

CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING

of the

PUBLIC WORKS and TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The Public Works and Transportation Capital Budget Meeting was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Smithtown, New York, on Wednesday, May 20, 2014 at 9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Al Krupski - Chairman
Legislator Thomas Muratore - Vice-Chairman
Legislator Steve H. Stern
Legislator Thomas F. Barraga
Legislator Kate Browning

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Legislator DuWayne Gregory - Presiding Officer
Legislator John Kennedy
Legislator Robert Trotta
Legislator Robert Calarco
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Lora Gellerstein - Chief Deputy Clerk - Legislature
Robert Lipp - Director of Budget Review Office
Jill Moss - BRO
Gil Anderson - Commissioner - DPW
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer - DPW
Christina Delisi - Aide to Chairman Schneiderman
Deborah Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern
Thomas Vaughn - County Executive's Office

TAKEN BY:

Gabrielle Severs - Court Reporter

(*The meeting was called to order at 9:52 a.m.*)

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Calarco.

(*Salutation*)

Good morning, everyone. Welcome to the capital budget hearings. We've got two cards from the audience. One is Ryan Lynch. Morning, Ryan.

MR. LYNCH:

Morning. Good morning, Chairman Krupski and Members of the Public Safety and Transportation -- Public Works and Transportation Committee. Thanks for the opportunity to testify on the capital program today. My name is Ryan Lynch. I'm the associate director for the Tri-State Transportation Campaign. We're a nonprofit transportation policy watchdog organization dedicated to creating a more balanced, environmentally-friendly and equitable transportation system in New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. I also serve as our Long Island coordinator.

Tri-State is here today with members of AARP. Unfortunately, Will Stoner could not be here today to testify. I know he wanted to be, but we have some great volunteers here today. We're here to ask that an amendment be created and implemented into the proposed capital program for a Complete Streets implementation fund. Suffolk County's home to some of the deadliest roads to pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists in the region. According to a Tri-State Transportation Campaign analysis of federal data, 122 pedestrians were killed along the roads in Suffolk County from 2010 to 2012, with Suffolk County's portion of Jericho Turnpike seeing 16 pedestrian fatalities alone. According to Governor Cuomo's Traffic Safety Committee, 278 motorists and passengers and 22 cyclists were killed during the same time period. 52,000 nonfatal injuries occurred as a result of almost 90,000 crashes from 2010 to 2012 as well.

In 2012, the county legislature passed and County Executive Bellone signed a Complete Streets Law that, upon implementation, will redesign our roadways to calm traffic and provide safer infrastructure for those who walk, bike, take transit and drive on Suffolk County roadways. Unfortunately, cuts to funding for safe streets programs have hindered implementation of this law. The current federal transportation bill, MAP-21, cut dedicated walking and biking infrastructure investment by 30 percent. The funding situation in New York is even worse. According to New York State Department of Transportation's 2014 to 2017 state transportation improvement program, or the STIP, which is a blueprint of how we're going to spend our transportation dollars over the time period, and it was approved last September. New York plans to spend only .98 percent of its total transportation dollars on biking and walking infrastructure. That represents a cut of 40 percent over previous funding or over \$100 million.

In region 10 on Long Island, planned spending on walking and biking projects by the New York State Department of Transportation is proposed to be cut by 24 percent over the next four years. The result is a paltry .5 percent of regional allocation of transportation dollars on Long Island that was proposed to be spent on bicycle and pedestrian safety projects. These funding levels persist despite the fact that pedestrians and cyclists make up over 27 percent of all traffic crashes in New York State, and the New York Metropolitan Transportation Council, the regional MPO, the regional planning organization estimates that pedestrians and cyclists makes up 50 percent of all traffic fatalities on Long Island.

Unfortunately, these cuts at the federal and state level put added pressure on local governments to make up the gap, and Tri-State's calling on the Suffolk County Legislature as well as with AARP and Tawaun Weber from Vision Long Island is calling for Suffolk County Legislature to amend the

proposed Suffolk County Capital Program to include additional funding to establish this Complete Streets Implementation Fund and investments in infrastructure that force motorists to slow down and go the speed limit like landscape medians, road diets, raised crosswalks, pedestrian safety islands and protected bicycle lanes will go a long way towards creating county roadways that will be safe and accessible for all county residents of all abilities and all ages. Thank you, and I'll be happy to answer any question.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. My colleagues might have questions. I know I do. Does anyone have any questions for Mr. Lynch?

LEG. BROWNING:

You start.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

No, go ahead.

LEG. BROWNING:

I was going to ask you if you could give me that capital program number. Do you know what it is in the book?

MR. LYNCH:

I'm sorry?

LEG. BROWNING:

The capital program number that you mentioned that needs to be amended.

MR. LYNCH:

Oh. We're talking broadly. There's no capital program fund yet, so we're hoping that it can be amended and inputted --

LEG. BROWNING:

Oh. I thought you mentioned something in here.

MR. LYNCH:

No, not yet. Not yet. We're hoping that by the end of the process.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Anyone else have any questions?

LEG. KENNEDY:

You spoke about the general importance, I guess, of the medians and the percentage of crashes that involve pedestrians and cyclists. So it's a fair statement to say, then, that your organization is in favor of sidewalks, bike lanes, all of the above?

MR. LYNCH:

Yes. We're in favor of -- so the mission of the organization is really to create enhanced mobility options for people that don't want to be totally dependent upon on automobile, and that's why we're here with AARP, because more and more seniors are giving up their automobiles, want to walk, take transit and what we're trying to do is create the safe option so people can do that if they choose to

do it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Excellent.

MR. LYNCH:

Yeah.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Good. Thank you.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Mr. Lynch, what I'd like to -- if you could provide a copy of your testimony, I'd appreciate a copy of your testimony.

MR. LYNCH:

Sure. I'd be happy to e-mail to you as well.

LEG. BARRAGA:

What you're talking about is an extremely important issue. The problem we've had over the years, especially since the recession is the lack of dollars, the fiscal reality of the budgets that we face, both at the state and local levels. You're not going to find anybody that's going to dispute what you would like to see happen. The question is whether or not the money is available. You know, when you take a look at the priority list that has to be done, often what you want is not in the top 10 or the top 20, and it's difficult, extremely difficult, to get funding. And, often, the type of funding you need, it's extremely -- you need a lot of money. You know, for example, there's some federal moneys, I think, going through the state down to the Hamlet of Bay Shore to take Maple Avenue and make it bicycle-friendly, and that's going to cause a stretch of about a mile and a quarter from the railroad station down to the bay where the ferry system is, it's going to cost \$1.6 million because it's just not a question of putting a line down the street so bicyclists can function. You often have to work on intersections and change lights. It's a very comprehensive and expensive proposition. And in this environment, from a fiscal perspective, those moneys are often not available. I certainly understand, you know, you wanting a special fund today be established, and if the fund is established, it has to come at the expense of something else.

MR. LYNCH:

Well, I mean, I think the -- I'd like to dispute a little bit about the fact that these things cost a lot of money. A lot of what can be done can be done very cheaply with paint and plastic bollards to help separate, you know, users of roadways from moving vehicles, so those are very, very cheap things to do. You know, a mile of a buffered bike line usually costs between \$15,000 to \$28,000 just by using paint and plastic so these are not very expensive projects when you look at the grand scheme of things. You know, the Route 347 project is upwards of, I think, \$150 million, and that's a project that we supported, and, you know, we worked very closely with the DOT to advance especially since they created, sort of, the infrastructure for cycling and pedestrians and transit users as well as, you know, enhancing mobility for motorists. But in the grand scheme of things, these biking and walking projects are actually very cheap when you compare them to other transportation investments. And your talk about priorities is absolutely right, and sometimes we don't even need more dollars. It's just about re-prioritizing the existing one that are there to enhance the mobility of different users on the roadway.

LEG. BARRAGA:

All right. Thank you.

MR. LYNCH:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

You know, I've had other conversations with you, and I do see the value, definitely, in what you're saying, and if you look at different county projects, the one on -- rebuilding Roanoke Avenue is going to become much more -- first of all, they're going to do the drainage, but as part of the rebuilding, it's going to be much more -- you're going to have wider shoulders, you're going to have wider, safe sidewalks on both sides of the road, so it is going to be a lot more pedestrian bicycle friendly. But a lot of these places where -- you said, like, re-striping and they paint the bicycle on the shoulder, taking a look at those places, sometimes it goes from a shoulder down to literally inches of a shoulder, and then the sign says "Share the Road." It's kind of a -- to me, it's kind of a misleading dangerous scenario where if you're a cyclist and you're unfamiliar with that area and you start off on a shoulder and now all of a sudden the shoulder goes down to less than a foot, you're really -- it really becomes -- and there's nothing; it's just dirt or a little rut alongside of the pavement, you're in a -- especially around corners and curves, there's telephone poles, there's traffic, you get put into some difficult, dangerous situations. So I see the value in doing it from the beginning when you actually re-do a whole road; then you could do it properly, but I'm always worried about the, kind of, the patchwork of things, you know, crosswalks, curves in the road, things like that where drivers are just not going to see it.

MR. LYNCH:

Yeah. I mean, I think the important part is to think about these from a context-sensitive perspective. You know, engineers, civil engineers are very, very smart people. They're presented with a problem, and then they find a way to solve that problem. It's more than my brain can work on sometimes. But you know, when we talk to traffic engineers, we have to sometimes refrain the problem for them. You know, a lot of the times in the history of the past 50 years when we've seen this sort of dominant transportation model being the problem is we need to move cars as fast as possible from point A to point B. And now the problem is how do we create a safe environment for everybody that's using that roadway, and if we refrain the problem for those engineers, they know how to solve that problem. It's just about kind of reframing it and telling them, This is what we need to do moving forward.

But I agree with you. It doesn't work in every situation, and we have to be context-sensitive and we need to figure out how we're going to make these investments that certainly we don't want to create more dangerous environments for people. But when we do put these types of infrastructure in sidewalks, bike lanes, we generally see an across-the-board drop in crashes, in injuries and fatalities of all users of the road, very broadly-speaking.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. And later on, I'll ask Commissioner Anderson, when he gives his presentation, what the county does, because I saw them in action, DPW in action in the planning for Roanoke Avenue of how they incorporate these principles into their -- a road -- you know, a major reconstruction, so I know it's happening at some level.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Can you please go over the figure with reference to state funding this year? Did you indicate that it was actually cut?

MR. LYNCH:

Sure. So the State Transportation Improvement Program -- so every time this comes out, we do an analysis of what types of projects are being funded and -- but just because it offers us the best roadmap, no pun intended, the best roadmap of how they're going to spend their dollars and where

their priorities lay. So in terms of the 2014 to 2017 STIP, New York State on bicycle and pedestrian projects only, they're are going to be spending point nine eight .98 percent of its transportation dollars on those types of projects.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Now is that a reduction from --

MR. LYNCH:

Yeah, it's a reduction of about \$100 million or 40 percent cut.

LEG. BARRAGA:

In terms of what you're receiving.

MR. LYNCH:

In 20 -- I guess it was 2010 to 2013. The only reason I ask, I recall several months ago, one of the assemblymen out here in Long Island had a press conference about how he was going to go out and get another 20 or 25 million for bicycle safety.

MR. LYNCH:

Yeah. We helped him with that. We're trying to push that -- to inject that into a \$20 million a year --

LEG. BARRAGA:

What did he get?

MR. LYNCH:

There was nothing included in the budget.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I figured. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Any other questions for Mr. Lynch? Thank you.

MR. LYNCH:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Our next speaker, Tawaun Weber.

MS. WEBER:

I'm just basically here to piggy back on what Ryan has said to you. We're basically looking at a request for a fund to be set aside for Complete Streets. We've already seen a lot of the towns have already started to adopt it in their own budgets. We've seen the Town of Islip, the Town of Brookhaven, Babylon Southampton, they're already starting to do this. The county has already passed a Complete Streets legislation, so it's already on -- your legislation, it's already on your books to do that; it's just unfunded.

Ryan has gone through most of the information that we would need to say. We're looking at starting it with just a million dollars, and that may seem like it's not going to go far, but for a lot of projects, it starts the way because we can get matching funds. One of the reasons why the State has talked to us about, you know, cutting back the budget is because we're not seeing an investment at home from the county. We've seen investment in Nassau County, but we haven't

seen as much in Suffolk County, so that's one of the reasons why we're asking for this fund so that we can go for matching funds.

We've also spoken to Senator Schumer, some of our federal legislators and they are willing to do a match as well. We've seen matches like this happen in other communities, small communities. Rob Calarco, our legislator, previously Legislator Kate Browning in Gordon Heights has seen this. We've gotten \$500,000 in sidewalks for that small community, and that came with streetscapes, that came with bicycle lanes, and it has made a huge difference in the community. Our accident count has literally been cut in more than half.

So these are some of the things that make it quite important for us to see that, and it's not always a matter, as Ryan said, of coming up with new funds. It's redirecting some of the existing funds. We've seen in County Road 58 in Riverhead, in County Road 39 in Southampton, they did the roadway improvements, but they didn't include bicycle lanes; they didn't include pedestrian safety lanes, so that's one of the things. We're just asking for it to be a change in design. That's something you're already doing, you know, just changing the design. It's a reduction from a 13-foot lane to an 11-foot lane to allow for bicycle paths.

As far as your question as far as some of the roads that are narrow and what can we do there, some of things are very simple. We've seen in smaller neighborhoods, Mount Sinai, where they have their pedestrian lanes, one of the things they've done around curves is simply just to highlight the yellow signs and to put up a mirror around the curves, that the cars are forced to slow down, they're forced to see around the curb, and the bicycles can also see around the curb, and the mirror is there. So there's very -- you know, there's a lot of different ways to do this. This is something that's done around the county. We're not asking -- around the country. We're not asking to reinvent the wheel. There are ways out there. We are more than willing to sit with DPW and go over some of these aspects.

We actually have on June 18 -- and I will invite you all out to that -- we have one of the leaders from Congressman Urbanism (ph), who's been doing this around the country. He's been doing this in downtown Atlanta, which is having huge growth, and they've been able to do this with 8 million highways to cut them back and do pedestrian safety. He's going to be doing a tour along Sunrise Highway. We invite you guys to come out and see that. I think that'll address a lot of your questions, but again there's funding out there. What they want to see at first is an investment at home. If the county isn't investing in it, if the towns aren't investing it, it's harder to get the state and the federal legislators to invest in it, so we're asking for that fund, and any support that we can give, more than willing. We've worked with a lot of the people, unfortunately, you know, the young lady who lost her daughter on 347 in Smithtown. The people that we've worked with who want to see traffic calming, and there's all kinds of organizations that are supporting this that are willing to put in the work, let us know where we can help.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

MS. WEBER:

Okay. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Barraga.

MS. WEBER:

Sure.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Good morning.

MS. WEBER:

Good morning.

LEG. BARRAGA:

The \$500,000 you were talking about that went into Kate Browning's geographic area, was that matching funds?

MS. WEBER:

It was matching funds. Part of it was from the town, part of it was a grant that we wrote to the feds that we got through Congressman Bishop.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Is that the main rationale for getting fund at the state and federal level? It's always a matching kind of scenario?

MS. WEBER:

For that particular grant, it was. They wanted to see some type of investment. It wasn't a full match. We had to have some type of investment so when we say we could levy additional funds, we had private investment dollars, public investment dollars for that matching grant. It wasn't a dollar-for-dollar, necessarily.

MR. LYNCH:

So the strategy taken at other levels of government is that unless the locals are willing to contribute, they're not willing to do anything.

MS. WEBER:

Well, it helps to prioritize it. I mean, if you're in a competitive grant, like some of these are, they want to see that there's some type of, you know, investment at home, that you want this, because other areas are getting this funding because they do have municipalities that are willing to say, Well, we'll put X amount of dollars up, if you match with us, we'll do this, you know, and that they have plants available, that they have a team available that are ready to do this and go forward.

LEG. BARRAGA:

So you don't field that's a rationale or an excuse that they're using at other levels of government just to not give you funding?

MS. WEBER:

No, I don't. I think it's a way of prioritizing their dollars appropriately. They're going to give to who wants and who's really ready to do this. Long Island needs it. I think Suffolk County definitely needs it. We're asking for this fund to be created so that it shows that we're invested in it.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Is that unique in terms of requesting matching funds for these types of projects compared to other requests or demands from towns and counties where they just appropriate the money in the budget and if they want to give you the dollars, they give you the dollars without matching funds?

MS. WEBER:

It's not always requested. I mean, it's not uncommon for them do that. In this particular, that's how it was set up. There are grants where they're not required to match, and you can absolutely go for those. Just for us for our priority, it actually worked out. Because we had done a visioning

process, we had our community drawn out where we had already put in a design for the bike lanes and pedestrian lanes, so it showed that we were ready. One of the things that they want to see is ready and willing. We had the plans, we had the community behind it, we had funding that we were ready to put up for it, so it showed readiness to do this and willingness.

LEG. BARRAGA:

I'm just concerned about a situation where they are making a request. Some of them probably are using it as a political explanation as to why you're not going to get any money.

MS. WEBER:

Well, I mean, I can't control what the feds do. I think personally --

LEG. BARRAGA:

Well, even at the state level, from what I understand from Mr. Lynch's comments, there's a reduction overall in this area. Doesn't seem to be a priority item in any way, shape, or form at the state level if they're going to reduce your funding in the future.

MS. WEBER:

I understand what you're saying. I think, once again, like I said, they're investing in things where people are saying they want it and they're ready. If we don't prepare and ask, then it's not fair. The asking comes from us as not-for-profits; that's fine --

LEG. BARRAGA:

It's just that it's very difficult when they make that request for local governments to come up with the funding because local governments don't have the dollars. They're broke.

MS. WEBER:

It's not even -- it's not always a case where they need to match. It's sometimes just asking. We haven't sent the ask. One of the things is setting this as a priority. In your designs, in some of the plans, if you have that set aside and you're saying you want to do this, then you can go for a state or a federal ask. If we don't have it in the design or we're not even planning to do it, I don't think they have a way of knowing that --

LEG. BARRAGA:

But at some point, do they want money? They want money appropriated locally, even though you have a design or you have intent, are they saying, you know, we actually want to see some dollars appropriated by towns or counties before we appropriate any dollars at our level of government.

MS. WEBER:

I think it's just the fiscal impacts that you're saying. I mean, everyone is working with a very tight budget. They have to maintain state roads, and we're asking them on the state level to do the same thing. So they're trying to do it with their roads, where These are county roads that we're coming to you and asking about, so they're going to say, Well, is the county doing the same thing with their own roads, so it's kind of, you know, what have you guys set aside and ready to do.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Just that some of these projects, you know, you get into a situation where one level of government is just shifting the responsibility to another level or making an excuse as to why they can't deliver, because some other level of government isn't doing something, yet is a \$133 billion budget, and they give out a lot of money in a lot of areas.

MS. WEBER:

I understand. I think the best way is to put your best foot forward and ask for that request is by setting up your own funding, saying, Look, we're already -- we're starting what we're doing here on our level and we've been responsible --

LEG. BARRAGA:

I can understand your point of view. It's just that --

MS. WEBER:

I mean, that's why we're asking for the county to set up a fund. You know, it just show that.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I think that Legislator Barraga brings up a very good point, the coordination between the different municipalities also. From my experience, I know my town applied for a federal grant for traffic calming improvements and sidewalks, and, you know, we didn't get anything. So there's an example of really having done the work, a really good job of applying for it, really concise plans, not just, Give us some money and we'll see what we can do, and we didn't get anything. And I think -- so when you work -- that's why I'm going ask Commissioner Anderson, when you work -- 'cause he obviously works with other municipalities -- does it pay to try to coordinate with other municipalities as far as -- because there's always interplay between -- this is a system road. They're county-owned and these are system roads, so you're always working with the towns and villages. Would that help towards getting any kind of state or federal money?

MS. WEBER:

I mean, in our experience, it has. You've got to understand, when you're going on a federal level, you're competing with the entire country; it's much more competitive. The more ways you can stack the deck, you know, in a way of speaking, where you can say, Okay, we have our funding that we're putting aside, we have our designs, we have our municipalities on board, we have our, you know, communities on board, the more ways that you can say that, the higher your chance of getting a grant. So that's one of the things -- you know, this is the first step in saying the county's ready.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Does anyone else have any questions?

MS. WEBER:

And we want to thank Legislator Calarco for your support on this as well.

LEG. CALARCO:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. That's all the cards I have. Is there anyone else who would like to speak? Then I'd ask Commissioner Anderson to come up and give us a preview of his analysis of the capital budget. Actually, before you start with the capital budget, if you could say a few words on what the county -- because, like I said, in my experience with the county with Roanoke Avenue, it was pretty positive as far as making it pedestrian- and bicycle-safe. If you look at 58 in Riverhead, it was not that same experience, so if you could just give an overview on what the county is doing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you, Legislator, and good morning, everybody. To start off, I want to say that when we go into a specific project, and we don't address things as generally -- I mean, we do it now; we are doing more sidewalk projects, things like that, and, in fact, we are in the process of implementing a study of bike lanes throughout county roads. We do not go into an area and say, as a rule, we're looking to look at the safe streets criteria. We do that as part of the -- as part of our project review in the scope within each individual project, so if we're doing a road, we look at where we can implement and what we can implement. One of the big concerns we have with putting in bicycle lanes is without having a destination and origin to those bike lanes, we don't want, as you mentioned, a bike line just in the middle of nowhere. So we are in the process now of doing a bicycle path study, you know, design-wise, starting to look at the preliminary study so we can implement a design of destination and origin.

CR 39 and 58 were identified as problem children as far as local streets, safe streets, and for those of you who were here may recall that at that time, the main concern was to get the flow of traffic, vehicular traffic, not necessarily pedestrian or bicycle traffic. It was to move cars through a specific area, and what we did was basically create lanes within the existing right-of-way without having to do additional land acquisition because the land acquisition in both 39 and 58 were huge, and those projects, they were federal-aided projects, they were large dinosaurs that just -- the land acquisition was actually sucking the life out of the project. So we implemented these interim projects, if you will, to make sure the traffic moves.

We did have, on 58, there is sidewalk, and on 39, there is, I believe, on one side at least sidewalk to get through. I'm not in any way making light of the need for pedestrian safety, but we do where we can to implement those -- you know, what their tenants are. I would suggest further discussion on this subject because if there are specific areas of concern, I would be very interested in where they are and to see what we can do, you know, within reason. We, again, are allocated a certain amount of federal funding to do roadwork, and in most cases, we are trying to do the larger public safety improvements within a limited amount of funding that comes down from the feds and the state.

Lastly, the only other comment I'd like to make on this is that if you look at the number of fatalities, the majority of them are on state roads; they're not necessarily on county roads. And that's where I understand the suggestion of trying to have a pot of funding available so that you can get matches. I think further discussion is needed to coordinate the levels of the town, the county, the state to see where we go with this.

But back to my initial point, we do try to implement the Safe Street Program whenever we go into a road project.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. And if you can just give us an overview of your capital budget now, and then I know legislators have questions -- specific questions about specific items.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, first off, before I get started, I want to commend BRO on their review of this document. As always, it's incredibly thorough, and I will use it as a tool in the coming year just to keep track of all the jobs we got going on.

This year, in 2015, we're pretty -- well, you know what? I really was not prepared to make a statement, and I'm kind of winging this, and I'd prefer to answer questions if at all possible.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Sure. Absolutely. There's plenty of questions. I'll start with Legislator Browning. I know she's got a healthy list there.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, I do. And, actually, talking about County Road 39, even though it's not my district, my nephew's girlfriend is at the Shinnecock Hills over the summer now with her college, and while they were there, they were told, I guess not too long ago, a young boy from Ireland was killed on 39. And you hate to hear it, but these kids coming over here to work for the summer and going back a casket. And since that, Shinnecock Hills has discouraged the kids, and most of them are here, no car, and most of them are riding bikes, so they have been discouraged from using bicycles; in fact, they were thinking they were going to take the bikes away so that they can't use them. So that's a shame, and I know we have a lot of immigrant workers and that are using bicycles out there. So, you know, I've been driving out there to go see her and noticing it a lot more, specially with the good weather because there's no sidewalks, there's no shoulder, and I can understand them understanding not wanting their kids to do this. It is dangerous.

But I'd like to get back to -- there's a couple issues. Do you want handle the ones that came up at the working group?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Go right ahead.

LEG. BROWNING:

Can I just say district-specific?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

No, no. Get right into the big issues.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Where should we start? Okay. One issue that I know that there's an effort to look for Sandy money for our sewers. Now, I have appropriated the \$1.9 million dollars for our sewer project, but there is no money for future years. Now, I hate to assume that the state is going to come through with any funding, and I'd like to know, you know, what kind of money do we think we would need to continue to move the project forward. I don't want to hear, Well, we appropriated \$1.9 million, this is how far we got, we're in the design stage, we're going to be putting out the RFP. So to continue to move forward with our sewer project, I don't want to see us running into a roadblock or up against a wall and find out we have no money, so you want to start with that one.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Sure. Again, I think it's always been the intention of our department to move that project forward. Certainly given the interest of the State to hopefully fund the construction, it's become certainly a much more realistic goal to look at to start to prep for construction right now. The numbers even for the initial district are pretty huge, so without any type of federal or state aid, it's going to be pretty unlikely that we'll be able to move to any type of construction. Certainly we could put a number into subsequent years, but I don't know that that serves any purpose until we've gotten through this next round, or hopefully get through this next round, of federal aid through the HUD funding. Maybe we can actually get this thing built.

LEG. BROWNING:

Right. The other -- well, the other thing is obviously the 1.9, so between now in the design stage to actual construction stage, we don't need any additional funding for anything?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, at this point, we've held back only because the overall size of the project has not been defined. The 1.9 is certainly enough to get us going and move this project forward, and we're

comfortable with that. Again, if we're only doing one phase, the first phase, that's a lot smaller of a design, if you will, then if we're going for three or four phases. So I would say at this point it's enough to get us going, and we would, if we need more, and I'll be frank: I assume we will need more as we get into this a little bit more, but without having a finite number, I'm very hesitant to put anything in there.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Well, I'll talk to you more about it at another time, sometime this week, but clearly if there is a -- maybe a 10,000 need, whatever, between -- over the next couple years, I'd like to at least have something there. I don't want to see us going into 2015 and saying we're \$10,000 short or \$20,000 of doing something that we need to do.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay.

LEG. BROWNING:

Another project that I reached out to your office maybe a year and a half two years ago, County Road 36. It's Capital Project 5541, and this was for the stormwater project. I know that somehow there was some money that you were able to come up with to actually do some of the storm drains. What do we have right now? I should see if I could dig it up.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There's nothing actually in BRO's report, then, and it probably reflects the fact that -- and I'll verify this, but I'm almost certain we are doing some storm work right now.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, there is some work going on, but it's not really phase two. I know phase one is done, but phase two is not being done. There was some additional funds to do some of the storm drains, but it's really not phase two is what I'm being told. So what do we need -- okay. Hold on. Let me see if I can get it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

What was the project number again?

LEG. BROWNING:

Project is 5541.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If you go to page 39 in the BRO book --

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm actually looking at both.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Oh. Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

It's a sunny day, Kate. It's not a good day to talk about drainage.

LEG. BROWNING:

Hey, it's water quality.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

According to the report, "The department is now receiving mixed neighborhood feedback regarding the unfinished portion of the project with some for and some against changing the existing concrete panel roadway. It has indicated that the continued scheduling construction funding in subsequent years, as requested by the department has included in the 2015, 2017 capital program is appropriate." So we do have 6.5 in subsequent years with the assumption that we'll resolve the questions on whether or not we replace the concrete panels.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'll talk more to you about that one, then.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay.

LEG. BROWNING:

Also, we had the County Road 21 in '08. We funded design for stormwater remediation, and the project number is 8241. It seems that that's kind of gotten to a standstill.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I will get back to you. I have to get back to you on that. That was 8241, right?

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. And a couple -- I did mention to you about the Yaphank lakes and the invasive species cleanup. You know, we just approved funding for Canaan Lake, and there's about a little under 15 percent of the lake actually belongs to the county. So, obviously, the Town of Brookhaven right now, they're working on providing the necessary funds to continue the project on the town portion, but as you know, the lower part of the lake does belong to the county, so I think we were estimating -- I'm trying to think -- about 700,000, something to that effect. I will get the accurate numbers to BRO. For our portion of it, I would like to have us look at that.

And one other project, did I mention the -- I didn't mention -- I know that -- you know the turnoff on Horseblock Road, from Horseblock Road onto Yaphank Avenue. There was a number of complaints and concerns about safety at that section of the road. I know we didn't put it in the program -- in the budget last year, but there was a recommendation of \$150 million for design and about 1.5 million for construction, and I know that that was because of safety issues. They want to, I guess, reconfigure that right turn. I'm certainly going to be requesting that we put some funding in for that project also.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Is that where you would turn to head south --

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, when you're coming off Horseblock Road. I'm trying to think of the name of the store. There's, like, a deli on the corner --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There's a deli on the corner, yeah, the Backstreet Deli.

LEG. BROWNING:

-- where there's a lot of issues with the trucks parking, and I think there's been a few accidents on that corner where the people that are making the right turn, instead of going to the light and making the right turn, there's a right turn lane that veers off onto Yaphank Avenue.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. We had requested 8.3 billion for construction, 1.5 million in 2015, and 6.8 in 2017, and the funding was pushed back, I believe.

LEG. BROWNING:

Where is that? But that's not just for that one -- no, for that one project, I thought that was about one and a half to two.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If you go to page 29 -- I'm sorry, page 292, if you -- it says "status" and identifies DPW requested 8.3 million for construction and 1.5 million in 2016 and 6.8 million in 2017.

LEG. BROWNING:

So that's a number of projects, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yep, number of phase, right.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So it's a number of sections on Horseblock Road, but I don't see the -- that's not included in the Yaphank Avenue portion.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, it is. If you look at the first phase that says CR 16, CR 21, and CR 56, which is Victory Drive, is in the planning stage with design to be completed by January 2017 and construction by December 2018.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I see Yaphank Avenue. Okay. And -- hold on. So there's nothing for that's all been pushed off to 2016. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct, because the design isn't to be completed until 2017.

LEG. BROWNING:

I was just looking at the Yaphank Avenue section because I know we looked at 150 for the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Design.

LEG. BROWNING:

-- design, and 1.5, I thought, was for the construction of just that intersection.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I can verify that.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I'll work with the working group to see if we can move some of that up because, again, it's a safety issue, and I don't think those are the types of things we should hold off. Do you want me to keep going?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Well, I just wanted to make a general comment about where we were trying to go with this budget. A lot of the things in here, we really are trying to make a distinction of things that are needing to get

done immediately versus things that you can push off for a year, and obviously the maintenance on buildings is really critical, and we know that you can't push maintenance off, and a lot of the drainage while you are doing the road, of course you need to do the drainage associated with the roadwork so that makes sense.

One of the things that came up, though, it seems like a high percentage -- it struck me and some of my colleagues -- a high percentage of the money goes towards, like, design and planning of these projects. And would it make more sense for your department to have an engineer to do all that design, planning, review of plans? And, to me, if it were done -- my experience, at least -- if it's done in-house, it gets prioritized better, and it gets done quicker. If you look at the numbers here, it gets done a lot cheaper also.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We have historically done a number of projects with our staff. Roanoke Avenue is a prime example of the things that we've done with our own staff, and there has been a significant drop in the number of DPW employees, and that obviously impacts our ability to get the work that's needed to be done. I fully concur with the need for additional staffing. I think it needs to be looked at in a larger discussion. Again, I go back to, as I said last week, I think my bigger concern right now, as much as I want more engineers and architects -- and again, keep in mind that originally, way back 20, 30 years ago, very, very little work was done by outside consulting; everything was done in-house. Now, it's -- I wouldn't say it's 180 degrees, but it's probably about 125 degrees the other way. My bigger concern really is for maintenance staff. Guys who fix the roads, who fix the potholes, the guide rails, crack seal the pavement, fix the roof, the building's maintenance people. They're huge. Any -- and they took a significant hit during the layoffs two years ago. Those -- the addition of maintenance staff will prolong the service life of a road or a building which pushes out the need to do any type of contracted maintenance, whether it's even repaving or reconstruction of the building or road. So that would -- and I think as we're going into the operating budget, I think that discussion has to be had, maybe not this year, but I think we need to come up with an optimal plan where we are with our staffing levels and what we -- where we really need to be.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. That was a big concern of ours. And, obviously, it's up to you to manage that department to say if we had guys to do this, we'd outsource less -- it cost us -- but it's cheaper in some instances to outsource because you don't have that labor, you don't have that payroll, benefits, and all that. It's just management.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There is certain expertise that we don't have in-house, without question, and even if we brought some of that on, it wouldn't be probably as much as needed to do the amount. Again, we -- there's a lot of work that's needed and a lot of work that we have to do. Again, I would look at some type of cost benefit analysis to say, Okay, if we bring on X number of employees, what would that do in the long term as far as the capital debt -- capital reduction, but I think you also have to weight it against the operating costs too.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Sure. All right. Thank you. Any other specific? Now back to specifics.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah. Well and, you know, our budget office is telling us the same thing, the maintenance, if you don't maintain things, it's just going to get worse. I don't disagree; they're right on the mark. And also the engineers, there are certain amount of work that, you know, our budget office is saying if you do it smart and have the right engineers, they can do a lot of the work instead of us bonding out a lot of these projects and paying for engineers that way.

There was a couple of projects that we looked at. There was 1133 and that was renovations to the surrogate's court, and Budget Review's comments were a little different. I'll give you the three projects that we looked at. It was 1133, 1678, and 1715. If you could respond to them, you know, BRO's recommendations versus the County Executive's. I will give you an example: obviously, the Riverhead County Center power plant. That power plant, we assume powers the jail, and it's very old, so you know. Give me an example. What would happen if that power plant was to shut down or something disastrous was to happen? What happens to the jail if we lost power? I mean, I'm assuming they have back-up generators and anything but just out of curiosity.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We are starting to wean ourselves away from the power -- that centralized power location. We have been putting in localized HVAC systems, things like that, again trying to get away from centralized power system. We do have -- and I can bring up Mike Monohan, who is our chief engineer of facilities. He can discuss what back-up type of a power we have. We do maintain significant backup out there just because of that, and I'll let him speak on more detail on that.

As far as 1133, the surrogate's court, we'd not that the change that BRO put the three years of funding back into a single year. We're fine with that. Either way, however you have to do it the balance things, we're fine with. Obviously, we can't appropriate the funds, but we can't actually let the project and start spending the money until we have all the funding, so it -- there is some logic to bringing it all back into one year.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Excuse me, Kate, for one second. I think the feeling was that if we appropriate all that money, is it going to be -- are we going to get results, or can it wait another year? I think that was one of the questions: Are you going to -- are these projects going to happen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The projects will happen; that's not a question. What was the --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Or should it be spread out, some of the HVAC and the electrical upgrades at the county center. Some of those, the ones that Kate was mentioning, are these things going to -- should we do it right away? I mean, what's the sense of urgency?

MR. MONOHAN:

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

And I understand everybody -- you're doing your job because you want to get these things done, and your interest is in maintaining what we have, and we all appreciate that. Our interest is trying to reach a balance between we'd love to maintain everything the way it should be every day, but unfortunately that's not going to happen, so we're trying to reach that balance.

MR. MONOHAN:

Good morning. This is Mike Monohan. I'm the chief engineer for facilities. I work for Mr. Anderson. To answer your question, Legislator Krupski, keep in mind we've spent significant funding over the last several years at the powerhouse to decentralize the heating hot water system in there, so now it's decentralized to each of the three buildings that it serves in the county center at an operating cost savings of about \$1.4 million a year with a return on investment over two to three years, so we're seeing the fruits of that money that was well spent.

The current projects we're talking about now have to deal with the emergency power distribution system in the county center building. All the emergency generator backup for the county center is currently located in that power plant building somewhere over two megawatts worth of generating capacity with three diesel generators. What we're talking about replacing now is the switch gear between the generators and the actual building. So if LIPA power or PSEG-LI power goes down, there's an automatic switchover to the generators, which start up in sequence, depending on the load. That equipment is 1950's vintage, and if it goes down, which it could do any day, there is no backup power in that facility; and by the way, the main power runs through there as well, so you have zero power. So it's very critical that that get replaced immediately, which is why we're asking for that money right now.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. There was the one other one, 1678, I think it was --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

-- that we had talked about was parking lots, sidewalks. I'll give you an example. You know, we're, obviously, for my liability reasons, we'd want to make sure that our sidewalks and everything, everything is being properly maintained, but as you know with our health centers, with the privatization of everything, and obviously Hudson River planning to take over, possibly, the Shirley Heath Center, because that was actually one of the facilities that was mentioned. You know, so we're always -- I believe, Rob, we talked about how much communication is there between the administration and DPW to say, Okay, well why would we -- which I kind of, like, joke is when you hear about the military spending money on military bases and then they close them, so why would we spend money on a facility that we could possibly wind up not owning anymore, maybe, within the next year? So have you guys looked at all these locations to make sure that, like, for example, why would we do it at Shirley Health Center, or do we absolutely need to do it? Well I can't speak on specific locations. We do monitor the parking lots. Obviously, you know, we do look to do an annual program to -- basically just because some of these lots are original in construction, probably going back into the '70s. No specific location. I believe, looking at the funding for 1678, there was funding in the Executive's recommended budget a little less than -- well, okay, about half of what we requested. Again, it's one of those programs if you give us the whole thing, we will spend it; if you don't give us the whole thing, we will spend it. The work needs be done, but again, there are other -- and I'll be frank; I did sit with the budget office and the county executive's office going through these, so there are -- a certain understanding that you're trying to maintain a certain level on the budget so --

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah. I mean, like, it says 750,000 for the Shirley Health Center, and, again, I know that we have a lot of these places that are public access, and we don't want to wind up with a lawsuit because of poor maintenance, so, you know, I will assume, then, that you're going to prioritize where it should be done first, and, again, maybe take a look at some of the locations and say, Well, you know, if there's a plan to offload the Shirley Health Center, then why would we spend \$750,000?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, I don't really have an answer for that. I'll get back to you on that.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All done?

LEG. BROWNING:

I think so.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Does anyone else have any questions for the commissioner? Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

You mentioned hiring a number of maintenance people. What number would that be? How many guys would you need?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That needs to be looked at. Without actually looking at it right now, I'd be just pulling something out of the air. I think it really needs to be looked at.

LEG. TROTТА:

How many do you have, approximately?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

In highways, our number including supervisory are roughly around 30, maybe 35. I'm guessing. I will get you the exact number, but it's getting pretty tight.

LEG. TROTТА:

I'm a firm believer that the maintenance is important because the road will fall apart if you're not filling it correctly and getting on top of it. It could last an extra 10 years. Would that be unreasonable?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, not at all. We concur with that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Okay. Legislator Browning has another question.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm sorry. I forgot one more. I know there's another project we've been looking at: The William Floyd Parkway drainage improvement, looking at the center median, improving that, and, you know, as you know that that outflow pipe at the Unkechaug Creek has -- I was actually down there not too long ago, and it does seem to be spitting out a lot of garbage through that pipe. And I know we just did a dredge project, so it does look like it's been shoved out to subsequent years. That is something I guess I'm going to be looking to get the working group to work with me on with making that a little bit closer.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We have just received, I believe, our proposals to do the design on that section of road. Do you know the capital project number on that? I'm sorry.

LEG. BROWNING:

5116. Let me see if I can find it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Legislator Trotta, there are 28 maintenance mechanics, and that includes supervisory, and that's for all buildings that are maintained by the county right now. So I can tell you that the custodial level is probably less than that, and, again, like I said, highways is probably in the same ballpark. So I would -- again, I'm not looking to rush into this and say I need another 30 or 40 people, but I would like to open up discussions to say logically, you know, how do we get -- what's the optimal number we need?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. On 5116, it's saying there's nothing recommended until subsequent years. BRO's recommendation is 250,000 for next year, and that would be, I'm assuming, for design plan.

LEG. KENNEDY:

(Inaudible).

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

No, no, you missed your turn. Sorry.

LEG. BROWNING:

It's all about my school district right now, John; don't worry about it.

(*Laughter*)

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I will get back to you, Legislator.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I know this is a project we've been doing a lot of stormwater remediation, and again it's with the dredging project, I would like to see that, you know, we have a good drainage system going down there, and I believe it was putting everything down the middle.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's looking at that as well as defining the edge of the road to keep the water from going off the road, so there were a number of things we've looked at, and we did request five million in '17. It was pushed back a year or into subsequent years, so, you know, again, if the funds, if we're ready and we can move them up, I would say at that point, we could move them up.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Well, I'm going ask BRO to take that five million from the subsequent years and move it into 2017 as requested and the 250, as you recommended. Thank you. I don't think I have anymore. Like I said, it's all about my district.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. It is today. Legislator Kennedy, you had a question.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes, I did.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

There's no money left after that last one, but go ahead.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I did, Mr. Chair. Thank you very much.

LEG. KENNEDY:

I have a couple of specific project numbers to go through, Gil, but let me pick up on what you talked a little bit about before about the energy improvement stuff. And, you know, while you have Joe here, the broader question I have for you is I know we've been fairly aggressive on the energy improvement stuff with the conversion of our heating systems, our boilers. We -- pretty much all of our major facilities, we're now on natural gas. We've converted from oil. We've just had some improvement done across the street in building 17, thankfully, and I appreciate that. Well, we have the motion sensors in now finally on lighting. How much of that is there still left that we could do, and what kind of return do we get with that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Legislator, I'm going to defer to Mr. Schroeder and Mr. Monohan to give you the answers on those.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. That would be great.

MR. SCHROEDER:

Legislator Kennedy, there's a significant amount of work remaining to be done on the balance of the county facilities that we own and operate, and even on those facilities where we have long-term leases where it's in the county's best interest to improve the energy use profile of those facilities because it affects our operating expenses.

The return on investment varies by the bundle of projects that we do. The typical return has been better than 25 percent. The bundle of projects that we have scheduled for the current process is in the order of magnitude of 23 to 25 percent, and it includes a number of very aggressive efforts to further reduce electric demand load, which is a significant cost to the county.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So let's talk specifically about 1664, then, Joe, and I see that he requested was 4,025,000; the exact recommend, 2 million; BRO is recommending that we go to the full four million twenty-five.

MR. SCHROEDER:

That's correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. And it's your sense or testimony that if we go -- see, here's the part that I struggle with a little bit when we look at energy efficiency projects. I understand the value of them. I know that cumulatively we reduce our drawer; absolutely, as government, that's what we should be doing. But, quite frankly, so if we go with BRO's recommended -- you know, when you talk about solar projects, they say, Well, it pays itself off in six years, seven years, eight years, if we go for the full 4,025,000, how quickly do we wind up offsetting that additional two mil based on the savings that we realize in not consuming gas or electric?

MR. SCHROEDER:

Well, I could tell you that the living list of projects that we have, including the projects that are scheduled this year and the projects that we intended to do next year has a projected savings of one -- over a million dollars net of debt service for the cost of doing those projects.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

MR. SCHROEDER:

And that's typical of the bundle of projects that we do. Now, you mention solar projects, and there are some projects that we that have a much lower return on investment than other projects, and that is a recommended process to follow because if you cherry pick all the low hanging fruit, then you never do some of the improvements that you might do if you bundle them together and ensure, you know, an aggregated rate of return that's acceptable. So that's why some of our projects have a lower savings profile than others. But as a bundle, we have achieved savings net of debt service in the first year for the typical bundle of projects that we put forth the last few years.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So you feel comfortable, though, in saying that for -- if we go for what the requested was, the full 4,025,000, you're confident and comfortable that we're going to go ahead and realize real long-term and ongoing savings?

MR. SCHROEDER:

I am, because we monitor and verify those energy use profiles ongoing. We are also implementing a realtime monitoring process at our largest facilities, which will capture about 70 percent of the county's total energy expenditures, and we're monitoring our electric and gas meters on a three-minute basis so we have very good feedback on the actual energy use that we have experienced in the past based on our utility billing, and we have even more accurate feedback on the energy use as we go forward. So we are measuring and verifying the savings, and as we speak now, at today's cost of energy, which is lower than the cost of energy years ago, we're saving approximately \$5 million a year.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good, good.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Legislator, if I could, I would draw your attention to BRO's report on page 77 and 78. Those graphs show the significant reduction in usage of both electricity and CNG as this program has been implemented over the years.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No doubt about it. As a matter of fact, you know, I see it from where things used to be to where they are now, just the boiler conversions and some of the other things. As I said, I love those motion sensors. Every building should have them, and, in my opinion, that in particular we should be accelerating. You know, somebody who works late -- I know we talked to -- I'm not blaming custodians or anybody else. It's just human nature sometimes to leave the lights on, but, you know, the fact that the motion sensors actually will cut it off, I don't come into the building on weekends anymore with lights on. Now, finally, thankfully, they're off, so it's working. My advice, and I would be willing to make the case to accelerate that, you know, within your bundle of energy savings work, if there's other buildings up here even on the north campus that we can capture. I know we have it here; now we have it in 17, but similarly we should be doing the ME building; we should be doing building 50; we should be doing them all.

MR. SCHROEDER:

Legislator Kennedy, included in this bundle of projects is a countywide lighting upgrade.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. All right. So it's in there. Good. All right. Thank you.

So let me shift gears a little bit, bit. Let's talk -- I want to pick up on the surrogates upgrade, in particular. So maybe that's Mike. The surrogates piece in particular, how critical is that for us to do that in '15, or is that something we can move up into '16? The one thing that I saw in particular is that I was kind of struggling to follow is reparation that the HVAC unit is 59 years old. My recollection is all of the county center is operated off of one set of chillers and handlers. They have separate unit over there for surrogates?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At the -- yeah. I'll defer to Mike, but I know we have been putting in separate handlers at the county center just to get away from the centralized plan specifically with regard to that. Surrogates, you're right, it's a unit from 1959, and I'll defer to Mike on any further comments.

MR. MONOHAN:

Yes, that's correct. The units themselves, most of them were replaced in the previous renovation, which we did about four or five years ago except for the surrogate's unit. The surrogate's is vintage, 59 years old, whatever we just said, and it has been patched together, because we knew we were going to do the surrogate's court. So we do have heat and hot water up to that particular air handler. It used to have a steam coil in it, steam heating coil. That was replaced with a hot water heating coil, but the rest of the unit is shot, and it's in need of replacement.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Can you even find somebody to service or maintain a piece of equipment that's 60 years old?

MR. MONOHAN:

You can just simply find replacement parts, whether they're dampers -- but eventually, if you're replacing the entire unit, you might as well go with replacing the entire unit with a much more energy efficient unit, new (inaudible), et cetera.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right. Okay. Also in that project is mentioned something about upgrading security and the bathrooms. Just coincidentally, I happen to be in and out of surrogate's periodically. The security is the same magnetometer that we have out front here. What's the alternative that's being proposed?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Keith Larsen is our architect on this project, and I'm going to let him speak on it.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay.

MR. LARSEN:

As part of the surrogate's project, we're making enhancements to the security system there. Currently, the security setup is at the -- sort of the far end of the building. It's not at the main entrance, so we're actually going to move that system, create more of a queueing area for the public. We're also going to be adding a panic alarm system in the courtroom and at the, I think, the judge's chambers. That's the only building, court building, that we have that doesn't have any special panic alarms. Typically, all of our court buildings have that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So where the double set of glass doors is, that would be the -- what would you call that? I guess that would be the northernmost part of the building that you come in that's not utilized now. You don't enter or exit there. You're actually going to activate that now? That's where the public would be coming in and out of?

MR. LARSEN:

Yes, that's correct. We're going to create -- we're actually going to enclose the vestibule that's there at the overhang.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah.

MR. LARSEN:

Create more of a queueing area for the public and put the -- and convert one office into the security room for the magnetometer; this way, they have a more efficient, you know --

LEG. KENNEDY:

But you're going to maintain that connection with the clerk's office and the rest of the building still.

MR. LARSEN:

Absolutely. That will become --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Title searchers come through there all the time.

MR. LARSEN:

Yes. Well, we're trying to discourage everybody -- title searchers, the outside public, and so on -- from coming in at that entrance --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Good luck.

MR. LARSEN:

-- because it creates a security issue with the county clerk. So they're trying to get everybody to go into the main entrance of the building and where they need to, sometimes there is a county clerk security personnel there who lets them go back and forth because I know they do have to access both record sets sometimes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Have you had a -- are you being proactive here, or have you had security issues there?

MR. LARSEN:

There have been some issues there, and they're afraid that since the record room is right there that some records could wind up disappearing, obviously. So it's not the ideal layout for the building, but we're trying to work with what we have.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Part of it goes to -- excuse me on second. Part of it goes to -- before we had the whole issue with our security guards, we actually had three people on staff in the county clerk's office who actually maintains access in and out of both points. That back entrance, we always had a security guard there. Now that they've been downsized, redeployed, there is no security presence, if you will. Typically, it's somebody who recognizes somebody. You know, if it's a title searcher, whatever, they'll let you in. My experience is, you know, if they don't know who you are, they won't, but that's a primitive system. Well, it's not a system; let's put it that way, so. That helps me to understand a little bit better.

And, then, I guess you're talking about restrooms there. You're just going to what, upgrade them, upgrade the fixtures, that kind of stuff?

MR. LARSEN:

The rest of the county center building, we renovated all the bathrooms, and these bathrooms at the surrogates are really not ADA compliant. They are original. The partitions inside are rusty, the fixtures are original, so we're going to do a complete renovation and make them ADA accessible on both levels.

LEG. KENNEDY:

The funding that's in '15, how far along are you with this project, how far along are you with this project? Assuming that the funding was going to be moved or committed, are you at the point where you could commence work, or do you still have design and other things to do?

MR. LARSEN:

We have consultants on the job right now that are approximately 75 percent done with the plans, so we were anticipating on bidding it next year when we originally were scheduled to get the money, so we're ready to do that if we can restore that funding. We can't really do the project without having all the money in one shot.

LEG. KENNEDY:

No, that I understand. I get that. Okay. Thank you on that.

Two other projects. One, there is a -- some funding that was juggled with -- this is a road project, Gil -- some funding that was juggled with -- the one in Muratore's school district, 5548. There was 10 million in federal road funding that was removed. I don't understand that. We've been talking about, for a long time, improvements along -- thanks, Joe. Joe, thank you -- improvements along County Road 83. I know there was some crash data that Legislator Muratore got. There's a significant number of collisions along that stretch. There's rollovers. You'll recall, what was it, five six years ago, we had an issue with somebody, I guess, coming down the grade. That's coming down right from over by Brookhaven Town Hall, I believe, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. It's coming down the hill --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

-- and it was at the intersection.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And it was at Granny Road, I believe.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It was the, I believe --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Fatality, I believe, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It was a fatality. We were in the process, and we have made some changes in that area to improve drainage. I think they hydroplane. So similarly, what you mentioned, we have had discussions with Legislator Muratore about the rollover issues that have occurred on the northern side of the hill, and we are looking at those trying to look at the data, seeing if we need more guide rail in that area.

As far as the larger project, I'd have to find out where that is with regard to the federal aid process, and I'll get back to you on that.

LEG. KENNEDY:

That would be on the -- what is it, the NYMTC list; is that it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. Essentially, the larger project was to look at removing the center drainage swale median, whatever you want to call it --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

-- and create -- construct a -- basically construct a concrete median in the two that would allow us to eliminate or -- I'm sorry, add a continual third lane because you lose the outer lane as you go downhill in both directions, so that was what we were able to look at. At that point, we would also look at sound walls in that area too. Again, I don't know where we are and it really is contingent on the federal process, whether or not we have the funding.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, I know that there's some amendment that's going on right now with that whole five-year list. As a matter of fact, based on the governor advancing that paving money, 100 million, I believe, for 25 and 25-A.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, again, the state has their pot; we have our pot. I mean, essentially everybody is allocated a certain amount of money over the course of time. This is the annual updating or the -- I guess the biannual updating of the plan.

LEG. KENNEDY:

So, then, if somebody from your shop can get a hold of Muratore's shop on that, then that would be good. I would appreciate that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We'll be happy to have discussions with the legislator.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okey doke.

The other one that I wanted to talk to you about was the Crooked Hill Road project, and I am looking at my notes.

MS. GAZES:

I think you're looking for 5538, I think is the number.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Probably. I don't have it written down, but I do know that we've had some contact with somebody from the Cosentino (ph) Plaza; Baker, John Baker called, and talked in terms of being able to extend that main that we have that stops at the hotel there on Crooked Hill.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We've had a number of discussions with Mr. Baker and his engineer about extending, actually, a sewer, a force line --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

-- from that plaza or I guess, actually, from the north side where -- was it PJ ventures?

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

PJ Ventures and then also Sloan Kettering to bring a combined sanitary force main down Crooked Hill to connect either at the hotel possibly --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Or they're going to run directly up to pilgrim. In either case, that work should be done prior to what we would do with the road reconstruction, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. That's what we're looking at, yes.

LEG. KENNEDY:

And we're kind of in sync that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. So if that's the case and that really is a go or viable, then could we -- at its best, that would take at least probably about a year to go ahead and do; therefore, we wouldn't really need funding to undertake the road construction until, let's say, '16 at the earliest?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The discussions that were had identified that we would be able to install the force main before we actually got the construction, and even if it was done simultaneously, that wasn't an issue, and we were comfortable with the timing of both as its laid out.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right. Just as long as we're talking about it and that we're kind of linked in.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Last thing I want to do is build a road and have to rip it up for anything.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Well, no doubt about it, and towards that end -- and, Roz, the number that I have is 5497. Do we

have two Crooked Hill Road projects? Do I have that wrong?

MS. GAZES:

I believe 5497 is the sidewalk project, the countywide sidewalk project.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Yeah, well, then I really did boot it, didn't I? Yeah, I was having a much better afternoon than I suspected. All right. Maybe it's 5538. In any event, my thoughts along that were since we're having so much other work done there, the road construction component of it, is it scheduled now to go north of the expressway, or does it stop at the expressway?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

My last recollection is it goes north of the expressway to that north service road and then a little bit beyond only because you have to transition that intersection, so you are going to have to extend a little bit beyond but not very --

LEG. KENNEDY:

You won't take it all the way up to where it meets Commack Road?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No.

LEG. KENNEDY:

All right. Well, you know, there's still a little more time to talk about it because if Sloan is expanding to the extent that it is, another 20,000 square feet, if Cosentino is expanding with putting in some additional restaurants and things like that, Henry Street just got completely rebuilt, courtesy of Lowes. It almost stands to reason, you know, all the things around it are being built out to add extra traffic; why wouldn't we want to be cognizant of that and address what our infrastructure is of the additional traffic?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

In general terms, I understand what you're saying. I think we need to look at the specifics of the additional traffic that would be added. The condition of the road, I don't recall being in bad shape. In order --

LEG. KENNEDY:

No, it's not terrible. It's not terrible, but it is vintage, you know, '30s and '40s construction. It's concrete slab. It's concrete slab, two lane with asphalt on either side. I mean, we were right there with the truck inspection station, which got built out and done very nicely. But nevertheless, what's coming to it -- I'm sorry, there's still only two lanes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Understood, but as far as I know, the numbers -- the amount of traffic that's used on that road and would be looked at, we could look at whether we need to widen or improve because of capacity; but again, then you start looking at takings, which is a time-consuming and expensive amount. So I'm not discounting anything but --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. We've got to bring the metrics to bare to support it.

All right. Last item, then. Let's talk sewerage; always near and dear to my heart. Tell me a little bit about where we're at with Kings Park as far as the latest, if you've heard anything at all, or are we still caught up in the broader things that are going on with RPA and all that other stuff?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would have to get back to you on that. I know we're still in the finals of the design. Beyond that --

LEG. KENNEDY:

Here's what I'd ask, Gil: Economic development has very -- or the IDA has agreed to go ahead and fund 300,000 for the downtown studies between Kings Park and Smithtown, but my concern or my challenge has always been to get a clear list of tasks yet to be done from EFC. So from time to time when we check in with them, they do get back and, you know, get some specific information, but your guys are most converse in it. I mean, Donovan and Wright know what they're talking about; I don't. So if you could ask them to check in with them and just give us a specific set of to-dos in order to move the project forward, I would appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Will do.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Anyone else for Commissioner Anderson?

LEG. CALARCO:

Yeah. Good morning, Commissioner. How are you?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you, Legislator; you too.

LEG. CALARCO:

I'm good. Just a couple quick questions for ya. I'm actually going to be very brief compared to my colleagues. I'll start with the one that's district relative, and that is something -- Capital Project 5014, which I see is just a strengthening of the roadways, strengthening and improving county roads. Part of that in there is County Road 101, which actually boundaries -- is the boundary between my district and Legislator Browning's district, and we've had a number of incidences that incorporate that area from Gazzola Drive all the way up to Harrison Avenue that interchange at Sunrise Highway. There's been numbers of accidents, and I know your staff has been looking at that. Is this the appropriate location for that kind of a project where we're looking at actually redesigning these intersections and possibly changing these roadways around?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. This is strictly what I would call our first line of defense and maintenance program. This is really repaving and minor improvements, if you will: drainage, curb, things like that to facilitate repaving, but that's primary what this is for.

LEG. CALARCO:

So am I looking at the wrong capital project? Because I know there's been several letters back and forth between your department and my office going back before it was my office on this particular interchange and that there was, my understanding, some sort of a project in the works to do the initial study in terms of what we need to do at that interchange to improve traffic safety. You have service roads that's are not complete and actually have two-way traffic on them; you have intersections that are coming in very confusing patterns, and it creates a very bad situation where there's a lot of accidents, people driving the wrong way on the roads because they don't realize it's not just a one-way road, those kind of things.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, any minor changes could be done under this, but primarily this is resurfacing. Let me look, and I will get back to you on exactly if there is a specific project, what that number would be, and where it is.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. I appreciate that. The other question, and it just gets into more of a philosophical thing that I think I heard a little discussion on earlier and something that's been brought up by budget review this year that merits discussion, and it's the idea of whether or not we can be doing more work --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Legislator, I just want to -- I'm sorry to interrupt you.

LEG. CALARCO:

Sure, sure.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If you go to 3301 --

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay, Safety Improvements.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That intersection is noted as one of the intersections being looked at. Halfway down the page on page 197, CR 101 Yaphank -- Patchogue Yaphank Road between Dutton Avenue and CR 99, Woodside Avenue.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. I see that. So that's going to allow for the study, or is it going to allow for the actual work there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is the actual study locations. This is actually the study. It's not actually the construction yet.

LEG. CALARCO:

So that's just going to take a look at what we need to do?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:

And are we anticipating that's going to get done in '15? I thought it was getting done this year, quite honestly.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't have an answer for that. I'll get back to you.

LEG. CALARCO:

I appreciate it. Thank you.

Okay. So getting back to the second topic, and that was a philosophical debate about whether we'd be better off doing some hiring and bringing some more people on staff as opposed to putting things in the capital projects and hiring -- you know, putting it out to consultants to have them do some of

this engineering work. And I think a lot of us around this horseshoe probably would agree with that philosophy that it's better to have a few more engineers on staff; I think you probably would agree with it too, especially considering some of the cuts and whittling down of your employees that's been happening in the department there.

But could you maybe give us an idea of what you could handle in terms of new employees and what we would be looking at in terms of ramping up to get, you know, ourselves into a position where that was be best effectuated? So, you know, obviously we could give you 20 new engineers next year, wouldn't be done until the fall, and then you'd be getting them in some time next year. You know, what is the -- what would be the phase-in to actually get you staff, if that's that decision we want to go? And how much work would they be able to take on so that we do or do not need to move things forward in this capital budget?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, again, that would be more of an operating discussion, and I would ask to be able to be speak with my staff to get some type of a quote, unquote plan. Certainly given -- again, we're not here to talk about the operating budget, but certainly given the issues the operating budget has had over the past few years, we understand the whole, you know, the deficit that we're facing and that and all those issues. The ability -- if you gave me 20 guys this year, it would not impact the 2015 significantly, to be frank.

The amount of time -- most of the projects we're look at under 2015 are already underway or very close. To bring somebody in to get them up to speed, I don't really believe -- that discussion, the discussion of bringing in engineers is an immediate discussion. I think it's a long-term discussion that we have to have based on future projections and, you know, maybe we start looking at -- again, without talking to staff, I would not expect it to be any impact in 2015. In 2016, we might start seeing some stuff, but again without looking at specific projects, what work has already been handed out to consultants, we're already taking on in-house.

LEG. CALARCO:

So realistically we wouldn't be looking at hiring anybody this year, obviously. Whatever's in the budget is in the budget, and that's not likely to change very much in the near future, so we would be talking about doing this during the operating budget debate in the fall for 2016, and then you would have to look at timeframes in order to hire them, bring them on -- in 2015, excuse me.

So when we're looking at this capital budget and we want to keep these kind of ideas in the back of our head here in terms of thinking long term, we're still going to have to focus on what needs to get done in '15 and '16 to the capital budget as it's being presented to us because we're not going to be able to really rely on additional staff to compensate in any way until late '16 at the earlier if we were able to give you new people in this upcoming operating budget in the fall.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. And one of the things I would note that our highway engineering end division has a number of young engineers who we have been working with, you know, not only to teach but also to implement certain projects similar to Roanoke Avenue, and that's where, you know, I think we would start to look at -- again, it's a long term discussion. I would caution again, and I appreciate the discussion, that what we really need is the maintenance level staffing, maintenance mechanics, equipment operators, laborers, things like that to prolong the life of our facilities.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you, Gil.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Nobody has any other questions? I would just like to thank you and your staff, especially what Legislator Kennedy spoke about: The energy savings and the energy efficiency that the county's done in the past. Going forward, you've got such a good grasp of that. We all really appreciate that. Doesn't make headlines, you didn't have a -- I missed the ribbon cutting for the new boiler.

(*Laughter*)

Couldn't make it that day. But this is the kind of stuff that really makes government work better, and all the big companies are doing the same thing, and I really appreciate the hard work and you're on top of all the details.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you, Legislator. I have the best staff in the world. They are committed to what they do, and we do look to where we can get the best bang for the buck for the county taxpayer.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. No further comment. We're adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 11:27 a.m.*)