

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 July 23, 2013.

Members Present:

Legislator Jay Schneiderman - Chairman
Legislator Steve Stern - Vice-Chair
Legislator Wayne Horsley
Legislator Al Krupski

Not Present:

Legislator Muratore - Excused Absence

Also In Attendance:

William Lindsay - Presiding Officer
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk, Suffolk County Legislature
George Nolan - Counsel to the Suffolk County Legislature
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Catherine Stark - Aide to Legislator Schneiderman
Robert Lipp - Deputy Director - Budget Review Office
Laura Halloran - Budget Review Office
Craig Freas - Budget Review Office
Paul Perillie - Aide to Legislator Gregory
Kevin LaValle - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Gil Anderson - Commissioner, Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Bill Houck - Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Garry Lenberger - Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Gail Clyma - Southampton Dark Skies Advisory Committee
Brian Rossi - Suffolk County Resident
Pat Lenehan - Suffolk County Resident
Rick Brand - Newsday
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Gabrielle Severs - Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:

Gabrielle Severs – Court Stenographer
Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary

(The meeting was called to order at 2:04 p.m.)

(The following was transcribed by Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Good afternoon. I'd like to call this meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee to order on this 23rd day of July, 2013. All rise, if you are able, and join us for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Wayne Horsley.

Salutation

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You may be seated. Okay. We're going to begin today's meeting, and thank you all for coming, with public portion. I have three cards. If you wish to address the committee and you haven't already filled out a yellow card you can obtain them from the table in front of me through the Clerk's Office. My first speaker is Brian Rossi, and I'll ask each speaker to come up to the podium and state their name for our records and each speaker will have three minutes to make their presentation. If somebody could assist Mr. Rossi. Thank you, Renee.

MR. ROSSI:

People can hear me I hope?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Yes.

MR. ROSSI:

I'm still not used to this microphone. Hello, people. My name is Brian Rossi. I have spoken here before on these issues. I'm here both as a disabled bus rider and the Disability Issues Liaison for the Suffolk Green Party. I'm speaking again about transit and paratransit issues in the County. Basically I'm still trying to see if there's any way to get bill 1306 un-tabled and hopefully voted yes to take the full dollar fare increase on disabled bus riders and spread that to all bus riders, since right now it's basically the price of a movie ticket to get a trip to and from somewhere.

And I'd also like to see what could be done to amend the previous bill 1295 that got passed in April, because while that's supposed to extend Sunday night service throughout the County on transit and paratransit, it's still not helping people like me who live in areas that are underserved. I still would have to have a very dangerous three mile on foot trip home in the dark if I went anyplace at night at this point.

To me, these are basic issues. These are elemental and life or death issues to disabled people in this County. I know what it's like to have to use the system to get around when family and friends can't get me around. I would be curious to see how things would go for everybody in this room and on this committee if you guys had to do the same thing for a week or two. So I would like that to be taken into thought when it comes time to hopefully un-table one bill and see what can be done to amend the other.

I would like to see if folks in this room would be interested in raising their hands if you feel that these rights are basic, transportation for people, disabled or otherwise, affordable transit. Yeah, like I said, I would like the one bill un-tabled and voted favorably and I would like the previous bill amended, please. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thank you, Brian. Our next speaker is Pat Lenehan.

MS. LENEHAN:

Hello, all. Thank you for hearing me. Good to see you all again. On June 26th I had an appointment with the Labor Department for a class that I was supposed to take. The 9:20 bus never showed up at Lake Grove, I waited there. I need to get in touch with somebody, either on their e-mail so I can keep you informed as to what's going on. I was on another bus where the driver had on a telephone earpiece. He got cut off by a car and we all went flying. This was on the 63. Thank God no one got hurt, okay. And there's so much more that's going on that, you know, I keep notes, I would be driving you crazy. So if it's just like two people I could keep -- let you know what's going on in the buses.

I'm being questioned by a lot of people --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can I just interrupt for one second, Pat? I won't count this against your time. Did you take those complaints and forward them at all through the telephone number to the --

MS. LENEHAN:

You can't get through.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What?

MS. LENEHAN:

You can't get through on their phone.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Really?

MS. LENEHAN:

Yup.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Well, the Commissioner is here and he's hearing that, so.

MS. LENEHAN:

Definitely. I have tried many times and so have other people that come to me, because you know I'm an advocate.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there an e-mail system where you can complain?

MS. LENEHAN:

You know what? To tell you the truth, Mr. Schneiderman, I like working with you better.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Thanks. But, you know --

MS. LENEHAN:

No, the truth is it gets done. And you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I appreciate it.

MS. LENEHAN:

I notice that it gets done, but I'm getting a lot of slack from a lot of the people that know me now, which I thought I'd be away from this by now, but I'm not, about when the Sunday buses are going to start and blah, blah, blah, which I don't have the dates of and I'd like to have that information.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

We'll talk about that a little today, I believe.

MS. LENEHAN:

Okay. Also, aside from, you know, almost having an accident, a lot of these new drivers that we're getting are really running again off schedule. A lot of people are missing their buses and they're leaving like -- I was supposed to leave the mall today on the half hour and they left ten minutes earlier, to get here, you know, and it's just chaos again.

So before I can finish up the documentary, which you know I'm working on, I was in touch with the Labor Department today, and a lot of the classes that you have for people that need to get back to work are being held at BOCES, Wilson Tech and all, and there's no early schedule for people to get to those buildings. So the Labor Department informed me that if the people get the funding, you know, for these classes and they don't show up for the classes, you get fined four times the amount of what you's were paid in funding. You know, so I'm on that end of the documentary now trying to work through this so that, you know, you are more aware of what's actually going on, you know, for people that do need to work. He said everybody that's over at the Labor Department that takes advantage of these courses are usually people that have cars, but I think the people that can't get to work are a lot of the people that take the buses, you know, so I'm trying to figure out how I'm going to work that into this documentary.

Thank you for your time and I'll find out about the schedule so I can let people know.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Hold on one second. I just want to make sure, did Gil or Bill get the notes on the three areas that Ms. Lenehan had issues with or complaints about? Okay.

MS. LENEHAN:

Okay. And also the handicap buses. I had a few people tell me that they're not even going to the person's house, they're making them meet them on the corner. The ones that are paying the extra money.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The SCAT, you are saying, buses aren't going directly to the house?

MS. LENEHAN:

Some of the bus drivers won't go directly and are telling them to meet them up on the corner.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are they making them cross the street or no?

MS. LENEHAN:

Well, wherever their house is located. I only had a few people telling me these things and, you know, I was like all right, I'll let them know. But I have it more date-wise at home, you know, and I could forward that information.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's possible that the bus, depending on the size of the bus, may not be able to pull into a driveway.

MS. LENEHAN:

They are small, the SCAT buses.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

But there still might be brush and things. There might be reasons why they can't pull in the driveway.

MS. LENEHAN:

That's good to know.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

However, you don't want to make somebody cross the street.

MS. LENEHAN:

Right.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That would put them in danger.

MS. LENEHAN:

Yeah. Well, if I know that I could actually ask them the question now like where are you located.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Again, Gil, if you could follow through.

MS. LENEHAN:

Thank you for your time.

(The following was transcribed by Gabrielle Severs, Court Stenographer)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. Thank you. And the last card I have is Gail Clyma.

MS. CLYMA:

I wasn't sure whether I should speak now or when you bring up the bill.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Now is the appropriate time.

MS. CLYMA:

Okay. Thank you. Again, Gail Clyma. In three minutes, I can't get into a whole lot of detail. I did speak, as you know, at the initial hearing in Riverhead. I just want to reiterate the reasons why blue light is not a good thing outdoors: It causes a lot more glare; it creates a whole lot more sky glow; it poses greater difficulties for older eyes; it has more damaging ecological impacts; and more readily disrupts human circadian rhythms. I'm going to leave you copies of my remarks from the Riverhead meeting because I didn't quite get to the end of them.

A couple of issues have been raised about this bill. One has to do with the -- what's called "efficacy," the amount of light that's produced per watt by the LEDs that aren't still blue. This is a very fast developing area. There's a report that I have a page out of, of Phillips, one of the manufacturers, is expecting that by September they will have an LED of about 3,000 kelvin. That'll produce 140 lumens per watt, so that's pretty good.

The other issue is the question of whether blue-rich light might provide better vision, and this is a very confusing and complicated topic. If you have this article that I handed out at the Riverhead meeting, on the beginning of the second page, there's a little discussion of it. The reason that it's confusing is that night vision is extremely complicated and not totally understood, but it has a great deal to do with the level of lighting that your eyes are adapted to, and while blue light may look brighter and it might afford better vision in bright surroundings, when you get to the adaptation levels that are common for streets and parking lots where these fixtures are mainly going to be used, it does not have an advantage over warmer lights. I have a little information about that that I will leave with you also.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Gail, before you go, I'd like to ask a couple questions because I think this is a topic that, for the most part, the Legislature and the committee is not familiar with. A couple years ago, I don't remember how many, I did a lighting law that had to do with directing light downward so that there wasn't sky glow. And the County has done, really, a remarkable job in making sure all its new fixtures, streetlights and building lights, are putting the light where it needs to go and keeping our skies dark, and that's been quite successful.

So this is an amendment to the successful lighting law, and it deals with a very narrow consideration, which has to do with the color temperature of the light, and what we're seeing is a conversion from incandescence. It was to compact florescence, but now everything seems to be going to LED lights, and the original LED lights that were in the market all had this issue with the amount of blueness in the light, and apparently, particularly for senior citizens, the blue causes a condition that makes it very hard to see at night. And a lot of municipalities have been putting limitations on the extent of the blueness in the light, and there's been an argument as to where that threshold should be, how far should we go in terms of limiting blue light.

The bill, as I have proposed it, has a 3,000 kelvin limit on blue light. Though those 3,000 kelvin bulbs are not readily available right now, maybe by September, so this bill in some ways is premature or ahead of its time, and we may need to amend that threshold at least until the technology is caught up to it. And I've had discussions with you about this, Gail, so I know that you're aware of it, and I likely will table this bill so I can make that amendment, so that -- but I do want to hear from the Commissioner today, at least to some degree. And this would not apply to lights that are already out there. We're not pulling out all the bulbs. This would be for future installations. I just want to make sure that was clear as well. Is there anything else you want to say from the scientific end of this as to why limiting the amount of blue in LED lights is important?

MS. CLYMA:

Just before I respond to that, as far as the availability of 3,000 kelvin fixtures, I just want to clarify. It's not that they're not available. They are available. They're becoming much more available. The issue is the efficacy, the lumens per watt, and this is where things are in a state of great rapid development. There are some out there now that are highly efficacious, but it's not like, you know, the whole market has them.

Why we should do this, is that what you're asking?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Well, the lights that we have been putting out, the LED lights, what is the correlated color temperature of the lights?

MS. CLYMA:

Well, they're kind of all over the lot. The first ones that started to be used in this type of lighting, public place lighting, street lighting, parking lot lighting, some of them were a 7,000 kelvin and even

higher in some places. And the public reaction to those was not very good, and so the manufacturers figured maybe they better rethink this, and they have been ever since then in the process of improving the efficacy of the warmer light fixtures. So now you'll see 5,000, for instance, 5100, unfortunately. I'm sorry to say New York City put a bunch of 5100 in Central Park, which is really, really terrible. After testing 3,000, they put in 5100. But there are other, you know, 4100 is becoming more common. It just kind of depends on where the technology is at when a particular municipality, you know, takes up the issue and decides what they're going to buy for their next order.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What are we seeing in terms of other municipal regulations in terms of where are they setting the limit?

MS. CLYMA:

There are several East End towns that have 3,000 kelvin. There are probably five altogether. Not all of them -- some of them were unfortunately were related to just metal halide because LED hadn't happened yet, but the threshold was 3,000 kelvin. I believe the City of San Diego has 3500. I don't have the names of others. The couple that have 3200, you know, people kind of looking for a spot in the middle there, the County of Hawaii out on the Big Island has a limitation which is not specified in kelvin, but they are trying to address this issue based on the percentage of the light that's in the blue range. And again, there's diagrams and that sort of stuff in here if you're interested. So more and more municipalities are becoming aware of this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Can you respond -- somebody spoke at the hearing about the cost that we would have to do more lights because of it.

MS. CLYMA:

You know, I'm not -- I wish I could have a more precise idea of what he had in mind when I first heard it, and I guess you must have been the one that told me about it because I'm not sure that he said it from the podium. At first I thought he was confused and he was talking about shielding fixtures. That is an argument that has been made in the past about shielding fixtures, but, as you know, we already have in Suffolk County a bill required full shielding, so that doesn't seem like it would be what he had in mind. The only thing I can think of is that he's talking about this issue of visibility and whether blue light -- you can see better under blue light at night, and that, as I say, a very complicated, confusing issue. Science doesn't really to this day understand totally how our eyes work at night.

I mean, when you think about it, human vision is pretty phenomenal. You can walk out on a brightly-lit beach and see just fine, and then you can be out at night if you're in a dark place and you can see by moonlight. I mean, there's this huge range of visibility and how the eye functions. Forget about the beach for the moment; just at night in different levels of adaptation is very hard to know exactly. There has been some research done which has suggested that you can see better at night with blue light, but a lot of the research has been based on -- you're probably familiar with rods and cones. You know, you have rods and cones in your eyes, and your rods are what are working mostly in low-light vision, but your rods are also responsible for your peripheral vision. So a lot of the research that's been done has been what people can see out here with blue light, and because it's the rods that are working on the periphery, it may look as though visibility is really better, but that doesn't mean it's better in front of you where somebody might be stepping off the sidewalk. So that's, you know, I don't know unfortunately exactly what he had in mind, but I guess it has to be one of those two things.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Thank you, Gail. Anybody else have any questions for the speaker? I'm sorry, Gail, stay there for a second. Legislator Krupski also has a question.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I don't know if you can answer them all or some might have to be answered by the Commissioner. You know, as far as the color goes, how would that -- I'm thinking about the streetlight in town. In our town, we replaced the incandescent bulbs with LEDs.

MS. CLYMA:

In streetlights?

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Yes. So the incandescent gives like a yellowish light, all right, and the LED gives like a bluish light. Now, you're shaking your head like "yes," but I'm colorblind, so what I see as yellowish or blue -- you know, you don't think I picked this out myself, do you? So I don't know how you really measure. Everyone sees colors differently. I'm not sure how you -- what we're trying to accomplish by saying you can only have a blue light but it can't be too blue. I don't understand that.

MS. CLYMA:

Well, the reason that we're proposing this legislation is because of the bad impacts of blue-rich light on the environment, on people, on the night sky and so on. There may be some personal variation in how people view the colors of things, but I think most people, and I know quite a few people are colorblind, but most people would, you know, agree that Jay is wearing a blue shirt and the gentleman next to him is wearing a pink one. I mean, there may be a little -- some may think it's pinker than others, and others may think the other is bluer, but there's kind of a general agreement about the color of these lights.

And I think I mentioned at the Riverhead meeting what the standard streetlight at this time as high pressure sodium, which has a very orange, gold, amber kind of tone to it, and that's about 2200 kelvin, which is how we measure the color temperature. But the common incandescent bulb that we all have in our homes is about 2700 kelvin, so this is a little whiter or warmer -- or cooler rather, if you will, than what we all are used to having in our homes, but it's still considered warm light, not blue. I don't know if that answers your question or not. If not, try me again.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Somewhat. And now they are all looking to see what color tie I have on.

(The following was transcribed by Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is there anyone else who wishes to be heard by the committee who has not filled out a yellow card? Are there any more yellow cards? All right. Seeing none, we'll go to the agenda. I will ask the Commissioner to come forward. All right. Thank you, Gail. Anything before we start? Great.

Tabled Resolutions

1035-13 - Oh, you know, let me just state for the record, too, that Legislator Muratore has an excused absence for medical purposes, medical reasons, from today's meeting.

IR 1035-13 - Eliminating impact assessment fee (Cilmi).

I believe this was the earlier version.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. This was the one that was superseded by --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This should be withdrawn, but it's not. I'll make a motion to table. Second by Legislator Horsley. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Tabled. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore)**

IR 1306-13 - Moderating fare increase for paratransit bus service (Schneiderman).

This bill was spoke of earlier. I'm going to make a motion to approve. This is to roll back the one dollar increase and hold the public hearing on an alternative plan.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Motion to table.

LEG. STERN:

And I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to table by Legislator Horsley. Second by Legislator Stern. Any other motions? Okay, so the only motion that has two is the tabling motion, so that's what I'll call the vote on. All in favor? Opposed? I'm opposed. Abstentions? Three votes to table. The bill is **tabled. (VOTE: 3-1-0-1 Opposed: Legislator Schneiderman; Not Present: Legislator Muratore)**

For those that are interested in that, I'm going to continue to press this issue within the budget process to see if I can make any progress on adjusting that fare.

Moving on to ***IR 1347-13 - Directing the Department of Public Works to conduct a traffic study on a portion of County Road 86 (Spencer).*** Can I get a motion one way or another?

LEG. STERN:

Motion to approve.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Motion to approve by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator Krupski. Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. We have been waiting for detail on exactly what is being requested. This resolution just generally asks for a traffic study down this corridor. We are doing numerous traffic studies. We have approached Legislator Spencer to ask for a little more detail. As far as I know, we haven't received what that -- what they're asking us to study. So I would ask that this be tabled. I'm meeting with Legislator Spencer on Thursday morning. I can bring this before him and ask him if there's been any progress. But to the best of my knowledge we have not received any type of specificity as to what exactly they want us to look at.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Which is 86?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Broadway down in -- it actually goes through the center of Greenlawn, but it extends all the way towards Deer Park Avenue.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Larkwood?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, it's Broadway. I just don't know what it's called south of Broadway.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think the Commissioner's request is quite reasonable. I'll make a motion to table. Is there a second on the tabling?

LEG. STERN:

I'll make a motion to discharge without recommendation. I hear you, Commissioner. I had the opportunity to speak with the sponsor. He would like it moved, however, I certainly do appreciate that the department needs, whether it's time to have this conversation or greater direction with greater detail, and saying that a meeting is coming up in the next couple of days. So if we just move it hopefully everybody can make some headway as a result of that meeting and then either you'll have direction or there won't be a need to go any further. But I hear you and, again, at the request of the sponsor I do know that this is something that he was hoping to have moved. So I put that for the committee members.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The only other thing I would say about this is the 90 days that it mandates that we do this is, again, that's something that's going to look to be -- we're going to look to change to ask for more time irrespective of what the actual detail is.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

The Commissioner is asking for the bill to be at least more specific and to have more time. It doesn't seem right to discharge it then without recommendation if it needs to be changed, so I'm going to stick with my tabling. So we have right now a motion to discharge without recommendation. We have a second to discharge without recommendation. We had a motion to table and a second. Let's clarify this. Was it a motion to approve that was withdrawn? Okay. So who had made -- Renee, who made the motion to approve?

LEG. STERN:

Let me withdraw the motion to approve and make it a motion to discharge without recommendation pending the conversation that the Commissioner is going to have with Legislator Spencer. And I agree with you, Commissioner, that based on the conversation Legislator Spencer may need to come back and rework multiple parts, including but not limited to the time period based on the conversation that you had.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

I'll second that motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And who had seconded the original approval so that --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Krupski is withdrawing his second on the approval.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Please withdraw my second on the original approval.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Now we have a second on the discharge without recommendation by Legislator Horsley. I still have a motion to table. Is there any other motions? Any other seconds? Okay. So the only thing that has two, which is what's needed for me to call the vote, is the discharge without recommendation.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

All right. To the Commissioner. So this motion to discharge will give you time to work with the sponsor?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. It will give me up to the general legislative meeting to meet with Legislator Spencer, and then at the meeting I will then come before the Legislature and advise where we're going with this. And then, you know, if we have to go back, which I'm hoping we do to revise this, that then Legislator Spencer would have to bring that before you or I make the statement, however it works. But, yeah, you will be advised on Tuesday.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Then I will support it.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

It gives double the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay, I'll call the vote on discharging without recommendation. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Discharged without recommendation. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore)**

(The following was transcribed by Gabrielle Severs, Court Stenographer)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. **IR 1472, Adopting Local Law No. -2013, A Local Law to amend Local Law No. 26-2004 to further reduce light pollution from County-owned facilities (Schneiderman).** I do want to have a short discussion on this bill. I'll make a motion, though, to table because there's a couple of changes I want to make to the bill.

LEG. STERN:

Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

There's a second by Legislator Stern. But, Commissioner, I just got some of those changes before when Ms. Clyma was speaking. One is the issue of the threshold of 3,000 kelvin and whether there are some choices out there that provide enough illumination at that level and whether they're affordable, etcetera. There clearly is a variety of lighting available at the 3500 level that would do

it. So that's, at least in the beginning of the phase-in of this limitations on blue light, I have no problem with starting out with a slightly higher threshold of 3500. Maybe after a couple years, trying to bring that down to a 3,000 threshold if there's sufficient lighting choices out there that would provide 3,000 or lower kelvin and have the proper efficacy, proper illumination.

I also wanted to clarify in the bill that it would only apply prospectively, only to lighting after the effective date of the bill that hasn't already received design approval.

Legislator Horsley, do you have something you wanted to add?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

I just had a quick question to you, Jay. When you reduce the level of kelvin, does that mean that it reduces the energy needed? Because then it's an energy-saving bill as well, which is an important argument.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Maybe we can bring Ms. Clyma up. She might have an answer, or somebody from DPW.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, I have Bill Houck here from DPW who can answer -- who should be able to answer that question. Before Bill -- as Bill gets up here, if I could just make a quick statement. We were going to ask for the bill to be tabled for one cycle so that we could meet with the sponsor. As was noted in previous discussion, we are aware that this is a swiftly-changing market. It is improving. There are constantly changes to the LEDs, and, again, we have some concern that we would like to discuss with the sponsor.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Jay, I have a question, too.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Let's have -- okay. And I also have a question for Counsel in terms of the changes as I've articulated them, whether that would necessitate reopening the hearing, too. But why don't we have Mr. Houck -- thank you for coming. Is it Bill? Is everybody at DPW a "Bill?" There's quite a few of them.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Bill, Gil, or Phil.

*(*Laughter*)*

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right, it makes it easier for me, I think, to remember everybody's name. So, Bill, the question from Legislator Horsley is, by lowering the correlated color temperature to 3,000 kelvin, are we also saving energy?

MR. HOUCK:

Basically we're comparing a couple of different things here. When you go into an existing product line that's on the market and you look for the lower color temperature offerings, usually, at least with the limited research I've done trying to come up to speed on this topic, the lumens per watt, the efficacy that Ms. Clyma referred to, generally becomes slightly poorer. That's not true in every case. I have found spotlights that give the same power irrespective of the color temperature. But for the highway luminaires that I've looked at, you usually do give something up, and that was a point that I made, you know, in interpersonal communications with Mr. Anderson and other people

in my department. The efficacy is still pretty good. It's still on a par with induction lighting and metal halide, but the -- but in all honesty, you have loss of, I'd say, probably around 10 percent.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Let me -- my question got lost there; probably because I didn't understand it. Does it reduce the energy usage?

MR. HOUCK:

No. I'm sorry, apologize for not being as direct as I could've been. The energy usage to get the exact same number of lumens on the ground would go up by 10 percent by going to this lower --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

So by lowering the lumens, you are actually raising the energy usage?

MR. HOUCK:

Yes, relative to the blue light. You would still have a very effective fixture. If I were designing a lighting system where blue light was a specific concern, I think that would probably be a tradeoff that I would be willing to live with. I think that's probably one of the things that's going to be improved during this technological evolutionary process that Mr. Schneiderman referred to in his earlier remarks.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

So there does seem to be a tradeoff. My guessing is, then, our energy bills would go up if we moved towards this direction at this point in time; maybe in the future it may be better, but not yet. Am I reading that right?

MR. HOUCK:

It's possible. You might have difficulty measuring it. For the most part, where we've been doing LED retrofits, we've found them to be very powerful, and I think that your electric bill, especially if you were replacing other types of lighting, would probably still not go up.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

So it's a minimal difference, then. I'm trying to --

MR. HOUCK:

Correct.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Correct. It's -- one or the other wouldn't make much difference as far as energy usage. Okay. I think I got it. That answered my question.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

In the County, how many types of fixtures do we have? I mean, because I think offhand you think about street lighting, but would this bill cover any exterior lighting for any County-owned facility? So it wouldn't just be street lighting.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. It would be parking lots.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It would be all exterior lighting, yeah.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

All right. So how many different type of fixtures? And are you looking at -- would this bill -- I mean, it's not just like changing the light bulb. Are you looking at new fixtures?

MR. HOUCK:

Generally, yes.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

So the cost -- so, then, the cost -- if you're looking at total cost of operation, then, you look at, you know, lifespan of the equipment, you look at lifespan of the bulb, and you look at the energy use. So shouldn't we get a cost analysis on this before we would jump into this? It seems like if you start replacing fixtures, it's going to become an expensive proposition.

MR. HOUCK:

Yes, it would be. I don't believe that this bill is mandating any replacement of fixtures, though. It's new installation and retrofit.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It's very specific to -- it doesn't affect any current light bulbs. You know, some of these LEDs, hopefully, will be there for 20 years once we put them in because they have these incredible lifespans.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

No, no; that's not my question, then. What would trigger the changeover?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I'm not sure that -- this would be for new LED installations that happen in the future, not things that have already received design approval.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If, in fact, we were going to redo the parking lot out front, that's when this would trigger. You know, we would now have to look at these type of fixtures in exchange for the ones that were out there.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Not if one bulb burnt out.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Actually, I want to make sure that's clear. If a bulb goes out in a streetlight, George, would the new replacement light, if it's an LED bulb --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I have been through this before. That's why I'm asking the question. I'm not just trying to prolong this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

No, I just want to check the language.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

It's just that how many -- you know, that's what I want to be clear on. How many different streetlights do we have in the County? How many different type of fixtures?

MR. HOUCK:

We have a number. We have a lot of fixtures of the variety called "cobra heads," which employ high pressure sodium, metal halide, a type of florescent lighting called "induction lighting," and LEDs. So with lights that look the same in the daytime, you've got four different technologies that are commonly used in our town and County highways. And then you have other stylistic configurations. The ones that LIPA gives you are sort of a rectangular floodlight; instead of the cobra head, you'll see a lot of those around. We own everything. We own shoebox lights, which are what we typically put in parking lots. Those typically are high pressure sodium or metal halide, and typically if we simply lost a bulb in one of those, we would replace it in-kind.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I don't know that those sockets are the same as for the LEDs, so -- and when we're looking at the specific language in the bill, it appears it's the fixture, when replacing the fixture or putting up a new fixture that this would be in effect, not the bulb itself. That's an interesting question, though.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

I just wondered what would trigger the changeover because then you look at the price of the fixture, the cost of the labor, and then you're gonna do one or are you going to buy 300 fixtures and do 300 because it would be more cost-effective to have a guy just go out and do 300 at one time. And Wayne asked the question about the energy savings, which I was surprised that there was none, either.

So what's going to trigger this? You're not going to go and order one fixture because that one needed to be replaced. Say somebody runs a pole over; you have to replace the fixture and the pole. At that point, you've got to replace the fixture, but at what other point would you replace a fixture and change this as per the bill?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would hazard to guess that when we came in and we did a reconstruction project where we're upgrading a road and we would look at lighting as one of the considerations in the design portion of it, at that point if there was a need to upgrade the lighting, certainly at points when the lighting becomes antiquated or is aged, you know, you look to replace it. So if you're doing a road job, you look to get those replaced at the same time. It's tricky because we, in many cases, once we put up lighting, we give it over to the town to maintain. So in roads, it's a little bit of, you know, a jurisdictional divide, if you will. That should probably be looked at here, too, as well because we turn it over to the townships once we do it, and they maintain the roads -- they maintain the lights, I'm sorry. That's something that would have to be taken into account as well, one of the things I want to talk about.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

And I just want to clarify the record, and maybe through Counsel too, because there's a different section in the bill that speaks to lamps and one that speaks more to fixtures, and so it's something we may need to clean up. It's actually not clear. It sounds like it may apply to the light bulb itself, which could be a problem because if it's a high pressure sodium, it's not going to be -- you're not going to pull that bulb out and put an LED bulb in. It's not the same socket. So, right, that's something we're going to have to address.

MR. HOUCK:

That's correct now. You know, five years from now maybe they will have drop-in replacements.

They've already done that with florescent fixtures.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. Counsel, did you want to add to that?

MR. NOLAN:

I think the intent wasn't to be that situation where if a light bulb went out it would have be the new better lighting or a different lighting. So I think -- but the language in the bill presently, I think, is not as clear as it could be on that point, so that would be another thing we'd clean up while amending.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I had other questions, right? Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you. Gil, when you say that it's then turned over to the town to maintain, what kind of maintenance is involved? Is it just the structure of the fixture that they maintain? What about ongoing costs; who incurs those?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Those fall to the town.

LEG. STERN:

To the town as well?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is for street lighting, not for lighting on County buildings.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. STERN:

Understood.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. Within our parks and our own facilities we are responsible.

LEG. STERN:

Theoretically, if there was to be a change in the structure or the fixture to this different type of lighting, that not only takes on that initial cost, but as we've just heard, perhaps an ongoing additional cost in terms of energy use. That would be an additional cost that we would be handing over to the town to incur on an ongoing basis, correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There may be, from what I understand, and it's limited, energy wise, it would be very minimal, if there was any. The maintenance itself, the contracts, if they haven't already been revised for maintenance of any LED lighting that are on County highways, they would have to -- their contractor would have to provide a cost to do that maintenance on those type of fixtures. So I would say in that particular case, it's probably going to be a tradeoff because you're now -- for the sake of argument, you do Deer Park Avenue, which is a State road but -- okay, Commack Road. You're

going in there, we put in lights. Now we're changing them, we're upgrading them into LEDs. There's still a cost either way to maintain those type of lights. We're taking on the cost of the construction and the replacement. They would in turn be responsible for the individual maintenance if there's an accident, if a light goes out. I would envision that there's going to be something of a wash.

LEG. STERN:

But there would be the additional cost of increased energy usage, as nominal as you're saying that that might be, but nominal times, an awful lot of lighting becomes not so nominal.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I think it should be analyzed, yeah.

LEG. STERN:

So I would suggest, then, that going forward, and I know that BRO's FIS here is that that the cost is indeterminate, that I would request that if after amendments are made, that we would look at the FIS not just in terms of what the cost for the structures would be, but if you can do your best to analyze what any ongoing cost might be incurred as well in the difference. That might prove to be indeterminate as well, but I'm hoping that that's something that BRO could take a look at.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

I think an interesting aspect of it is as the County switches over to LED lighting, you know, the utility costs are going down. So the question is by going this direction, maybe they are not going to go down quite as much. They could've gone down more. So how, from a fiscal impact, do you analyze that? It's not as much savings as you could have had, but still savings, so.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

You can quantify it because LIPA charges per pole, and it depends -- they charge as much as the fixture is, so they charge different for LED than they do for the same pole and the same fixture for an incandescent. And I know as the towns switch them out, they get -- the towns get that savings for each pole that's changed out, so that you can quantify that. We should be able to see that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

BRO, did you want to comment on that?

MS. MOSS:

This is a fiscal that our energy specialist looked at, Joe Schroeder, so I will bring back the concerns.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Very well. So we're tabling it for a host of reasons. There's a motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? It's **tabled**. **(VOTE: 5-0-0-0)**

I know, Gail, you and I will meet, I think, later on this and I'll work on an amendment to the bill. Hopefully we can address most of these issues. And, Gail, thank you for bringing this to my attention and to the committee's attention.

(The following was transcribed by Kim Castiglione, Legislative Secretary)

Introductory Prime

Okay. Moving on to Introductory Resolutions. ***IR 1511-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with removal of toxic and hazardous building materials and components at various County facilities (CP 1732)(Co. Exec.)***. I'll make a motion. Second by Horsley. All in

favor? Opposed? Abstentions. **Approved.** (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: *Legislator Muratore*)

IR 1513-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with Median Improvements on Various County Roads (CP 5001)(Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second, same vote. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: *Legislator Muratore*)

IR 1514-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with Intersection Improvements on CR 80, Montauk Highway at CR 31, Old Riverhead Road, Town of Southampton (CP 5569)(Co. Exec.). I'll make a motion. Second by Legislator Krupski. Gil, this is --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is for land acquisition.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is so that we can fix that intersection that comes in at a strange angle that causes the trucks to swing far over?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I think so, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So we're looking at acquiring land so that we can either add a turning lane or realign the road, is that it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, to do some changes to the road. Certainly possibly add turning lanes. We're not that far into the design, but we are looking at options and we will need to acquire land.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So there's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved.** (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: *Legislator Muratore*)

IR 1515-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with Reconstruction of CR 48, Middle Road from Horton Avenue to Main Street, Town of Southold (CP 5526)(Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Krupski. I will second. Gil, is there any information on the project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We're looking to realign 48 in the vicinity of the Sound View Motel, basically moving it away from the motel. This funding is for land acquisition so we can do that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. We had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: *Legislator Muratore*)

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It does include planning, too.

IR 1529-13 - Amending Resolution No. 1396-2006 to reallocate funding in connection with improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 18 – Hauppauge Industrial (CP 8126)(Co. Exec.).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We are requesting that 400,000 of these funds are -- this was for land acquisition that we don't need. The town -- originally we were looking to locate -- purchase some land from the town for pump stations. We are now -- the land is being transferred to us by the town. We don't need the 400,000. We are, however, doing night work under construction for the sewer and this 400,000 will go to offset the additional costs that are going to be incurred by the County for the differential and the night work.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That is in the same sewer district?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct, it is.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. A motion by Legislator Horsley. Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore)**

IR 1546-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with Energy Conservation at Various County Facilities (CP 1664)(Co. Exec).

Same motion, same second, same vote. **(VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore)**

IR 1547-13 - Appropriating funds in connection with Dredging of County Waters at Various Locations (CP 5200)(Co. Exec.).

Motion by Legislator Krupski. I will second. Actually, this is a fairly large bond on this one, more than we typically see for dredging. It's throughout the County. It's seven million, roughly?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Seven million for actual dredging, 400,000 for equipment to help us do our dredging efforts.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

This is partly Forge River?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's the Narrows Bay portion of the Forge River project. It also will include Nissequogue River, Stony Brook Harbor, Porpoise Channel and those waterways in that immediate area. And it also will include dredging in Cockles Harbor.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All this is subject to permitting.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. Well, the Nissequogue and Stony Brook we have the permits, we have bid the projects out. They will be moving forward. Cockles we are working to get the permit so we can do the work. Narrows Bay we have the permits as well.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is any of this work reimbursable? Is any of this shoaling from Sandy or no, this is just standard dredging.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, you could make an argument that it did, but FEMA basically told us no.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

At least we tried.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You can make the argument.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You can make the argument. Okay. So that's 1547. We had a motion and a second. All in favor? Oh, I'm sorry. There's a question from Legislator Stern. Hold the vote.

LEG. STERN:

I'm looking at the resolution here has -- it just says various locations. My notes have a couple of specific locations and you had mentioned a few. My notes reflect here Narrow Bay, Nissequogue River, Stony Brook Harbor Yacht Club, Porpoise Channel, a couple others. My question here is, is this dollar amount that we're voting on today, do you believe that this is going to be sufficient to cover all of the work that's going to be required on all of those locations or is that just kind of a wish list and maybe we'll get to them, to some of them, maybe not so much others depending on the permitting process. What does this list represent and does the dollar amount correspond accordingly?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

What likely you're seeing is there are two different lists. One was the list that we would go out to bid with, as we mentioned earlier, Stony Brook Harbor, Nissequogue River, you know, all those. There is also within the detail that we provided within the IR we also identified a couple of other locations that we anticipate doing either in-house or -- mostly in-house, but also with, you know, potential smaller creeks, if you will, that we'll be looking at. And those will be like Strongs Creek, Smith Point Marina, Swan River, Mud Creek and Fosters Creek. So those -- to answer your question, yes, we feel that the seven million will be enough.

LEG. STERN:

And as to the 400,000 for equipment, what specifically is that for? Is that for equipment that we're going to be purchasing, that we're going to just be utilizing? What does that represent?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's dredge equipment so we can do smaller areas. It'll basically be, you know, to get into tighter areas where we need a little bit more, not the size -- we need things that are smaller, similar to the Corp uses bigger equipment because they do larger projects.

LEG. STERN:

But that's equipment that we're going to be purchasing?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. STERN:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Legislator Horsley.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Just quickly, Gil, somewhat unrelated to dredging. You had mentioned that several projects were not qualified by the Corp for Sandy monies. If like say opening up canals and things like that are Sandy related, how do they get handled at this point in time? When -- does it get into another year's schedule or how does that work out, the opening of canals.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

One of the first things you'd have to do is you'd have to have some type of previous existing, prior storm survey and a post survey so that you -- you would have to go back to them and say, "Okay, we knew that it was an elevation three prior to Sandy coming in and now it's an elevation one." That's the first thing you'd be looking towards. How you would get reimbursed? I mean, we still -- there's still a lot of project worksheets that are still being developed, that are still being put together. You know, there's mitigation funding, the 404 funding that's looking at this type of thing. There's requirements that have to be met to get that, you know, access those funds as well.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Is your office working on those types of issues or are they talking to the villages and towns? Because we are talking about particularly opening up canals, which becomes our responsibility. Are they talking to you or do you have that on your agenda now or on your table?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

As far as canals and stuff?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. We were pretty much told that they weren't going to consider any of that.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Oh, see I hadn't heard that. Okay. Even if they were Sandy related?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, if the town could make a good enough argument, a good enough case, I'm sure they'd consider it. In our discussions with them we were told, you know, no.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

Okay. When they say no, they're a tough act to change their minds. Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Bill, do you have any more detail on the equipment and how it's going to be stored? Is it actually another boat or is it a platform or is it a pump or is it piping?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

First I have -- Bill just came up and cleared -- my statement was incorrect. It wasn't for equipment. It is for smaller creeks and we still do feel that the funding is sufficient. But it wasn't for equipment.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

It was actually for private contracting?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's to hire a contractor to do the smaller creeks that we can't do along the South Shore.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Is it like for our requirements contract? Is that what that is?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. Along the South Shore we do have a contract for dredging, but we also do bid out.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

They are the ones that don't come too far west.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct, small ones.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:

I was being sarcastic, but.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Actually they wind up usually using mechanical means rather than hydraulic, so they don't use a cutterhead, they use a clamshell.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

That was my question. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Have we voted on that one?

MS. ORTIZ:

No.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

All right. So let me call the vote on IR 1547. Don't go anywhere yet. I actually have one more question. On 1547, all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? Approved. **(VOTE: 4-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore)**

Gil, before we adjourn, I had a question earlier about Sunday bus service and I know that you had been working on a plan with DPW that grew out of the bill that we passed to apply the increase in STOA funding that we received this year toward expanded Sunday service. I know you applied for the JARC grant and it appears that that's successful and we're going to have a significant amount of money next year to roll out Sunday bus service. Have you developed a plan at this point?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

First off, I mean, not that \$2 million is not significant, but I would just caution that two million is only going to, you know, only going to get us so much. Part of that was the -- a portion of the STOA and part of it is the JARC funding. That's, in fact, what we're looking to meet after this meeting to talk about that as well with you before we got into too much detail.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. But just for the committee, is there a plan now? I mean, it sounds like it's -- at least for next year it's a total of 2.6 million between the JARC and the County's contribution, which is significant. But there was a -- the bill had, I think, a 30 day period to develop a plan for the roll out. Garry?

MR. LENBERGER:

We do have a plan that we'll discuss with you later on for adding additional service during the

weekday for morning and evening service.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

What about for Sundays?

MR. LENBERGER:

No, not for Sundays. Right now we're going to use 10 routes and they will be on a Saturday service.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. So ten routes will get Sunday service based on their Saturday service.

MR. LENBERGER:

Right, correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are those the same ten routes as was in the critical artery plan?

MR. LENBERGER:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And when will that begin?

MR. LENBERGER:

With FTA approval, which we believe will be on time, by the end of this year we plan on rolling that out right after the first of the year. I don't have a calendar in front of me.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

That's what I feared you would say, that it would start January first, because that's when the JARC money, the Federal money, begins. But there was a million dollars set aside this year for expanded Sunday bus service. And if my calculations are right, that's more than enough to roll out the service say by October, you know, the last quarter of this year. By taking that million for expanded service we could start earlier. That has many advantages. It gives us a chance this year to kind of test the system out. It also takes the S92 and we wouldn't have to shut it down and then start it up again. So I would ask that we do that.

There's one other -- before you comment on that, too, the S92 is currently paying 25 cents more than every other route. It is the only one that has Sunday service, that and the 10C. And at the same time as we roll out the additional Sunday service, it would not be fair to charge that route more for the same service that the other ten are getting. So since that 25 cent fare increase is associated with a pilot program that will no longer be in effect, I would say that there really is no authority at that point to charge the extra 25 cents. If you could comment on that.

MR. LENBERGER:

Off the top of my head the fiscal impact of that would be probably a reduction of about \$82,000 in revenue.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

By taking away the 25 cents.

MR. LENBERGER:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So it's not a big impact.

MR. LENBERGER:

It's \$82,000. If it was in my pocket it would be.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Right. But you understand the unfairness, for having ten routes with Sunday service and that's one of them. They all should be paying the same fare.

MR. LENBERGER:

I can't argue with that, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. Gil, did you want to comment on the -- particularly on the timing of the Sunday service roll out?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I wasn't even planning on commenting on that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

You want to talk about it after the meeting.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, I'd like to, if I could.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay. And again, just for the record, I want to make it clear that the million dollars that was set aside for expanded service for this year I would like to see spent this year on expanded service. So if we wait until January that million goes somewhere else and it doesn't go to expanded service, so it's something we can talk about.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you. I would like to bring one other item to everybody's attention.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I have here a CN that we hope to bring before the Legislature next week. It's for --

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Can you bring them Tuesday morning instead?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I can bring it that afternoon, yeah. And I will -- after this meeting I will get in touch with all of the Legislators so that they are aware of it, of this coming. But this is for \$18 million, to appropriate \$18 million for the construction of -- the reconstruction of the intersection of CR 3, Pinelawn Road, with Ruland Road. It's a federally funded project. Eighty percent of the project is federally funded. The reason we have to put it in as a CN, the Federal fiscal year ends September 29th. There aren't enough -- our concern is there aren't enough meetings prior to that because we -- let me step back.

Public Works & Transportation 7-23-13

We have to, and I will speak clearer at the Legislature about this. We have to get the approval, the appropriation to the State by September 15th. So that means we have to process this whole thing, it has to be executed, and we have to hand it over to the State by September 15th in order to get it within this fiscal Federal year. So that's the reason for the CN. You know, we just didn't get it in on time and that's really it. It's \$18 million. It will be Federally reimbursed with 80%. More likely that it will be less than that. I mean, it will be more than that because Machiavelli funding will be hopefully eventually added to that. It could get it down as far as --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

Are there any questions from the committee? I don't see any questions on this matter. Any other matters? Gil, last week we had a brutal heat wave. Did we see effects from that? I know that things expand with the heat. In terms of road surfaces was that something you had unexpected issues from that heat wave?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I know there was buckle on the Expressway. We had lightening hit an AC unit in our building believe it or not. But for the most part, that was it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:

So we made out all right. Good. Thank you. All right, we are adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.)