's going to be a request made to the County Executive's Office perhaps to issue a Certificate of Necessity.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
We can't discharge it out.

MR. NOLAN:
No, we can't do that. The only way it can be voted on at the next meeting is with a CN. We've done that a number of times with ferries -- different ferry licenses and rate changes. But if that doesn't happen, we won't be able to vote on it until our first August meeting.

MR. CLARK:
Thank you very much for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay, Bill, safe travels. We called the vote. That was tabled.

1440, Directing the Department of Public Works to hold public hearings on reducing bus fares for veterans. (Muratore)

Legislator Muratore, you are withdrawing this one?

LEG. MURATORE:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Madam Clerk, this is being withdrawn by the sponsor.

1487, Naming a portion of CR 16 in Farmingville in honor of Lieutenant Richard Nappi. (Muratore)

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Seconded by Legislator Stern. Has this been now through Sitings?

LEG. STERN:
Yes, Mr. Chairman. This came before the Sitings Committee. Legislator Muratore appeared before the Sitings Committee to give an explanation. That was done to the satisfaction of the committee. The vote was all in favor with only one abstention, so this has been approved by the Sitings Committee.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Any other discussion? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1488, Naming a portion of CR 96 in West Babylon in honor of United States Sergeant William McKenna. (Horsley)

LEG. HORSLEY:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by the sponsor, Legislator Horsley, seconded by Legislator Stern. Counsel, does this have all the prerequisites it needs?

MR. NOLAN:
Yes. For the record, this did go to the Namings Committee initially, but our Naming Law expressly excludes the naming of roadways for veterans from the purview of the Naming Committee. So this type of naming takes place simply by resolution of the Legislator.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. We've had a motion and a second. Any discussion. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

Okay. Introductory Resolutions.

1533, Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of hybrid electric vehicles of various models for County Fleet and accepting Federal Aid (CP 5601, PIN 082638). (Co. Exec.)

I'll make a motion.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Seconded by Legislator Barraga. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1534, Appropriating funds in connection with installation of Fire, Security, and Emergency Systems at County facilities (CP 1710). (Co. Exec.)

I will make a motion to approve.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Seconded by Legislator Stern. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1537, Appropriating funds in connection with Underground Injection Control Management Program (CP 8220). (Co. Exec.)

Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Horsley. Commissioner, can you give us a little detail on what injection control is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. This is a program that was mandated by the EPA. We are to locate, inspect and improve, if needed, any underground injection control facility, which is basically a leaching pool, catch basin, anything that basically allows water to seep into the ground. This will allow us to continue the program, to meet the Federal mandates. It's for 300,000 in planning and 500,000 in construction costs.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(*the vote was amended. See Page 27)**

1538, Appropriating funds in connection with application and removal of lane markings (CP 5037). (Co. Exec.)

Same motion, same second. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1539, Appropriating funds in connection with Replacement of Major Buildings Operations Equipment at Various County Facilities (CP 1737). (Co. Exec.)

Let's do same motion, same second. Commissioner, if you want to give us any detail.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is to appropriate $600,000. And our intent with this money is to upgrade the electrical service at Suffolk County Police Headquarters. Even though the building is relatively new, because of computer systems and the like, we are at a point where the electrical service is just about at its maximum point. So this will allow us to upgrade it and increase the service, similar to if you were home and you went from 100 amp service to a 200 amp service. That's what we're looking to do with this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Any discussion? Questions? Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Which building is this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Police Headquarters out in Yaphank.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yaphank, thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Other questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote was amended. See Page 27)**

1551, Amending Resolution No. 625-2009, accepting New York State Marchiselli Aid in connection with the rehabilitation of CR 17, Wheeler Road from the vicinity of CR 100, Suffolk Avenue to the vicinity of Bretton Road, Town of Islip (CP 5097, PIN 075733). (Co. Exec.)

Tom, you want to make a motion for State aid for an Islip project? Motion by Legislator Barraga, seconded by Legislator Stern. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1567, Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of considering proposed increases and improvements of facilities (Phase 2A) for Sewer District No. 21 - SUNY (CP 8121). (Co. Exec.)

Motion by Legislator Horsley, seconded by Legislator Stern. Commissioner, what type of improvements here?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We're looking at process enhancements -- construction of process enhancements and improvements to our de-nit filters. The process enhancement include aerators and dissolved oxygen

improvements to the facility and are mandated through a consent order that we're trying to meet.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So we really have no choice here anyway. It's a DEC consent order?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. The intent is also to meet the Long Island Sound Study requirements for the levels of nitrates, which these improvements will allow us to do. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1589, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with dredging of County waters (CP 5200). (Pres. Off.)

I'll make a motion, seconded by Legislator Horsley. Commissioner, this is what, 750,000?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is 750,000 to do the actual dredging of the Grant Canal down in Oakdale. Last year, the funds to do the study of it, you know, the reporting and the permitting were provided. This will -- even though we haven't gotten the permits yet, this will allow us to do the construction.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And the money is coming from?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
1755, the infrastructure, traffic and public safety.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
This is an available offset?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. This is Legislature's capital project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1597, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with road improvements for CR 83 from the vicinity of CR 16 to the vicinity of NYS RT25, Town of Brookhaven; PIN OT2465 (CP 5548). (Muratore)

Motion by Legislator Muratore. Is there a second?

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Seconded by Legislator Barraga. I'm going to make a motion to discharge without recommendation, but I'd actually like to hear from the Commissioner. This project is an $18 million project; correct, something in that range?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And it's a traffic safety improvement project, it adds an additional lane?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The intent of the overall project was to eliminate the median that exists there and put in concrete barriers. By doing that, we would be able to -- in both directions, when you're down the main hill up near Bald Hill, it goes from three down to two lanes. And we would be able to continually have three lanes, build an additional third lane in either direction. By doing that, we would -- we would have to look at noise, because we're adding a lane in there, and as such, we would likely have to build sound walls. So we're looking at -- this is within the Federal aid program.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
A sound wall is a Federal requirement when you have six lanes, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, it's really when you're increasing the noise -- if you're increasing a lane, if you're adding a lane, if you're doing something to expand the roadway that's going to potentially add noise to an area, then you would have to look at mitigating that, and the mitigation would be, in this case, sound walls. The fact that we are taking the road and -- for lack of a better term -- squishing it into the right-of-way rather than having a wide median, which we currently have through most of the road, we would have basically a concrete barrier with a shoulder on either side. So we would minimize the amount of land that we would have to take to put in sound walls.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Is the sound wall an option here or is it a requirement, I guess is what I'm trying to get at. Can the traffic piece be done without the sound wall?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. The traffic piece could be done without the sound wall if we did it with our own funding.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
With our own funding. If we use Federal funding, we have to build this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. We have to look at it. We don't have to build it. It would have to be studied. There's always a chance that the levels wouldn't be --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Does the bill before us allow both options or no?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is really just the very preliminary beginning of the project. This is really just a feasibility study.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
This doesn't commit us for the whole 18 million?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, it doesn't.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Just $100,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And the other 400,000 is Federal.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We could do the study, and the study turns out to say, no, it's not worth doing.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So it's 500,000 in planning of which we're spending a hundred and the Feds are spending another hundred -- 400. If the project does move forward, it's what, 80% Federal?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Eighty percent Federal.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
But my understanding is there might be some Marchiselli Funding possibly.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Marchiselli usually you don't get to the very end. It's always given, but it depends on the state of the County, how much -- depends on the state of State and how much money they have.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So it's likely we would get it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That much I don't know.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Maybe Bill has more information on this. I know, Legislator Muratore, you're chomping at the bit here. I'll give the mic to you in one second.

MR. HILLMAN:
As the Commissioner said, the Marchiselli Funding is lagging, and we wouldn't know -- each phase has a potential design, construction or even right-of-way has the potential to get Marchiselli Funding. All the projects get sent up to Albany, they get rated and ranked in Albany, and then the Marchiselli is divvied out until it's gone. We have no control over it. It's completely a State process. And we could not make any guarantees. Most of our projects have received Marchiselli Funding in the past.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
If we move forward, we're not committing to necessarily build the sound wall; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It would have to be studied.

MR. HILLMAN:
The commissioner explained it exactly right. It's a requirement to study it. And if it meets noise requirements, we will be required to install it. It if doesn't meet the noise requirements, we will not be required to install it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And the timing of this in terms of Federal funds, I know it's before us today, we don't meet in July, we're back in August, is this a time sensitive matter? Let's say it waited a month, would that

adversely affect the ability for the County to move this project forward?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It makes it harder, but it doesn't negate it. We don't hit a wall. We would be able to put the required paperwork in within the 45 days. It's just that at the end of the year, it does become tighter.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Is there a possibility that we might lose the funding because we waited a month?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There's always a possibility, yeah. If we get it in August, we get the approval the first week in August and we have 45 days beyond that, that puts us into the middle of September, I think we'd have a very good shot at that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It is possible that if this were not approved today that we would lose the Federal funding?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, it is possible today. Again, because there are so many questions not only from this body, but also from across the street, that we table it and we have a meeting and go through issues.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
But the tabling it could end up killing the project. We could discharge it without recommendation as well. Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:
You know, Friday I was at a press conference, and they talked about capital projects and what they're going to do for the County and how hard we're working to make sure these come through. Now here we have an $18 million project, and it's only going to cost us $900,000 at the end probably, if we get that State funding.

Everybody's talking about sound walls. It's really not a sound wall issue there. That's a dangerous road. That intersection down on Granny Road and 83, there's been four deaths down there. It's gotten to the point the fire department came to my office asking if I could reach out to DPW. And as usual, DPW came through and they brought these temporary jersey walls, they did some drainage work up there. I don't even know of there's been an accident there for the last couple of months. So it's gotten a little bit better up there just with some temporary fixes.

I know personally, a good friend of mine, his daughter was almost paralyzed because of an accident down there and hydroplaning. And another young man was paralyzed that works at the farm in my district. So it's not really about the sound walls. This goes back a long, long time when Caracappa was here. He'd even gotten some funding for this. And then when Joe left, somehow the money got taken away or wasn't used or time lapsed when Beedenbender was here, so the project fell on its face.

So now we're talking again about a project that would bring a lot of jobs to Suffolk County and really help a road that needs a lot of help. And we're going to do it relatively cheap. You know what I say, I like to do projects when we do it with other people's money. That's the best way to do it. I know there's pressure from other people saying, "Well, maybe not now." But why not now? Why are we putting this off? Do it by, if you want, discharge without recommendation. I would like it to be approved by this committee. It seems like we have people that are concerned with sewers and Public Works projects and getting jobs in the County. I heard them say it. So I would hope they

would join ranks with me and approve this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm not sure right now whether we can wait or not. I think we've had a little bit of conflicting testimony. I'm a little bit concerned that if we did table it and it ended up killing this project, that this committee would be blamed for killing an $18 million project that could put a lot of people to work. It's too big for me to allow this to die in committee. So I will support discharging without recommendation to let the Legislature wrestle with this, but -- if it goes that way. I don't mind holding back a cycle if I'm confident that it's not going to kill this project. Any information -- if you can do further analysis on that issue so that at least when we vote on it next Tuesday, if it does reach the floor, we know whether it has to happen on Tuesday or not. If it doesn't, we can recommit it even.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Understood. First off, let me just address something that the Legislator said. He's absolutely right, it doesn't have to have it included in there the sound wall. The 18 million that you are speaking of is an estimate based on inclusion of the sound wall, probably even a little bit less, but, you know, in that same realm. Cut it in half if you don't do a sound wall.

You know, with the issue of killing the job, to a certain extent, we're at the mercy of the State. Once we submit it to the State for the Federal process, they have to work and they have to do whatever review of the project that they need to do to get -- make sure that that project stays on the tip. Right now it's on the tip, but it's only that first portion, it's only the 500,000 that we're speaking. So it's not the ultimate construction cost. That will be years out once we get through the design phase.

Again, it's unlikely that it's going to kill the job to wait, but if this body would prefer, I'll try to get a tighter number if you were to discharge it without recommendation, and at next week's committee, I'll make a statement as to what I find.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
In terms of public safety, Gil, would you rate this as a very important project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
To be honest with you, with the exception of the issues that we've addressed down at Granny, it's a capacity project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Capacity.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Certainly safety at both intersections at both ends of the projects, it's the intersections that are the ones that would need to be studied, and we have been looking at and we have been working on improvements to it. This specific job is to try to improve the capacity by the removal of the medians, putting in the concrete barrier in between the two and creating the additional lanes in either direction that are needed. So you don't have to drop from three lanes down to two lanes as you're heading over the hill and downgrade.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm not 100% convinced that this is the best project. But I'm fairly convinced that if it's going to be killed, it probably shouldn't be here at the committee if it means that a delay is going to kill the project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We think it's a worthwhile project, it's just, you know, again, to us it's more of a capacity project than a public safety project, but the components of both are in there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
You do think it's worthwhile?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And do you think it's likely it will be 95% funded other than by the County?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Eighty percent, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Eighty percent for sure, Federal and another 15% -- you said before that it usually comes along, the Marchiselli funding.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, I did say that. Bill, correct me if I'm wrong, as far I know, we can't anticipate that funding because there's a chance that -- they have X number of funds. In fact, I think last year's cycle or the year before, not every job got 15% worth of Marchiselli Funding. They basically have a pot, they take from that pot. At some point, they start running out of money, and they can't contribute.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Now, the bill itself doesn't speak to this, right? I certainly would be more inclined to support it in general if I knew that it was only 5% County funds. Seems like a worthwhile project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
But there's no way that we can guarantee that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
The bill isn't contingent upon State and Federal funding?

MR. HILLMAN:
It's contingent upon Federal funding, it's not contingent upon the Marchiselli 15. But let me clarify, the only funds that are -- Federal funds that are available to us at this moment is $500,000 for this project. There is no other Federal funds identified for this project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Four hundred thousand in Federal?

MR. HILLMAN:
It's 400,000 in Federal, but, yes. All these future numbers that are being discussed are when the Federal funds become available, we will try to get them on what's called the TIP, Transportation Improvement program. All the Federal funds that we have presently are all allocated to other project. I'm just clarifying, that is a normal process, you don't always -- because this would be five, six, maybe seven years down the road. So we would hope to identify those funds moving board.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
So what you're saying, if I understand you correctly, you can go ahead and spend this 500,000 on the planning and construction, but if at the end, you make the decision we should proceed and then pursue the rest of the project, if the Federal money is not available it's just a dead project, you're not going to go forward with it.

MR. HILLMAN:
That's correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Horsley, Legislator Stern, and I have Legislator Kennedy who is not on the committee but is asking --

LEG. HORSLEY:
Commissioner, just quickly on this. We were chatting up here when you were discussing your conversation, what are you going to give to us on Tuesday if we discharge it without recommendation?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The request was -- I guess a little more detail on the ability of the State to process and maintain its project if it was tabled so that the discussion could continue with a lot of the questions.

LEG. HORSLEY:
If it's tabled or discharged without recommendation?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, again, at this point, there seems to be so many questions on this that I felt it might be better to table this so -- a cycle so that we could have a full discussion with the County Executive's Office as well as this body, and -- so, you know, we could put everything on the table. We do think this is a project worthy. I don't believe it's a project that's going to -- you know, with one cycle, I don't believe we are going to lose the funding, but I said I would verify that. We may.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
There is a chance that one cycle will lead to the loss of the Federal funding. It's possible.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Just for clarification, that's because, what, there's a deadline here in September, all of the paperwork has to be in in September; is that correct?

MR. HILLMAN:
October 1 is the deadline. They then moved that up unofficially to September 15. So if the project is not what's called "authorized" by September 15th, you won't be getting the money.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
What's involved from your end, Bill, in terms of once the Legislature gives you the go-ahead, what do you have to do to secure the funding?

MR. HILLMAN:
The resolution along with a project description is sent to State DOT, that person then takes that

information and we always call it "flip some switches," and you know, the paperwork goes from desk to desk, and this person makes an approval, that person makes an approval, and next thing you know, we get e-mailed an authorization sheet. What that process exactly entails, I'm not exactly sure.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
That's really where the uncertainty lies, is once you get it up to the State, the State might not get it back in time for you to get it to the Federal Government; is that right?

MR. HILLMAN:
Well, we get our authorizations from the State. It goes from us to the State to the Feds, from the Feds to the State to us. So we don't ever really discuss anything with the Feds. The State is our liaison. So once we hand all the resolution and all the information over to the State and request the authorization, it's a bit of a black box; we don't know what goes on there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
The State would have to stamp it "approved" before September 15th, is that what you're saying?

MR. HILLMAN:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So it's really up in the State's hands. Do they typically need more lead time than a month.

MR. HILLMAN:
As the Commissioner indicated, toward the end of the year they're trying to get approvals for a number of projects. If it was earlier on in the year that they don't have a big workload -- it's hard for us to say.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So that's really where the uncertainty comes from.

MR. HILLMAN:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So the earlier we approve it, the more likely the State will be able to meet that September 15th deadline.

MR. HILLMAN:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
The later we approve it, the less likely, and there's a chance that they won't make the deadline. Okay.

LEG. STERN:
Maybe you could take me through the process. There's the $100,000 and the $400,000, that's a total of $500,000. Does the $500,000 have to be spent towards this analysis, toward this study in order to be the key to perhaps access the 80% Federal funding? I mean, going back to Legislator Barraga's question on the timing here, does this money have to be spent in full in order to even have a shot at the 80% or is this money that just has to be authorized, we have to show that it's been authorized in order to get the shot at the 80% Federal funding?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This money has to be appropriated so that we can show that we are moving ahead with it. It will be 80% Federally funded. So we are only talking about 20% of the cost, which is $100,000 that we are speaking of.

LEG. STERN:
Right. Because of the project, that's right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're going to do a report, the report is going to identify, yes, project is a good that has a cost benefit ratio and it's adequate and we should move forward, or it's going to say no. But it's the first step you need to take amongst a number of steps before you even get to construction. So if you do this report and it determines that it's a waste of time, then that's where it ends and we've expended 100,000 rather than 500,000.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Kennedy.

MR. HILLMAN:
If I could just clarify one thing also. We don't submit an application to the Feds and they either approve or disapprove. We get allocated a certain amount of Federal funds each year, and we as a department make a decision as to how to apply that. So right now, the Federal Transportation Bill is locked up in the Senate -- no, the Senate passed it, the House, it's locked up in the House. So for over four years now, we have been, as a country, have been kicking the can down the road not approving a Transportation Bill, and our Federal allocation from State DOT has whittled down year by year by year.

But the point is the Feds or the State don't make decisions, we do. If we're given $10 million, we apply $10 million the most appropriate way we think it should be applied. If we're given 15 or 20 we apply that in the best way moving forward. So moving forward on the construction, when we have available funds, we would move forward with this project.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It is possible we could decide at that point that this isn't the best use of those Federal funds and we want to apply it to another project?

MR. HILLMAN:
There is a point of no return where you would have to reimburse the Feds, and it's beyond this initial report that the Commissioner indicated. We'll be doing what's called an EPP. It's basically a report, and it will lay out all the different alternatives. Again, as the Commissioner indicated, he will do a cost benefit analysis, and it will make a recommendation; either move forward or not to move forward. If it makes a recommendation to move forward and we appropriate additional Federal funds and take the next step, we're going to be committed to the project. At that time then, say we finish the design and then we say, "Oh, well, you know what? We don't want to do this project," we'll we're going to need to reimburse the Feds for the design cost.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Even the 400,000 involved with the planning part, would we have to reimburse them if we didn't --

MR. HILLMAN:
Took next step? Yes. Beyond this one.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
If we took the next step and then abandoned it, but not this planning phase.

MR. HILLMAN:
This planning phase does not commit us to anything. We could use this money, identify that the project is not moving forward and not have to reimburse the Feds. This is what the Feds call the planning stage.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So this bill doesn't commit us to building the third lanes or the sound wall or any of that?

MR. HILLMAN:
Commits us to nothing. The next step does.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
The next step does. Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. I wanted to try to share or clarify with the Commissioner a couple of observations about this road in particular. First of all, as to the sound wall, having just dealt with that issue on 347, the sound wall selection process under the Federal highway guidelines is really a very tightly regulated and governed process. And in all cases, it's a decision that's driven by residential homeowners adjacent to that area with a fairly tight perimeter where they're solicited. And in the case of 347, there was a decision by the adjacent homeowners not to go for concrete sound walls, as you know. Simple fencing and shading foliage and vegetation fit the bill. You also know firsthand what we did on Motor Parkway, CR 67 down in the Commack area with an alternative involving berm and wooden structure. So there clearly are alternatives, as you had spoken about.

The other piece, as you know is, much of that stretch is not proximate to residences. You have Brookhaven Town Hall to the east, you have the Amphitheater to the west, you have the Farmingville Hills, and you're proximate right to the Sixth Precinct. As you eyeballed this, all of those areas clearly wouldn't even fall in sound wall area just because you're not proximate to residents. Do you agree or?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Not completely. In looking at this, yes, at the top of hill, obviously you have Town Hall and you have the Amphitheater at the side. Just to the south of there, once you get off the off ramp going onto Bicycle Path, you have houses immediately to the east.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Yes, there's some residents proximate there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Similarly to the north on the eastern side, once you start on the down gradient, you do have houses right there adjacent to the park -- sorry -- to the road. And on the west side, little there's a bit of woods, but them you do have houses. So you are right, there is an area that isn't. Again, this all has to be studies. They are options, as you mentioned, to the sound wall. But in the case of Vets Highway too, from what I understand, there was no additional laneage created.

LEG. KENNEDY:
No, there was. We added a third lane. There was a third lane, as a matter of fact, that came through. It triggered that whole mandatory Federal highway administration solicitation process and query, and there were lines that were established of included residential properties. And it's a really

very narrow group that polled, and it's a simple majority. So it's not this whole complex or mandatory area.

The only other thing that I would say to is that as much as we would characterize this as capacity, you've got to acknowledge that that southbound downgrade lane on a day like today where you hit an intersection with Granny on a skew is a dangerous area. It's easy for traffic to lose control. Any time you get an inclement weather, as traffic on the south end -- unfortunately, we've had four fatalities. It's not a well-designed or situated intersection. And that would go as much to the project as looking at capacity.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
As Legislator Muratore stated, we went through down near Granny -- and in both cases, any comments that I've had at public sessions have indicated accidents at both Granny and the northerly one -- I'm drawing a blank, I apologize, but in both cases it was where there were down gradients, people speeding coming down the hill, and during unfortunately with wet weather the likelihood when you're going a little bit too fast, you can hydroplane, you lose control. We have added drainage in the area. We're constantly looking at intersections to improve them. Again, that's the reason that I would consider this a capacity and not a safety -- we are going to look at safety improvements. That's certainly something we look at in every project, reason but that's the reason for my classification.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
If we supported this resolution and eventually went through the entire project, as I understand it, you know, we're talking about -- if it's 500,000 and 18 million, you talking $18,500,000 with an 80% reimbursement from another level of government. So our cost at the County level is 3.7 million with the possibility of some Marchiselli Funds if they're available. So why don't we go ahead with this? It seems like a slam dunk. Most of the bills I'm looking at with the 70, 80, 90% reimbursement from some other level government, there's no discussion, we just approve it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Any one else? So right now before us we have a motion to approve by Legislator Muratore. We have a second by Legislator Barraga. We have a motion to approve. I'll make a motion to discharge without recommendation. Is there any other motions.

LEG. MURATORE:
Mr. Chairman, can I just ask question, why don't we just move it ahead? What is this discharge without petition? Why do we have to do that?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
As I said, I'm not convinced on the project itself, but I do have a feeling that if it doesn't make it to the floor, it might end this project. And not only could the project potentially put some people to work, but it sounds like it might be an important project for capacity.

So by discharging it without recommendation puts it on floor, but it sends a signal that we're not 100% backing this project, but I do feel the Legislature ought to be able to vet it. I have reason to believe that not getting this done before we recess for July could lead to losing that Federal money. And because of that, I'm not prepared to let it die here in committee. I'd rather not see it die here in committee, so that's why I support discharging it without a recommendation. Any other motion? So we have one motion to discharge without a second, we have two motions to approve, an no other motions? So we'll call the vote. We can only call the vote on the approval.

LEG. STERN:
I'll second the discharge without recommendation motion. I still have questions on the merits as well. Maybe this gives it a couple more days. The Commissioner said he's going to ask some questions. I don't know if I am necessarily convinced that the timing puts the resolution in jeopardy. Maybe the Commissioner, maybe your department can come up something more definitive that will kind of show us the way when we come back on Tuesday to make a real informed decision as to whether that's not the case.

I'm reluctant to just let a project of importance die in committee without having at least gone through the steps, especially if timing becomes an issue. I don't think any of us would want to see that. But before I certainly am able to make a final decision come Tuesday, I'd like for the Commissioner to be able to come forward and make that case for us. So I will support the discharge without recommendation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:
To the Commissioner, are we going to get a different answer on Tuesday, ir is it going to be same you told us today, "Well, maybe we will and maybe we won't"?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
He is going to research it some more. It's not a fair question. It depends on what his research is.

LEG. MURATORE:
Is he going to come up with an answer? Can you find answer for this is what I'm asking?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'm going to go to the staff members that I have that deal directly with Feds and the State -- one of gentlemen is in depth and very knowledgeable in this -- and see if i can get a better understanding of percent chance that it's going to be impacted by the time we get to August.

LEG. MURATORE:
If you can do this in four days, that all you have. You have tomorrow and Thursday and Friday, and then you have Monday, then we need the answer by Tuesday.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The answer is going to be a answer that, you know, I can't guarantee that it's not going to be impacted by waiting through August, but I think chances are -- you know, we're not killing the project by waiting until August, I can say that, but the percentage --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I thought you said it might kill the project. That there's a chance that waiting until August --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Once you give it over to the State --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- could kill this project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Once you give it over to the State, once you turn that approval process to the State, we have no

control over it. It could sit on a desk. We've had issues in the past where things have sat.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Can you guarantee me that waiting until August won't kill this project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No I can't.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
There you go. So it might.

LEG. MURATORE:
The sooner we get it to State, the more time we have to work on it. If we wait a cycle, we're not being fair to the State either, we're shortening the time that they have to work with it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Essentially my issue is they cannot guarantee that waiting a month won't kill the project, and that's an issue. All right. So we have a motion to discharge and a second, we have a motion to approve and a second. Any other motions on the floor? Any other discussion? Counsel, I do the discharge without recommendation first. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
DISCHARGED WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).

1610, Directing the Department of Public Works to implement bus fare reduction for veterans (MURATORE).

We don't have this on our agenda, because I think we got this after we printed the agenda. So has everyone seen the bill? This basically don't require the Commissioner to hold hearings because it's a fare reduction, but it would reduce the fee that veterans pay to 75 cents, which is the same fare that seniors are currently paying. Is there any motion on 1610? I'll make the motion, seconded by Legislator Muratore. On the motion, Legislator Stern?

LEG. STERN:
What's the motion for?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion to approve. This reduces the fare for veterans to 75 cents.

LEG. STERN:
There's been a motion and a second?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Tom, you want to explain it first.

LEG. MURATORE:
What we're doing is we're just charging any veteran to use the bus, 75 cents from the normal fare, $2 now.

LEG. STERN:
There was legislation that was introduced prior that seeks to deal with the same issue with the same end result. That legislation called for a public hearing, that legislation called for a survey to be

done, that legislation called for report to be issued to determine what the impact was going to be. This legislation doesn't call for any of that. I guess my question, through the Chair, to the sponsor is why. What information do we have, if any, on what the impact of this is going to be?

LEG. MURATORE:
Well, the Commissioner came before and told us that he felt -- I think at the last meeting -- that there wouldn't be relatively any impact on the system because of this reduction to 75 cents.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
At the last meeting, we felt, in looking at this, that this puts it to the same rate as the disabled riders rate. And if the vets were disabled, they would be riding it -- most of the vets --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Also, if they're senior citizens, it's the same rate.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Butt he hope is that by doing this, we'll attract veterans to ride the bus, and that will increase the number of riders that are there now. But to get tight numbers, we really don't know. We feel, though, that this is a minimal impact.

LEG. MURATORE:
Also, just one other thing, didn't we decide that the public hearing would cost like $3000? So rather than spend that money needlessly --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I think there was actually some testimony from -- maybe it was Garry Lenberger --that it might actually increase the revenues, because more vets would ride the bus.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. That's what I was trying to elude to. Yeah, because it will hopefully attract veterans to ride, that will increase revenues. You know, it would be a minimal increase, but it's an increase. We could use all the money we can get. Certainly, there is a cost to holding a public hearing, and that's generally around 3000, 3500.

LEG. STERN:
Then maybe I can just get a clarification, because normally, if there's going to be a reduction in revenue, then we need to find a corresponding offset. If the comment is -- I guess this is a question for Counsel. If we merely have a comment from one of our Department Heads that the decrease in revenue, if any, would be nominal and perhaps there might even be a nominal increase, is that statement Suffolk to obviate the need for some type of an offset or at least some kind of an analysis as to a potential offset?

MR. NOLAN:
As you know, because you sponsored it, we have in our Charter requirement that if, during the operating year, we reduce a revenue in the budget, then you have to have a corresponding offset of some kind. What suffices to satisfy -- like, we have the department saying they believe there's not going to be a fiscal impact. It's really up to this body to decide if they're going to accept that or not. If you think -- if you believe that and you think it's going to happen that way, then the body can accept it. You may want to look at other things; whether there's a fiscal impact statement. But if there is a loss of revenue, there should be an offset under the law.

LEG. STERN:
Part of the concern is that some of the information that we may have had, which is what was proposed prior with analysis being done, public hearings being done, a report issued, this doesn't call for any of that. So as to these other things that we might be able to look at to make that decision, there are none of those requirements that remain.

So, again, the bottom line is whether or not we think that the representation being made is going to be sufficient. And I ask the question because I look to the language of the bill. Maybe, George, you can opine on this. It's the Third Whereas Clause, which says, if I'm looking at the most recent version, it says that the transportation operations in DPW indicates that this fare reduction will have a negative fiscal impact. That's what I'm going on. If the department is saying that there's a negative fiscal impact, I think that's different than a neutral fiscal impact. I was just wondering if that --

MR. NOLAN:
That, I have to say, is a scribenor's error, because what it meant to say is there would not be negative impact, because that's what they testified. So we will make that correction. Two things happened at the last meeting; you had somebody from Transportation say they didn't think there would be a negative impact to the County on a fiscal front, and B, they also testified that in their opinion no public was required, because it's a fare reduction. And that's why there's really a new resolution before the committee today, because of that testimony.

LEG. STERN:
So if that's just a -- that's an issue that can be taken care of prior to the final vote then, the language in the Whereas Clause?

MR. NOLAN:
Yes, we will correct that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Can I ask in terms of consistency -- and I like what this bill is trying to do. We all want to do everything we can for those who risk their lives protecting this country. Are we being consistent though, because this is only one of many fees and fares the County charges. Do we do something similar in Parks? Do we have other areas in the County where vets get reduced fees; Green Keys, those kinds of things, or is this a first? Does anybody know the answer to that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
(Shaking head no).

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Nobody knows. I know we do for seniors. I think there are -- we also have to be careful too, because there's a lot of worthy groups out there; our firefighters, ambulance volunteers and things like that. All right. It would be helpful to know if we are being consistent. Nobody knows the answer to that? Okay. You want to vote on it? There was a motion and a second to approve. We're going to fix the scribenor's error before it hits the floor. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1612, Amending the 2012 Operating Budget, transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, and appropriating funds in connection with improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 9 College Park (CP 8163). (Co. Exec.)

Commissioner, you have some detail on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This resolution requests to appropriate $50,000 for design fees. The design fees are intended to develop plans for a new polishing filter and associated equipment and also to improve the recharge pools within the facility. This is the college park facility, Suffolk County Sewer District Number 9.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Any questions? No motion yet. Is there a motion to approve?

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Stern makes the motion, I'll second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1619, Amending the 2012 Operating Budget, transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund, and appropriating funds for safety and security improvements for Sanitary Facilities in Suffolk County Sewer Districts (CP 8103). (Co. Exec.)

Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Horsley. Commissioner, do you have more detail on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This appropriates $300,000, would allow us to purchase two mobile generators. The generators allow us to obviously provide electricity in the case of power loss. It's a back-up to a back-up. But we have found in times of need, these are very effective, and that's why we're looking for the funding.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1622, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, A Local Law to further regulate utility poles on County road right-of-ways. (Schneiderman)

It has to be tabled for a public hearing. I'll make a motion, seconded by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1626, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with roof replacement on various County buildings (CP 1623). (Co. Exec.)

I'll make a motion, seconded by Legislator Stern. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1629, Deleting and replacing certain previously approved maps and adding an "A" Map regarding the acquisition of lands pursuant to the New York State Eminent Domain Procedure Law, in connection with the acquisition of properties for the reconstruction of CR 3, Pinelawn Road/Wellwood Avenue at Colonial Springs Road, Towns of Babylon and Huntington, Suffolk County, New York (CP 5510). (Co. Exec.)

Do we have a motion?

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Stern. Do we have a second? I'll second. Commissioner?

LEG. STERN:
My understanding is that new maps have to be drawn because the scope of the purchase for land in order to complete the project is actually going to be reduced; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. STERN:
So it's actually in a good direction.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
In other words, we'll be saving money for the County.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Any questions? Comments? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1630, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) vehicles of various models for County Fleet and accepting Federal Aid (CP 5602, PIN 082636). (Co. Exec.)

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Stern, seconded by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. KENNEDY:
On the motion, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you. I just have a quick question for the Chairman -- I mean, for the Commissioner. This is for procurement of vehicles, but the Compressed Natural Gas vehicles are operated or fueled from specific compressed natural gas fueling sites that we have, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. KENNEDY:
We have two of them so far?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We also have agreements with Brookhaven and Smithtown to use their facilities as well.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. We have another one slated for Yaphank; is that correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. But the guy that designed the two that we built is on the layoff lift, I believe. That would be the Program Coordinator.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The gentleman who I know worked on the construction, yes, is slated for termination.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. Is that some specific expertise to build these fueling sites? You are working with gas an electric. I mean, do you have to have somebody who knows what they're doing?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I do like to believe that Public Works and what we do does require expertise.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. My point is just we're taking vehicles and at the same time, we're letting go of the people that are building the fueling sites. I appreciate it. I'll yield, Mr. Chair.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I appreciate the point, Legislator.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

We are at the last item **1631, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with acquisition of lands for the reconstruction of CR 16, Portion Road from Ronkonkoma Avenue to CR 97, Nicolls Road, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5511, PIN 075598). (Co. Exec.)**

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion to approve by Legislator Muratore. Anybody else?

LEG. BARRAGA:
I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Seconded by Legislator Barraga. Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is just part of the eminent domain process. The additional funding is required to enable the County to pay for a court ordered settlement, which was above our original estimate. These are four separate claims. This was the project that was done last year and the year before on CR 16, Portion Road from Ronkonkoma Avenue to Nicolls Road, CR 97. So this is -- you know, we're

mandated by the court to have to pay this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
If I could, may I?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes, Commissioner. I was going to ask if the committee members had any other questions for you before we adjourn, but if you have something to share.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I just realized -- okay. At the next Legislative Meeting, we're going to request a C of N for the inclusion of a $1.7 million appropriation for construction. We will looking to appropriate $1.7 million to augment an already appropriated $3.2 million within the Capital Program.

The funds are to be used to augment existing funding to complete the switch-over of the Riverhead County Center power house to the centralized campus-style heating configuration to a distributed system with satellite boilers in each of the Riverhead County Center buildings. The funds will be offset from four different existing capital programs, but I wanted to make you aware of that. Two of them, I should have actually asked you to table today. I will make that clear before the Legislature.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
What needed to be tabled? I'm sorry, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Two of the resolutions that we approved today, I should have asked to be tabled. IR 1537, which is CP 8220, the underground injection control program legislation, and then IR 1539, which is Capital Project 1737, replacement of major buildings operation equipment. Both of these, we are going to resubmit the resolutions.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
If that's the case, I don't want to waste the time of the Legislature. Let's reconsider them and keep them in committee. We can still do that. We haven't adjourned. I haven't said the magic words yet. In light of that, that they're not ready to go yet, I'm going to make a motion to reconsider --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
1537, which is capital --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let's do them one at a time. I'll make a motion to reconsider 1537, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? There are two bills that we approved that the Commissioner is saying is not ready.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We're going to resubmit it, use some of the under the next two legislations that we're going to speak of to help pay for a CN that we're looking to do.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
1537 is back before us. This is the injection one. So I will make a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

What's the second bill?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The second bill was 1539, which is Capital Project 1737.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion to reconsider 1539, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. So 1539 is now in front of us again. I will make a motion to table, seconded by Legislator Barraga. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1539 is **TABLED (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

What else you have for us, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's it. See you next Tuesday.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Anything else from anybody? All right. We are adjourned.

(*THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 3:10 P.M.*)

{ } DENOTES BEING SPELLED PHONETICALLY