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 October 1, 2013.

Members Present:
Legislator Schneiderman - Chairman
Legislator Stern - Vice-Chair
Legislator Horsley - Deputy Presiding Officer
Legislator Krupski

Also In Attendance:
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Lindsay
Christina DeLisi - Aide to Legislator Schneiderman
Paul Perillie - Aide to Legislator Gregory
Kevin LaValle - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Robert Lipp - Director, Budget Review Office
Sharen Wagner - Budget Review Office
Rick Brand - Newsday
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken and Transcribed By:
Gabrielle Severs - Court Stenographer

(*The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.*)

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Good afternoon. I'd like to call this meeting of the Public Works and Transportation Committee meeting to order this first day of October 2013. Please rise and join us in the pledge led by Legislator Krupski.

(*Salutation*)

You may be seated.

This is actually the first committee meeting I've chaired since we lost our beloved Presiding Officer, so I just want to say this on the record: What a great honor it was for me to have been able to serve with Bill Lindsay for those years. I try to keep his voice in my head as we deliberate because he always seemed to bring us altogether with compassion and wisdom. He certainly is going to be missed but never forgotten, I think always in our hearts. So we'll miss Bill Lindsay.

We have a number of yellow cards. We're going to start with public portion. I have three cards. If you haven't filled one out or if you wish to be heard by the committee, you need to fill out a yellow card. They are available at this front table by the clerk. My first presenter is going to be Damon McMullen. Each presenter will have three minutes to make their comments known to the committee.

So, Damon, if you'll step up to the podium, I think you have to push the button to get the mike enabled, and then you may begin. Just start by identifying yourself for our records.

MR. MCMULLEN:
Good afternoon. My name is Damon McMullen. I'm a trustee in the Village of Northport. I'm overseeing the construction for the expansion and upgrade to the wastewater treatment plant in Northport. I'm here because I want to thank the committee for all its help and support in this. I just wanted to encourage you to please vote for this, for this funding for our treatment plant. I believe it's very important. As you have seen over the last week on News 12, they have done a great exposé on the water quality in Long Island, and I would also like to mention that this is something that the Village is doing because it's something that's mandatory. It's come down through the EPA, and it brings us in compliance with the Long Island Sound study, which is the basis for the nature and the scope of this upgrade that is being done as we speak. It's being constructed and moving ahead with it.

I'd like to point out that this will lower the nitrogen output that the plant puts into the harbor and the greater Huntington Bay area. And it will also, in the future, will give us the ability to add more homes and businesses onto our system that we'll be able to expand the number of people that are able to use it.

I also want to say that Northport has received -- we've gotten some grants through the state, through the DEC and the state, and the Village is prepared to make its own contributions through the EFC financing that we've been able to establish that will cover any costs that are not covered by grants that we're able to get. Also, you know we are trying to seek more grants as we go along.

Also, I'd like to point out that Northport is a naturally-occurring smart growth community, which is often used as examples to other parts of the Island to copy the sewer system that serves the community of Northport, the residences, and the business, and it is critical to the local economy of the business and the residents because all residents in Northport pay through their taxes. They

contribute to the operation of the wastewater treatment plant, but they could be without funding such as this. They could possibly be facing a 40 percent increase in that portion of their taxes that goes to operating the sewer treatment plant and, for those that are connected, that increase could be as much as 60 percent.

That's really basically all I have to say. But just once again, it is very important that we get this funding to help pay for this project because it is going to make a difference in the quality of the water in the harbor as you have heard about the different red tides and such. So once again, thank you. I appreciate any kind of help you can give the Village of Northport.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Thank you. Before you go, Mr. McMullen, we have a question from Legislator Horsley.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Yes. Hi, Mr. McMullen. It's good seeing you. It's been a long road to this point. I was out there with Doc Spencer, I guess, maybe it might have been a year and a half ago touring the plant and the like.

One of the -- we're very proud of the stabilization fund, use of the stabilization fund. We're happy that we can help you with red tide issue, your issues with the nitrogen levels, the state and the like. Certainly one, of the criteria that we had, and you had just mentioned it, in an offhand way that you are going to have been abled (sic) now to expand your district to a larger entity at some point because of these dollars. I just wanted you to maybe, if not elaborate, just commit to the fact that we're very interested in expanding sewers in Suffolk County, and these dollars, as small as they may be in comparison to how costly sewers are, that we're putting our moneys in the right place.

MR. MCMULLEN:
I can answer that. Part of this overall project, just shy of $10 million, is to reline our collection system. We've completed the televising and cleaning of the lines. Right now, the RFPs have gone out to certain sections to repair, replace, reline the pipes and the manholes because some of them are as old as the plant back to 1930.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I remember the pipe that was in the -- that was laid barren on the sand just off the harbor itself. That was very scary. That was compelling.

MR. MCMULLEN:
Well, that's going to be replaced, and we know that one of our biggest problems is the amount of fresh water that's coming into the system and we estimate that's 106,000 gallons a day that we're getting for fresh water into the system, and just that fact alone, stopping that will give us the ability to add -- I don't know off the top of my head -- how many new residents onto the system. Just doing that portion of it is going to make a very big difference. Gene Guido, our village administrator, and I have already been meeting and discussing where along the coastline of the harbor we would like to go into next. Once this project is complete in July, within a few months, we should have the numbers. It'll tell us --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Exactly how far you can grow, what you can expand to.

MR. MCMULLEN:
Exactly. Right.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
At the end of the day, it's going to make your plant more economical just by having the economy of scale.

MR. MCMULLEN:
Yes. It will make a significant difference, and it all makes a difference, as I mentioned, in the economy because as everyone, I hope, understands, when you have things like this, it maintains the property values, it makes people who want to come and live in our community and go to all the good schools we have, and supports our businesses, and most of all, it's important for the ecology and the water.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Absolutely. Congratulations. It was a competitive contest, by the way, for those dollars. So we're glad you're in the game, and we're looking towards a clean harbor and growth in your sewer system.

MR. MCMULLEN:
Thank you very much, everyone.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Mr. McMullen, we had another question. Legislator Krupski has a question for you, sir.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
First of all, preliminary congratulations because apparently you're doing a very good job if Legislator Horsley and the committee chose you, and it's good that you're worried about the water quality there. Northport Harbor, does it still have active commercial shellfishing?

MR. MCMULLEN:
Yes. Actually, our mayor is a lifelong fisherman. We have several boats that go out. There's clammers; I would say lobsters, but there really aren't a lot left of them, they do oystering and conking, and there are some fisherman that have fin fish licenses through the state, through the DEC and then not just the commercial but people like myself that have boats that go out clamming and fishing. And I think, personally, this is just a first step because it has to be looked at. It's the greater Huntington Bay area. That Northport facility is just the first step in cleaning up the -- not just the harbor but the bay, which then obviously affects the Long Island Sound. That's why the Long Island Sound study is brought up because --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
So you have a regulatory closure around that existing outfall for shellfishing. So did you work with the DEC to make that regulatory closure smaller? Because now that you've got to do the upgrade, you're going to have much better water quality there.

MR. MCMULLEN:
No, we haven't gotten into that at all. The lines where the harbor is officially closed for shellfishing have not changed in a number of years and --

LEG. KRUPSKI:
With this upgrade, you should contact them because this should make a significant difference in water quality, and you should be able to, really, open up more land, underwater lands for shellfishing.

MR. MCMULLEN:
The mayor has been -- I believe it's through Cornell Cooperative Extension where he's involved in a project where hopefully they're going to start doing ridged mussel growth so that they can -- that,

for anyone that doesn't know, the blue ridge mussel is very good at removing nitrogen from the water, and they're very prolific. We can expand the amount of blue ridge mussels far quicker than you can the regular white oysters that are in the area. So there is that project starting up relatively soon, and hopefully that'll allow us to move the north line of the closure further south and open up some of the beds to the south.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Good. Thank you.

MR. MCMULLEN:
Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Thank you.

I'm going to continue on with public portion. Let me just say so I don't forget to say it later, I'm going to give Legislator Muratore, who's not here today, an excused absence from today's deliberation.

Okay. So our next speaker is Debby Triola from the -- it looks like the NPT Chamber -- Northport Chamber of Small Business.

MS. TRIOLA:
Thank you for listening to me today. I can't really give you the technical details that Mr. McMullen can, but I would like to say as the president of the Northport Chamber of Commerce and as resident and as a small business owner in Northport that I hope that these funds will be passed and processed to help us partially fund these necessary sewer infrastructure upgrades. By improving our water quality and lessening the tax burden to individuals and to small businesses, this grant will help the village remain, what I think is, a very vibrant, healthy, and growing community. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
You're welcome. All right. Our next speaker is Philip Ingerman. I think this is on the same bill.

MR. INGERMAN:
Yes, it is. My name is Philip Ingerman. I'm the director of intergovernmental relations for the Town of Huntington, and I want to thank Legislator Schneiderman and the committee on behalf of Supervisor Petrone and the Huntington Town Board for the opportunity to speak briefly on this.

We are completely in favor of Introductory Resolution 1806, to amend the operating budget to transfer funds from the stabilization fund to the infrastructure fund to complete the work in Northport. I want to thank Legislator Stern who has been with us at some of our meetings, Legislator Horsley who has been there, invite Legislator Krupski to come visit and see the Northport plant because your comments were right on board. I'm sure as soon as the nitrogen levels start to go down, we will be able to open some of those shellfish beds. I think the two major economic development issues here are the shellfishing industry, which the trustee pointed out. Northport has always had a very active shellfish industry, and, obviously, recreational use of the water.

Just as a brief background, we had a meeting in Centerport, which is on the western side of Northport Harbor, which is how the Town of Huntington gets involved in this. Part of the Centerport -- not part -- the Centerport Sewer District, which is part of the Town of Huntington, does have effluent traded in the Northport plant, so this upgrade is equally important to Northport as it is to Huntington.

In the spring of 2010, there was a meeting. Actually, Steve Israel convened the meeting, Congressman Israel, and he had people there from the EPA, federal agencies, state agencies, county agencies, including your own Suffolk County Health Department to discuss what had become a major problem in Northport Harbor, and there's two elements to it. One is the shellfish bed closures, and the other is the bathing beach closures in Northport. As a result of that, Supervisor Petrone and Adrienne Esposito from the Citizens Campaign for the Environment along with the villages of Northport and Asharoken formed a committee called the Northport Water Quality Protection Committee, which has been meeting quarterly ever since for about three years now. Legislator Stern has been to some of those meetings. Legislator Horsley came to one of our onsite visits.

One of the major projects that this committee determined was necessary to upgrade the water quality was the improvement in the Northport plant, estimated now about $10 million. Part of that funding, obviously, is going to come from the taxpayers in the Centerport Sewer District and the Northport Sewer District, but in order to fund the entire project in a timely manner, these deadlines are supposed to be met by 2014. The grant that would be provided by this resolution and the loan guarantees are very important to completing that part of the project. So without taking up any more of your time, and you've already asked, I think, the important questions here and gotten the important answers back, the Huntington Town Board Supervisor Petrone would urge you to pass this resolution. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Thank you Mr. Ingerman. I'm glad all the supporters for Northport are here today. Of course the bill in question is beyond just Northport. There's a number of grants and loans to spur sewer development: Riverhead, Babylon, Patchogue, as well as Northport contained in this bill. I think this is the type of project that exactly Legislator Horsley had in mind when he spearheaded efforts to make these funds available, so he deserves a lot of credit.

I have one additional card. This is the last card I have for our public portion. Eric Alexander.

MR. ALEXANDER:
Thank you, Legislator Schneiderman, Legislator Horsley, other members who certainly care deeply about sewer investments. We're certainly here, Vision Long Island is here today to support the legislation to advance sewer funding, particularly into many downtown areas and expand, both in capacity and improve the water quality of these places. We -- Legislator Spencer spoke this morning to our Long Island Business Council with about 110 business leaders and presented the importance of downtown sewer investments. I told him I would come by today and weigh in. Certainly, we want to support this. We work with the Long Island Lobby Coalition with Adrienne Esposito and the Long Island Federation of Labor, Northport, Mastic Beach, Wyandanch, Smithtown, Kings Park; and then in Nassau County, Hempstead and Bay Park are areas that we want to see prioritized. Clearly, Northport's on this list but certainly Riverhead and Patchogue and Babylon are important downtowns too and communities, so we want to see that kind of priority infrastructure.

We're glad that the county is in the sewer business. For too long, the county hasn't been in other levels of government. When you look at the state level, when we've been lobbying them and we find that, you know, we're -- 17 percent of the population, we pay 20 percent of the taxes, and we're only getting three percent of wastewater treatment funds down to Long Island. And then the federal government -- well, today they're shut down, but they have not invested in ways that we wanted to see, so we're glad the county is stepping up, and that's kudos to your leadership and the leadership of the county executive. We've had conversations with the county executive on Northport. His challenge to me was, Hey, you're not building up. I'm like, Well, hey, we have smart growth. We have apartments in our downtown. Actually lived in one for 22 years. And we have a thriving economy, but we need these types of investments in order to keep our small

businesses functioning.

I serve on a committee with the Village Merchants' Association, which is mostly focused on downtown promotion, and, you know, one of their priorities is making sure that the sewers can work, that the downtown infrastructure can function. So, you know, I personally live there. I can attest that these investments, particularly for Northport, will really be a sound investment for the community. We've watched the village work with their local engineer in really stepping up. I think in the past, maybe they haven't applied for funds and such in years past, but in recent years, they've really been on it. They've been attentive. They've been focused. I think the whole community's come together, quite frankly. If Legislator Spencer were here, I'm sure he's shared that with each and every one of you, and, again, you've been on your tours.

So again, I just say, on this day when the federal government's shut down, once again, we're constantly saying that local government is leading the way. Local communities are leading the way and solving problems in a bipartisan fashion, and we're glad to see that happen again here today, so we're, quite frankly, proud of that. So carry on and hope this moves forward. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Eric, stay right there. Legislator Horsley has a comment or question.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah, and it is more of a comment than a question. I bumped into Eric the other night with the New York Rising Program down in Babylon Village when they were displaying how the community is going react to Sandy, and Eric's comment to me was, Hey, listen we need the sewers in Mastics. And I just wanted to assure him that there are still monies in the stabilization funds that we have not released because projects weren't shovel-ready, and so let's get Mastics to the point of shovel-ready together so that we can help with that project into the future because we know that they need it as well.

MR. ALEXANDER:
I think there's a meeting tomorrow night that Kate Browning has, so we're just going to stay on that one.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
There ya go. Okay. That's great.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
You know, on that issue -- and this is less for you, Eric, and more for Legislator Horsley -- when that fund was created, and again I applaud your efforts to make that happen, there's also a separate fund set aside, as you know, too, for alternative systems that actually go further in terms of nitrogen reduction, and they're much smaller in nature. So on the East End, it's tough to do these larger sewer districts, but these small-pocket sewer systems show great promise for protecting the environment and allowing some commercial development. That fund has, I think, an allocation of roughly $2 million per year. I'm certainly eyeing it for the work we're doing in Riverside.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
As I knew you would.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Which is, I think, will end up being dependent on securing a graph to help with that infrastructure. Do we know the balance on that fund at this point?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I think Miss Lansdale would probably have a better number, but it was 18 million, something like that.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
No, not on that portion.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
No, not on that portion, no.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
No, the alternatives fund, I think, is two million per year.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Yeah, it's two million per year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Maybe even a more important question is --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
When Director Lansdale gets up here, we can ask her.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Have we developed the standards by which we'll allocate that money yet?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Do you want to come up? Do you mind?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
No, I'd love to hear from Director Lansdale.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
We've been working on this.

MR. ALEXANDER:
Thank you, guys.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Thank you, Eric. Sorry. I'm sure Mr. Alexander is interested in the conversation but doesn't need to be at the podium for it.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I think you could tell it better, Sara.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
So we are working right now on the standards in collaboration with the sewer infrastructure committee. Hope to have those out shortly. We have a draft application.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Do we know the budget in terms of the available --

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
Total funds available as of -- well, it is, as you said in the legislation, it's $2 million a year annually.

In the legislation, though, it does say that if the funds are unused, then it goes back into the fund balance to be applied for the bigger sewer projects. But we've discussed that at the sewer infrastructure committee to look into that in greater detail.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, because I think ultimately, we'll use it. It may take several years. It would be nice to see that fund a little bit so we can do a little more with it.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
Definitely. And if I can just make one comment in relation to Mastic, Shirley, and areas such as that with high water table and small lots on septic systems that are close to the shoreline, we have the county -- the county has applied for two grants specifically to address that very issue that you raised; one through FEMA for the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program, and the second through the Empire State Development Corporation Consolidated Funding application process this past summer.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And thank you for addressing those. Just keep me in the loop, if you would. If we receive those grants, that could be significant.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
Happy to do so.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Krupski has a question or comment.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Question on those grants: What would they be for; for infrastructure, for a new regular, standard treatment plant, or what would they be for?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
They would be for alternative decentralized systems and inclusive in the areas would also be Orient and some of the other areas and also Flanders.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Would the grants be for pilots, or would they be actually for -- to put the decentralized plants in for the whole communities?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
They would be pilot systems right now.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I didn't know if you were talking about a million dollars or $50 million.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
We're just trying to get the ball rolling on this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. I don't have any more yellow cards. Is there anyone else who wanted to be heard who hasn't been heard? Okay. Then let's move to the agenda. We're going to start with ***tabled resolutions***. I have but one.

IR 1306, Moderating fare increase for paratransit bus service (Schneiderman). In the past, I have been opposing tabling. At this juncture, I'm not going to oppose tabling because we're

in the budget process, and there was nothing we could do this year, anyway. So if this could be looked at by the Budget Working Group, I would appreciate it. I'll make a motion to table 1306. Second by Legislator Horsley. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **1306 is tabled**. **(Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

Moving on to ***Introductory Resolutions.***

1717, Amending Resolution No. 40-2012, establishing a Blue Ribbon Panel to examine restructuring all County-owned sewer districts into one consolidated district (Horsley).
Legislator Horsley, what's your pleasure?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I'll second. Can we get an estimation on the restructuring?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Sure.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The current date is the end of this year. We're asking for another year's extension.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Just a time extension. Okay. Any other questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?
Approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)

What are we going to do, Wayne, without you on this? Are you going to come back and visit? Who is the chair of that; is it currently Legislator Horsley?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's moi.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It's you. Okay.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
That's right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We are, in fairness -- the Department of Public Works still has to complete some of those over-arching reports. We're waiting on the return of them, plus with the ASRF funding and we -- you know, our intent really is to get it done before the end of next year.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
And also working with the Commissioner is Robert Lipp as well, and he's been knee deep in figures.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Absolutely, Dr. Lipp.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
And it has been quite active. It's not like they've been lagging. It's just there's a lot to do.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Is there anything to prevent the Legislature from preventing Wayne Horsley, citizen, to the Blue Ribbon Panel next year?

(*Laughter*)

LEG. STERN:
Second.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Let's discuss this after December.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We can always add New York State Parks to the committee.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. We approved that, right, 1717?

We're moving on to **1730, Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of CR 59, Long Lane, Town of East Hampton (CP 5561) (County Executive).** I will make a motion to approve.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Seconded by Legislator Stern. Commissioner, on this -- and I'm thrilled to see this moving forward -- there's a lot involved. There's drainage involved, there's repaving involved. This is one of those roads that is, in large part, concrete, I believe.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct, but there is significant deterioration and there is a large amount of drainage issues out there, plus on the road itself is a school. So we progressed the design in-house and we're looking to construct it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. And this would include the shoulders as well, so it would be a uniform surface throughout shoulders and road and then re-striping and drainage. And is it the hope that, because there's been a lot of flooding in this area, this hopefully will alleviate?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Alleviate a lot of that, yeah. Our intent is all of it but you know.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And I think, Legislator Krupski, did you have a question or comment?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
What's the timeline on the project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I would anticipate going to construction early next year, you know, actually starting construction, moving very far along on it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Like springtime?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's my hope, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Because the asphalt, you can't do until spring.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. Come the heavy part of the winter, unless we get a significantly mild winter, it's very unlikely that we'll be able to start that. Even if we went out to bid now, realistically, by the time we got the bids, got contracts in place, it really wouldn't happen until the spring, anyway.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. And it's a roughly a $2 million project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Any other questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

1731, Appropriating funds in connection with Suffolk County Highway Rehabilitation Project (CP 5576) (County Executive). Do I have a motion?

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Second.

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

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This looks to appropriate $4 million for construction on CR92, Oakwood Road.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I mean, it's full-depth pavement, rehabilitation, asphalt resurfacing --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And it extends from --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
-- curving and sidewalk drainage as well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right, but I was just trying to look up the extent. It'll extend from New York State Route 110 to Craven Street.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. And it's roughly $4 million.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yep.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Anybody have any questions?

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Same question: What's your timeline?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Again, our intent is to begin construction last year, probably a little more into the middle of the year, but it is to begin construction.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
What town is this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Huntington.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
This is -- oh, this is not one of those system roads. This is actually a CR.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is a real road, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
A real road. The others are imaginary roads?

(*Laughter*)

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Fake roads.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
This is a real county road. Thank you for the distinction. Okay. So we had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

1748, Authorizing an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Board of Trustees of the Freeholders and Commonality of the Town of Southampton, and accepting funds associated with overtime costs for dredging of County waters within the Town of Southampton (County Executive). I do want to talk about this, but I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Krupski.

All right. So, Commissioner, I mean, I know this has been our practice recently because there's no overtime being approved of asking the towns to pick up the overtime so that the dredge crew can work around the clock; otherwise, because the windows are so short, we can't stay on our dredging

schedule unless we do overtime. But I hate the idea of asking the towns to cover the overtime. In this case, they have agreed to do it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Can we not come up with the money to do -- how much money are we talking about?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
In this particular case, it's over $14,000 for the Town of Southampton. Again, given the current operating budget concerns, overtime is a big issue with us. We have to work two shifts. We work a regular shift plus a full overtime shift. We're working 14 hours, 15 hours a day to try and meet the goals of the dredge over the short window that we have, which is really October 1 to December 15, January 15 if we get an extension.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I mean, look: We increased the dredging budget substantially. It used to be one million; now we have, like, six million or something like that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That was capital.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
That was in capital. Right. How do we --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
To be honest with you, it's a small cost to ask out of the towns given the amount of effort --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I know, but they really shouldn't have to be paying it. We should figure out how we can cover this cost.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I agree with Legislator Schneiderman that the -- you know, it is in the county charter. It's the County's responsibility to pay for it; however, it's not, really, it's not DPW's fault that they can't get the dredging done in that short window, and I have seen you at the meetings and I have seen the commissioner and his people at the meetings with DEC, with Federal Fish and Wildlife to try to, well, address the issue of the purported winter flounder spawning season. So until that is resolved with the Federal Fish and Wildlife, there's going to be no alternative than to try to squeeze in the whole winter's worth of dredging into a few months.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Well, the alternative, I guess, would be -- is to try to get the county executive to approve the overtime.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It would be to put it into next year's operating budget and, you know, put that in there.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Well, this is our dredge. This is the in-house dredge, which is our work crew.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, sir. We do most of -- all of our work is done in the Peconic. Occasionally, we go to the South Bay, but for the most part, all of that work of our crew is done along the Peconic.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
You obviously have a labor budget, but it doesn't include overtime or it's not sufficient in terms of overtime. So if we could do this again in the budget for next year to allow a sufficient amount of overtime, that would solve the problem, or if we could get the county executive to approve the overtime, right, would solve the problem. So what I'm going to do -- and Tom Vaughn is here too -- I think we should approve it, but I also would like to ask the executive if he would approve the overtime so that the village trustees or the town trustees, Southampton Town trustees, would not have to incur this cost. Tom, do you have a comment on that?

MR. VAUGHN:
Well, I was actually thinking about Legislator Schneiderman's words at the beginning of the meeting and talking about hearing the voice of the Presiding Officer in his head while we were here at the horseshoe. And I think, and I would never try and echo the Presiding Officer, but I do think he would just remind all of us that we have no money.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
"You guys, we don't have any money." Right. Exactly.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
That was pretty good there, Tom.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Nonetheless, though, he would also be, I think, always doing the right thing. And in this case, I'm not sure it's the right thing to place this on the local trustees. So, again, if you could send the county executive that message to consider approving the overtime and use this as more of a backup plan, this inter-municipal agreement, I'd certainly appreciate it.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
And, please, send him the message from the other four East End towns, same message.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. So we have a motion and a second. This is on 1748. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1748 is **approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

1753, A Resolution making certain Findings and Determinations in relation to the establishment of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 – Smithtown Galleria (County Executive). I will make a motion. Seconded by Legislator Krupski. Galleria seems to always be in front of us. Is this different than the one we recently did?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, this is -- the last one was to hold a public hearing. This just basically makes a statement of the findings that were, you know, any comments in such that occurred during the public hearing. The next step would be then --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
What were those findings?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Basically, everything was positive. If I remember right, I don't think anybody spoke, but don't hold me to it. You know, at this point, now that there's no opposition, it can proceed to the State Comptrollers's Office for approval.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So we would, then, be forming the sewer district?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. There's a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

1756, Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of SCSD No. 11 - Selden with Wincoram Commons, LLC (BR-1647) (County Executive). I'll make a motion. Second by Legislator Stern. Commissioner, any additional information?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This specific resolution is an agreement between Sewer District 11 and Wincoram Commons to allow Wincoram to connect into the facility. There is sufficient capacity at the plant, and we will receive -- well, we have the ability to treat the plant, and this is a project that is a positive for the county and we're stimulating economic development and it's being progressed by our economic development.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Do you know how many units, approximately, this Wincoram Commons has, not the retail side but the residential side?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, I don't.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Only reason I bring that up is I just want to make sure we're complying with the law I passed years ago that requires 20 percent affordability on anything over, I think, five units that connects to a county sewer system.

MR. VAUGHN:
Legislator Schneiderman, actually, I do have that number on me, if you could just give me a moment.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I have a question in the meantime.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Tom, while you're looking that up, Legislator Krupski has, I think, a different question.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Is this a taxpayer-subsidized affordable housing program here, this development?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe it is a privately -- it is a private development. It's not public. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Tom.

MR. VAUGHN:
My notes indicate that there's actually going to be another bill tomorrow in front of Gov. Ops. that authorizes funding for infrastructure improvements and oversight in the Wincoram Project, and that'll be for $1.5 million tomorrow. My notes indicate that 100 percent of the units are income restricted.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. So that more than qualifies. Okay. Good.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There will be a CN on this that I need to discuss after this, just so you know, but I don't need to do it now.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. We had a motion and second, I believe. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? 1756 is **approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

1757, Amending Resolution No.147-1999 in connection with the renovation to the Physical Plant Building/Warehouse (CP 2165) (County Executive). I'll make a motion. Second by Legislator Krupski. Commissioner, can we have a little more information?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is -- this resolution is for funding through the community colleges, Suffolk Community College. I don't know, John or Ben, if somebody could speak on that.

MR. ZWIRN:
Yeah. This is a reauthorization of funding. There are contracts in place ready to go forward, but because it has expired, we have to get it reauthorized. Money hasn't been borrowed yet. We haven't paid interest on it, but the projects have taken longer than we had anticipated, but they're ready to go, so we formally need an approval from the legislature.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Which campus is this?

MR. ZWIRN:
Selden campus.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Selden campus. And this is, like, where all the mechanicals are held. Is that what it is?

MR. ZWIRN:
John Demaio's here from the capital part of the college.

MR. DEMAIO:
Afternoon. This is where central receiving is for all three campuses.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Where what is?

MR. DEMAIO:
Central receiving. So any materials received by the college, the warehouse that receives all incoming materials is in this building. In addition to that, our campus facilities group is housed there, our print shop, and other related services.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It's building repairs or reconstruction, roofing?

MR. DEMAIO:
A lot of roofing. There's a roof leak that needs to be repaired, certain building code issues, indoor air quality, basically a building -- existing structure being renovated.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Anybody have any questions about this? Okay. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

1758, Amending Resolution No. 909-2002 in connection with the renovation to the Physical Plant Building/Warehouse (CP 2165) (County Executive). I guess this must be a different building. Why don't you come back up? Oh. Hi, Gail.

MS. VIZZINI:
When taken together, we're talking about the same facility. When we originally authorized the money, it was in two pieces of legislation, so we would require reauthorization in two pieces of legislation.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So help me understand this. So it's already been authorized. Are we extending the time?

MS. VIZZINI:
You're reauthorizing. You're extending the --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh. Because the authorization would expire at the end of the year?

MS. VIZZINI:
It actually expires -- according to finance law, it expires after 10 years. So bond counsel and audit control discussed this and said what would be acceptable to them would be a resolution to reauthorize.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So that 10-year period is actually up?

MS. VIZZINI:
Yes, even though the legislature --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh, right. These are from 1999, right, yeah, 2002. These are old, yeah.

MS. VIZZINI:
The college has been focusing on our student areas. The warehouse, although critical, and

especially now, we actually have contracts ready to be signed, roof repairs ready to be done.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And how long -- we're going to reauthorize so it starts a fresh 10-year clock; is that what it is, in essence?

MS. VIZZINI:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. I have no further questions. Anybody? All right. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
IR 1759, Amending the 2013 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with strengthening and improving County roads (CP 5014). I'll make a motion. Seconded by Legislator Krupski. Commissioner, you want to provide a little more detail?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This resolution looks to appropriate $1.1 million for construction services in connection with repaving county roads. We have two projects that we have found the estimates came in much lower than we thought they would be, so we're looking to offset those funds. The first one, the offset was CP 5526, land acquisition for reconstruction of CR48 Middle Road, from Ruch Lane to Chapel Lane. We're looking to appropriate -- or offset 400,000 from that project. This was right away acquisition funds that we do not need. And then the other is we're looking to offset 700,000 from CR59 Long Lane. Our revised construction estimate actually came in much lower than we originally anticipated, so we're looking to use that. This is our repaving program. It's integral to what we do in maintaining our roads, and we would be looking beginning of next year to pave three roads with the funding. CR46, Montauk Highway in the vicinity of Old South Country Road in the vicinity of William Floyd Parkway; CR67 Long Island Motor Parkway, a portion of in the vicinity of Carleton Avenue, CR17, to Vets Memorial Highway; and the last one is CR35 Deer Park Road at the intersection with Deer Park Road East CR 66.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
On the Long Lane project, we haven't gone out to bid, obviously; we just authorized it just now. Are you comfortable with the $2 million estimate rather than the $2.7 million estimate?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, we are.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Did the scope of the project change at all?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. I think the construction costs have been exceedingly favorable and prices have been down with road construction, highway construction, so we're confident that this will come in within the $2 million.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. We had a motion and a second. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

Moving on to **1806, Amending the 2013 Operating Budget to transfer funds from Fund 404 Assessment Stabilization Reserve and appropriating funds in connection with the Sewer Infrastructure Program.**

1806 probably should have been taken out of order a while ago, but maybe some of the people are still here who spoke in support of this.
Do we have a motion to approve?

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Motion to approve by Legislator Horsley. Second by Legislator Stern. I think we all are aware of this. Is there any questions regarding this bill? We spoke about it a little bit earlier. Commissioner, is there anything you wanted to say, or Sarah? Okay. I'll call the vote.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Just a comment.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Yeah, just a comment. I want to thank everyone who is involved in this because when you look at Riverhead standpoint and the, really, whole Peconic estuary system here, instead of Riverhead putting their -- all the effluent into the river, now, because they did the work with the DEC and they did the work with the county health department, they'll be able to, once they do the upgrade, help the effluent onto the county golf course next door. So environmentally, it's a really big plus for Peconic Bay, and it's a big plus for Riverhead, obviously, to get the money to do the upgrade, but it's a big plus environmentally. Plus they will be able to land apply the sludge instead of shipping it off the Island, which is a lot less trucks leaving Long Island. So all in all environmentally, this is a huge plus for the East End, and everyone out there really appreciates the attention.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, I have a question too. Well, you know, I'm looking at the distributions, and it seems fine. I wasn't on this committee that made the determinations. I do notice there is kind of some money that is straight out grants and some money that is more of a revolving loan. It's going to be coming back. How are we deciding who gets the money and what's a loan and what's a grant. I thought that all the money basically came back ultimately from the sewer districts, but it doesn't look like that. Maybe I'm wrong. Maybe, Director Lansdale, you could educate me in this regard.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
Sure. Thank you. So the sewer infrastructure committee approved an application that was made available, and it had guidelines, and it had -- we scored the applications based on a hundred point, and we made the funding decisions based on the top four applications that were received. We did receive 12 applications in total. We also established, through the committee process, funding guidelines, and the funding guidelines are as follows: All eligible projects are considered that funded projects should be transformational projects. They need to be part of a larger community revitalization effort that's municipally endorsed. We suggest funding projects that received a score of 50 points or higher. We fund projects that already leverage non-county funds, so the county funds are really the completion funds, not the initial funds into a project. And that we fund requests greater than a million dollars will receive the following funding allocation: The maximum award will be two-thirds of the total project cost, and the maximum grant will be one-third of the total project

cost. So and we recognize that many of these projects are already on the Environmental Facility Corporation's list intended-use plan so that they are already eligible for funding. So that in a nutshell, those were the funding guidelines that we used to establish the project grant versus loan allocations.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let me get some clarification there because if they are already eligible for EFC funding other grants, why, then, wouldn't we not provide those grants and let them get EFC money and allow us to have more money to spur sewer infrastructure? You know, 'cause you said that there were, I think, 12 or so projects. Only four of them got funded. We might have been able to fund another one had they used the EFC grant money, or loan money, rather.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
One of the big keys that that committee determined was necessary is the construction had to take place within a year. It was important that we weren't going to let this thing drag out. Not all -- EFC doesn't necessarily fund the entire project, so what Director Lansdale was trying to say is that if you had a portion of the project that was funded by EFC and this could supplement it, we didn't want to be the first money in. It would have to be something they needed to be able to complete the project and get moving and build the thing and start construction within a year; that's why these four were chosen because they met all the guidelines that the director mentioned as well as the timeline, which was this wasn't some other thing out in the future. We want today be able to show progress within a year.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Commissioner, am I right, or Director Lansdale, in that the money that is not in the grant category here is not reimbursable, that the Assessment Stabilization Fund won't be paid back from the members of that sewer district in future years, or will it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There was the grant funding and then there was a loan. So if it wasn't a grant, it was given as a loan.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So the grant pieces, we give it to them and we don't get it back.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
You actually do get it back because you get increased water quality. You're looking at Northport Harbor here. You're looking at Peconic Bay. So you get the increased water quality, you get the increased economic development because of that, so you will get that money back.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. Typically, though, when we do bond authorizations for sewer districts, it comes back that ultimately the -- it's just that district that's paying for it. This is different in the sense that the whole county is paying for that sewer district. And I don't disagree; it could be a very good thing in terms of spurring economic development and environmental protection and sales tax growth. I just wanted to -- you know, it's a big difference between a revolving fund and a non-revolving fund, so once it's gone, it's gone.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. And I think that was identified in the original bill, when we originally were given the task of

coming up with the criteria and moving forward with this, there was no set way of doing this. The committee who developed all this came up with the idea of "let's do some as a loan, some as a grant" with the intention of you are going to stimulate economic development, but we are going to have funds for a future two, three, four depending on how many years and how much funding we have available above the 140 million.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
Legislator, you're completely right: This is a new and different program.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. So that's really what I'm getting at: When was that determination made, how was that determination -- I'm not saying it's a wrong determination. I remember this came up when we were discussing the bill, and I asked this question. Was this money that was going to be revolving, you know, coming back, or was it going to be straight grants. There was a policy decision made somewhere along the way. I mean, some of these grants are just pure grants. Some of these projects have a grant and a loan. I just want to make sure however we're doing this, it's fair across the board. You know, if you say whoever gets money, we're going to split the money between a grant. Half of it comes back and half of it doesn't come back. I just don't want to get into the politics of it, you know, where one community gets money and they don't have to ever pay it back and another community does have to pay it back, that kind of thing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The complete grant requirement was for projects that were requests that were under a million dollars. Above a million dollars, a request that was above a million dollars, was split, the percentage loan and grant, as the director mentioned earlier.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So we're treating everybody the same.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
That's right. And this decision specifically was made at the Sewer Infrastructure Committee level.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. No, I know it's not in the legislation.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
That's right.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I mean, you may want to consider trying to codify that. That would be a future amendment: Legislator Horsley won't be here for that, unfortunately. Something to think about.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Right, so you wouldn't hear me carping at people.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
We need somebody else to step up as the sewer advocate. Might not be the nicest title.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Mr. Sewer.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Tough shoes to fill. So where are we now. We have a motion and a second, I believe; right, Madam Clerk?

MS. ORTIZ:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
All right. Then I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

MS. ORTIZ:
Wait. I'm sorry. We don't.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Oh. Okay. No, we did. I definitely did because I think I had --

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
I made the motion. Steve was the second.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Well, let's do it again. Motion by Legislator Horsley. Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **Approved. (Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

Congratulations.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Legislator Schneiderman, can I just make a quick comment to Director Lansdale?

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Absolutely.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
Sarah, I want to thank both you and Gil and the entire committee for the numerous hours of effort that it took to get us this far. Those exact same questions, the first day, Legislator Schneiderman, those exact same questions that you brought up were the exact same questions that were posed the first day the committee got together going, Oh, my God, this is going to be tougher than you think.

And they modeled a very fair process off of EFC documents, and it was long-lived, and, in fact, I was calling them on a monthly basis trying to say, *Come on, we got to get this thing moving, we got to get this money out there, we got money to give out,* and the like. And they stuck to their guns; they did it the right way; they did it the fair way, and I just couldn't be more pleased. I want to thank both you guys for that. Job well done.

And the other thing I wanted Mr. Schneiderman to know in particular, and I mentioned to Eric before, was that there are still moneys left over. We purposely left moneys out so that new applications that are coming in can be funded, and what they have to wait for is them to be shovel-ready. What we don't want to do is give out moneys and just have it sit somewhere in some account, whether it's a village or municipality or whatever, and not being used. We want them to be activated and used. And so that is part of the decision-making process and part of our thinking, and I think that we have done a good job so far, and I expect great things from this.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let me echo those accolades for all of you, for Gil, for Sara, for everybody involved. I think you did

a great job, and I know it was a lot of work, and to Wayne, too, for spearheading the efforts to create this program. You know, I was delighted with its distribution, frankly. Riverhead, which I didn't know was going to be on the list, came out with roughly $12 million, 4 million in loan and 8 million in grant. I know that they had to do a very expensive upgrade to their sewer system, which is going to really impact the residents in terms of their taxes. So to have this money is going to make a great difference in the people's discretionary incomes, because they might have some now. I know it's certainly good news for Legislator Krupski who represents that area, but it's not far from the area that I represent, and I know there's a lot of people in that area who could use a break, and this is a big deal. So thank you.

D.P.O. HORSLEY:
And Go Flanders.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah. That's next.

All right. I have, yet, just one bill left, ***1810, Directing the Division of Vector Control to develop and maintain plans to reduce tick-borne illnesses (Schneiderman).*** I'll make a motion. Second by Legislator Krupski, who is the co-sponsor there. What this bill does, just as we do a yearly plan on mosquito control, it would require a section of that plan be dedicated to efforts to reduce the incidents of Lyme's Disease. The Department of Vector Control was formed by charter to deal with both mosquito and tick-borne illnesses. We're doing a great job with reducing the incidents of West Nile Virus, and this is with an effort to help stem an epidemic of Lyme's Disease, which is certainly impacting the East End but other areas of Suffolk County as well. And right now, Lyme's Disease is about 300 times more likely to contract -- an individual to contract than West Nile, so it's quite serious illness, quite debilitating, and with our health department, I think we can help assist some of the towns and villages that have been trying to grapple with developing plans to reduce Lyme's Disease. And, of course, Lyme's Disease is just one of several tick-borne illnesses. Rocky Mountain spotted fever would be another one that people probably have heard of, Babesiosis. There are several so...

I made a motion. Second by Legislator Krupski. On the motion, Legislator Krupski.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I'd just like to thank Legislator Schneiderman for his work here. This is really -- it's really an epidemic on the East End at this point. Going to vector control on their big board, they show the mosquitos and they show one tick, so it's kind of on their radar. This is good. Thank you, Jay, for showing this leadership in this to put this forward and put it a little bit more on their radar. One of the vector control -- of course, the tick is the vector of the disease, but the white tail deer is the vector of the tick, and without the deer, the tick doesn't survive very well. Besides humans, they're the only large warm-blooded mammal on Long Island. Because of the total lack of predators, besides the Buick, there's really not much to control the deer population. So this has been something. Deer, unfortunately, are regulated only by New York State DEC. We need to get more local control. Local control would equal better control, more effective control, and so anything that we could do at the county level would be a help.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
I just want to make two points. I know other people want to comment too. One is, actually, the primary -- I just learned this recently. The primary vector for Lyme's Disease is not deer; it's actually mice, black-footed mice. So there might be some -- you know, might be worth looking at ways to also control the rodent population or somehow get insecticides onto rodents like they are doing with the ticks with the deer. Shelter Island's been experimenting with putting insecticides on deer through these rollers of 4-poster systems with pretty good success, I'd say.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
I have cats, and they can control the mice, but they have difficulty controlling the deer. The last thing you want to do is put more insecticides into the system. So to control the deer, you can do that without the use of insecticides, and that's more effective than --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. Yeah.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
-- treat the deer. So we don't want to put more insecticides in. I don't think the purpose is to have vector control spray everybody for ticks.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Yeah, I hope not. Anybody? Okay. So, Commissioner, do you want to comment? It's okay. You don't have to.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, I mean, first I would ask that this be not included in this year's long term plan, obviously. We haven't submitted it yet and I wouldn't want -- this is going to involve a lot of work on our part in putting this plan together.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Let me ask George in terms of when it's passed when the first plan would be. I think you have to submit it in October, right? So this wouldn't become effective until signed by the county executive, which, if it gets approved today -- I don't think it would affect the current plan. It would be the next plan that gets developed.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. We would have to have a plan developed before the next plan next October.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Right. Exactly. George.

MR. NOLAN:
The resolution is really silent. It doesn't say it goes in effect this date or that date, so it's generally effective upon the signing of the resolution by the county executive, but that time, being the way it will work out, that it will be for next year's plan.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. I'll call the vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? The bill is approved. **(Vote: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore)**

Okay. That's the last thing I have on the agenda. Is there any other questions? Anything for the commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I did have a CN to discuss. Before, we discussed a connection agreement with Wincoram and Sewer District II. We are going to be requesting a CN be placed before the legislature, and I will get this to the committee as well as the full legislative body. We're -- this CN simply asks that the connection fee that Wincoram would have paid be put towards the upgrade of the pump station. The pump station that they're going to be connecting to needs to be expanded to handle the amount of flow. So rather than the county expanding the thing and then paying us, we want to allow Wincoram to use their connection fees and make the improvement to the pump stations that are

needed. The reason for the CN is because there is some time sensitivity specific to funding, so that's the reason we were asked to put it in now. We have to have everything in place, and I will get further information for the general meeting, but that's my understanding. So we're asking this as a CN to allow Wincoram to use their connection fees to rebuild the pump station.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So rather than give us the money for the connection fees, they would kind of give us in-kind contribution.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Essentially. They would expand --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
It would be the same amount of money?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. If there's any money left over from the expansion, that would go to the district. But in turn we don't -- we estimate it's pretty much of a wash.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
So we'd require them to spend what they would have spent on connection fees towards the upgrades to the pumping station.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct, and if there was any left over --

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Anything left over --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Goes to the district.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
That will be in the CN?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
And the remainder. Okay. Legislator Krupski has a question.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Just to be clear, if there was no Wincoram project would the county have to spend money on a pump upgrade?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Not to this capacity, no, we wouldn't.

LEG. KRUPSKI:
Wouldn't, then, the developer have to pay this anyway to do a pump upgrade, so shouldn't they pay for this separately? That's my point.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, what would normally happen is the connection fee would pay for the expansion. To do the connection, we would have to do the expansion. What this does is saves us the step of taking the money and going to construction. We'll allow them -- obviously, with our oversight and approval -- to do the construction, and if there's any funds left over, that goes to the district.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Does that CN -- would that replace the Wincoram resolution we already passed, or is that in addition to it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's in addition to it. The one that we just passed is a connection agreement.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Okay. Just trying to get clarification. Okay. So we can look forward to that CN, then. Anything else? Commissioner, do you have anything else for us?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, that's it.

CHAIRMAN SCHNEIDERMAN:
Thank you for your continued service, and we are adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 3:17 p.m.*)