PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A meeting of the Public Works 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 November 13, 2012.

Members Present:
Legislator Jay Schneiderman - Chairman
Legislator Steven Stern - Vice-Chair
Legislator Wayne Horsley – Deputy Presiding Officer
Legislator Tom Barraga – District Office 11
Legislator Tom Muratore – District Office 4

Also In Attendance:
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Justin Littell - Aide to Legislator D'Amaro
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Renee Ortiz – Deputy County Clerk
Ben Zwirn - County Executive's Office
Tom Vaughn - County Executive's Office
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - Public Works
Garry Lenberger - Fleet Service Manager
Gail Vizzini - Director Budget Review Office
Robert Lipp - Deputy Director - Budget Review Office
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office
Paul Perillie - Aide to Legislator Gregory
Kevin LaValle - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Michael Guisto – Sayville Ferry Service
William Stonar - AARP
Rick Brand - Newsday
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken and Transcribed By:
Gabrielle Skolom - Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 1:57 p.m)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Good morning. I'd like to call this meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee to order this 30 day of November, 2012. Please rise and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance)

Please be seated. Madam Clerk, do we have any yellow cards?

MS. ORTIZ:
No, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let the record reflect we have none. Commissioner Anderson, if you'll step forward. Gil, I know you have been a busy man, between hurricanes and nor'easters and breaches and broken roads. You want to give us a quick little overview? I know you've been reaching out to various towns and trying to help put things together. I appreciate that. If you want to just kind of tell us a little bit about Public Works' role in the wake of Hurricane Sandy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Obviously, we have many fronts in DPW that we've been working to assist town -- I mean County residents. First and foremost, in debris management, we first came through and cleared our roads, got the trees out of the way off the roads. Then, at the direction of the County Executive, we then reached out to the various towns to assist them in their debris removal to get it -- basically to get the roads cleared so that LIPA could get out and make the repairs that were needed to their facilities. We are now -- you know, that -- from the highway end, we are now preparing for snow, putting up snow fence, things like that, as well as debris removal. That will be an ongoing process probably for another, I would guess, at least a month between the County and the town as the material's taken away from the roads, brought to staging areas, and then brought to the Town of Brookhaven's landfill where it will be burned. They have three burn units that are, basically, incinerate any large trees, things like that. From the viewpoint of sanitation, we did really well. We had no -- thank God, we weren't like Bay Park. The plant operated all the way through.

(D.P.O. Horsley and Leg. Stern entered the meeting)

We had a little bit of a problem with flooding in Port Jeff, but our plants are operational, and we're very comfortable with staying. We stayed in operation through the entire storm, all of our facilities.

The only other item that comes to mind is the breaches at Fire Island. There were three breaches. We have been involved with the discussions with the Army Corp, DEC, and the other various regulatory agencies in implementing the Breach Contingency Plan. And whereby, as of right now, the Army Corp. is moving forward with bringing in their dredge that they were using for the Shinnecock inlet to Moriches and the material from the Moriches inlet will be used to repair the breach at Cupsogue and repair the beach at Smith Point. At this point, there is one other breach which is within the wilderness area of fire Island that's under the jurisdiction of the National Parks System. They are observing it to see if it will heal itself, basically close itself up. There is some indication that it may do that. In the meantime, we have established whatever documentation trail we need with the various agencies that if we have to come in and make the repairs, we can make the repairs. Similarly, on the west side of Shinnecock, the project we had, we were working on -- fixing that after Hurricane Irene, we are now going back into it and having to repair it because that was damaged too. But as you can see, we've been pretty busy. Obviously, a week ago, we had

snow. So we're moving ahead on all fronts.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I have a bunch of storm-related questions. First of all, buildings, in terms of damage to buildings, shingles.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Any County buildings that were damaged, it was strictly minimal; maybe a shingle or something like that, but other than power outages, we had, obviously, power outages.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And how did we -- in terms of our fleet and our gas supplies, it seems like we held up pretty well in terms of -- while everybody else was waiting on long lines, we had good reserves on our gasoline.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. That's something I forgot to mention. Our fleet staff was fantastic throughout this storm. They maintained contact with their supplier. We had supplies coming in. I would say, we never went below two thirds, so we were able to supply gas to first responders and other units that came in to assist the towns and assist LIPA in the cleanup.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Busses, as well, did they fill up at the same stations?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, they have their own supplies, but they were fully -- they were fine as well. We checked on them and we monitored --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, 'cause I noticed we didn't have to shut the bus system down. That was good.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We had to for a little while.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
A couple days but not because of gasoline, though.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. It was really due to because there were no signals operating at the time, and it became a public safety concern.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I know we shortened some of the hours. Some nights, we ended a little bit early. In terms of recordkeeping, receipts for FEMA reimbursement, are you in pretty good shape in terms of overtime, in terms of whatever supplies were needed?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We've been working on getting -- you know, making sure all of the records are kept the way they are supposed to be. There's a debris management coordination who are working with FEMA and SEMA -- I guess that's the Office of Emergency Management for the State -- and making sure all the records are kept the way they are supposed to be. Thankfully, for better or worse, last year, we went through this, so we know what records have to be kept and the process. So we're in good shape that way. I mean, it is straining us, but we're making it do.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Capital projects. I know we have, seems like dozens of major capital projects that are going on right now that are in midstream. Were any of them affected?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. Other than due to debris removal, all our -- we basically shut down our sites before the storm came in, and we were in good shape and, you know, continuing, albeit based on the impact of any debris that was in the area. But for the most part --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
What about the dredging? I mean, we lost a week or so.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe we are either finishing the forge or we have finished the forge, and then the crew should be going out to Aquebogue.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN.
Oh, great. Okay. I suppose if we need more time at the back end of the window, perhaps the U.S. Fish and Wildlife or DEC might give us a little more time in light of what happened --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We can only ask.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
We can ask, yeah. Well, again, Gil, I know you've been a very busy man throughout these storms. So get some rest. Thank you. Job well done.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Any thanks really should be going to my staff. They were the ones who did really the work. They were out there during the whole storm, and they're still out there, and they deserve all the credit, you know, that they get. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Out along Soundview and Montauk out by Gosman's, we're going to have to do something on that road there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I think all the sand that we put in place is gone.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There were a few places, yes, where the roads were undermined, and we are in the process of getting those repairs made, correct, and that's one of them.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Dune Road, I know portions of Dune Road is ours, but that's being transferred to the Town.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, the -- they're -- actually, a large portion. In fact, the portion that was really impacted was either Town of Southampton or within the various villages. We have a very small portion. Our portion was fine. Under the system roads issue, we have worked out that we're going to help the

Town of Southampton as much as we can, but they would maintain that road and continue it. They have -- it's pretty wild when you go out there and you get to see four feet of sand sitting on Dune Road. It's -- right now, we've been actually in conversations with the Town Highway Department to, rather than remove that sand, basically build a new road over it in those portions that are buried only because, you know, at this point, it doesn't make any sense to -- it's a pretty big operation. They have removed some portions so that the fleet that's housed out of Shinnecock can get access to their fleet, but the remaining section that's buried, we're talking with them now about just putting eight inches of stone on top, creating a road over the winter, and then basically doing final pavement come the springtime after we see what the condition of it is.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So it's actually a benefit in a strange way.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, except the only concern is, obviously, there's a phenomenal amount of dunes that were --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Washed away, yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
-- washed away during the storm. And, you know, there is some indication that they're starting to build up but slowly; you know, it'll take years.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I know that's a major issue out in my neck of the woods where we've lost a primary dune. Downtown Montauk, there's no dune areas, ditch plains. They're very exposed, precarious situations; some bulkheads that got damaged on the north side. But they seem to -- we got through that nor'easter. I was worried about it then, but we still have -- we have the winter ahead of us.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We're not out of the woods yet.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yep. Any other questions for Gil?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I do.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I heard an "I do." Wayne.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Thank you very much, Legislator. Let me echo some of the comments that Legislator Schneiderman had said about the department and how well you guys did, and I share that as well. I wanted just to quickly comment on, to me -- I see that apparently Newsday was interested in it as well. Today, in their editorial -- maybe it was today, yesterday, whatever it was -- concerning the sewer plant. It was there over the next day --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
The miracle of Bergen Point.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

The miracle of Bergen Point. We went up to a 113 million gallons flow when the plant was ultimately designed for 90, to never to exceed 90, we went up to 113. It didn't blow. It didn't wash -- wash over into the community, and God bless you; that was wonderful. I just -- I want -- I told the guys directly, 'cause when I was down there, but I wanted to thank them personally. What a great job. I mean, apparently it was like one of those scenes where it went up to the top. Everyone's watching it reach its level where it could have gone elsewhere, and then it hit its peak and slowly receded and everyone breathed again.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It kind of sounded like a movie.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
It was one of those movies, yeah, exactly. So tell the guys for me that I mentioned it publicly that, you know, I really was thrilled with how well they handled it. It was a tense situation, and we all appreciated it in my district.

So, anyway, I did want to just quickly question on the breaches. You're saying that they're going to start to fill them in and the like. My recollection of the way breaches work, usually don't they expand as -- if we're sitting on there waiting for us to put the sand back in, I don't know what else you do, but don't they usually grow rather than repair themselves. I mean, that's always been the case that I've always heard, like they're always concerned about Gilgo and the State Parks, when I was in State Parks, that they would grow to -- grow to the size it wants to do naturally. What -- is that true or not true?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right now, and I don't know all the science, but right now, the flow through that breach at low tide is so minimal that they are -- they feel that it will start to heal itself from the bay side and what they're seeing is is sand starting to come in there and back up. Again, we're watching. We have another phone conference on Friday, and we are on position that if it is needed and is identified, we can get in there and do that work under the breach contingency plan which will expedite everything. We already have our permits. We have everything in place to get what we need to get done.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
That's great. You'll certainly keep us informed. Gil, keep us up to date --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Will do.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
-- you know, if things go to the contrary. They always fear that on Ocean Parkway that if it opened up, it's going to open and open much wider than it was even during the storm, so I appreciate your comments. Again, thanks a lot for all the department has done. Good job.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
Thank you. Thank you. Good job. The -- our fuelling stations were able to keep our vehicles fueled. We were able to assist first responders and others -- we usually do -- who needed fuel. At any time, did power go out? At any time, were we unable to pump fuel as it was needed on the power source that it's usually on?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We have generators at most of our main facilities, and by main, I would say the three Commack, Yaphank, and Westhampton. So we were operational 24/7. We've installed, I believe, at the police precincts, you know, where we have gas, we have the same thing, so even if the power was down, they were able to get gas. I don't recall any location that wasn't able to provide gas. We just -- we identified those three major locations for non-County assets to fuel up.

LEG. STERN:
Would you think that during the course of those few days that the reason why we were able to continue pumping was because we had to click onto generators and put those to use.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Oh, correct. And it's the same thing that Legislator Horsley said: One of the main reasons that or sanitation system did so well is because we had generators in place for this type of situation. We knew the storm was coming. We basically got as much fuel as would could at the time before the storm and our supplier, to his credit, was able to provide us fuel during the immediate aftereffects and continually throughout the last two weeks.

LEG. STERN:
Thanks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Gil, I know Dennison lost power for a couple days. We have EMS over there at Dennison. We don't have a generator for that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Part of the whole TVB thing is to look at a second EOC emergency operations center, but really everything at the time of an emergency switches over to Yaphank, the emergency management facility, and that has generators.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So we weren't adversely impacted by the loss of power there at the Dennison facility?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. No, and actually, I think it was only a day or so when we had power back. Here, it was a little bit longer.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
What about, you know, any particular lessons learned, things that we need to do differently?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, I think with any event like this, after we get through everything, it's important to assess where things might have been improved, where things might have gone wrong, how do you fix them. You know, that I think remains to be seen. I know everybody is giving LIPA a black eye right now, and, you know, to some extent, it's probably justified. But this was a big storm, and I think all the emergency services that have answered the call have answered nobly and done really well. But there are things that have to be worked out, and, you know, we'll look at them.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It was a big storm, and personally, you know, having lost a woman I know from Montauk who took her dog out, the dog ran off the first night of the storm, and she went too close to beach and got

pulled in by a wave and got washed up in East Hampton. You know, this was serious storm, and there were tragedies not just for property but also to human life. But in many ways, it could have been a lot worse. We got lucky in that we didn't take that brunt of it. It went to Staten Island, Breezy Point, Jersey. And, you know, the wind that first night shifted, came out of the south rather than out of the northeast, which would have made the tides three or four feet higher. It could've been much worse, but I only say that as kind of a cautionary note that I'm not sure we're ready. I mean, if we lost a million customers without power for an extended period of time, you know, had we had a worse storm, which was certainly possible, who knows how long it would take to get the economy back going?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Absolutely. Without question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So I'm not sure we're ready. In fact, I don't think we're anywhere near ready.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Again, I would -- we were planning on beginning reassessment of Irene in December. EOC -- FRES was planning on having an assessment of the storms and to see what was needed to be implemented based on that storm. Now we have this storm. Hopefully, within a month or so, we can look at both, see what areas could be improved and come up with plans. To be frank, as far as debris, I think everybody did what we could, and it was well done. I think all the towns, all the highway departments from the towns, certainly our highway department, our sanitation department, they all met the challenge. You know, there are improvements to be made and to set up.

I would give one example. We knew the storm was coming. We were able to go to the contractor who provided the -- I don't know the right term, but these burn units, these giant, basically dumpsters that incinerate wood, and get them on the road, get everything in process so we would have them weeks before we had them last time. So we learned a lot of lessons from Irene, and I believe after this one, we'll get lessons on it and get ways to improve ourselves as well.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
We had hospitals running on generators longer than they should have. It just seems to me there's some critical infrastructure that needs to be hardened, whether it's utility lines that need to be buried, substations that need to be better protected --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And that's a big question, is how do you pay for that stuff.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Well, look at the economic cost of not doing it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, absolutely, and I think that's what will be determined after this storm.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. So I ended up with one yellow card, Michael Guisto.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Jay, can I just ask a quick question?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh, sure.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I just forgot to ask this before. Commissioner, did we have anybody go out and take a look at some of our houses in the middle of the woods and places like that? Those many, many, many residents -- I know Parks is in charge, but, I mean, did they go out and take a look at -- 'cause trees are all around those places. I mean, did we -- everything --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. I believe everybody has -- they've looked at their facilities to assess them. As far as I know everything --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Well, that's amazingly lucky.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I could be wrong. Nothing's reached my level that there was any real damage. I mean, it probably did, but nothing's reached me.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Right, right. And the last thought is just something that I think as a county we've got to look at and maybe in our building departments across the Island and stuff like that. Those, and maybe the County, it might be in some ways, easier to look at when we do go to bag things along the shorelines and stuff like that, we start looking for those ways of raising the electricals, the wiring in the houses, anything we can do as far as anywhere where we're vulnerable across the County as far as County buildings and stuff like that. That should be built into and considered in our plans.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I know that -- I mean, just sea level rise along is something that's being examined and the implications of that impact on top of the regular storms surge, things like that.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Anytime that we do anything there --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
As an example, I can advise you that in our current expansion, we are now building concrete foundations to basically take into account buoyancy and what happened if you had a tank that wasn't full and you come in --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
And it gets pushed up.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah, I could see that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
So these are things that we're starting to look at.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Should we be looking at a seawall from for the Bergen Point plant?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is, I think, long-term planning. That may be something that has to be looked at. You have cost involved. You also have permitting involved. We've been looking to harden our shoreline because of damages over the past two storms and we did have a little bit of a small --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Right, which we never did our landscaping. We never got to the landscaping part. I don't know if that would have helped but.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. Yeah, it's really -- you really have to have a hardened type of structure which is the giant riprap, whatever you call it, like a sea wall all along there to basically protect it because we did have a little washout on the road to the sledge building.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I see the town lost the dock to the left at the end of Bergen one more time. That was knocked out during Irene. That was being rebuilt, and it looks like they had more damage again.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It was pretty wild down there the next morning, boats in the road, everything.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I saw it. But, you know, a seawall, that might be the place to -- if there's a place to look at and consider, that might be the location, you know, and maybe even some height, as ugly as it might be.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
But, I think, also, there has to be, and there is, some long-term planning going on along the shore, again, because the sea level rise alone.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Well, the sewage treatment plant is not so pretty, anyway.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
That's true. That's true. We would put plants, a lot of vegetation in front of it, but we certainly don't want that washed over.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah. Is that -- we have one yellow card, and we have a long agenda. All right. So, Michael Guisto, I know you're speaking on behalf of Sayville Ferry Service for the law firm Neufeld and O'Leary.

MR. GUISTO:
Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. My name is Michael Guisto from Neufeld and O'Leary. I'm here on behalf of Sayville Ferry Service with regard to IR 1810. This is the first rate increase which Sayville Ferry Service has sought since 2006, and the public hearing on this matter was closed on October 9, and the Budget Review report, dated September 5 of this year, supports our request for an increase and notes that that increase sought is less than the CPI since the last time that we sought and obtained a rate increase. I'm here if there are any questions that the committee may have. Otherwise, I would just ask that the matter be voted out of the committee with the recommendation that that resolution be adopted.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Any questions for Mr. Guisto? What was the issue -- somebody came by one day with an issue about not being able to use the ferry, or was that a different -- maybe it wasn't you guys.

MR. GUISTO:
Not that I recall.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I think I'm thinking of a cargo ferry that went across.

MR. GUISTO:
Oh, no. I believe that was on the last time this was before the committee, but that was not concerning Sayville Ferry Service.

LEG. BARRAGA:
That was to ship propane over to Fire Island, because there's a guy over there -- there's only one ferry company that has exclusive rights, and I think the question came up whether or not Sayville Ferry was also going to apply to get the propane --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. That's what it was. Okay. And if there's no questions, thank you, Mr. Guisto.

MR. GUISTO:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. So let's go to the agenda.

IR 1731, I'll actually not read this because we already did this by CN at the last meeting. It shouldn't have been on the agenda.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, actually, this should. This is a little bit different. From what I'm told, this is -- and I could be wrong. This was for -- with respect to just the County's portion, which is sewer district 10 and 19, because I questioned the same thing, and I'm told by staff that this did not reflect the other funding. I mean, I could be wrong.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It says number 21.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, it is Sewer District 21, but 21 has two districts within it: Sewer District 10 and sewer district 19, so we need to -- our request would be to approve this.

MR. NOLAN:
We adopted this resolution.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
We adopted this resolution, 1731, by CN at the last meeting.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We did.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let's pass over it. All right.

1802, Eliminating impact assessment fees (Cilmi). Did this get amended as per our meeting?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. Basically, we met with Legislator Cilmi. I would ask this to be tabled. We haven't completed amending it yet.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I think you met with me on this one too. I think I attended.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, you were there as well, yes; I didn't forget. But they -- we spoke to them about it. We're still -- given everything that's gone on in the past few weeks, we'd ask one more -- another cycle so we --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'll make a motion to table. Seconded by Legislator Horsley. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled**. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

I guess I'll set the stage for my colleagues that the original bill was to eliminate all of these impact fees, but what we're looking at now is basically restructuring impact fees.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So. Okay. All right.

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 (P.O. Lindsay).

We've held the hearing and we've closed the hearing on it. Is there a motion? Motion?

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Muratore making the motion. Second by Legislator Barraga. There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
Approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

1838, Authorizing a request for proposals to enforce the County's Laws associated with utility poles (Romaine). I thought we tabled this subject to call -- all right. So that shouldn't be on the agenda. Let's skip that.

IR 1875, Directing the Department of Public Works to study the feasibility of siting a solar farm on County-owned property (Cilmi).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe this was, and I haven't had a chance to check -- this was supposed to be revised to give us a little extra time on completing it otherwise we were fine on it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I think I attended a meeting on this one as well, probably the same meeting.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It was the same meeting.

MR. NOLAN:
The resolution is to study 180 days rather than 90, and it substitutes photovoltaic arrays for solar farms in the title and throughout the bill.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Are you okay with it in that case?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And, Gil, I want to know what happened to my wind feasibility study, because that's about seven years old now, and I'm still waiting for it. Make a note. I know you've been busy. I'm a patient man, but you reach a point. All right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Understood.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. 1875, do we have a motion to approve? I'll make a motion.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Barraga.

LEG. STERN:
Let me just --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
On the motion.

LEG. STERN:
Mr. Chairman, thank you. Let me just ask again. Gil, you had said that you're good with it, you have the time with it. I'm looking at it here. There's going to have to be some ongoing dialogue with LIPA. As well, they have their hands full, so we might be able to handle it inhouse. I assume that it's all being handled by you guys. Given the circumstances and working with LIPA specifically, you think that the timing works?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, we were comfortable. We met the Legislator as well as the Chairman and spoke about this specific bill and really just needed time -- a little more time to look at it, but we were comfortable with being able to address it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can I ask you, when you do this study, this think outside the box a little bit, you know, you have, like, a building like Dennison that's got glass windows throughout. They have now things that go over glass windows that are actually solar collectors. You can still see through the windows. You know, we've done these solar carports, but I think there are potentially other more creative ways to get solar power without losing space, so I just encourage you to look at what's out there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Will do.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. So, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1875 is approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1937, Directing the Department of Public Works to comply with County reporting standards for sewage discharge (Romaine).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Do you want me to give an explanation?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, go ahead. Let me hear your two cents on this.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay. This legislation requires Suffolk County DPW to report any discharge of untreated or partially untreated sewage at any County wastewater treatment facility to the Suffolk County Department of Health Services who will then notify elected officials and the public. Current regulations require that we notify New York State DEC of any such spills. The Department of Health Service -- sorry. The Department of Health Services is copied on any such notification. As such, we do not feel this legislation is warranted. However, I would state for the record that any such discharge is extremely infrequent and only due to mechanical failure or tidal overflow during severe storm events. New York State, and we do know that New York State DEC is in favor of public notification, so we don't -- I don't see the need for this legislation, but we will gladly abide by it if it's forwarded.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
The bill requires you -- how are you supposed to notify the public?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Within -- hold on a second. It's within a certain timeframe we are supposed to notify --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
How? On the internet?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. You do it in writing. It has to be something formal. Generally, we, if there is such an event, we notify DEC in writing and we copy the Health Services Department, so I don't see the purpose of legislating something we already have to do.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
This just requires you to tell --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
The elected officials seems to be the only piece you're not referring to -- referencing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. That's in there too. Certainly, we can comply with. It happens so infrequently and for such a short period of time. I mean, we're on top of our plants, and, you know, you know that.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I do.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't see the need for this bill, but if you so choose, we'll abide by it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yes. So you're saying the bill would require you to tell Health Service; you already do that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. Health Services is already notified. You know, any type of spill like that, we can notify the committee as well.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It says that you're -- you're supposed to post the reports online.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It says HSV is supposed to notify us under this and post the reports online, so it sounds like it's more directed at the Health Department than it is at DPW.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's a notification process. Rather than legislating it, if you want, we can do it as policy that we will, anytime we have a spill and we identify, you know we would to the -- when we send a letter to the DEC, we can then just copy the committee at that point.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Sounds good with me.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
There is -- we already have a rule, don't we? We already have a rule requiring that information be provided if there is such a discharge. It's a rule that goes on to talk about specifics: day, time, location of the discharge, volume, treatments, date of the discharge, et cetera, et cetera. We already have that requirement, correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's the one for the Health Department.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
That's for private, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's for private. That would include --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

County.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
-- public -- County facilities.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
How many are there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe there's 23, 24 -- I take that back; 26, if you include the two districts we will be talking about. We hope to make it public districts, but it's in that range.

LEG. STERN:
Gil, can you talk about -- because there's a rule, then, coming from New York State, right, that is to be implemented that will cover municipally-owned facilities.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It already is there. Any time there's any type of discharge or noncompliance with the regulations, we have to notify the Department of Environmental Conservation.

LEG. STERN:
So combined, then, what you're saying is, yeah, if it's there, you can handle it, but really, what's the point, because cumulatively it really covers the kinds of things that you're doing, anyway.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. I don't see the reason to legislate it. It could just be a policy decision that we notify you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
But this isn't asking the County to do anything we're not asking the private sector to do.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. Well, it would -- it's --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Basically, we'd be living by our own standards.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Like I said, I don't have a problem. I don't really see the need for it but that's --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
You're saying it happens so infrequently, it's not that big of a deal.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Not at all.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'll make a motion to approve. Is there any other motion?

LEG. MURATORE:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Second on the approval. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Discharge bill is discharged. 1937, couldn't resist a pun. This septic stuff is just so humorous. **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1939, Prohibiting the use of hydraulic fracturing brine on County property or roadways (Calarco). I didn't know we were using hydraulic fracking brine on County properties and roadways.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We are not. It's also extremely unlikely that the liquid from fracking, you know, which would come from upstate would reach, you know, the most extreme downstate corner. Having said this, we do not object to this legislation.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
How can we be against it?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
A solution in search of a problem.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Especially since we don't know what's in it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Somebody want to make a motion --

LEG. STERN:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- from prohibiting what's actually not happening. Legislator Stern makes a motion. Second by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (5-0-0-0).** All right. Now it's a prevention.

1954, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the reconstruction of CR 97, Nicolls Road from the vicinity of Long Island Expressway to the vicinity of NYS Route 25A, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5512) (County Executive).

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

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

LEG. STERN:
What are you doing with a second?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'm trying to get a second.

LEG. STERN:

I'll make a second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Stern seconds. Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You want an explanation?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The resolution appropriates 200,000 for planning in connection with the feasibility of a grade separation at the intersections of Nicolls Road, County Road 97, with the entrance of both the Suffolk County Community College as well as South Coleman Road. Additionally, the study will include investigation of possibly adding a third lane in either direction from the Long Island Expressway up to New York State 25 Jericho Turnpike. Funding for this project is proposed to come from CP 7433, which is restoration of driveways, gutters, catch basins at the Vanderbilt.

LEG. STERN:
How is that working?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
How is what --

LEG. STERN:
There's money that's being taken from that project. What's the status of that project and what, if any --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That was -- these were monies that the museum said that they would not be using this year, and they were fine with us using that.
CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved.**
(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

Moving on to **1955, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the construction of sidewalks, road resurfacing and drainage improvements on various County roads (CP 5497) (County Executive).**

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Stern. Commissioner, do you want to give us any additional information on this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This resolution appropriates 265,000 for planning in connection with investigating pedestrian safety improvements, including sidewalks, roadway surfacing, and drainage improvements along County Road 35 Park Avenue from New York State 25 Jericho to County Road 11 Pulaski Road. Funds for this work will be offset from CP 5196, which is our Countywide highway sign management system as the department is not ready to proceed with the engineering of this project at this time.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
This is less money than we originally had in the capital budget?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This was additional money -- we bid out the work, and the fees came in higher, so this section, we did identify it as needing work and this would allow us to do this section of road.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. So we had a motion? We did, yes. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Commissioner, with reference to this particular bill and a number of others, do you think it's prudent, based on what has happened in the last eight or nine days with Sandy, that maybe we should take a look at the possibility of holding off on some of these projects to see how this all lays out from the County's perspective and the fiscal perspective? I mean, I can see a lot of municipalities incurring a lot of additional expense associated with this storm, and they are all sitting around thinking that some other level of government is just going to feed them all sorts of money to make them whole. I mean, you've got sidewalks and road surfacing and drainage improvements; can they be held off a little bit, or should they be delayed a little bit until we get a better feel in terms of what the possible negative fiscal ramifications of this storm may or may not be on Suffolk County?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Certainly, we could hold off on this. I mean, but again, there is -- there has been a need for pedestrian safety noted along this section of roadway, and that's the reason we're asking to move forward with this. We're confident that -- and we're working with FEMA and the State Emergency Management folks to make sure that the County is reimbursed, and I believe the anticipated funding would be -- I believe it's 80 percent federally-funded and then another 10 percent State-funded. So the County, at the end of the day, would only be -- have to pay for the 10 percent of the overall cost. Last year, under Irene, the State picked up all the charges, so there was no cost to the County even though we had to first instant fund it. I think that discussion has to be had.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I just have some general concerns about it because as I pick up the paper every day, I see somebody requesting 30 billion. Before I walked in here, the Presiding Officer of the City of New York, Quinn, she's looking for another 20 to 25 billion. You know, this thing is going to jump to not 50 billion as originally projected, but in the end, it's going to be more like between 150 to $200 billion dollars, and every level of government is going to look to the federal government for funding, for reimbursement. I'm just -- just a word of caution in terms of some of the projects, especially if we feel we might be in harm's way as a County or a lot of pressure is all of a sudden applied because something didn't come through that we anticipated, and now we've got a huge hole that we have to fill. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Fair enough.

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

IR 1956, Amending the 2012 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Shoreline protection at Hashamomuck Cove, Town of Southold (CP 5330) (County Executive). I'll make a motion.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Barraga. Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This resolution appropriates 390,000 for engineering in conjunction with the County's participation in the Federal Army Corp. of Engineers study of the shoreline protection of Hashamomuck Cove as previously authorized under Resolution 761-2009. The intent of this project is to stabilize the shoreline and the vicinity of Hashamomuck Cove due to its close proximity to a portion of County Road 48. Should erosion continue, it could destabilize and undermine our highway which is one of the two major links through the North Fork. There are no funds included in the 2012 Capital Program for the project. However, pursuant to the Suffolk County Charter, section C4-13, an offsetting resolution is not required on amendments financed by at least 50 percent Federal or State aid.

In this case, this phase of the project is estimated at 2.6 million at the Federal share at 50 percent, or $1.3 million, and the State having a 70 percent portion of the remaining sponsorship, which comes to $910,000. The County will assume the remaining 30 percent of the cost, $390,000, and we intend on providing in-kind services to reduce that amount by 100 to $150,000, so that would bring it down to a further $240,000.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Can I ask the obvious question? In terms of Hurricane Sandy, and I don't know if you've had a chance to look at this area, but when this was first put together, it was to protect 11 or so houses in that area in fear of breaching. Did it breach in Hurricane Sandy?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It was -- no, it did not impact that area. It seemed to have missed that area. I have no explanation for it. I can only tell you the last few nor'easters have hammered that area. So beyond that --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It got lucky, but that's not reason to not do the project. You're saying the fact that Hurricane Sandy didn't affect it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. I mean, the proximity of 48 through there, it's, in some locations, about 50 feet from the road.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. All right. There was a motion and a second. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1959, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the

increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 11 - Selden (sewer system improvements) (CP 8117) (County Executive).

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Muratore. I'll second. Commissioner, any additional?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This resolution establishes certain findings and determinations of a public hearing that was held on October 9, 2012, regarding a proposed project within sewer district 11, Selden, to improve the sewer system within district 11. The improvements will include replacement and repair of sewers, force mains, and manholes, and the project is estimated at 2.5 million.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. So all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? I think what I'm going to do, since a lot of these we've already gone through the initial phase, then you went to public hearing, and now you're actually making determinations, I'm assuming in each case you are okay with the improvements after the public comment.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So unless a Legislator wants more information, I will just try to go through these as quick as possible, if that's okay with the committee.

1960, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 5 - Strathmore Huntington (CP 8115).

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Stern. Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstention?
Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

1961, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 10 - Stony Brook (CP 8175) (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1962, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (infrastructure improvements) (CP 8170) (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1963, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 7 - Medford (CP 8150). (County Executive).
Same motion, same second, same vote. **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

1964, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 7 - Medford (Woodside) (CP 8119) (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. Approved **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1965, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase, improvement and extension of facilities for Sewer District No. 18 - Hauppauge Industrial (CP 8126) (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**.

1966, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement to the wastewater treatment facilities for Sewer District No. 14 - Parkland (CP 8128) (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. **Approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1967, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 20 - William Floyd (CP 8148) (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1968, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 23 - Coventry Manor (infrastructure improvements). (CP 8149) (County Executive). Same motion, same second, same vote. **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1974, Calling a public hearing for the purpose of considering the proposed establishment of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 16 - Yaphank Municipal (CP 8158) (County Executive).

Commissioner, do you want to give us any additional information on this one?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This resolution calls for a public hearing to establish sewer district -- Suffolk County Sewer District 16, Yaphank municipal, as a formal sewer district. The proposed district would be solely owned by Suffolk County and currently serves all the County facilities at the Yaphank County Center. It will consist of 16.5 acres of land, 10 of which are for future expansion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. I'll make a motion.
LEG. MURATORE:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

1975, Calling a public hearing for the purpose of considering the proposed establishment of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 24 - Gabreski Municipal (CP 8177).

Commissioner, are we going to allow others to look into it; is that the plan?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The intent is so that they would be able to and could connect as a connectee. Until we establish the district, we can't do that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'll make a motion.

LEG. STERN:
Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved.**
(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

1993, Permitting Cornell Cooperative Extension to purchase fuel from the County. I'll make a motion for purpose of discussion. Second by Legislator Stern. Have we do done this with groups like that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. We've done it for other non-County facilities such as certain fire districts, I believe the school district. There's quite a number of different semi-governmental agencies.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
But they're not semi-governmental. They're a contract agency. I know they happen -- we own the building, the McGrath building where they're headquartered, and I'm sure there's a County pumping station right behind it, and I'm sure their employees would love to be able to fill up their cars. I don't know how they're going to work that out but I'm not --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Again, it would only be -- it wouldn't be for their employee vehicles. It would be for vehicles that are owned by Cornell Cooperative.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I don't know what arrangement they have with their employees. Are they given cars to take out into the field?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That I don't know.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Are we going to lose out on sales tax at the pump when they fill up?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I mean, certainly, I wouldn't object to tabling this, and I'll ask for further information.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I wouldn't mind more information. I could see with fire departments and schools. Now we're getting into contract agencies. This is kind of new to me.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'm advised that this is an extension of a current agreement that's already been in place for 10 years.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh, we're already allowing it to do this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yep. I didn't know that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. I guess it's worked out okay. Then I guess it's all right. All right. There's a motion and second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

Does our policy in general allow contract agencies to enter in agreements like this to purchase fuel from us?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It would have to work out, you know, if there is an impact to our fees. That would all have to be -- you'd have to make a determination on how that gas, and providing that gas, would impact their fees.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let's say we took a group like Island Harvest, you know, and they wanted to fill up at our pumps. We could offer this to them.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. I mean, again, I don't know all the details and -- but I believe as long as their fees for their services reflect any reduction in gas costs, if their contract was based on private industry, they would -- you would then have to, obviously, make some type of adjustment because of the reduced cost of County gas.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Let's move on.

This is **IR 1997, Directing the Department of Public Works to make common sense changes to Bus Routes 1A and 1B.**

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I have reached out to Legislator Gregory and asked that this be tabled. We are moving forward with this. There seems to have been a miscommunication between my department and the Legislators' office for this and I believe the next one, but we are moving forward in this. He's agreed, similar to what we did with the bus route that ran along Carleton Avenue a couple years ago. We ask that it be tabled. We will update you as things progress, but we are moving forward, provided we can get approval of the private shopping center that we're looking to do some changes to. This -- we can all make this work.

LEG. STERN:
Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion to table by Legislator Stern.

LEG. MURATORE:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Muratore. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So **tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

IR 1998, Directing the Department of Public Works to conduct a traffic study on a portion

of County Road 28.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is -- similarly, I reached out to Legislator Gregory. We have identified this as a location of need. We have done a preliminary investigation, and we are moving forward with a traffic study. Again, I just only don't want to progress legislation that we're already doing, you know, if we don't have to. So that's the request. He was fine with tabling it, and we will identify at the next Public Works Committee as we move forward where we are with it. Similarly --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Was this conversation today?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, it was.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh, okay. Because I had spoken to him earlier today, but you'd probably spoken to him in the in-between period.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, I spoke to him about 11:30. That was when I finally spoke to my staff about this.

LEG. STERN:
Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Same motion, same second. Motion is to table. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
Tabled (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

2017, **Directing the Department of Public Works to study establishing concessionaires at certain County facilities.**

Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We're fine with this. It's been an issue that raises its head every couple of years. In the case to say Dennison, we've tried to go out in the past to get interest from vendors, and because of the low number of people in the various County facilities, there has been no responses. Now that we are going to be moving the Traffic Violation and Parking Authority into that facility, there may be interest. So we can move forward with this. I didn't look at the timeframe on it.

MS. MOSS:
90 days.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, it's certainly something a little longer than 90 days. I can reach out to Legislator Cilmi, if possible.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. I'll make a motion to table.
LEG. STERN:
Second.

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

Yeah, if you would reach out to the sponsor.

Before we do 2025, I did receive another yellow card, and it happens to be on this issue, so if the committee will indulge me, I will call the individual up so that -- otherwise, the comments will be for not. We'll have voted on it. William Stonar from AARP on IR 2025.

MR. STONAR:
Thank you for the opportunity. I apologize for missing the public portion. As introduced, I'm Will Stonar. I'm the associate state director for livable communities at AARP, and on behalf on our more than 300,000 members here in Suffolk County, I want to thank Legislator Calarco for forwarding this resolution and also thanking our partners, Tri-State Transportation Campaign, who couldn't make it, and Vision Long Island, who will be submitting comments on this resolution.

If Suffolk County passes this resolution, they'll be one of dozens in New York State who have been forward-thinking about pedestrians, bicyclists and improving our driving conditions, and they'll be one of several hundred in the State or -- I'm sorry, in the country. For AARP, the reason we're involve in this at all, as you can imagine, right now, 8,000 baby boomers are turning 25 every single day, 8,000. So in just 13 years, 8,000 baby boomers will be turning 80 years old, losing their ability to drive. So we need to be very thoughtful about how these older adults can continue to get around their community, access community services, get to the doctor, get to the pharmacy, get to the grocery store, et cetera, and complete streets go a long way to helping to do that.

And the concern that we have at AARP is all the studies are showing time and time again that we have the fourth worst pedestrian fatality rate in the country, twice the national average of people over the age of 65. That's alarming considering the population shift and that we are all aging, but the numbers of aging individuals right now -- so we at AARP have been saying we can do much better than this. We don't have to be fourth in the country. Number one is, believe it or not, Hawaii, which comes as a shock. Most people think California or Florida. California is number two, Florida is number three, and then Alaska -- or sorry. Alaska is number three.

So we've been working at the State level. We did pass the State Complete Streets law, which is great. Senator Fuschillo from Nassau County was the major sponsor of that, and it deals with all State roadways or roadways that accept State and Federal funding so that we continue to work at the local and County level to make sure that we can get a holistic approach to our roadway system, because most fatalities, unfortunately, happen on local roadways, as the Tri-State testimony will also reiterate for you.

The benefits are clear, but when it comes to safety only. When you start talking about economics, more and more studies are showing that downtowns that take a Complete Streets' approach have a dramatic improvement in pedestrian shopping, more people visiting the area, more people spending money. And an example of that is Valencia Street in San Francisco. Merchants saw a 40 percent increase in retail and a 60 percent increase in pedestrian traffic on that street when they changed their policies to reflect a more pedestrian attitude. I'm hopeful here in Suffolk County, we'll see a dramatic improvement on Main Street in Smithtown since they've made the changes there, and we're hopeful that the data will actually play out in the near future.

There's also green aspects: using bioswales, changing center lanes to planted medians. They filter rainwater better. They keep more water off of the streets. Plantings calm traffic down, give the

community a sense of place. Cars react automatically to trees, plantings and such.

But important to us too is connecting it to transit. When we poll our members, it's a shocking number, but more than 50 percent of them said they don't feel comfortable crossing the street in their own community to get to transit, so that's a concern that we have. And we know the health aspects are significant. Communities with sidewalks, 43 percent of people in communities with sidewalks actually meet their daily allowance for physical activity as compared to 20 percent who do not have sidewalks.

So, you know, our members are always saying, *"Well, wait. Are you advocating sidewalks in every community?"* Absolutely not; but where appropriate, certainly, because home values go up, health improves in those communities and certainly gives a better sense of place in those communities.

And last but not least, as good as this resolution is, we would just -- two ways to strengthen the resolution would be the Complete Streets -- the National Complete Streets Coalition only recommends three types of exemptions. One exemption is where bicyclists and pedestrians are just not allowed or prohibited where cost for implementing the Complete Streets measure is disproportionate to the total cost for implementing it and where's there's a demonstrated absence of need. That's one.

And then the second change or way to strengthen it would be making the final authority for allowing the exemption to be either the Commissioner or the County Executive, and I know that my partners from Vision and Tri-State will be echoing some of these comments, but we do support this. We think it's fantastic. It's a great way for the County to move forward to start preparing for this aging population and the age boom that we're about to see and are seeing now. But also it benefits people of all ages and all abilities, whether it's a mother, father pushing a baby carriage or someone with a walker or stroller or a wheelchair.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Sir, would you indulge us? We have questions from the Committee. Legislator Barraga.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I wanted to get your input because certainly on paper, this sounds fine. You know, Suffolk County is an extremely dangerous place for pedestrians and bicyclists and motorcyclists. It's an automobile community. When they are behind the vehicle in my area, it's the biggest vehicle that wins, much less looking for pedestrian or bicyclists. I mean, over the years, I have had many individuals come in and they want to take up bicycling for exercise. About 90 percent of them, and I kid you not, get hit by an automobile. It's not "if," it's just a question of "when," because to get that kind of exercise, you have to go maybe 10 or 20 miles to make it worthwhile. And the way people drive out here, it's just not very conducive. I can see maybe in the Hamlet of Bay Shore where you have a given structure, a main street. But on the open roads, the side roads, people with automobiles don't expect to see people walking; they don't expect to see them on bicycles; they're not even looking for them. It may sound good, but I'm not so sure it really works.

MR. STONAR:
Yeah. I mean, it comes down to where appropriate, number one. We want bicycle lines where appropriate and where connected. For example, on 112, when they redid 112, they did a fantastic job of putting a bicycle lane in there. I'm from Mount Sinai, so when I bicycle, I have to go down North Ocean Avenue, which I don't relish, but then when I turn onto 112, I feel much more comfortable because they put in a designated bike lane. So, very important is that it has to be where appropriate. But the thing about drivers not looking for pedestrians, people are walking. They are walking already. They are walking in dangerous conditions in some situations because there are no -- there's no infrastructure for them to walk safely, so they're making what they call

"goat pads" or they're cutting through property, and it's unsafe conditions. So we're saying where there's a demonstrated need for these approaches, making it safer for pedestrians and bicyclists, we would encourage it, and we strongly encourage it.

Now when it comes to the Complete Streets policy for us and how we view it, most problems we're having with pedestrians of all ages is at intersections that already exist. Where there are -- there is infrastructure but the infrastructure could be improved, maybe there's not a countdown signal or maybe there's not a crossing signal to begin with or that the striping for crosswalks is inadequate or nonexistent and pedestrians are at a greater risk because drivers are not attentive to the needs of the community, even in the local areas like Patchogue. Patchogue has had a few pedestrian deaths in recent years because there's not proper markings and proper ways to highlight that there are -- this is a pedestrian-heavy area. They're making dramatic improvements in these areas, and we continue to encourage the local changes, but as a policy, we want to see an overall policy so that when they're thinking about all these changes that they're thinking beyond the vehicle; because you're right: For so many years, we are corocentric (ph), and we'll continue to be that way because we are an urban -- I'm sorry, suburban and rural county. But if they can look at a policy, they will say, Okay, look, we have a population explosion of aging adults. They're going to lose their ability to drive. There's no question, and it's around 80. So we want to make sure that they go --

LEG. BARRAGA:
What happens at 80? Do you anticipate me at 80 years of age being on a bicycle riding five to ten miles a day; is that they key here?

MR. STONAR:
No, most likely walking.

LEG. BARRAGA:
If I'm able to.

MR. STONAR:
Yeah, hopefully walking to transit and connecting to transit. Or the other, unfortunately, is isolation, and we know what isolation brings, so that's our other concern.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Just very quick, and I'll end this. It's just that even drivers today, if they only got behind the wheel and drove their vehicles, but in many cases, they're on the phone. I had a constituent the other day stop in who was sideswiped on Higbey Lane with sidewalks crossing from one small street to another, and a person was on a cell phone, sideswiped them, never stopped, never even realized that they had hit an individual.

MR. STONAR:
Yeah. Unfortunately, we can't eliminate all pedestrian and bicycle problems, and that's not what Complete Streets is supposed to do. What it does do, though, it enhances the visibility of the pedestrian or the bicyclists because you're putting in easy measures that can actually raise the visibility of that, whether it's better crosswalks that use higher visibility paint or higher visibility markings -- I know it's tape -- using the new technology for latter markings so that it's a clearly-designated area for pedestrians and it's clearer to the driver, but drivers are selfish, and they tend to -- they're texting, they're talking and whatnot, and you're never going to eliminate all pedestrian problems. And you can't eliminate all pedestrian err; let's be honest. A lot of pedestrians make errors, and they cross mid-block, or they cross against the light, and they're getting hit because they're making mistakes. But they do know with more and more infrastructure changes or simple changes within the Complete Streets ideas, you can actually reduce the number of instances with people of all ages and abilities.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Thank you.

MR. STONAR:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
Will, how are you?

MR. STONAR:
Good. How are you?

LEG. STERN:
Good to see you, as always.

MR. STONAR:
You too.

LEG. STERN:
Thanks for being here. First, just a jurisdictional question: This -- this has been implemented as the policy of New York State, which we were all very pleased to see, but you're suggesting that this initiative remains important here at the County level so that it will be part of our policy in the event we're doing work where we're not receiving Federal or State funding, correct?

MR. STONAR:
Correct.

LEG. STERN:
All right. So it's still important for us to do here on a more local level. The -- you have made suggestions as to what might make it a better bill, although you're in support of this one. Have you spoken with the sponsor about those recommendations?

MR. STONAR:
Yes, we have communicated with his office.

LEG. STERN:
Any word on -- and I have not, but any word on the likelihood of any kind of changes?

MR. STONAR:
No, unfortunately. I'm communicating -- it's Ryan Lynch, who is from Tri-State Transportation Campaign, who actually got caught in traffic in Brooklyn trying to get here. He's the one that's communicating with Amy directly in his office about the suggested improvements, but if they are not going to be amended into the resolution, we still support it. These are recommendations that if you wanted to strengthen the resolution, this is what we would do, and that's where our organization normally comes from. You know, as always, you are always happy to have a resolution that's does good work, but if there are ways to strengthen it, you make those comments and hope that if it's possible, they get included. And if not, it's still a good resolution. It still makes a good case for how they would implement this.

LEG. STERN:
And the standard here is that these are to be considerations as a part of the design process, but talk to me about the cost. The standard there is disproportionate -- tell me about the standard that's used here in the legislation. Have you seen different standards used in other places? And I guess, most importantly, what kind of an objective measure could one or should one use in our Department of Public Works when determining that as a factor?

MR. STONAR:
Well, that's where we're asking that the final say would be from the County Executive or the Commissioner as to what exemption mean -- what is disproportionate cost? But what we've been finding nationally and internationally is when you do in the design phase, the costs are miniscule. It's like anything else. When you do it in the design phase, you can take a little from one thing and put it into another. So if they were going to put in a bike lane, you could take a little from the shoulder possibly or a little from something else to make sure that the job wasn't disproportionate. But there's no hard and fast number as to what is disproportionate. It would be left up to the discretion of the body that you put in the authority of making that final determination, and our recommendation would be the County Executive or the Commissioner. But it's -- that's where there's a lot of wiggle room.

LEG. STERN:
Thank you.

MR. STONAR:
Thanks for the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Thank you, Mr. Stonar. Commissioner, I'm looking forward to hearing your comments. I also want to know how this is different than the bill we did with Legislator Hahn's bill. Didn't she do a bill where you were asked to consider the very same factors?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe -- was that the green legislation as compared to --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I thought it had to do with streets.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, I think it was.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It was one on streets.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
In fact, this legislation --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Green Streets. Was that different than -- Safe Streets? I thought that was Complete Streets too.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I have to look back at her legislation. I know that when we did speak about that, we do -- and similarly to this, we do consider the, you know, the tenants that are set forth under the Complete Streets policy, we spoke with Legislator Calarco when he was drafting this legislation, and, you know, we do have certain concerns about being hamstrung by this, and I'll be frank, but we worked

with Legislator Calarco to basically conform it so it sticks with the intent of the Complete Streets policy but also doesn't necessarily be over burdensome to DPW.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So you're okay with it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, I am.
CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. We haven't had a motion or a second yet. Legislator Stern making the motion.

LEG. STERN:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And I will make the second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Let the record reflect Legislator Barraga is voting in opposition, but the bill did pass out of committee, 2025. Approved **(VOTE: 3-1-0-1, Opposed: Barraga, Not Present: Horsley).**

2027, Adopting Local Law No. -2012, A Charter Law to strengthen monitoring of sewer plants operating in Suffolk County.

This needs a public hearing.

LEG. STERN:
Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I will second that motion. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled for Public Hearing (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Horsley)**

2029, Appropriating funds in connection with Public Works Buildings Operation and Maintenance Equipment (CP 1806) (County Executive).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
If I could, I would ask this to be tabled. I think there may be a little confusion on DPW's part. If I could get it tabled for one cycle just so I could confirm exactly what we were looking for. I thought we were looking for a bucket truck to help out our operations maintenance, which would actually save us money in renting one.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
My notes say "an aluminum step van and an F-350 service van."

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Service van, yeah. When I questioned the staff this morning, they were unfamiliar with this. Something got messed up en route, so I'd ask for it to been tabled and we'll make --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Muratore to table. Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **So tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Horsley).**

2030, Appropriating funds in connection with Removal of Toxic and Hazardous Building Materials and Components at Various County Facilities (CP 1732). I will make a motion.

Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (4-0-0-1, Not Present: Horsley).**

2031, Appropriating funds in connection with Construction and Rehabilitation of Highway Maintenance Facilities (CP 5048) (County Executive. Same motion, same second. Commissioner, is there any particular buildings in general?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
These are for two -- the replacement -- I'm sorry, for the planning of two of our salt storage buildings, one at Yaphank which collapsed two years ago under the weight of snow, and the second at Nicolls Road, which is in need of rehabilitation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Did the snow immediately melt when it collapsed into all that salt? I don't know. All right. There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved.**
(VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Horsley).

2032, Appropriating funds in connection with Installation of Guide Rail and Safety Upgrades at Various Locations (CP 5180) (County Executive).

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved.**
(VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Horsley).

2044, Authorizing the County to enter into an MPO Member Agency Federal-Aid Project Agreement with the New York State Department of Transportation. I'll make a motion.

LEG. MURATORE:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Muratore. Commissioner, you want to give us more detail?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This continues our -- the County's involvement in the Federal process, enable us to continue to access Federal funds for our projects. We have been involved with the unified planning work program for some time, and this just extends that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Stern, do you have a question?

LEG. STERN:
No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0) 2045, Authorizing the purchase of up to 29 paratransit vans for Suffolk Transit and accepting and appropriating Federal and State Aid and County funds (CP 5658) (County Executive).** I'll make a motion.

LEG. MURATORE:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Muratore. On the motion, Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
Gil, can you just speak to the type of vehicles that this covers?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
These are our paratransit vans, the SCAT busses. They are the smaller units that we provide services at people's homes and bring them to, you know, the locations. It's a $3 fee, and it's a service that's required under ADA and the federal process. These busses will replace existing aging infrastructure, and at the end of the day, it's only 10 percent of the County share of the $1.885 million. The County will have to pay $188,500.

LEG. STERN:
Are they essentially the same type of models that are currently in use?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Is that a good thing or a bad thing? Those mini busses oftentimes are only carrying one person.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
They also us provide the ability to pick up multiple passengers if there is an extended route, the provider -- and Garry can speak further on this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
But if they're mostly just carrying one individual, which it seems they often are, it may not be the most efficient way to operate SCAT. I don't -- it seems like other communities have smaller vehicles for their accessible transit. Garry, do you want to comment on this?

MR. LENBERGER:
Yeah. Actually, we had a buy a few months ago that was 22 vehicles. We actually downsized the vehicle. This was a continuation -- more.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
You did? To more of a van?

MR. LENBERGER:
Yeah, on the van paratransit bus, and this is a continuation of that, so it's a little bit smaller. If we go smaller than this, we jeopardize STOA funds, which is State --
CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
But it is smaller than those boxy busses that we've been running.

MR. LENBERGER:
They are somewhat smaller but not much, and if we go to a smaller bus, then we can jeopardize State Transportation Operating Assistance.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I don't want to do that, but I wouldn't mind saving on gasoline, with the price of gasoline, by having a slightly smaller vehicle.

MR. LENBERGER:
Yeah, and we actually are looking at it, and we may anticipate going for a waiver in the future to go to even a smaller vehicle.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. And I brought this up before about whether we ought to be advertising on the SCAT busses; we do on the main busses, but I see those SCAT busses all over the place. We've never done that before, but I have asked the Commissioner to look at this, so are you guys looking at that possibility, too, about selling advertising.

MR. LENBERGER:
The problem with that is the -- we like to have a visibility factor with the disabled community, and they do get confused quite often if we start changing the bus, and if you put wraps on them and advertising, they may mistake the bus for, you know, something that is not privy to them, and that's one of our concerns.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Well, if you can continue to look at it, maybe there's a way to do it, not necessarily wrapping it but put a sign on the back of some kind, generate some revenue. Okay. That's the only questions I have on it, so there's been a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

2051, **Appropriating funds in connection with Underground Injection Control Management Program (CP 8220).** I'll make a motion.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Second by Legislator Barraga. Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This resolution appropriates $400,000, $100,000 of which will be for planning and $300,000 for construction and will enable to continue our program to document, register, and mitigate and/or eliminate potential point sources of groundwater contamination. This program is required by the United States Environmental Protection Agency regulations. We are only requesting $400,000 at this time. The remaining $400,000 is being offered to use as an offset for Capital Program 1664, which is our energy conservation at various County facilities.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And this is where we have to document every single point of pollution underground that we're --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, every leaching pool, every catch basin, you know -- we have to locate them, inspect them --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
County-owned?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct, any County facility.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And it's costing us hundreds of thousands of dollars to do this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
We have to show them on a survey or something?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, we have to provide all that documentation to the EPA.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0).**

Can I just ask you a question? Because it's on my mind when I see this underground injection. You know, a few years ago, we approved a contractor to inject a biological agent into the Bergen Point line. Do you remember that? I haven't done anything since we've done that. Has that worked out for us.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. Actually, the contractor pulled out of the project. It wasn't cost-effective for them to maintain it, and apparently it didn't provide the services we thought it would in as large a system.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Thanks for the follow-up. I spent a lot of time on that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, we did.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. I wasn't sure how we were going to count further reductions in waste based on it, or nitrogen based on it, anyway.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
They were the only bidder, just so you are aware. There was no second bidder we could go to at that point so.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
2052, Authorizing the purchase of up to thirty new hybrid-electric transit buses for Suffolk County Transit including spare parts, radios, and other related equipment and accepting and appropriating Federal and State Aid and County funds in connection with this purchase (CP 5658).

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Muratore. I will second. On the motion, and this is kind of exciting. I guess we're getting actual full busses that are hybrid. I know we did the clean diesel. These are actually -- these are hybrid.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
These are hybrid electric. We had purchased four previously. This is increasing our fleet as we go to replace it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And this is primarily, what, 90 percent federal.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. Ten percent is County.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Ten percent County.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's -- the total estimate is $16, 650,000 of which the County shares 10 percent, which is $1,165,000.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Are we replacing -- 'cause we just replaced 85 busses. Are we replacing busses we've already replaced? We have a lot of brand new busses.

MR. LENBERGER:
It's 81.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Not 85, it's 81.

MR. LENBERGER:
81.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. At least somebody's counting. All right. So we just replaced 81. Is this replacing busses we just replaced?

MR. LENBERGER:
Absolutely not. These are 1999 Orion busses that we'll be replacing.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. And they must have hundreds of thousands of miles on them at this point.

MR. LENBERGER:
They have 5 to 600,000 miles on them.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Let me ask you this question, 'cause this is exciting. It's hybrid electric. This is -- I'm glad

we're moving in this direction, cleaner significantly but also should be significant fuel savings. Are we seeing the fuel savings reflected in our budgets? It should be much less expensive to run these busses than our traditional diesel bus.

MR. LENBERGER:
They are about a 10 to 15 percent fuel economy savings on these busses.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
That's it? All right. So, then, still, we should be at 10 to 15 percent savings about, right? Maybe 10 percent 'cause there's some cost to the electricity. Although, the hybrids, although we're not actually plugging them in, they are generating electricity, so it should be a 10 to 15 percent reduction, then, in our gas consumption.

MR. LENBERGER:
On the diesel busses, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
But the price has probably gone up by 10 percent so.

MR. LENBERGER:
Hopefully not.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Hopefully so -- because I have asked these questions before about whether our utility bills are going down based on all these energy improvements that we're doing, and I have always gotten the answer *"not yet,"* so I'm hoping one day in the budget, we're able to knock the fuel line down by 10 percent because of all the things we've done.

MR. LENBERGER:
Well, Suffolk County Transit uses 1.9 million gallons of fuel a year. That's just on the fixed route busses, not the paratransit.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Almost $2,000,000. Okay. And, Gil, you had said before that the busses had their own gas supplies.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
We paid for that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Is their price similar to what our price is? Would it make sense to have them to fill up at our stations?

MR. LENBERGER:
No. They actually have the same supplies that the County buys off the State contract. We actually monitor those fuel prices, and they actually get the same, sometimes even better, than what the State is getting.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. All right. Thanks. We had a motion and a second, not a vote, or did we vote on it?

MS. ORTIZ:
Didn't vote.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Didn't vote. Thank you, Madam clerk.

So on 2052, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
Approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)

2054, Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest and the Town of Babylon for Geiger Lake Park (BA-1643) (County Executive).

Any motions? Motion and a second.

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion by Legislator Stern. Second by Legislator Horsley. Any discussion? Commissioner, any additional information? This is an agreement to connect into the Sewer District number three with the Town of Babylon. It will permit discharge of 5,901 gallons per day. The connection fee for that is $177,030. It was based on the $30 per gallon per day connection fee.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Are we charging a different rate for a municipality than we would for a private?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. It's same fee for everybody.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Great. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

One more, guys. **2055**, **Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest and Melville Plaza - 610 Broadhollow Road (HU-1631) (County Executive).** Same motion same second. Commissioner, any additional information?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This allows 610 Broadhollow Road to discharge an additional 341 gallons per day which brings their total up to 6,110 gallons per day. I don't have the actual connection fee in here, but it was approved by the --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
It's already hooked up, though.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It was already hooked up, and I believe it's -- the total connection fee was $183,300.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
How we doing capacity-wise? That's Bergen Point, right, southwest number three?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We're doing well, and we're actually under -- we're in the process of expanding it so --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved (VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Gil, do you know what 610 is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, I do not.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Any other questions for the Commissioner? Again. Thank you for your hard work in the wake of Hurricane Sandy and in preparation for Hurricane Sandy, and the nor'easter that followed. We are adjourned.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I will relay that to my staff. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
We are adjourned.

(Meeting adjourned at 3:33 p.m.)