

**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 March 10, 2014.

Members Present:

Legislator Krupski - Chairman
Legislator Muratore - Vice-Chair
Legislator Barraga
Legislator Browning
Legislator Stern

Also In Attendance:

Legislator Robert Calarco - District 7
Renee Ortiz - Chief Deputy Clerk
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Gil Anderson - Commissioner, Public Works
Jill Moss - Budget Review Office
Christopher Lubicich - Public Health Engineer, Department of Health
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer, Public Works
Joe Schroeder - Engineer Specialist
Michael Monaghan - Chief Engineer of Facilities
Patricia Lenihan - Transportation Advisory Committee
Brian J. Lowery - Idle Hour/Oakdale Civic Association
Ron Beattie - Co-Chair, NYS Rising Community Reconstruction Plan
Bill Single - Great River Community Association
Carol Purdy - Great River Community Association
John Batuello - Project Bus Stop
Vivienne Glasser - Project Bus Stop
Sam Shaffery - Project Bus Stop
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken and Transcribed By:

Kevin Gruebel - Court Reporter

*(*The meeting was called to order at 2:06 p.m. *)*

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. I'd like to call the regular committee meeting of the Public Works, Transportation, Energy Committee to order. Could we stand please for the pledge of allegiance led by Legislator Browning.

*(*Salutation*)*

All right. Welcome to the meeting today. We have a couple of cards for the Public Portion. The first card is for Patricia -- how would you say your last name?

MS. LENIHAN:

Lenihan.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

MS. LENIHAN:

Good afternoon. And I'm glad to see everybody. It's been quite a cold winter and a hard start on your Sunday Service. Patricia Lenihan, 212 Westwood Drive, Brentwood. Okay, I am an activist for the public. I come in and speak to whoever doesn't know me about the bus service, et cetera. We're having a problem as far as the bus scheduling is concerned for the people that have been able to use it. The buses are not showing up on the time they're supposed to be because of the lack of customers probably on some of the other, you know, stops. So, people are either not getting the bus because the bus left already or it's late, one or the other. To me, it would be that it left already, okay. So, I wanted to bring that to your attention. In the beginning of this Sunday Service we were hit with a lot of bad weather, okay, and people in Brentwood and on the South Shore, a lot of them did not even know we had Sunday bus service. I rode the buses, and I opened up the fliers that you -- that were put in the buses to put under their little boards, the menu boards, to let the people know, and in our area a lot of the people are Hispanic, and they can't read the English. So, there's a problem with that as far as them not being able to -- and probably even the Chinese and other workers that we have here that need to have the scheduling in different languages.

We have a big problem with the S60 not running. The S60 is from Patchogue. It goes through Port Jefferson Village, which the store owners there could use the business as well as Stony Brook University. I don't understand why nobody considered the S60 for Sunday. You have students in Stony Brook that pay a lot of money in -- to be here on this island, and they're not getting the buses to get them to work on the weekend, and they're not getting to even go out shopping, okay. So, I'd like you to take into consideration that bus route especially because it's really necessary especially with the influx of the students and the amount of money they put into this community.

Okay, now, I have a thought as far as the trial period -- which thank you to the Commissioner for explaining that this is going to be for the whole year so you'll be getting out all the bugs in the system. I'm pretty happy to go back and tell people all this, but the connections are mostly western, all right. People that need to get to the mall, if they don't come from a certain area they have no bus to get them there. Where I live in Brentwood, I have to take a bus to get me to the Brentwood Railroad to catch a bus. That bus that gets me there doesn't run. So, I have to still pay for a cab if I wanted to go to the malls. So, I think, you know, working out some of the -- trying to get all of the buses running would be a great idea, and I think you've already -- it's been proven that your rate of customers has increased even with the bad weather. So, I'm very glad that I spoke to the Commissioner. I got a lot of my answers to go back with the public for. So, just put down in

your notes whatever I said. I haven't done this in a while. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. And I see people from Department of Public Works furiously taking notes. So, I think all your comments have been noted.

MS. LENIHAN:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. All right, our second speaker, Brian Lowery.

MR. LOWERY:

Thank you. Brian Lowery from 254 Connetquot Drive, Oakdale, New York. I'd like to thank you for allowing me to address you today. I'm here on the issue of the Grand Canal. It's a dredging project that the County is hopefully going to undertake. I know that we're asking 75,000 additional dollars to complete the study. The Grand Canal -- I've lived on the Grand Canal for 32 years, and it went from a pristine waterway to basically now a cesspool. The County, we've been working -- we're trying to get the County to approve this project for two decades. Usually, it's the DEC that's the stumbling block in any project, waterway project; however, it looks like now it's the County that's the -- the culprit here.

The DEC has been asking the County to produce an application to do this dredging now for years, and the County seems to be stonewalling this application. In 2005, the DPW and the Health Department released a study. It showed that there was West Nile in the birds and the pools adjacent to the Grand Canal. Now we're going to do another study.

It's like going to the firing range and aiming and aiming and aiming. Somebody's got to pull the trigger on this project. I know Bill Lindsay, Sr. has taken the forefront on this and has been championing this project for years but to no avail. After Hurricane Sandy, the local -- I know that all the cesspools of course got flushed into the Canal, but adjacent to the Grand Canal is the Dowling College sewer treatment plant. It pumps 70,000 gallons of sewage or water into the ground adjacent to the Canal. After the Hurricane Sandy that whole system emptied out into the -- into the canal system. For years they've had problems with managing the water in their containment pools, and if I might, I'm just going to pass two photos around. Those photos will -- those photos will show you water leaking from the sewer treatment plant into their parking lot, from the parking lot into the drainage system which goes into a viaduct which goes directly to the Grand Canal.

In 2012, the DPW responded to one of those photos, the latest photo, saying that it's not water seeping from the sewer treatment plant; it's water coming out of the drain, going uphill, up the embankments and into the pools from the sewage. That would be akin to somebody saying I pulled the plug on the bathtub and the water went up the faucet. It's time Suffolk County owns this waterway. It's time that they maintain it and manage it correctly. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Mr. Lowery, if you could stick around because we have a resolution on the agenda, 1197, concerning that. So, you might want to stick around to --

MR. LOWERY:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

-- see how the discussion goes.

MR. LOWERY:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Is there any other public comment? Anyone else like to make a statement before we start? All right then. We have two presentations, and we'll start with the Bus Stop Project or rather Project Bus Stop.

MR. BATUELLO:

Hi, my name is John Batuello.

MS. GLASSER:

My name is Vivienne Glasser.

MR. SHAFFERY:

And I'm Sam Shaffery. We represent Project Bus Stop, a group of eight high school students from each of the three high schools in the greater Town of Southold. We thank you for giving us today the time to see us.

MR. BATUELLO:

We thank you today for giving us the time to see us.

MS. GLASSER:

We live in the Town of Southold, okay, sorry. When you live in the Town of Southold, a common sight as we drive by in our heated and air-conditioned cars is one of people standing waiting for the bus in the sun, in the rain and the snow unprotected from the elements.

When we began this project a year and a half ago, none of us had ever been on a local bus. So, this -- so that was our first order of business. This is a picture of us waiting for the bus. We rode to Riverhead and back. It was a surprise to see how clean, efficient and pleasant the trip was once we were on the bus.

MR. SHAFFERY:

When we began this project, we envisioned a giant collage, 1,000 photographs of people standing, waiting uncovered and waving at you, the folks who have the power to do something to change this seemingly simple problem, but taking the photos was much more difficult than we originally thought.

First of all, many people who are taking the bus don't want their picture taken. Some may not be legal; some felt stigmatized by the perception of them as needing something. Parents with children didn't want their kids' pictures taken by some sketchy high school student. We felt guilty driving up asking an old person standing on the road because the actual bus stop was up on a grassy knoll covered in two feet of snow if we could take their picture, to then drive away in our heated, dry car, nor could we become a taxi service.

But who rides the bus? Working people going from jobs, students who don't drive or whose parents work, getting to after-school activities or extracurricular activities, elderly folks who no longer drive, the carless for whatever reason. More people than ever are taking the County Bus S92 in Southold.

MR. BATUELLO:

Americans -- Americans are resourceful and uncomplaining group. When the solution is not provided, generally they will improvise as in the case of this semipermanent fixture at the bus stop across from the Waldbaum Shopping Center in Mattituck. It's a good-looking solution, and there

are plenty of shopping carts available just across the road.

MS. GLASSER:

These two benches were built by two different people. The one on the left hand of the screen was built by a man who takes the bus to work every day but because of a physical disability can't stand for the time it can take to wait for the bus. He did not want to be identified, but he did mention that it wouldn't be a bad thing if there was something over the bench when it rains. The bench on the right has only been there for a couple of weeks. Do you feel a trend building?

MR. BATUELLO:

For the past year and a half, we've been talking to anybody who'd listen about bus shelters. We usually get a blank stare at first, and then when people get what we're actually talking about they usually say something like, "Well, yeah, why would that even be an issue? It seems so simple," until we started talking to the people that can actually do something about this. Every person on the Transportation Committee for Southold Town has assured us how difficult it will be to get shelters erected. They tell us that they've been struggling for years. There's a small but vocal bit of pushback in the Hamlet of Southold itself. If you talk to the person in question long enough as we've had the opportunity to do, you'll realize that what she's opposed to is not necessarily the shelters themselves but the kind of people she believes will be under them. We feel that there is significant support for this project among the quieter and less-vocal residents. With this in mind, we're collecting signatures on a petition and feel that while we couldn't get 1,000 photos we will have over 1,000 signatures in the next couple of weeks.

MR. SHAFFERY:

The main reason we are here today is to greater understand what we should be doing in order to get this project moving forward. Is it figuring out property issues, raising money or just being a constant physical reminder to you, the good folks at the County Legislature, that shelter is a basic human need, and we are falling sadly short of our responsibility to shelter a vulnerable segment of our population from the elements. It seems like a very simple issue, and yet we are aware that within governmental channels it is more complex than we realized. We ask that you, the Public Works & Transportation Committee, help us. What are the next steps that we can take to be helpful to you? We ask for your guidance and help, and we look forward to seeing you again. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Just wait there, see if anyone on the Committee has any questions for you.

LEG. MURATORE:

Great job. I really appreciate you young people taking time out of your days and your studies and come here and talk to us adults who maybe can do something here. You know, I'm a big bus person. I see a lot of people in my district using the bus and how important it is, and this past winter it's been heck out there with the standing in the street waiting for buses. So, you know, I assure the Committee's going to look this over and if at all possible -- you know, money's always an issue, but I know Brookhaven is partnering with some people, right, to do some advertising on the bus shelters. They're going to put them up, and we're going to get some free shelters. So, maybe it'll come over into Southold, and maybe even Southold can do something like that; maybe partner up with some people and say, "Well, you advertise on the shelter, and we'll" -- you know, "You can put up and put your signs there as long as you keep it nice and you get the people to enjoy it," but again, great job. You're carrying a great message. Just keep it up, okay? Thank you.

MR. BATUELLO:

Thank you very much for your support. One thing that we really strongly believe is that there's no way that any Southold resident would allow advertising on bus shelters. We -- we're aware of the deal with Brookhaven Town, but we don't believe that it'll work in Southold.

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, have you tried? Did you go in, and did you do a presentation before the Southold Board and --

MR. BATUELLO:

We will. We're meeting with Southold Town on April 1st to discuss -- we have the locations written out, but we're going to discuss property issues and things that the Town are involved in.

LEG. MURATORE:

Well, give it a shot, you know. Maybe they'll listen to a younger people. Maybe the Town fathers will listen to the younger people and pay heed to what they want to present, okay? Good luck.

MR. BATUELLO:

Excellent. We'll give it a try. Thank you.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, excellent job. I enjoyed the presentation and thank you for your efforts. I'm sure that when you guys undertook this project you had a certain idea as to how it was going to go. Just be interested -- it's a question I always ask our young people when they get involved in such an important project like this one, if there's anything that you felt was a big surprise to you. Was there something that was very different than what you thought it was going to be when you first undertook the effort?

MR. SHAFFERY:

It's certainly more difficult. And as I mentioned earlier, we weren't expecting it to be so difficult to gather pictures. I mean, that was supposed to be the first step of our project. That was supposed to be kind of the first year, but it ended up being very, very difficult, and, you know, we learned a lot about the people who ride the bus, and there's -- I mean, we obviously knew that there was a need for it when we -- when we initiated the project, but it seems like there's a pretty significant need for it, and there are a lot of people that ride the bus.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

MR. BATUELLO:

Yeah. We had -- I mean, we had some idea of the processes that we would need to go through. So, there weren't big surprises in that case.

MS. GLASSER:

I didn't think it would take as long as it has. Like, if I -- the process, I mean, like, planning and all of this stuff that we had to go through to plan the meetings and the dates and how many snow days we went through, but I'm glad -- what's going on here.

LEG. STERN:

Good.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Well, I think, you know, I'm really glad that you came here. You did a great job. I know my colleagues are impressed with the level of not only the work that you did but your commitment to this, and I know from experience with the previous bus shelters in Southold it was difficult getting the first couple up, but once people see what they look like, I think acceptance would come a lot easier. So, I know you can work with me on this, and certainly Commissioner Anderson is going to

be very -- play an obviously important role, and we'll stay in touch, and if someone from DPW can go to that Transportation Committee Meeting in Southold it'd be a lot better to get all your questions answered.

MR. BATUELLO:

We would love that. Thank you.

MS. GLASSER:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Before we start with -- there's a -- there's a presentation on the feasibility study for the conversion of the former Foley Nursing facility, but before we start that I do have one more card for Ron Beattie.

MR. BEATTIE

Hello, thank you for seeing me late. I'm sorry. Hi, George. I'm Ron Beattie. I'm from Oakdale, New York. I'm co-chair of the New York State Rising Community Reconstruction Plan in Oakdale and West Sayville, and I understand that one of the things that's under your consideration today is for the dredging of the Grand Canal, and I wanted to be clear that that's not something that we included in our plan, but it's something that -- our plan calls for improving the health of our wetlands, and in the extent -- to the extent that the canal abuts the Remmer-Pickman Wetlands, that's something that is in our plan and that we're going to have some people take a look at in terms of doing the study to improve the flow of water in and out of there. To the extent that we're doing that, I would encourage a joint study to take a look at what the dredging of the canal might do to that plan as well. My only points.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Does anyone have any questions about the -- or do you want to wait until we get to the resolution about the Grand Canal? I know there was a request from DPW to take this resolution out of order. Is it still -- would you like to take this resolution out of order?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, sir, I would, please.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. I -- I'll make a motion to take IR 1197 out of order. All in favor? Opposed? All right.
(Vote: 5-0-0-0)

Could -- yeah, could you come up, Commissioner? Thank you. All right.

IR 1197, Amending the 2014 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with dredging of County Waters (CP 5200). (Lindsay).

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Is that a motion?

LEG. MURATORE:

Yeah, I'll make a motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Is there a second? Is there a second? Legislator Browning, thank you. All right. If we could get -- on the motion, if we could get Commissioner Anderson to give us a overview of the proposal.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you and thanks for taking this out of order. This specific project has been an ongoing discussion as one of the gentlemen who spoke before mentioned. Over the course of the years, we've looked at it from -- and we were directed by the Dredge Project Screening Committee to look at this pursuant to public health. There are -- at the time, there were ten criteria. Nine of them primarily dealing with navigation, one dealing with public health.

What we have -- since internally we've been dealing with vector control and Health Department. We've been advised that -- and in discussions with the -- with Department of Environmental Conservation, that to declare a health emergency in this area would be a very big lift, but what we are doing since there is now an 11th criteria which deals with the environmental health of a water body, we -- and right now primarily the Health Department has gone out to request proposals from consulting engineers and environmental groups to study this issue. \$200,000 was put towards this task by Bill Lindsay, Sr. We went out; we got proposals in; we've selected a consultant in reviewing the bid; the cost estimate. They need an additional \$120,000, I believe, and that's what this resolution calls for, is for that additional funding to be able to procure the engineering services to do that report so the canal can be determined whether dredging will be an environmental benefit for it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So, the proposal is to -- for -- is to look at the dredging or to look at the water quality?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, it's to look at -- well, the proposal is actually for additional funds to be able to study the -- whether dredging would have an environmental benefit to the canal, would improve its environmental health.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

'Cause we heard just earlier at this committee how there's a lot of cesspools that overflow into the canal and how there's a sewage treatment plant there, might or might not have an impact on the water quality in the Canal. Now, is that something that the study is looking at also, the inputs into the Canal?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would defer that question to Chris Lubicich from the Department of Health. He can probably provide more detail on exactly what the study will involve.

MR. LUBICICH:

Good afternoon. I'm Chris Lubicich -- okay, Chris Lubicich from the Suffolk County Health Department. The study is going to look -- we'll revisit the public health issue, but we'll also be looking at the requirement for the Health Department to certify if there's an ecological problem, okay. We'll be looking at the canal; we'll be looking at the wetlands associated with it. The sewage treatment plant, I did recently look into that when issues were raised, and it's actually very -- it's performing well. It's located just north of the wetlands, and in 2005 there was -- there was no evidence of any raw sewage coming into the Canal. What you do have is - and everybody is aware of - is in general the fact that you have cesspools and septic systems that are increasing the nutrient loads onto the surface water bodies, and you do have contributory nitrogen loading from the groundwater to any water body like this. This request for proposal did not specifically ask the consulting firm to look into the impact of the -- the cesspools of the treatment plant. It's to look at

the overall quality of the water, of the benthic environment, the microorganisms, the fishery and, you know, give a status of the current ecology of the Canal and the associated wetlands.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Is there -- is there going to be an effort to monitor coliform bacteria counts before and after and also any other inputs that would come in -- besides nitrogen, that would come in through a septic system? There are tests for those.

MR. LUBICICH:

Yes. That's where it would be part of the water-quality evaluation. It also includes a value -- well, a study the storm-water inputs into the Canal.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Has any -- so this would be a part of -- what town is this in?

MR. LUBICICH:

Town of Islip.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Is there -- do they have an active MS4 program?

MR. LUBICICH:

I don't know. I don't have contact with them on that issue.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Would this -- I mean, would this be, like, in conjunction with an MS4 program because no matter how deep -- obviously, no matter how deep you dredge anything if you're going to get that input, high input, whether it's from storm-water runoff or it's from, you know, failing septic systems, you're never going to improve the water quality.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, that's something we could look at in the report, you know, to look at what's the Town's MS4 system is and see what type of waterways, you know, or what type of road drainage that might go into that water body. That's not, I don't believe, a terrible lift, a big lift for the consultants who'll be doing the work.

MR. LUBICICH:

Yeah. That's included in -- looking at the storm-water inputs is -- that's included.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Anyone have any questions? Ladies first.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Gil, so, you know, when I'm listening to the comments I'm thinking of the Forge River all over again, and I hate to think that we're going to have a new Forge River. You know, the gentlemen made a couple of comments, I guess, that the -- I guess basically that the County was the ones who have, I guess, failed in what they're supposed to do, but the waterway and the ground on that waterway belongs to the Town of Islip; am I correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It actually belongs to both -- well, a number of agencies as well as the residences that border the waterway as well. So, there's a whole multitude of owners that own that bottom, and one of the things that I would say is -- is to keep in mind that Public Works dredges primarily for navigation

and for public benefit, and they're -- you know, as much the argument has been made to -- that there, you know, there would be public benefit, it did not meet the criteria of the Dredge Screening Committee, and we are looking with this report to try to identify whether the dredging would provide an environmental benefit for this Canal.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. And the spoils, obviously you're testing the spoils to see what kind of contamination if any, which I'm assuming there probably is. Have you got spoil sites identified for --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That would be -- that would be really more in the later phases at this -- at this time. We're --

LEG. BROWNING:

Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Once we identify whether there would be an environmental benefit we would have to look towards either Town of Islip or the community or somewhere to find some type of, you know -- if it's contaminated, we'd have -- it'd have to be disposed of properly or contained. So, but we're not there yet.

LEG. BROWNING:

Well, I think you know based on experience in my own district, I don't think it's something that you'd be waiting on, that starting to look at identifying spoil sites might be a good idea because, you know, the Town of Islip is going to take it into their landfill, you know, if the residents have a location where they need to put it because I know that there's not a lot of places to put the spoils, and I guess depending on what the spoils show up being like. So, anyway, no, I appreciate it, but I thank you for giving us the information from the residents at the Grand Canal, but I'm hoping it doesn't turn into being another Forge River type story.

MR. LUBICICH:

The project does include getting a sampling plant, sediment sampling plant approved by the DEC and then carrying out that sampling plant and testing. That way -- getting it approved by the DEC should -- it should be able to be used for any subsequent dredging application.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you, sorry. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Did I hear you correctly when you said that the project did not qualify for dredging but that this environmental analysis being undertaken -- am I understanding it correctly that the environmental analysis is critical to determining whether or not they'll be a dredging project? Is this -- is going forward and dredging contingent on the results of this analysis?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It is.

LEG. STERN:

And so, ultimately, the -- has there been an analysis on what the ultimate cost would be for the dredging project if it went forward?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, there hasn't.

LEG. STERN:

That has not been done at all?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. But given the size of the Canal, the confines of the immediate area, it wouldn't be -- it would be expensive, probably over a million dollars.

LEG. STERN:

I see here the offset is 1755.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. STERN:

Money. Is -- this is the first offset in this budget year.

MS. MOSS:

That's correct. A million dollars was adopted in 1755. This is for 120. So, there would be a balance of 880,000.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. Thank you. And then ultimately is this -- the environmental analysis going to take?

MR. LUBICICH:

I'm looking at about a year.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you.

MR. LUBICICH:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

What's the physical scope of the project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You mean the -- like, the actual physical geography? Chris.

I'm assuming that's -- it's from -- the Grand Canal actually starts and finishes in the Connetquot River. It's a big U, I'm assuming.

MR. LUBICICH:

Right. There's a -- there's a north-south section.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Is it 300 feet long; is it 3,000 feet long; is it 50 feet wide; is it 250 feet wide?

MR. LUBICICH:

I think it's 8,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I think that that sounds about right.

MR. LUBICICH:
8,000.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
How wide?

MR. LUBICICH:
It varies. I think somewhere in the 2005 report it said around average of 20 feet, but it -- it varies quite a bit.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Is this manmade, and if so, when?

MR. LUBICICH:
It was manmade when Vanderbilt owned the property down there, and it was -- I believe it was hand dug. Anecdotally that's what I've heard. It was hand dug, and they used it for Vanderbilt to use.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Has it ever been maintenance dredged since it was dug?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Not by the --

MR. LUBICICH:
The 2005 report said no, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No.

MR. LUBICICH:
Not by this department.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And if it doesn't meet the criteria for Suffolk County so that public funds can be used, would this information that you're going to get, would that be available if the Town or private-property owners decided to fund their own dredging project for their own purposes? So, could they use that in order to get a DEC permit to conduct the operation?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Certainly. They might have to FOIL it, but I would believe that it's public information.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

MR. LUBICICH:
Well, you have the two criterias that apply to the Health Department, the public health and overall ecology of -- and if the Health Department certifies either a public health hazard or a, you know, significant environmental issue, that does allow for County funds to be used for dredging.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So, what criteria do they use?

MR. LUBICICH:

So, Criteria 6 is the public health criteria, and Criteria 11 is the environmental, ecological criteria. Specifically?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Specifically.

MR. LUBICICH:

These are the dredge criteria. Criteria 6 is the reduction of the risk of public health problems based upon a certification by the Suffolk County Department of Health Services that public health would be protected by dredging for the particular year the channel is proposed to be dredged. That's Criteria 6. Criteria 11 is improvement of the environmental, ecological health and/or marine productivity based upon a certification from the Suffolk County Department of Health Services Office of Ecology or the Suffolk County Department of Environment & Energy. Such determinations shall consider factors including but not limited to flow rates, contaminant levels, nitrogen levels, phosphorous levels, coliform levels, algal growth rates, salinity levels, Ph levels, dissolved oxygen, water temperature, oxygen levels and other such considerations that may jeopardize the health of the marine ecology or productivity.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

But are they specific parameters that need to be met, say, dissolved oxygen, if it said that this level today, and the proposal is to dredge, and it's going to increase to this level, are there -- is there a certain threshold there that could or is supposed to be met before those funds, public funds can be used, or is it just --

MR. LUBICICH:

Not in the criteria itself.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So, who makes that decision?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I think the argument has to be made by the consultant in the report that -- that the criteria or that the dredging would result in increased oxygen levels, increased improvement of the environmental health of the Canal. That still has to go -- remember, it still has to go back before the Dredge Project Screening Committee.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

MR. LUBICICH:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Anyone else have any questions? So, I have a motion and second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. *(Vote: Approved 5-0-0-0)*

And we have one more presentation, the Department of Public Works is going to give a presentation on the feasibility study for conversion of the former John Jay Foley Skilled Nursing Facility.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you for taking the time for this. I appreciate your patience while we set up.

Okay, well, thank you for the time to provide this. We were asked to present a brief presentation on the results of our study, the study, the conversion study for the former John Jay Foley Skilled Nursing Facility in Yaphank. Under Resolution 757 of 2013, the Department was asked to look at two potential reuses of the building; one as a jail facility, and the other as a substance-abuse treatment facility.

The existing facility - thank you - consists of five floors, 180,000 square-foot gross area, 240 beds. It's a Construction Type 1B, occupancy classification I-12. I'm sorry, I-2. Structural design, live load at 40 pounds per square foot, fire sprinklers, fire alarm and fire pump. It has 304 parking spaces. The next slide you'll see here before you is the current typical layout of a floor. There are -- I think it's -- okay. You can see the individual rooms with a central corridor there with the nursing station central to the overall floor and generally a dayroom on each floor for the patients to spend time during the course of the day.

Proposed Correctional Center use looked -- was to look at in replacement of the current Phase II project over at the Yaphank facility, adding 360 inmates. Population based on the Yaphank Jail expansion. That would result in a Construction Type 1B, an occupancy classification of 1-3. The structural design live loading of a hundred and -- a hundred pounds per square foot. An integrated access control and security system as well as site security enhancements such as an outside day area; things that you see on the current jail expansion now.

The next -- this slide here, you'll see what we developed as a typical floor layout. The cells -- there it is. The cells on the perimeter of the floor similar to the rooms when it was a health center, there would be a central core monitoring station - There are two per floor - where the sheriff or the correction officer could look down and see the doors, not necessarily the same level as in the current configuration over at Yaphank where from the central point you can see into every cell, but it does provide the best given the layout. This central area here would be a support area, whether it's some type of day area or, you know, possibly some other use, excuse me, as well.

So, the cost factors we looked at were increased structural loading requirements, the endoskeleton installation, air handling and building management systems, thank you. At the end of -- or at the end of their useful life over in the Foley, and we would -- they would have to be replaced. All HVAC, electric, fire alarms, plumbing system and equipment at Yaphank Jail, the size for Phase II but too remote to furnish over at the Foley. The building would require redundant functions of an infirmary, a control room, a library, a chapel, visiting and kitchen and laundry, and site building integrated with security system would be required, and there would be required a sanitary macerator, which is basically just a -- what we call a muffin monster, but it basically grinds down the waste as it leaves.

Synergies, the reuse of the existing 1,500 kilowatt emergency generator could be used. Could reuse the existing 6,100 MBH - and we'll leave it at that - gas boilers. The existing water, sanitary, electrical services are adequately sized. We possibly could reuse the existing kitchen which serves about 800 meals per day capacity and the laundry, but that would have to still be determined. Create a common site security entrance to both jails, and then the minimal new parking would be needed.

Parameters, we looked at the corrections center as a whole. The \$400 per square foot is based on -- through means, which is a standard industry document. This was based out of New York City costs for similar type of structure. Added in there is \$115 per square foot for demolition. It would be selective demolition because, again, we're holding within the existing square -- within the existing footprint of the building. There's \$50 in there for structural improvements. Keep in mind that the

loading is significantly greater with a security facility because the -- the building right now is designed for a medical building. The walls are not the same as you would need for a security facility. It's like going -- well, it is going from, you know, wallboard and metal studs to concrete on -- you know, whether it's block or poured concrete. There would be a cost for seismic loading, which is now required pursuant to New York State law which wasn't at the time we built the building. That's another \$20 a square foot. There would be site modifications. By that, we don't mean the parking area. What we're talking about is a day area, creating day areas and secure areas where -- where inmates could potentially go and -- and recreate, and then the last -- because it is anticipated that the project would take in the range of three to five years, we have escalation costs. There's contingency. Contingency is based on the fact that this is a cursory number, and you want to -- it's a ten percent contingency, which is not unreasonable given the stage of this project. And then lastly, the consultant costs, and that adds on to -- all those three add on to \$206 per square foot, which brings to the grand total of \$811 per square foot. In comparison, the Phase I of the Yaphank Jail, without including the furnishings, fixtures and equipment as well as the mechanical, electrical and plumbing equipment was \$504 per square foot.

Similarly, we looked at the substance-abuse treatment facility. The criteria - I'll go through quickly here - was to reuse existing 240 beds for a treatment facility. It's the same occupancy as a nursing home, which is an I-2. You'd have to provide a secure pharmacy, and there would be some other cosmetic upgrades that would be required and some security upgrades. But in all, it would be minimal interior renovations. We would still have to do the HVAC and the -- and building management system replacement because they have come to the end of their serviceable life; however, given these and the minimal amount of interior renovations and exterior renovations that would be required, the cursory budget here is \$100 per square foot. Again, before I -- before I ask for any questions, this is a report based on strictly an engineering -- and architectural questions, and if you have any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I -- Legislator Browning, questions?

LEG. BROWNING:

I don't have the other report with me, but there was -- if you could explain 'cause not my expertise. What is live loading, and what's dead loading? There was three, and I forgot what the third one is. What does that mean?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Live loading -- okay. Dead loading is a deadweight in simple terms. It's -- you put a desk on an area, and there's a certain weight that gets distributed by the floor, and then the -- then the supports in that. Live loading is people coming in and out, things like that that are temporary and that move.

LEG. BROWNING:

And, you know, the building -- I think I understand if it's to be a -- if you were going to convert into a jail, jails have cinderblock walls where this is probably mostly, you know, like a -- what do you call it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Standard construction for lack of a better term.

LEG. BROWNING:

Board, yeah. But the other part when you talk about the rehabilitation, the substance-abuse treatment facility, have you had conversation with the sheriff and what he was looking at? Because I did have a conversation with him when in -- he saw, you know, this hundred dollars a square foot,

and I don't think he's quite looking at it in the same context that you are, and, let's say, if we were to take the Foley Nursing Home and contract with a nonprofit, it's not going to be a jail type treatment facility. So, I would assume that how it stands right now would be acceptable, and again, the issue is is that -- I know in my conversation with him there are people who are sentenced to treatment facilities, and sometimes - it's my understanding - they don't necessarily go to a treatment facility. If they're sentenced to a treatment facility and there's no beds, sometimes they do wind up in the jail until there's treatment facility available for them and, you know -- so, if they're in a Phoenix House or Seafield they can -- they can sign themselves out and walk out any time, but obviously they're going to go back to court. So, I don't know that what you're saying here with the hundred dollars a square foot - which I think it equated to about \$18,000,000; am I correct - for renovation, that that is necessarily what the sheriff was talking about. So, I think there should be a part three to this.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And I'm sure there will be, but at -- I mean, this is -- again, this is looking at it from an engineering standpoint. The renovations would still be need -- need to be done. There's certain -- certainly, the sheriff is going to want some. If it's -- if it goes to the sheriff or of it goes to -- if it's decided some other way to refuse this facility, there -- you know, we have to anticipate there's going to be some interior renovations. The -- sorry. The pharmacy would need to be secured. Right now, it's, you know -- there -- there's nothing that's stopping anybody from going in there. You know, that would, you know, not be -- you would need to do that. Again, it's minimal. We still have to do the HVAC and the BMS replacement. There are costs involved with this no matter what we do, and, you know, we're just anticipating this as part of the report.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Well, I -- you know, I'd like to follow up with the sheriff to see what he was looking at, and I know we had the issue with the snow where Father Frank was wanting to go take a tour, and, you know, maybe it's something not as secure that he was looking at, you know, with this here. So, I -- and again, who did this report? Did you have an engineer accompany --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. This was done in house.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

These two gentlemen here.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I think you did a nice job in house. It's very --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

It's pretty comprehensive. Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:

Thank you. I thank the Committee for allowing me to be here today. I'm not on the Committee, but I appreciate the time to ask the questions. And, Gil, I'm going to get to kind of what Legislator Browning was getting to because I wanted to get a better handle of exactly what we were talking about in terms of a drug-rehab facility in terms of what you're looking to put into it, to get a better

handle of exactly what is it that our estimates are in this report. So, when you talk about security upgrades, what are you talking about with that; is it just maybe some checkpoints at the floors, or what exactly does that mean?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It may be something as simple as camera systems, you know, some small type of security station, you know, obviously not to stop anybody. Again, this would all be flushed out as we -- if this was the direction that's eventually taken --

LEG. CALARCO:

These are just rough estimates?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

But it's more along the lines of what kind of facility you would have, say, at, like, Sagamore or South Oaks or some of these other facilities.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, yeah, outpatient type of facility, yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. So, it's not looking at something where you may have the courts remanding people to the -- to an inpatient program - just hear me out for a minute - where, you know, maybe they have a weekend reporting where they have to go in and be there for the weekend but they get to come out during the days to go to work and, say, those kinds of things during the week, but on Saturdays and Sundays they have to turn themselves in. That would require a more extensive security apparatus.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't know to what extent it would -- how much more it would take. Again, this -- you're comparing a facility for incarceration full-time as a jail would be as compared to that. There may be some lessening of a security.

LEG. CALARCO:

Well, I guess, like, take the DWI facility that we have, right, that's more or less a trailer in a sense, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. CALARCO:

And it's not anything extensive. Would the alterations you're looking at under the drug-rehab center for the Foley facility meet the needs that you -- that we have for the DWI facility, or would it need to be a more secure facility than that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. That should -- I mean, it should be fine for that. What we're looking at right now is sufficient to get it to that point.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

LEG. BARRAGA:

Just a couple of questions. It seems, you know, as I look at this, the feasibility of the correctional facility seems not feasible at all based on \$811 a square foot. Now, you're talking about \$100 a square foot in terms of substance-abuse treatment facility, and you're saying that's \$18,000,000. The question is: Where do we get the money for any of this? It's my -- it was my impression the administration wants to sell this building and sell the grounds. Is there a request for proposal out there? Wasn't there -- what, didn't somebody respond to that? I remember reading a figure of 11.5 million dollars.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, sir.

LEG. BARRAGA:

If the administration is moving in that direction, why are we spending so much time on these alternate plans which do not seem feasible? Even if they were feasible to some degree, we don't have the money to do any of this.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's a very good question.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I guess I'll answer a little bit of that, is that my conversation with the sheriff is, is that we have so many people sitting in the jail that really don't belong there, that he -- there, they have people with drug problems that basically need to be in rehab. We don't have enough rehab beds. That's the big problem, and how much we spend, it's about \$270 a day for a jail cell versus rehab which is going to be less expensive. So, what he's looking to do is to say let's minimize the size of this new Phase II that we have to build, which I think is, what, about 130 million; am I correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe a little less than that. About 120, yeah, thereabout.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. \$120,000,000 to build a Phase II, and if he can reduce even the size of these two then we win. Again, whatever we do here, whether we sell it -- if we sell it for \$11,000,000, okay, minus what the consultant gets, now we have to build Phase II of a jail, and if we had to put 18 million into this for a rehab facility and it reduces the amount of beds that we're going to have to build in the Phase II of the jail we save. You can say, okay, we're going to take that \$11,000,000. That's the one shot that we're going to get to fill up our financial woes; however, now we're going to use a credit card to build Phase II, and we're just passing the buck to the next generations, and if there's a way that we can use this facility and use it wisely and reduce the number of beds in the jail, I think we can win. I just don't see spending all this money on a Phase II of a jail when we could maybe -- maybe we can do a half of that, half that size. We'll save money. You can't keep bonding when -- how many times do we hear about bonding and bonding? That's one of our biggest problems right now that we have, is that unfunded mandate of a jail. We've just finished the Phase I. It's cost us a fortune, you know. Now that debt is being passed on to your kids, and now we're going to have a new debt of Phase II, pass that on to your kids. So, if there's a way that we can configure this into our Phase II part, why shouldn't we be looking at it?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and maybe through the chair to Legislator Browning or to our DPW professionals in following the logic and its identifiable need, the question to you. Legislator Browning, or to anybody in the administration: To what extent if any has anyone had a meaningful conversation with the State, as you mentioned that we are under a State mandate. Is that a feasible position for us to take assuming that numbers work and that programmatically it works? Is this indeed something that may in a realistic way put us in a position where we can have that kind of negotiation with the State to reduce what the requirement would be on Phase II?

LEG. BROWNING:

Actually, the State did come down. I was with them when they toured the facility. I'm not sure if any of you guys were there. And obviously there are, you know -- they were very surprised when they saw the building. They were thinking of -- that they were going to see something totally different than what they saw, and I don't think it's always necessarily the State. Part of it is - and I know the sheriff has had conversations - we have drug court, we have mental-health court, we have the veterans court, and a lot of it is to do with the judges and not necessarily the State because when somebody's being sentenced, where are they being sentenced to? And that's up to the judges and not necessarily the Commissioner of Corrections. So, if we had a facility where rather than sending people to jail sending them to an intensive rehab, it's better for the person who's been arrested and charged, and it's better for us because we're putting less people in jail. You know, you know yourself, jails don't rehab people. They just don't work. So, and we talk about recidivism, you know, you heard the County Executive talk about it at the State of the County Address. We have to be doing something. We need to do something different because what's been done is not working. So, I think using our drug court or veteran court and our mental-health courts, and I know that the sheriff has had the conversations with them, that if we had somewhere to send them I believe that they would be more than happy to send them there.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Rob.

LEG. CALARCO:

Thank you. Gil, I had a couple more questions for you because the conversation has kind of got me thinking of other things. What is -- say we were not to do the renovations for the facility to be usable? We'll put out an RFP to entities to come in and use the space, maybe we'll even be willing to divvy it up, maybe we'll use, you know, Father Frank to do some inpatient services, and we'll find somebody else who could do some outpatient services, and maybe there's two or three other uses that might be able to use the building. It's a pretty, pretty big building. What is it that we would need to make in terms of investment just to get the building ready for that so that, you know, whoever wants to come in and use it, if they want to do outpatient or inpatient work, you know, maybe they can foot the bill to do whatever modifications they might need to do that. What is the lowest level of investment we need to make to get the building up and running again?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At the very least, I would say we have to redo the HVAC and the building management systems. Those are -- again, not to harp on this, they are up on their useful serviceable life. They need to be replaced. I couldn't even give you a cost. I mean, I don't -- about five to eight million just to replace them.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

So.

LEG. CALARCO:

So, so, to just -- that's what we would need to make the building ready to be used again.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

From what I recall, I mean, there'd be some other things. We'd have to replace a couple of doors, entranceways only because that -- when we had to secure it we had to do, you know --

LEG. CALARCO:

So, there's some other basic cosmetic-type improvement?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. Ceilings are probably going to be an issue too only because in letting the building sit we have had, you know, the environmental systems on, but they -- you know, with nobody in it and keeping it -- the temperature restrictions lightened a little bit, you know, it'll get a little bit hotter and get a little bit colder.

LEG. CALARCO:

You mean the ceiling tiles?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

So, with -- again, probably a little more than that. If we said \$8,000 or -- I mean \$8,000,000, sorry, that would, you know -- that might be a little bit more palatable, but again, without knowing who's going to go in there, what the purpose is, you know, it's all conjecture right now.

LEG. CALARCO:

And what would be the cost - and I understand this is really just kind of throwing things out there - but what would be the potential cost, say, to divvy up the building, and, say, we were only going to give, you know, the top floor to one unit and the second floor to another unit, what would we -- what would be -- what would we need to do in order to make those divisions within the building?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Really, I'd let my guys here saying that it would depend on use, it really would. It depends on who's going in, where they're going to go, type of access they need, you know. Again, each floor is a little bit different. I mean, not every floor, I don't believe, had --

LEG. CALARCO:

Is it viable to divvy it up by floor, divvy it up by wing maybe?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, it's --

LEG. CALARCO:

Without too much effort?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's -- well, I mean, it can be done. I mean, similarly, you know, you can build it into a jail. You can do anything. Engineering-wise, we can do anything, you know, but it's the money and what the final, you know, decision is made as to what type of use it's going to be. You know, certainly the building is much more favorable towards the medical use than obviously a jail or even an office but --

LEG. CALARCO:

I would imagine if we found an entity that wanted to come in and, say, use a portion for an adult-daycare program that wouldn't be a very heavy lift for them since we've -- it was already established with doing that kind of a service or maybe some outpatient dialysis, which is also something we were doing there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, as far as I know right now, we've had two tests; one that the -- to look at these two, and I believe the Legislature, you know, directed that the building be sold. So, beyond that -- and I'm not trying to be snarky. It's just this is -- you know, we don't have anything really --

LEG. CALARCO:

I guess the way I'm looking at it is if we could find -- if we could divvy the building up and we could find one or two uses that are, let's say, more profitable than others, that might be able to help us carry the cost of doing some of the renovations we have to do while also giving us the flexibility to give some space to provide for programs that are needed but are not exactly profitable.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, off the top of my head, you would have to look at a central core, central access, then getting up to the different floors. You know, there is some modifications that would have to be done to the interior based on multiple uses. Again, it could be done. It's just determining what those uses are and getting the money to do it.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. Thanks, Gil.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator, final comment.

LEG. MURATORE:

I'm a little confused. I don't know who to answer this question, to ask you or to ask Kate or to the Commissioner. What are we building here? Are we going to do a jail, or are we going to do a drug-rehab center; are we going to do mental rehab? Who's going to work there? Are County employees going to work there or private-sector employees going to work there? Are we going to commingle everybody? I mean, I'm really lost here. I don't know what we're doing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This was really just from an engineering perspective. We were told to look at what the cost would be to convert the building from its current or previous use, which is the nursing home, to a jail and/or a substance-abuse facility, and that's what we looked at. Anything as far as operations, you

know, you would have to discuss with the sheriff's office, and I don't believe there's any plan right now to do much of anything with the building.

LEG. MURATORE:

'Cause to convert that building from civilian to jail has got to be -- and like you're saying, \$811,000,000 here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Multiply that times --

LEG. MURATORE:

You've got a 20 percent cost overrun. So, you're talking of what, billions? Is that 800,000,000 plus two -- 200,000,000 more? Is that --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's 811 square -- dollars per square foot.

LEG. MURATORE:

So, what's the cost then? What's the actual -- what's the bottom-line cost? What would then multiply that out to?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

About 140,000,000. I don't know. Hold on.

LEG. MURATORE:

So, you're looking at about 150, 150,000,000 with cost overrun and everything.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

146 -- 146,000,000

LEG. MURATORE:

All right. So, 160, 170 with cost overrun, okay. Plus furniture and everything else.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's right. I mean, this doesn't include furniture and, you know, operations. There's a whole big factor too, but again, I would defer that to the sheriff.

LEG. MURATORE:

I got you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay, final word.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I -- no offense to DPW in putting it together, but I would like a second opinion on, you know, the report. And don't forget, this is in place of. This idea was to replace building Phase II. So, the Phase II as 120. If -- and again, having the conversation with the Commissioner of Corrections, with the courts, with the sheriff is: Can we reduce that 120-million-dollar Phase II jail, and if we were to put 18,000,000 into this for a drug rehabilitation and it was to take away that Phase II, and, say, the Commissioner of Corrections came, we win. It's better for us to not have to build that

Phase II. And again, that's the conversations that still have to be finished up and need to continue, but again, I'm not saying that we're not going to have to build Phase II. We, you know -- they may just turn around and say, "No, you're building it anyway." I get that, but if the opportunity is there for the Sheriff to have that conversation with the Commissioner and say, "Hey, listen, now that we have this new facility, I could take" -- and in my last conversation with the sheriff, he says he could take two hundred people out of the jail right now that should be in drug rehab. That's a -- that's a lot of empty beds now in the jail, and he's not a -- I know he's got the variances, but he's not sending anybody Upstate right now, he's not sending anybody out of Suffolk County right now. So, I think we should be looking at it and the need for, you know, what -- working on recidivism, working on the drug problem here. Sending the people to jail is not solving our problems. So, if we can save a lot of money on bonding Phase II, I think it's always worth looking at.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. There's no other questions. Thank you, you're very informative. All right, back to the regular agenda, tabled resolutions.

IR 1117, Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law prohibiting the sale and use of hydraulic fracturing byproducts. (Spencer) I make a motion to table for public hearing. All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1160, Approving Cross Bay Ferry License for the Fire Island Ferries, Incorporated. (Pres. Off.) Is there a motion? All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1161, Approving Lateral Ferry License for Fire Island Ferries Incorporated. (Pres. Off.) Same motion? Same second? All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1163, Approving Ferry License for Fire Island Water Taxi, LLC. (Pres. Off.) Same motion? Same second? All in favor? Opposed? **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1177, Appropriating funds in connection with the purchase of sewer facility maintenance equipment (CP 8164). (Co. Exec.) Is there a motion? Motion and a second. Commissioner, any enlightenment here?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. This -- sorry. This resolution asked to appropriate a million dollars for sewer maintenance equipment. We are responsible to annually maintain about 1,250 miles of sewers within not only Sewer District 3, which is Bergen, but the outer districts as well. It would go to plows, trucks. There's a flatbed crane we use, a track loader, some pickups, a truck with a generator crane and then a vacuum/jetting combination truck, which is commonly known as, like, a Vacall, that type of thing.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Anyone have any questions? Okay, we had a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? **Approved (Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1181, Appropriating funds in connection with reconstruction of drainage systems on various County roads (CP 5024). (Co. Exec.) Do I have a motion? Motion by Legislator Muratore. Second by Legislator Stern.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This resolution asked to appropriate \$275,000 for construction in connection with various drainage improvements on various County roads. The larger road projects that we do, we'll take care of and look to upgrade storm drainage when it's needed. This is in the case of a reconstruction that's required in smaller areas, smaller work areas where it's not necessarily attached to road-reconstruction project. It will include the excavation, the repair to the existing drainage structure or the replacement, piping, new concrete or asphalt pavement, the curb, sidewalk and plastics, paving, that type of stuff, but it's not -- it's in connection with smaller localized drainage improvements.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Any questions? Need a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? **Approved**
(Vote: 5-0-0-0)

IR 1182, Appropriating funds in connection with equipment for Public Works Material Testing Laboratory (CP 5141). (Co. Exec.) Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator Muratore. Second by Legislator Barraga.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you. This resolution requests appropriating \$80,000 to purchase equipment for our laboratory. We daily test asphalt and concrete on highway projects. This is particularly important to Federally-aided projects where we have to do it on a daily basis. The two pieces of equipment we're looking for is a ground-penetrating radar device which determines the asphalt thickness and quality as well as a gyratory compactor, and this is used to determine the compaction of the asphalt. As I said, Federal guidance -- guidelines, Federal aid guidelines for the design and approval of construction reimbursement require concurrence of the pavement thickness as well as its compaction.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Any questions? We have a motion and second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved.
(Vote: 5-0-0-0)

IR 1183, Amending the 2014 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Suffolk County Intelligent Transportation System (CP 3308). (Co. Exec.) Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Barraga.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you. This resolution requests appropriations of \$112,500. It's for design of an Intelligent Transportation System, ITS, for arterial monitoring and performance measures. It'd be similar to establishing the IFMS on County roads and would allow better communication, provide drivers with a heads up of traffic patterns on the expressway, Northern State, those types. We would envision eventually tying into the system so that a driver traveling south on Nichols Road has an idea of what he's coming up against coming to the expressway or, you know, if he goes onto Sunrise.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Question, Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gil, in my notes here, I show that our 20 percent would be used for the engineering and the planning --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. STERN:

-- portion, and that the dollar amount is \$112,500.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. We believe -- it wasn't included in the Capital Budget, but we believe that that dollar amount will cover the entire cost of the -- of the engineering?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, sir.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

And what is the timeline and implementation for that project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Hold on. I'll let Bill handle that detail.

MR. HILLMAN:

Bill Hillman, Chief Engineer. Probably 2016 the -- we'd be in construction.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Any other questions? Made a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Approved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1184, Authorizing planning steps for the Voluntary Acquisition of Land and if necessary public hearings pursuant to Article 2 of the Eminent Domain Procedure Law of the State of New York in connection with the acquisition of properties to be acquired for the replacement of a bridge on CR 16, Horseblock Road over the L.I.R.R. and Long Island Avenue, Town of Brookhaven, Suffolk County, New York (CP 5855). (Co. Exec.) Is there -- motion by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Muratore. Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This proposal will allow the Department to undertake Eminent Domain proceedings to acquire easements as well as lands. We're looking at reconstructing the bridge from CR 16, Horseblock Road over the Long Island Railroad and Long Island Avenue. The structure itself needs some realignment, and we will require the land to basically construct the structure over that, and that this allows us to begin negotiations with the landowner for the easements as well as for acquisition of small parcels.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

When was the bridge built?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Any idea, Bill?

MR. HILLMAN:

Again, Bill Hillman, Chief Engineer. I don't have an exact date, but it's roughly 50 or 60 years old.

It's heading towards the end of its useful life. It needs a good rehab.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So, how much land do you need to reconstruct it?

MR. HILLMAN:

The majority of the property is Long Island Railroad property, and I believe most of it's going to be an easement; however, they require that we purchase that from them. So, it should only be a small piece, and I believe it's only the Railroad.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So, it's a Railroad -- they own the fee title, it's not a Railroad easement?

MR. HILLMAN:

No. The structure is ours. That bridge is ours. So, it -- and we're going over the Railroad.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

No. But the property that the Railroad is on, is -- they own the property?

MR. HILLMAN:

That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Any other questions? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. *(Vote: 5-0-0-0)*

IR 1193, Authorizing the purchase of up to 10 paratransit vans for Suffolk Transit and accepting and appropriating Federal and State Aid and County funds (CP 5658). (Co. Exec.) Is there a motion?

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Motion by Legislator Muratore. Second by Legislator Barraga on the motion.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you. This request is for \$550,000 which will allow the County to purchase up to ten paratransit vans for Suffolk Transit. We're -- this will allow us to improve our services to the folks and will help ensure that there are no -- I don't know the right term, but when we had to turn -- you know, if we have to turn people around, it'll allow us to make sure we can give people the rides they need.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Any questions? All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. *(Vote: 5-0-0-0)*

IR 1197, we approved earlier.

IR 1207, Designating July 10th as Nikola Tesla Day in Suffolk County. (Anker) Is there a motion? Motion made by Legislator Barraga. Is there a second?

LEG. BROWNING:

Sure. Why not.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Second by -- an enthusiastic second by Legislator Browning. Is this -- is the Commissioner of Public Works going to answer this question?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Nikola Tesla was a -- an -- for lack of a better term, an associate of Thomas Edison. He worked on electricity. He is -- was for some time established in the Rocky Point --

LEG. BARRAGA:

That's the building, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yup, yup. And that's, I believe, the basis for this, yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:

Isn't there a Tesla in --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There probably is, yeah. I mean, he -- I think he died penniless. Before the -- if need to, at the Legislative meeting I'll give a full report on Nikola Tesla if you want, so.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Maybe next year. Thank you for volunteering though.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1208, Amending the 2014 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with energy conservation at various County facilities (CP 1664). (Co. Exec.)

Is there a motion?

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Motion by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Muratore.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is an annual capital program where we look to do improvements throughout the County. Under the 2014 timetable, we will be looking to utilize analysis to complete space management and performance-management initiatives; replacing window gaskets on various County buildings,

continuation of the energy dashboard control and monitoring installation for large County-owned engineering users, replacement of fluorescent light bulbs. This one we're particularly looking at, replacing long-term rental-building lighting, DC to DC solar lighting demonstration at DPW headquarters, additional Riverhead Jail heating system modifications, chiller replacement at the H. Lee Dennison and the Legislative building, and then complete 100 kilowatt photovoltaic system at the Board of Elections. These projects are expected to produce over \$700,000 in reoccurring savings.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Over -- thank you. Over what time period?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Annually.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Wow. That's really impressive. Does anyone have any questions? All right. What is the DC to DC lighting proposal?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I will refer that one to my chief engineer of facilities or Joe Schroeder or both.

MR. MONAGHAN:

Good afternoon. Our typical photovoltaic projects to date have been direct current to alternating current, right. So, photovoltaic panels generate DC. We have an inverter which provides AC power. We're going to be doing a study on DC to DC, which means that the photovoltaic panels will create DC. We're going to be installing some test lighting circuits which operate off of DC current as well, and we're going to evaluate the efficiency of those in comparison to a DC to AC conversion and look towards the utility to provide us some rebates in the future.

MR. SCHROEDER:

The typical model that's installed in most buildings, you use what power the panels generate, and then what you're not using will feed back into the grid. It's a utility-side model. This is an alternative building model for the solar bizzes, which allows you to use the direct current directly into dedicated circuits within the building; therefore, you're not transferring energy from one form to another. You save efficiencies in terms of the -- on the -- and use side of the equation up to 15 to 30 percent depending on the applications, and it's something that occurs on a customer side of the meter.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, Michael, Joe, thank you for your work on this. And the ongoing savings, are those the result of -- strictly the result of efficiencies that are built in because of these upgrades? To what extent if any are those ongoing savings because of incentives that we participate in or we would be able to participate in?

MR. SCHROEDER:

The gross project costs are offset by incentives initially. We use the annual energy savings calculated at the current cost of energy to determine our recurring annual savings. In this case, in addition to the over 700,000 that would be realized in direct energy savings, is over \$400,000 in maintenance savings on top of that, and annually, debt -- net of debt service, the savings are over a million dollars.

LEG. STERN:

Very good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. No other questions? Thank you very much. So, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Motion passes. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

IR 1247, Requiring installation of carbon monoxide detectors at County Facilities ("The Steve Nelson Safety Act"). (Kennedy) I've got a -- to table. I think there's a request to table this by the sponsor. Okay, motion to table, Legislator Muratore. Is there a second to table?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We had -- if I may, I had spoken with both Legislator Kennedy as well as Legislator Spencer to request that this be tabled for one cycle. There's a lot of questions that we have before we can actually even advise what that cost impact would be to this proposal. We need some clarification. There's a number of concerns we have, and we're -- our hopes is that we can at least define what exactly everybody's looking for before we come back and say it's going to cost X number of dollars. Yeah, just look for one cycle to be tabled. That's all.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I need a second on the motion.

LEG. STERN:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

There was -- I thought he said he wanted to table it for one cycle, yeah. Let's get a -- let's get a -- give me -- no, no, give me -- well, give me a second, and then we can ask the Commissioner again. Do I have a second on the motion to table?

LEG. BROWNING:

He's going to call him.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. The motion's lost then. It will go to the next -- go to the next -- well, we'll come back to it.

IR 1253, Calling a public hearing for the purpose of modifying the plan of service for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 4 - Smithtown Galleria and repealing the terms of inconsistent Resolution Nos. 749-2013 and 1200-2013. (Co. Exec.) Is there a motion?

Motion to approve by Legislator Browning. Is there a second? Second by Legislator Stern. And Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This resolution simply looks to authorize a public hearing to make corrections to previously-legislated approvals and to move forward with the County takeover of the maintenance and operation of the sewage treatment plant within Sewer District No. 4, which is the Smithtown Galleria.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Does anyone have any questions on the motion? All right. No other questions on the IR 1253. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **(Vote: 5-0-0-0)**

Back to **IR 1247**, is there a motion to table?

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion to table.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Motion to table, Legislator Muratore. Is there a second?

LEG. STERN:

I'll second, and my understanding's that this is at the request of the sponsor.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Yes. Second by Legislator Stern. It -- do you want to get any more information on it anyway from the Commissioner since we're here and he's here?

LEG. STERN:

I guess this -- the question to the Commissioner: Commissioner, has there been any financial -- to BRO, has there been any financial impact?

MS. MOSS:

There is a financial impact statement that's filed for this. We came up with an estimate of \$533,000 based on information from the Department of Public Works, which I understand, they do want to have time to clarify some of the unknowns. The 500,000 would be the County; 33,000 approximately for the college.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. So, there's a number that's now associated in at least in some cursory way with the initiative, but at the request of the sponsor he's looking to continue the dialogue with our Commissioner, okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Any other questions? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved.

(Vote: 5-0-0-0)

Any other business? All right, meeting adjourned.

(*The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. *)