

**PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**  
**OF THE**  
**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**  
**MINUTES**

A 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, October 2, 2012.

**Members Present:**

Legislator Jay Schneiderman - Chairman  
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chairman  
Legislator Wayne Horsley - Deputy Presiding Officer  
Legislator Tom Muratore  
Legislator Tom Barraga

**Also In Attendance:**

Presiding Officer William Lindsay – 8<sup>th</sup> Legislative District  
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature  
Legislator John Kennedy - 12th Legislative District  
Legislator Tom Cilmi - 10th Legislative District  
Justin Littell - Aide to Legislator D'Amaro  
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay  
Ben Zwirn - County Executive's Office  
Tom Vaughn - County Executive's Office  
Gail Vizzini – Director, Budget Review Office  
Robert Lipp - Deputy Director - Budget Review Office  
Craig Freas - Budget Review Office  
Jill Moss – Budget Review Office  
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office  
Paul Perillie - Aide to Legislator Gregory  
Kevin LaValle - Aide to Legislator Muratore  
Greg Moran - Aide to Legislator Nowick  
Ali Nazir - Aide to Legislator Kennedy  
Maria Barbara - Aide to Legislator Tom Cilmi  
Rick Brand - Newsday  
All Other Interested Parties

**Minutes Taken and Transcribed By:**

Gabrielle Skolom - Court Stenographer

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Good afternoon. I'd like to call this meeting of Public Works and Transportation Committee to order this second day of October, 2012.

If you would rise and join us in the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Stern.

**(Pledge of Allegiance)**

Please remain standing for a brief moment of silence. I don't always do this, but as we just learned of the loss of several Americans in Afghanistan, if we could pause with them in mind, as well as all those brave men and women who are risking their lives at this moment to protect our freedoms overseas. Keep them in our hearts and prayers. Please join me in a moment of silence.

**(Moment of silence observed.)**

Thank you. We'll start with public portion. I have but one yellow card. If you wish to be heard by the Committee and haven't filled out a card, please do so. The sole card I have is Lance Reinheimer from the Vanderbilt Museum. Lance, you have three minutes to make your comments known.

**MR. REINHEIMER:**

Thank you very much. Generally, or usually, I'm here asking for money for the Vanderbilt Planetarium and Museum. Today, I'm in a different role. As I said publicly in other meetings, in the Parks Department, Parks Committee meeting and the Legislature, there's a project for the Museum: 7433, Restoration of Driveways, Gutters and the like. There's a million dollars scheduled this year, and I just want to say on the record that we're not asking for those funds this year. There's a resolution, IR 1910, that's using \$100,000 as an offset, and we fully support the use of that offset for whatever the Legislature and County Executive deems necessary.

It's also my understanding that soon there will be a resolution to use the balance of that project, \$900,000, and, again, we're not asking for those funds. I said earlier this year we weren't using those funds, and we support the County in using those funds for whatever capital project they deem is necessary. So I just want to speak in support of using that offset.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thank you, Lance. I don't have any presentations down; however, there is a CN coming, and the County Executive's office wanted an opportunity to basically go over that CN. It's a Public Works-related CN. County Executive Bellone has sent down Dr. Errol Toulon as well as Luis Montes from his office to talk about the CN. It has to do with Traffic Violations Bureau. Gentlemen, I'll call you up, I think, to this front table. We don't have copies of the CN yet, but it seemed to make sense to try to vet it to the greatest degree possible here in the Committee so that we would be -- we would have the ability to bring that knowledge to the floor of the Legislature on Tuesday. Gentleman, you have the floor.

**DR. TOULON:**

Good afternoon. We've currently looked at quite a few sites for the operations of the TVB. The site that we designated after a security review and a review through Public Works is Building 158, which is the Civil Service building. After talking to Public Works, we have made plans to move the Civil Service and People With Disabilities office to the Dennison Building so we can retrofit Building 158.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Tell me what's involved in setting up a Traffic Violations Bureau. What are the needs? That building is in pretty good shape right now, the Civil Service building.

**DR. TOULON:**

One of the key things that we've identified after reviewing quite a few TVBs on the Island is, one, is the security, the security of the building. Currently, Building 158 has an area for cashiers where the glass would just need to be changed. One of the things that we found is that sometimes you have a lot of irate customers. We've heard of one instance where a cashier was spit upon; one was the glass was punched through; the court officers at the magnetometer have had to restrain individuals; and also weapons are being left outside where the TVB location was. The current location also has a waiting area, a room for a magnetometer, has access -- rooms that need access cards, so those security procedures are already in place, and that was one of the things that we looked at and considered just to try and offset some of the costs.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah, I want to talk about the costs for a second. And it is important that we, as a Committee, all understand what's involved with the TVB because we don't, I think, for the most part. But you, in this CN, you're going to be looking for money, no doubt, to renovate these spaces. So probably, I guess, the authorization to move the offices as well as to securing money to renovate the space. Do you know what amount of money you are going to be looking for and how you're offsetting that?

**MR. MONTES:**

It's 3.6 million is the total number.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Three point six million?

**MR. MONTES:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And how was that arrived at.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Although I can't speak about the actual specific offsets, because I haven't actually seen the legislation, we offered up a number of projects, capital projects that are ongoing, annual capital projects that would -- we had sufficient funding to continue the work through the year and into next year, and we felt we could give these funds up with the anticipation that next year we would come back to basically refill those capital projects.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Do you have a list of those projects?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can you read them to me?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Oh, sure. They would be -- I mean, the ones we identified were Capital Project 5201, which was dredge support equipment, \$220,000; Capital Project 5196, which is sign management for \$500,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm sorry. Go a little bit slower. So 5201 is dredge support equipment.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Oh, sure. Yep, and that was for \$220,000. The second was CP 5196, which was sign management, and that was for \$500,000. The next one was Capital Project 1616, which was rehabilitation of fuel management equipment, et cetera, and that was for \$550,000. I assume the Vanderbilt is in there too.

**MR. MONTES:**

Yes.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There's an additional \$700,000.

**MR. MONTES:**

Nine hundred thousand.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Oh, okay, 900,000 from Capital Project 7493, which is the Vanderbilt Museum, and that's the drainage, driveways capital project.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So we're up to 2.1.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. I know there were other offsets that they've pre-used, but that's the only ones -- I haven't seen the legislation, so I get --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Simple question. You know I've been involved with this Committee for a number of years, and if you want to renovate spaces, I guess it's easier in some ways than building new spaces, but still, there's tremendous amount of engineering and design work that goes into just renovations. So we do the design work, then we go out to bid, so we renovate the spaces. How on earth are you going to spend this money before the end of the year? We're in October now. It's going three or four months just to do the design work at best.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The actual TVB placement is going to be within a space that's really ready for it right now.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Which is great, but where are you spending 3.6 million by the end of the year? That's hard even for us.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That was based on -- we're going to do the design in-house, and the construction will be -- we'll do the construction through annual contracts. So we have annual contractors that we can give the work out to. I don't know that it's going to be, given the current plan --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How do they -- how do we -- how do they do \$3.6 million worth of work before the end of this fiscal?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, the facility has to be ready by, essentially, February.

**MR. MONTES:**

February 15.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Why is that?

**MR. MONTES:**

Basically in the meantime, from January 1, we have this already with the District Court that we will start receiving jurisdiction of the cases that are going to plead not guilty to the State that are currently being written. Even though the authority -- we will receive it until April 1 of next year. So we will need to accommodate a minimum staff before the starting date of April 1.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So we're talking about 3.6 million.

**MR. MONTES:**

That's correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I have only heard about half that offsets, a little more, 2.1 million offsets, so we've got another 1.5 to go.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I have been advised that the other offsetting funds will come from two park projects, and I can get that information for you, and the third will be from a Health capital project, Health Department capital project that we're going to do through other funding.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Until I see the offset, it's very hard to support it because I don't know which projects are being left behind. Do you have the other offsets?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

These are the other offsets. Yeah. So as I mentioned before, we have -- okay. I'll go through the ones I haven't mentioned so far. So you have Capital Project 1726, which is fiber cabling network and WAN, W-A-N, technology upgrades, and that's \$50,000. We also have from same capital project another \$250,000 that we will use as an offset, so I guess the total of \$300,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Three hundred thousand, that's also fiber cabling and WAN?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes. We have Capital Projects, 1765, renovations to Building 50, North Country Road -- North County Complex, and that's \$125,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What building is that in?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That's the ITS building -- IT. It's right next to the old Fourth Precinct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Yeah. I know the building. So that's how much there?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

One hundred twenty-five thousand. There's more.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. What else you got?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We have Capital Project 3442, the domestic preparedness storage building, which is a FRES project; that's \$175,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We have Capital Project 4008, purchase and installation of generators for full power supply at County-owned health centers. That's --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I remember that, because they needed to keep the vaccines at a certain temperature. There was some concern because there was a power outage in the past, and I had --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. Health has indicated that since they are going to the Hudson River FQHC model, they are not going to be needed.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

How much is that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

\$375,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Getting closer.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yep. Capital Project 4055, 4-0-5-5, purchase of equipment for health centers. Again, the same reasoning; and that's for a 167,450.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is that it?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Nope. Capital Project 7009, improvements to campgrounds; that's \$500,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Which campgrounds?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It doesn't say. Just says "Parks indicated project is available as an offset."

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Capital Project 7145, improvements to newly acquired parkland, and that's for \$100,000.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Does it say which one is that?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Capital Project 7145?

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I know, but do we know which improvements --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No. I think it's just a general -- yeah, it's just various improvements for various new parks. They don't identify a specific park. And that's it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. All right. So we have the offsets now. I trust that they add up to 3.6 million.

**MR. MONTES:**

Correct. Just as an FYI, Budget has reached out to every single department to make sure they are okay with the offsets.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So then you'd encumber all this money, so then you could go out to bid, bring somebody in who would have to finish the job by February, and the job itself is a combination work to the building across the street, the Civil Service building, and then also work to Dennison so that Civil Service can move over to Dennison.

**MR. MONTES:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And there's adequate space at Dennison for that operation.

**MR. TOULON:**

Yes, there is.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Has Alan Schneider been involved in the process?

**MR. MONTES:**

Yes, he was informed.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Did he have any particular comments on whether that was feasible in terms of the new location in terms of accommodating the needs of the department?

**MR. MONTES:**

Yes. Basically those are -- that's why, you know, People With Disabilities and Civil Service will be in the same place. That was part of this --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm sorry. Which two functions are in the same place?

**MR. MONTES:**

People With Disabilities and Civil Service are going to be in the same place.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. And we're moving everything from that building, all the job-training functions, it's all coming over to Dennison?

**MR. MONTES:**

No, everything is going to be moved to Dennison Building.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah. Everything is going to Dennison. I don't think I have any other questions. I'll turn it over to Legislator Stern. And so the number, basically, is a rough estimate. You haven't gone out to bid. It could be much lower.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I actually anticipate it will be lower.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah. It's just, it seems like a high number for that type of renovation.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It was based on our original discussions, and that we were looking at a number of sites. That was really based on creating a new Traffic Violation Bureau. The building that Civil Service is in now is really ideal for the same purpose, so rather than building two homes and moving people around, we really only have to do it once.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It strikes me personally as a really high number for renovating space.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes. I believe it is, but I can't -- without, you know -- now that we have a direction, we can now prepare the plans and get, you know, the construction underway, and we're comfortable with the timeframe.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So if it turns out when you go out to bid if it's much lower, then we might have some money available for offsets of other County needs, right? Some of these projects -- all these projects aren't going to happen this year because of this. Some of them aren't going to happen, anyway, so possibly some of them could be brought back at a later date.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, these are -- most of them -- and I can only speak for the DPW ones -- the DPW ones are annual capital projects that, you know, we are moving forward. We anticipate in the next year's Capital Program, we'll be coming back and asking for more funds for these, anyway. We just had sufficient funding in the program to be able to do what we could do this year and then, you know, have to come back next year and ask for more.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Yeah. Because there's quite a number between the dredge support equipment, the sign maintenance, the rehabilitation of fuel machinery. There's quite a bit there that could impact the department, but you're saying that it won't.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. We have, you know, like for example, the fuel management; we have at least four sites that we're already planning to do work on, the work in excess of \$600,000 -- \$650,000, so we're going to be fully focused on that. We aren't going to get to this funding this year, so we were careful to look at what we were giving up as an offset.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let's go to Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. So there are some items on this list that can be put over. There are some items on this list that, clearly, you can pull because they are projects that aren't going to go forward. The total number here adds up to more than the amount you are seeking in this project. So my question is who decides ultimately which projects are going to stay; which ones are going to be allocated towards this other purpose? Is that what is going to come before us in session coming up, or will those decisions have been made and this list will be widdled (sic) down by then; and how are you going to come -- I would assume that those projects that clearly aren't going to go forward are ones that are going to make the list. What criteria are you going to use, then, going forward to determine what stays on that list and what comes off?

**MR. MONTES:**

Clearly, there's going to be a list of the projects that are going to be included before the end of the week. That's something that is being drafted right now. And then determination is basically made between budget and the departments just to see the priorities of each department.

**LEG. STERN:**

So between now and -- that's going to be filed when; any idea?

**MR. MONTES:**

I would say Thursday or Friday of this week.

**LEG. STERN:**

So anyone on this Committee or any of our colleagues that have a real concern with any particular items have a couple of days to have that conversation with you or those that are going to make that decision to be able to voice their concern about particular items that -- that they might want to have removed from this list? Because it looks like there are some that are clearly going to be included and others that -- yeah, others might be concerned about having come off that list. But you're saying there's going to be a few days to be able to voice those concerns. Who should those concerns be voiced to, Gil? If anybody has an issue with the items on this list, do they call you or is it someone else?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

They can certainly make their concerns noted to me, and I will pass them on to the County Exec's office for consideration, or I would imagine any of us here.

**LEG. STERN:**

Because the -- if there's a need for speed here, the particular items are going to be in that legislation. At that point, we're going to have a whole package to vote on. You're not going to pick and choose at that point. It will be too late.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right. Correct.

**LEG. STERN:**

Okay. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Barraga.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

You know, certainly I understand the concept of offsets, because most of the time, when I'm sitting here, it's usually one capital project offsetting another, and neither one generates any revenue, but this TVB is going to generate revenue, right? Isn't that the whole point of it? We had State Legislation approved. As a result, revenue is going to come to the County. So rather than get involved in offsetting with a lot of capital projects, why don't we just bond it out for 3.6 million, and as you generate revenue, pay the debt service associated with the bond. You're a revenue-generating entity.

**MR. MONTES:**

That's correct, but that's a decision that has been made by the Budget department.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Well, has that been proposed to them as opposed to, you know, offsetting with a whole list of projects that are either ongoing or provide employment to people. I mean, it seems to me you're a revenue-generating entity, and that's a big element as far as our budget is concerned, but certainly, I think there's enough merit here to do a bond issue and pay off the debt service associated with the bond issue from part of the revenue you're generating.

**MR. MONTES:**

Sure. It's something we can bring up to the Budget department, but at this point, obviously, we're not in the position to make a decision.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Yeah. If you bring it up to them, I appreciate it, because it seems to make sense. I mean, it isn't as if you're going -- you're offsetting one road project to another road project. The end result here is that you folks will be generating quite a bit of revenue for Suffolk County, and there should be enough there to pay the debt service associated with the bond issue.

**MR. MONTES:**

That's correct, and we'll do that.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Cilmi.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Thanks, Mr. Chairman. I'm not on this committee, but I appreciate your deference. I thought we already had a capital project for this, or we had some side set in the Capital Budget for this. Is it for next year, maybe, or --

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

Yeah, it probably is.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Not that I'm aware of but, I mean, we can look. If it was, if it came into, obviously, the last discussions, it would have been for next year.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Budget Review, do you have any information? Maybe I'm confusing it with the County Executive's Budget Deficit Mitigation Plan.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let me recognize Gail Vizzini, Budget Director.

**MS. VIZZINI:**

What you're thinking of is the two economic development starter projects that are in the 2013 capital. One of several things that were under consideration was we might need money for a TVB, but I don't think it's to this magnitude.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And the magnitude, again, is three point something million dollars?

**MR. MONTES:**

That's correct, 3.6 million.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I swear it was more than that that we put in the budget. I understand it's for next year, and we want to do this year, but if we could look for that, I would appreciate it. And meanwhile -- forgive my ignorance, you guys -- what are your roles in the County? Are you in charge of the Traffic Violations Bureau?

**DR. TOULON:**

I'm the Assistant Deputy County Executive for Public Safety, so the TVB will fall under me.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. And when were you appointed to that position?

**DR. TOULON:**

Approximately three weeks ago.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. Welcome.

**MR. TOULON:**

Thank you.

**MR. MONTES:**

I'm Assistant Deputy County Executive for mostly Intergovernmental Affairs. I work on special projects, and I worked during the transition when Harold -- before Harold was appointed.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So you're both -- you've both been here about three --

**MR. MONTES:**

No, I have been here from the beginning, since January. I worked on the legislation up in Albany to get it passed.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I see. Well, congratulations for that. Thank you. Let's see if we have. I mean, if we -- if we're -- if we had money put aside next year, I don't see any problem with diverting some money this year to get started earlier. It'll generate -- you know, it'll help generate revenue sooner and -- but let me -- while they're looking, let me ask you this: Right now, the Traffic Violations are adjudicated at the State level, and I would imagine most of them are adjudicated at the State Office Building next to the Dennison Building, correct?

**MR. MONTES:**

That's correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

What are they going to do at that space now that they are not going to be handling these Traffic Violations any longer?

**MR. MONTES:**

We actually pursue -- we actually pursue a lease --

**LEG. CILMI:**

You did.

**MR. MONTES:**

-- with that space. We spoke to OGS, and unfortunately, because they are going through the same -- a space problem that we are going through here in Suffolk County, that they are trying to get rid of their lease programs, they are relocating people back to the State buildings, and they recently made a move from Garden City from the Department of Taxation and Finance at the State level, they moved them back to DMV Hauppauge building.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Okay. So the space that the current court, I guess, was in or is in is now going to be utilized by some other State agency.

**MR. MONTES:**

That's correct.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I see. That's a shame because that was already set up for -- right?

**MR. MONTES:**

Yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

And they are doing -- just out of curiosity, did you entertain with them the idea of just flip-flopping spaces since that one is already set up for this? They sort of allow us to use that space; we maybe allow them to use the space that you're proposing that we switch over.

**(Presiding Officer Lindsay entered the meeting at 3:00 p.m.)**

**MR. MONTES:**

Obviously, at that point, they pretty much -- they didn't want to pay any extra money, so that's why they're moving people back from private properties to estate properties, so I think -- yes.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right. Well, what I'm suggesting is that there might be sort of a reciprocal arrangement whereby they could use our space, which is office space currently, and we could use their space which is set up for a traffic violations court, and it may save us both money in the end, no? I mean, I don't know if I'm -- does that make sense?

**MR. MONTES:**

Sure. No, no, I have no problem. I definitely could reach out to OGS again, but obviously, given the time constraints that we're dealing with right now, we have to be up and running by February 15.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Right. Even more so -- even more so given the time constraints. If we're under such pressure, it would clearly be easy for us to move into a facility that's already really set up for us to do what we want to do. And I'm sure they are going to have to go through some renovations to retrofit their space for what they want to use it for. Why not allow them to do that, if it's even necessary, at our building and, you know, our move at that point could be probably within a month, I would imagine, right?

**MR. MONTES:**

Yes, definitely. It's something, you know, we can touch base with OGS again. That was our first option, and unfortunately because of the decision they made, we didn't pursue it further.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Any luck, Budget Review?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

Soon.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I ask a question while they look that up?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Please.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can you just explain, maybe, this Traffic Violations Bureau in terms of income? I know we projected quite a bit of money from it. How again -- how is it that we generate revenue here. I know there's expenses as well too. What are we projecting from it? But basically, how is that we now are making all this money where before we weren't?

**MR. MONTES:**

Just to put it in perspective. Basically, back in 1991, when Nassau was approved -- Legislator Barraga was up in Albany -- it took Nassau five years just to get it up and running and five more years to basically make a profit; yes, make it profitable. Now at this point, what we have done is we have learned from their experience, and we're going to try to minimize all the expenses they were running in the beginning. So the issue here is that now that the opportunity for us to adjudicate those cases are -- we have now the possibility of plea bargain. So the possibility of plea bargain, something that at the current DMV facility, we don't have that opportunity.

The other issue that is key to the operations of the DMV, it's also the overtime that we incurred with

a police department by having police officers adjudicating -- basically serving as traffic prosecutors in the DMV court. You just got to go, you know, to the DMV building and see five, six police cars standing or parking outside, just having police officers inside serving as traffic prosecutors. This is something -- that's a figure that we eliminate because of the structure of the new TVB or the new violations agency. It allows to hire traffic prosecutors on a part-time basis, and they are the ones serving us. Basically, they figure that in the past was served by police officers, so we eliminate overtime there. We also -- now the revenue is going to be going to the County rather than the State, and we're just going to pay the fees that are already in the statute established by the traffic -- by the Vehicle Traffic Law.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So the State got all that revenue? None of it came back to the law enforcement agencies that collected the money? It all stayed with the State, right?

**MR. MONTES:**

We receive an approximate of 9 to 10 percent every year from all the tickets that the local law enforcement agencies were writing --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. But now we'll get 100 percent. We won't have to give any to the State?

**MR. MONTES:**

There's a minimal cost, obviously, to the State because we still have to pay them for certain fees that they have -- you know, that every TVB in New York is running.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

But the bulk of the money --

**MR. MONTES:**

The bulk of the money will be coming to Suffolk County.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The bulk of the money from tickets will come back to the County. And explain to me again the East End, you know, the five East End towns, I guess, and the villages that are outside the Police District. There's a distinction there. Do they not go through this Traffic Violations Bureau? They prosecute in their own justice courts?

**MR. MONTES:**

That is correct. This only applies to the five western towns or the Police District.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Those towns are already doing it, so there's no additional fees that they will incur.

**MR. MONTES:**

They have their own system already in place that it will not be affected by this new agency.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So the towns and villages outside the PD are already collecting the money and keeping the money?

**MR. MONTES:**

It's a different set of -- structure of fees for them. They deal directly with the State rather than with the County or any other municipality.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So the Traffic Violations Bureau will only be dealing with tickets that originate from the Suffolk County PD?

MR. MONTES: (Inaudible) -- I'm sorry -- including MTA, including state troopers, including Suffolk PD, Stony Brook Police, parks police, et cetera. It's 24 agencies that we're going to be adjudicating cases for.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Oh. Okay. I didn't realize that. Okay. So any of those law enforcement entities that issue a ticket would go, then, through this agency -- this entity.

**MR. MONTES:**

That is correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Did we get Tom's information?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

If you recall, in the adopted 2013 Capital Program, project 6409 Suffolk County Economic Development infrastructure, there's \$2 million, and it's still there. There's five million in Project Jump Start. Not that all this money was intended for the TVB, but it was intended for economic development purposes. It's possible, since you've already locked in the 2013 adopted capital, that if your priorities are to restore anything to the projects that are used as offsets in '12, perhaps some of this money that was intended for TVB could be used as the offset in '13.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Tom, that answers your question, right; is that it for you? And the other Tom?

**LEG. CILMI:**

That's it for me.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

The third Tom? Everybody's good? All right. Thank you, gentlemen. Gil, unless you have something that you want to apprise us of before we begin, I'll just go right to the agenda; are you good with that? Okay.

So under **tabled resolutions, 1731, A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 21 SUNY (CP 8121). (Co. Exec.)**

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I could.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The reference is a Federally-mandated upgrade of the wastewater treatment facility at Sewer District 21, Stony Brook. The work will involve improving and enhancing process -- processes which involves aerator dissolved oxygen facilities as well as installation of new denitrification filters to meet the requirements of the Long Island Sound permit. We're under consent order to complete this work in 2014. The cost of the work is estimated at 18.3 million, and funding for this project includes a

Clean Air Clean Water Act grant for 12.07 million, as well as about 3.5 million from SUNY Stony Brook, as they are a -- the largest contributor to that treatment plant. The remaining funding will be provided through Sewer Districts 10 and 19, which are served by this facility.

Unfortunately, an error in advertising the meeting of the public hearing delayed the public hearing for the project August 7 to October 9, 2012. Because we were under a consent order to complete the work by 2014, we would request that this resolution be forwarded, whether approved or discharged without recommendation. Providing there are no negative findings at the hearings, which will occur next week, we would like to get the finding and determinations approved after the public hearing next Tuesday. Similarly, we hope to lay two resolutions on the table as CNs that will further enable our department to award this project and begin construction as soon as possible.

The first resolution will accept the 3.5 million in funds from SUNY, and the second will transfer 2 million from the stabilization funds to cover the money needed from the sewer districts. Again, as stated earlier, we are submitting these as CNs because of the need for expediency. The construction project itself has been bid, and once we have the funds in place, we will award it for \$17.258 million.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Counsel, the bill itself says August 7, as the date of public hearing, which is not accurate.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I think this resolution needs to be updated to reflect the October 9 date, so I would suggest doing this. Make that change and do this one as CN as well.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Okay. Yep, we will do that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So, then, all right. We wouldn't -- I was going to suggest discharging it without recommendation and wondering if that -- it's such a technical --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I would say just table it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second by Legislator Barraga. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled. (VOTE: 6-0)**

**1802, Eliminating impact assessment fee. (Cilmi)**

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Motion to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion to approve by Legislator Muratore. I'll make a motion to table. Is there a second?

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Legislator Stern second.

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

I seconded to approve.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

We've got a second on the approving, second on the tabling. I had some concerns -- I understand this is to simulate economic development, that we have historically charged these fees, and these fees are directly associated with County costs because of work along these roadways and the impact to our roadways from these development projects. They're not arbitrary fees. They are carefully calculated based on pretty clear guidelines. Gil, do you have -- have you studied this, or Gail? Some have a --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We've looked at this. Obviously, we were the one -- ones who established the actual fees that were created. That is obviously permitted under New York State Highway law. I would make a statement that approximately 90 percent of the projects that come before the department, they are not -- there is no assessment fee put on the actual developments. I don't know of any development that has not progressed because of the assessment fees. And, certainly, we have had a number of discussions where, and with the Legislator himself, where we've, you know -- where we've had to, we've made adjustments. Again, I'm not aware of any project that's been abandoned due to the impacted fees. We're against it. I mean, really, that's the bottom line.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

What do we anticipate in impact fees over the next couple years? It's in the millions, not --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Two point three million.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Is there any offset in this bill to fill that hole?

**MS. VIZZINI:**

There is no offsetting in the legislation, and it's approximately 300,000 annually.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

300,000 a year in impact fees. Tom, you got an offset in mind?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Since 2004, we have received over \$2 million from approximately 50 projects.

**LEG. CILMI:**

With respect to the offset, my understanding, and I'm not using this as an excuse, but my understanding is that there is no line item in the budget that's specifically attributable to impact assessment fees, first of all. But I would suggest, second of all, that increased economic development as a result of this bill may, in fact, offset the \$300,000 a year in and of itself. And, you know, I could certainly make the argument -- and I'm sure that each one of us here has heard stories of -- from businesses who seek to, you know, expand or build and are faced with having to make public infrastructure improvements in addition to all of the improvements they have to make on their own businesses that we require, and it just gets to a point where it's a burden that can't be

overcome by business owners. I mean, they're paying additional taxes as business owners. They're employing our residents who are in turn paying their mortgages, who are in turn purchasing goods and services and paying sales taxes. We either have to send a message to businesses that, you know, not only do we talk a good game about small business being the economic engine that runs our County, but we need to back that up with action, so this would do that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Tom, is there a particular business that you're aware of that has opted to not develop because of the impact fee?

**LEG. CILMI:**

Yes, I know of a number of them. One example is one that the Commissioner and I worked on together; Great South Bay Brewery, as a matter of fact. I spoke about it on Fox and Friends on Sunday. Great South Bay Brewery invested literally \$300,000 in a property in Bay Shore, which is on a County road, and although the Commissioner did his best and the Department did their best to work with us in terms of mitigating those fees, in the end, they couldn't be mitigated to the extent that made a difference, and so ultimately, the businessowner decided to go elsewhere.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let me ask a question. I'm glad you provided a clear example. I guess my question is for Counsel. Is -- are impact fees something that this Legislature has the ability now to waive on a case-by-case basis.

**MR. NOLAN:**

I don't think we do have an authority to do that. I think that's established -- well, it's established -- I forgot where they're established. If this was established by a resolution, then I guess by mere resolution we could waive the fees on a case-by-case basis.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Because what I'm thinking is not all businesses are created equal. Some are creating more jobs, higher-paying jobs, providing services to the community. Though, you know, I hate to, as the Legislative body, stand in judgment as to who should pay and who shouldn't. There's some merit to a bill that waives them all, but maybe as an interim measure, if you wanted to put in a bill that would give us the authority on a case-by-case basis to waive, and, you know, we could listen to the argument from the brewery and maybe --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, they're done. I mean, to finish -- to finish the story, they moved elsewhere. They are doing business elsewhere. The -- as I said, the \$300,000 that they invested in that particular property is now down the sewer.

**LEG. CILMI:**

The owner of the property now has, you know, "property for lease" signs on the property and the grass is all overgrown, and there'll probably be a lawsuit between the owners of Great South Bay Brewery and the owner of the property because of --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Because I'm sure you could understand, too, you know, recently, we assessed fees to Lowe's in Riverhead and Costco --

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, this is -- it's a good point.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

-- and Costco in Riverhead, and we did spend millions of dollars on County Road 58 improving that road. The County will certainly have more wear and tear on that road because of these businesses.

**LEG. CILMI:**

This bill exempts --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm just -- I know -- if you start exempting, now we just charged millions of dollars to these other companies, and we're letting people off the hook. That's not fair, either.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, what this does in a very fair way, I think, is that it exempts those fees that are as a result of SEORA determinations, so this is only for non-mitigation measures. Anything that's determined by SEORA that needs to be done would still have to do whatever it is that you have to do. So this would basically -- those large projects that you're talking about would not be impacted by this bill.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This -- if I may, this, under New York State Highway Law, Article Six, Section 136.2, we comply with those regulations. Certainly it's a decision of your Body whether we do it or not. I'm not 100 percent sure as superintendent that I have the ability to, you know, just -- basically, the law was established so that it was not as arbitrary discussion. Everybody had the same impact fees when it was created a couple years back. Otherwise, we have the ability to negotiate with anybody who comes to ask for a road opening permit to mitigate the impact of that development on our roads, as you mentioned. You know, the larger projects, there's always going to be that type of mitigation. Under this specific -- when we set this up, we looked at -- we looked to impact only facilities that come in that have 50 vehicles per peak hour that add -- they add that amount to the traffic pattern. So the Brewery, and I'm not -- I feel terrible hearing that. We did work hard for them. They were going to bring in, not initially, but eventually a high number of cars.

**LEG. CILMI:**

But see, this is what makes this all the more -- this particular circumstance all the more troubling is because we asked them to pay these impact fees in anticipation -- in anticipation of some future level of success that they never achieved, and many small businesses, as all of us know, don't succeed. So to ask a small business to pay impact fees when 80 percent of them -- I forgot what the statistic is, but it's some very high statistic -- 80 or more percent of them don't succeed after the first five years to begin with, you know, you could certainly make the argument that had they had that extra cash to -- as cash flow in their business, maybe they wouldn't fail. So, to me, we should be saying to businesses, *Welcome*, and what these fees do is they say to business, *We're just going to dig deeper into your pocket*, and the pockets are empty. You know, I appreciate that the County needs the revenue, but the fact of the matter is the County needs jobs, and the County needs businesses that are successful. Otherwise, all our taxing jurisdictions: the County, the school districts, the towns, et cetera, they are all going to fail eventually.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Personally, I think you raised a good point. I'm actually not sure what to do with this one, other than the fact that we're struggling to pass a budget right now.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I may.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I don't want the County to be a disincentive for business. You know, I hate that this Brewery, you

know, decided not to build here.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I got phone calls, Mr. Chairman, from Florida, after my appearance on Sunday saying, *This is the single most important thing to us in our business. This is killing us.* And so it's happening across the country. This is a chance for us to be a leader.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Where is the Economic Development people on an issue like this? You know, we have a whole bureau of economic development, workforce housing. Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I could, I, just again, I want to stress the fact that 90 percent of the applications that come in do not get -- you know, we do not mandate any type of impact fee. Certainly, if you want to discuss raising the bar, you know, maybe to a higher level, we could sit down and talk about that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can I suggest that since the Brewery is not pending right now, and I do want to get through the agenda, philosophically, I'm in agreement with you, so maybe we could further this conversation with the Commissioner. I'm happy to meet with you and the Commissioner and see if maybe we can change the thresholds or talk about a waiver process.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I would certainly be able to do that. Otherwise, I'd --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Are you okay with that? It's not time-sensitive right now.

**LEG. CILMI:**

Well, I think that every day that goes by is -- I think it is time-sensitive. It's not to the brewery, granted; and I appreciate your offer to work with us, and I appreciate the Commissioner's offer to sit down and chat down about it. But I just think it's something that we need to get done. We need to make a statement to businesses that we're going to support them, and I recognize it's only 10 percent, or you say it's only 10 percent of the number of applicants, but for those 10 percent, it's money that's -- it's food out of their mouths, and it's potentially jobs that we're losing to other parts of the county.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Has Costco paid that million-dollar impact fee yet?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I honestly couldn't tell you. I don't know.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. I think we ought to know this, personally, and if we're going to waive it for all, we're going to waive it for all. It's not fair to punish the people who have already decided to pay it.

**LEG. CILMI:**

You wouldn't want to waive it, though, for when SEQRA determines that some mitigation is necessary; you wouldn't want to do that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I'm not sure that's the case in the Costco and Lowe's situation.

**LEG. CILMI:**

I don't know that it is.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. I mean if the site was already disturbed, it probably didn't have -- there wasn't --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Tom, I just got to ask you, can we get one more cycle? I'm happy to meet with you and the Commissioner. I'm going to support tabling here, but, conceptually I hope we do move in a similar direction with a little bit more -- maybe a little bit more protections so that we waive when it makes sense to waive.

**LEG. CILMI:**

It's up to the Committee. I'm not a member of this Committee. I just came to support my bill so...

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Where are we now? Is that the first -- motion to table, is there a second?

**LEG. BARRAGA:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second by Legislator Barraga. Is there any other motions? Tom, are you making a motion to approve?

**LEG. CILMI:**

(Inaudible.)

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right. So the only motion before us is to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled. (VOTE: 5-0, Not Present: P.O. Lindsay)**

**IR 1810, Authorization of alteration of rates for Sayville Ferry Service, Inc. For Cross Bay Service between Sayville, New York and the Fire Island Communities of Fire Island Pines, Cherry Grove and Water Island. (Pres. Off.)** Have we -- we haven't held a public hearing, have we?

**LEG. STERN:**

Hasn't been closed yet.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. The public hearing has not been closed, so it must be tabled. I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1810 is tabled. (VOTE: 5-0, Not Present: P.O. Lindsay)**

**IR 1838, Authorizing a request for proposals to enforce the County's Laws associated with utility poles. (Romaine)** We just passed a bill. I don't know if the County Executive has signed it

yet. Do we know? Thirty Days Local Law to deal with this issue. That bill has not been signed yet. I'm going to make a motion to table what is basically an almost identical law, 1838.

**LEG. STERN:**

Table subject to call.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. Table subject to call. Thank you. Is there a second? I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1838 is tabled subject to call. (VOTE: 5-0, Not Present: P.O. Lindsay)**

**1875, Directing the Department of Public Works to study the feasibility of siting a solar farm on County-owned property. (Cilmi).** The sponsor requests that this be tabled. He's still working, I guess, with the department on this, correct? I'll make a motion to table.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Okay. **Tabled. (VOTE: 5-0, Not Present: P.O. Lindsay)**

Moving on to **Introductory Resolutions.**

**1899, Appropriating planning funds for the New Replacement Correctional Facility a Yaphank Phase II (CP 3008). (Co. Exec.)** Commissioner, what is the New Replacement Correctional Facility?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is -- this appropriates 4.3 million for Phase II, which is an additional 360 beds that's proposed for the facility. It's nothing to do with the construction that we have previously completed as well as the renovation of the existing. This is mandated by the State.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Was this planned? This is a Phase II, right, so unless we got a variance, we knew we were going to have to do this.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. What's going on with that -- is it -- we call it the pod? There's, like, a tent building there. Is that being --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. I mean it's still there. I don't know -- I would say you would have the Sheriff's Office. I really don't know whether it's still housing inmates. I believe it is. Once we -- that's what it is. Okay. Once we begin to open up the pods that we just built, which we should be in November, they will start to pull beds out of the existing pods areas that were going to work as well as the pod and house them in the new dorms that we have. I don't know whether the -- whether or not the sprung structure will be allowed to be used as --

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Sprung, yeah, that's the term I was thinking of.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah -- that'll be allowed to be used as beds in the future.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Probably not, I suppose.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I would ask the Sheriff's Office about that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. But this funds -- this has nothing to do with the sprung structure. This would be, what, a new --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

A new additional six housing pods, most likely somewhere along the west end of the building.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And this is just for the planning money, and what's the number attached to this?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Four point three million. Probably up near nine to a hundred.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

To plan it?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

To plan it.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So we're looking at, what, like \$40 million to build it?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, more.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

More?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Probably up near 90 to 100.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And this is in the budget, the Capital Program?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It is.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So -- all right. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

How long is the Phase II planning process projected to take?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If we -- we're still discussing that with COC, but if we begin this work, actually awarding a contract, which we will be going out -- if approved, we will go out for an RFP process, bring a consultant in, assuming by March, April of next year, we would look to actually begin construction at the end of '14, the beginning of '15. And then just a further on that, we would anticipate two years -- three years construction, two to three years.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

You said 80 million, something in that range?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, somewhere in there.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And, BRO, is that part of our pipeline debt service that we've projected? Is that in our calculations? You can get back to me on that.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

1899, do we have a motion?

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved.** (VOTE: 5-0, Not Present: P.O. Lindsay)

**1903, Appropriating funds in connection with construction of sidewalks on various County Roads (CP 5497). (Co. Exec.) I will make a motion.**

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved.** (VOTE: 5-0, Not Present: P.O. Lindsay)

**1908, Directing the Department of Public Works to study alternative methods for purchasing transit fares. (Hahn).**

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Motion by Legislator Muratore.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second by Legislator Stern. Commissioner, what is this one about?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This is -- this directs the department to issue a report regarding alternative methods of purchasing transit tickets for the busses, whether we go with a card similar to what the MTA uses or even possibly the electronic purchase that was recently in the newspapers. We're fine with doing a report. We're in the process right now of upgrading our ticket boxes, our fare boxes, and certainly with the MTA style swipe card, that's an easy upgrade. Bigger question will be where you will put the actual units that sell the tickets; do you put them in the train station? So obviously, we've been thinking about it a little bit.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It sounds like the right direction, particularly when you have fares. I mean, right now our fare is \$2 on the main fare. I mean it's, I guess, pretty easy to slide \$2 into the machine, but as, you know, as you look at other fares, whether it was \$1.75 or two and a quarter, now you've got to make change. This potentially will move traffic, people, through faster, and that can't be a bad thing. Also might be better in terms of cash control; in terms of keeping track of ridership; and keeping track of the money to have it all electronic. Makes a lot of sense.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Agreed.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So we had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved.**  
**(VOTE: 5-0, Not Present: P.O. Lindsay)**

**IR 1910, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Engineering, Planning, and Design of Ronkonkoma Hub Sewer Project (CP 8156). (Co. Exec.)** Commissioner?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This resolution appropriates \$100,000 to initiate design of the Ronkonkoma hub sewage treatment facility. The funding was placed into the 2013 we were Program which will complete the need of 1.2 million in design funding for the consultant who has been selected by the Department. These funds will carry us through to next year to that point where we will be appropriating the continued funds to complete the design and the construction. Funds have been offset from CP 7433, which is the Vanderbilt Museum, restoration of driveways, gutters, and cash basins.

**MR. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I thought we already used that as an offset.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There was a hundred -- there was a million dollars that was available in that capital project.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I thought it was \$900,000. We had some testimony from Lance earlier.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That was going towards the -- my understanding was a million dollars in the Capital Program. 100,000 went to -- is proposed for this project, and the other 900 went to the Traffic Violation

Bureau.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

There is a motion -- We got lots of motions. Motion by Legislator Horsley. Second by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (VOTE: 5-0, Not Present: P.O. Lindsay)**

**1914, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with acquisition of lands for intersection improvements on CR 100, Suffolk Avenue at Brentwood Road/Washington Avenue, Town of Islip (CP 5065). (Co. Exec.)** Any more detail? Commissioner?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah. This appropriates \$1,107,500 for land acquisition that was required to complete improvements to the intersection of County Road 100, Suffolk Avenue at Brentwood Road, Washington Avenue. The project involved widening, which is why land acquisition was required. Under eminent domain, if the court-ordered settlement is above the initial offering, the additional compensation must be paid; hence the need for the extra funding. As no funds were included within the we were Program, we proposed to use the following offsets. Capital project 3308, which is the Suffolk County Intelligence Transportation Systems, ITS, \$300,000. The department is not ready yet to proceed with the design at this time.

Capital Project 5054, \$112,500, that's traffic signal improvements. We'll be able to fund the remaining work through the end of this year and into next year with existing funding that we have already. \$95,000 from Capital Project 5371, which is reconstruction of culverts. These are being funded -- this work will be funded through existing funds that we already have in place through the rest of the year. Capital Project 5381; that's construction of a seawall on County Road 77, West Lake Drive. We're looking to offset \$350,000 from this project towards this. This project is still -- is not ready to proceed with construction, as we're still in discussions with the Town of East Hampton as well as the DEC about it.

Capital Project 5510, the County share for reconstruction of County Road 3, Pinelawn Road, \$200,000 is proposed to use as an offset. Currently we're waiting for DOT to provide us with approvals on the ongoing documentation, and we're not going to be ready to proceed with construction this year, and then the last \$50,000 from Capital Project 5548, which is right away acquisition for County Road 83, Patchogue-Mount Sinai Road, we do not feel -- well, we're not ready for acquisition, but we don't we don't feel that we need it for this project.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Let me just ask you one question about one of the projects in my district. The seawall -- and I'm somewhat familiar, a little bit with this project, because I remember road washed out and you guys -- there's parking lot that got undermined there, and you actually were able to get some rock and sand in there to stabilize that roadway, and I guess more substantial project has been designed for that.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That's what we were proposing to do, and there's been some objection from East Hampton. As I said, we're also -- we've also been discussing with DEC to see what we can do within limits of their permit.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It is a high velocity area there. But the town, I think, also has a prohibition on hardened structures.

I think they actually allow some hardened structures in that area but with pretty strict limits on the designs. So all right. So right now, you're working with the town on that, and the town right now is objecting to the County's design; is that correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, that's my understanding.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. So I'll -- is there a motion yet? I'll make a motion. Motion by Legislator Barraga.

**D.P.O. HORSLEY:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved.**

**(VOTE: 5-0, Not Present: P.O. Lindsay)**

That concludes the agenda, and we are adjourned.

**(Meeting adjourned at 3:39 p.m.)**