PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION AND ENERGY COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Minutes

A meeting of the Public Works, Transportation and Energy 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 April 21, 2014 at 2:00 PM.

Members Present:
Legislator Al Krupski - Chairman
Legislator Tom Muratore - Vice Chair
Legislator Thomas F. Barraga
Legislator Kate M. Browning
Legislator Steven H. Stern

Also In Attendance:
Presiding Officer DuWayne Gregory
Legislator John M. Kennedy, Jr., 12th Legislative District
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature.
Tim Laube - Clerk, Suffolk County Legislature
Joe Schroeder - Budget Review Office
Jill Moss - Budget Review Office
Sarah Lansdale - Director/Department of Planning
Gil Anderson - Commissioner, SC Department of Public Works
Darnell Tyson - Deputy Commissioner/SC Department of Public Works
Cathy Kenny - Associate Director/NYS Petroleum Council
Robert Williams - Briscoe Protective Systems
Neal Lewis - Executive Director, Sustainability Institute at Molloy College
David Berg - Cameron Engineering & Associates
Walter Dawydiak - Director of Environmental Quality, Suffolk County Health Department
Dorian Dale - Suffolk County Department of Community Development
Boris Rukovets - Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:
Kevin Gruebel - Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:
Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide

(THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:00 PM)

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
We'll call the regular Committee meeting to order. Could we stand please for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Muratore.

(*SALUTATION*)

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Welcome to the regular meeting of Public Works, Transportation and Energy. The public portion, I've got two cards. Cathy Kenny, can you come up to the microphone, please. Tim, could you make sure that's on for her.

MR. LAUBE:
I sure will.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

MS. KENNY:
Good afternoon, Chairman Krupski, and Members of the Committee. I'm Cathy Kenny, I'm the Associate Director with the New York State Petroleum Council. The New York State Petroleum Council is the Office of the American Petroleum Institute, which has -- based in Washington and has some 33,35 offices across the United States. We have -- we essentially represent the major producers and refiners of oil and gas in the United States. We represent over 550 member companies including large integrated companies as well as service and supply firms.

We appreciate this opportunity to comment on intro 1117 of 2014, which prohibits the introduction of natural gas waste into any wastewater treatment facility, the sale of natural gas waste within the County and the application of natural gas waste on any road or real property within the County. With your permission I would like to use this time to provide some information about the treatment of waste from oil and gas production as well as the beneficial use of production brine. While there remains perhaps a great deal of controversy in some minds about pending State regulations on permitting high-volume hydraulic fracturing, an issue certainly I can address at another time, there exists in New York long established and comprehensive regulations that cover the disposition of these wastes.

As you are probably aware, under the Revised Draft Supplemental Generic Environmental Impact Statement, I've learned to say that quickly, the SGEIS, DEC has indicated that "data available to date associated with NORM" that's naturally occurring radioactive material "in Marcellus Shale production brine is insufficient to allow road spreading under BUD," the Beneficial Use Determination. Use of waste from conventional hydraulic fracturing, however, is permitted and is currently used in as many as 23 municipalities in the State as well as by the State Department of Transportation. Road spreading of oil and gas brines have been permitted pursuant to DEC regulation for decades under its Beneficial Use Determination Program with its extensive testing and manifest requirements that track materials from source to application. Therefore, such brine that has undergone this vigorous examination process has no discernible difference from salt and saves municipalities considerable money at the same time as it encourages recycling and keeps this waste out of scarce landfill space. Therefore, because this proposal would ban the use of brine from both high-volume as well as conventional hydraulic fracturing waste, we believe it is overly restrictive.

With respect to the bill's ban on the introduction of natural gas waste to any wastewater treatment facility in the County, policymakers should be aware that publicly owned treatment works as well as private wastewater treatment plants are highly regulated and need to undertake what is known as a Headworks Analysis, to show that they can safely pretreat wastes and have the assimilative capacity

to handle the wastewater in order to discharge to -- am I over time?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
No, you keep going, you can finish.

MS. KENNY:
Okay. Most of this is covered in Appendices 21 and 22 of the SGEIS.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Keep going.

MS. KENNY:
It might be worthwhile to distinguish between the types of solid wastes we are talking about in this context. There is solid waste, which can be characterized as sludge or filtrate from treatment of produced water, which may come from a waste treatment water plant. There is waste composed of contaminated soil and general waste. There is solid waste from liner material including waste from the deconstruction of pad size reductions. And there is solid waste from drill cuttings, which are mostly fine particles of rock and shale mixed with small amounts of drilling fluids. All of these wastes are collected transported and disposed of pursuant to both federal and state regulations. We are aware there are some concerns have arisen about the concentration of NORM in these wastes. A study commissioned by one of the areas major waste management companies that has some 500 employees in New York State should help to put those concerns to rest. Its 2009 study showed that the average concentration of Radium 226 in on-site soils was 0.9 pCi/g; for the average drill cuttings was 2.1. To put this in perspective, the EPA standard for surface radium for uranium mill cleanups is 5 pCi/g which is the standard for unrestricted use for property developments such as hospitals and elementary schools.

It is important to note that in addition to the foregoing, the state Pretreated Waste Transporter Permit Program covers such wastes and imposes strict regulatory requirements that cover manifests; placarding of shipments; a system to ensure that the waste is only delivered to an authorized waste site; identification of the type of waste being transported including any testing that may be necessary to determine whether or not the waste is hazardous; maintenance of records of the amount of waste transported to each receiving facility, to name just some of the components of the program. Additionally, the SGEIS has yet to be promulgated covers waste transport in Section 7.1.7 and requires among other things, that as part of a well permit, that the applicant provide a plan for the proper disposal of drilling and production waste. Other plans include, for example, a water supply plan and a stormwater plan, approximately 20 such plans in all, a number of which a required under the federal Clean Water Act enforcement of which has been delegated to the state.

Accordingly, if hydraulic fracturing waste does become permitted activity in New York, disposal and treatment of HVHF waste will fall under the egis of the existing program. Moreover, since EPA is in the process of completing its own multi-year study, it is unreasonable to assume that such waste cannot be handled and treated appropriately by DEC.

It is understandable why this Legislature might consider this bill as a means to safeguard this community. Please be assured, however, that state as well as federal regulations are in place to accomplish this goal. Moreover, state and federal regulatory bodies have now over 50 years' experience with this type of oil and gas production and the evolving technologies that help to reduce waste as well as wastewater. They possess the expertise that most local municipalities are unable to acquire and it is for this reason that the industry supports statewide regulation to ensure uniformity without a patchwork regulatory scheme that may not in the end provide anymore environmental advantage but will for sure hinder business development, energy production and impose higher costs on a very needy commodity.

Finally, besides the foregoing problematic issues, this bill will have the effect of discouraging the recycling of wastewater for retreatment and reuse which is contrary to every sustainable principle that the industry and the environmental community espouses. Thank you.

I would say, perhaps parenthetically, it is very unlikely that given where the Marcellus Shale is that you'll see any waste transported to Suffolk County. It's just -- it's just not practical. I am addressing this issue because I see pockets of communities addressing this issue, and to me, particularly in Suffolk County, it's pretty much a nonissue. I'm not sure if Suffolk County ever used brine on the roads, but the brine that's currently being used even from high-volume hydro -- high-volume hydrofracted wells in Pennsylvania is being used in New York and for the same reason this waste transporter did this survey. New York State will not permit its use until further studies are done. So if I can put any concerns to rest it should be based at least on the current status of what DEC has decided.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. And I would, unless there's any comments, thank you and I would invite you to attend the public hearing. We are going to table the resolution today for the public hearing Tuesday. Is it closed already? Oh, I thought there was another one. Okay.

MS. KENNY:
So it's closed today.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Does anyone have any questions?

MS. KENNY:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay. Second card is from Robert Williams. We'll give you the same three minutes.

MR. WILLIAMS:
Okay. Good afternoon, Legislator Krupski, Chairman and Members of the Committee. My name is Bob Williams, I'm a longtime resident of Smithtown and for the last 35 years I have owned a New York State licensed security and fire alarm company that is currently located in Centereach, New York. I was also a Suffolk County firefighter that responded to many CO alarm conditions.

I am here today to show my support for the bill intro 1247 that requires the installation of carbon monoxide detectors in County owned and leased facilities, also known as the Steve Nelson Act. I commend the Legislature on their response to this pubic safety hazard. CO, which is a colorless and odorless condition, is very hard to determine. Many times when we went on alarms it was hard to convince people to leave the residence if there was some trace of CO as opposed to fire where you're seeing smoke, you're feeling heat and you're -- you're seeing flames.

I am thoroughly supportive of any legislation that requires the installation of CO detectors in both public and commercial buildings in New York State. These detectors should be installed as part of the existing fire alarm system so that the CO alarm or trouble condition would resonate a distinct CO signal on the premise and notify a central monitoring station with a distinct carbon monoxide signal. This will give the general public the fastest awareness and emergency responders as well.

There is an important distinction when talking about carbon monoxide detecting devices. There are really two types of devices. There's a detector, which is connected to the fire or CO alarm system with a remote power and standby source that can transmit alarm and trouble signals to a central

location within the building or at an alarm monitoring facility. There is an alarm, which is a single or multi-station alarm that incorporate a sensor, control components and the alarm sound integral in the unit. Those are usually found in -- sold in Home Depot and other places and are found in a residential application. These alarms are not connected to a fire or CO alarm system and do not report to a central location or a monitoring station. There's more technical definitions in the National Fire Protection Association Guidelines.

The location and installation of any CO devices should follow the guidelines of their UL listings, NFPA standards, and the device manufacturer's guidelines. They should be designed, installed and maintained by persons licensed and trained to do so for best protection of the general public and people in the buildings.

In order to avoid an installed but not maintained situation, I recommend that a frame placard be put in the lobby of the main entrance to any building that notifies the general public of the maintenance condition of the CO and fire alarm devices. Are they in working or nonworking condition and a number to report any off-normal conditions to authorities. We have such precedent for that with occupancy signs in locations and also the Department of Health has signage in the front of every occupancy for restaurants, etcetera. New York City goes even further where they give grading for restaurants and you know if the grading is not satisfactory you may -- you may exit the location.

I have a noncommercial PowerPoint presentation that I can make available to the Committee that discusses this issue in more detail. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Does anyone have any questions?

LEG. KENNEDY:
Mr. Chair, I'd just like to thank the speaker for coming in. He's been instrumental in working with my office and this Committee will see, I believe today, Counsel, we have a series of amendments to this bill actually done in cooperation with Public Works that make it a better bill and one that is definitely implementable. So thank you and thank you to the speaker.

MR. WILLIAMS:
You're welcome. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. All right. Is there any other public comment that -- from anyone who hasn't filled out a card? All right. Then I'm going to ask Director Lansdale to come up and give us a presentation.

I hope everything goes smoother from now on.

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
Good afternoon Members of this Committee. I appreciate the invitation to come here and give a brief presentation on what's known as our septic roadshow. And I'm joined here today with Dorian Dale as well as Walt Dawydiak and Boris from the Department of Public Works.

The format is going to be, I'm just going to give a brief overview and then I'm going to turn it over to Dorian for key findings and then Boris and Walt will talk about specific technologies and then next steps.

So last month on March 19th through the 21st we -- there were 13 people that joined us, eight staff from Suffolk County on a tour -- a four state tour of septic systems in four different states in the State of Maryland, New Jersey, Rhode Island and Massachusetts. That screen, that PowerPoint

presentation was a presentation made earlier this morning and is not exactly related to what we'll be discussing today.

So the objective of the tour was to -- was for Suffolk County and our partners, and I should say that we had several nonprofit partners including the Nature Conservancy, as well as Peconic Green Growth, as well as our Federal and State partners, our Federal partner from the US Environmental Protection Agency, as well as the New York Facilities Corporation also joined the tour as part of the 13 member group that went on the tour.

So the tour, the objective was to gain valuable insight from other states that have already undertaken the installation and operation and maintenance of innovative alternative septic systems that reduce nitrogen effluent by at least 50%. And Walt could provide you with greater details on that. And, more importantly, it was also to build those relationships that we'll need to have in place moving forward in the development of such a system. So with that I'd like to turn it over to Dorian Dale to talk about some of the key findings on this tour. Thanks.

MR. DALE:
Thank you, Director Lansdale, Chairman Krupski, the balance of the Legislators. I think, first of all, you have to appreciate that in advance of determining whether this is an issue that's sufficiently substantive for our respective concerns, the -- I think the starting point is do we, in fact, face a significant crisis as a result of the 75% of the County that is and remains unsewered with 360,000 septic and cesspools?

The four states we visited certainly concluded, based upon the impacts on their waterways, as, I believe, we have in this County, that it was a significant and substantial problem. So the key findings really fall into a number of different categories based upon this tour that we took. And, of course, realizing that this is just the outset we're at the really threshold of addressing these various options that we can conceivably draw upon to begin redressing this -- this issue. So just realize that as Confucius once say, *a journey of a thousand miles begins with one humble three day trek in a van.*

So, first and foremost, in advance of any of these programs and certainly in advance of the programs that we're looking to put together in this County a plan is elemental. Secondly, I believe before you are able to launch on any kind of significant initiative you've got to figure out how it's going to be funded. Each of these locals had different ways of approaching that. Maryland has a dedicated funding stream based upon fees, which some people call taxes. They are otherwise known in the media as flush taxes or rain taxes. In effective terms they basically amount to a $60 assessment that's placed on the property in some instances or is extended through water bills in other instances, $60 per household or in the case of folks on septic systems on the order of about $5 a month.

Then very much akin to a solar program that, for example, depends on system benefits charges, respective homeowners can apply for grants through the Maryland program. And they can, in many instances, realize close to complete grant funding for that portion of the system beyond the elemental aspects, effectively the denitrification components of the system. Now, realize that in Maryland as well as the other three states, New Jersey, Rhode Island and Massachusetts, these systems are not inexpensive. And I think contextualizing them we have to realize that in most of the feasibility studies that the County has conducted relative to the feasibility of extending sewers, the per household levy would be on the order of 55 to $65,000. The septic systems that are known as alternative innovative systems that are capable of really taking the contemporary installed technology to a 50% decrease in current performance will cost on the order of about 20 to 25,000 over and beyond the elemental system so you're looking at somewhere in the neighborhood of 30,000; it varies. Of course you don't have in most cases economies of scales so we really aren't at

a stage at which we can understand or appreciate what the long-term cost per system is going to be.

In a couple of the other states there is a significant loan program. In the case of Rhode Island it is sourced out of the -- their equivalent of the environmental finance corporation that we use here for our standard big pipe financing. And at this juncture Rhode Island dedicates 5% of their total funding for wastewater treatment to these alternative innovative systems, which enables Rhode Island to extend 0% loans to the administering municipalities, which in turn have their own respective wastewater districts. And the municipality turns around and extends loans to participating homeowners at 2%. I believe it's up to $25,000. And at this juncture the Rhode Island program of all four is clearly far and away the most robust having installed various forms of technology to the tune of about 19,000 units.

Maryland is up around 5500 units. New Jersey, which is really rather circumscribed as its coast is largely sewered unlike the Chesapeake Watershed or the coastal area around Rhode Island that has a considerable similarities to Long Island as does the Cape, is only at about three -- 241 systems so it's really an anomalous program. It was, I think, interesting in that it was an outlier and really said more about what really isn't applicable than would be applicable here on Long Island.

Cape Cod, which has the most comprehensive testing center and has clearly done the yeomen's work on evaluating systems, they've evaluated 31 systems. Interestingly to note three of -- only three of which were devised in the state of Massachusetts has really gone far and beyond its neighbors in terms of evaluating systems but has never really developed a program that gets any kind of traction or buy-in. So as a result while they have 123,000 septic and cesspools and look at about 12,000 failures per annum, they're only capturing four -- 400 of the 1200 failures that bring them to alternative innovative as opposed to conventional systems. We can get more into the weeds on those kinds of issues a little bit later if you're interested.

The Rhode Island Program, I think, more than any, given its robustness, has led the way in terms of how any conceivable program might unfold here on Long Island. They did it with demonstration projects, I believe, something in the order of 756. And what this enabled them to do was really ratchet up the training required for the installers, but perhaps even more importantly it demonstrated with typical homeowners that these systems, you know, either worked at some level or perhaps conceivably didn't work. But I think more than anything, you know, when you have neighbors who are regular, you know, Mr. and Mrs. Smiths who are conceivably experience -- experiencing a particularly new technology then when they can subsequently testify to their experience with that technology then you get significantly more uptake. That's clearly been the case with the Rhode Island program.

So program design is another obvious takeaway from this trip. We, I think, we're -- as again, I've indicated most favorably impressed with the Rhode Island Program from an operational standpoint. I think the Maryland Program is instructive from the standpoint of both evaluating technology but more significantly identifying funding sources. Because again, if you look at the 360,000 systems that are either unsewered or on 50 and 60 year-old septic and cesspools and you conclude that at least something on the order of what, 250,000 of those are in sensitive -- or 220,000 -- 209, okay, sorry, are -- are in areas where they are having substantive impacts from a nitrogen loading standpoint, you're looking at something on the order of about an $8 billion program. At this juncture you know what the dedicated funding streams are within this County and it's clearly not even -- doesn't begin to be even close to what will address this problem.

So, again, it gets down to this existential question: Is this a problem that really obliges the kinds of costs that we're looking at? And, I think, what we discovered when we did energy efficiency retrofits was that you could monetize carbon, basically sealing up buildings pays for themselves.

Nitrogen, at this point, is really not monetized, but intriguingly, I think, as we look at it more closely it can, in fact, be monetized. So, for example, we already know that Suffolk residential homeowners use 80% of the fertilizer that's applied in this County, it uses 17 and-a-half percent of the residential fertilizer that's applied statewide. And by many reckonings it's probably -- homeowners are probably applying in excess of $250 more in fertilizer then they need to. If they eliminate that problem, because they now have a septic system that actually is a shallow drainer, well, it's like Erma Bombeck said, *the grass is always greener over the septic tank.* So that's $250 saved. If they're not pumping out at least on the order of one time or maybe two times a year, that's another three, or four or five or $600 saved per annum. So you begin to get into the realm of how these systems conceivably pay for themselves.

So, as it stands, we are still, I think, tracking how these technologies work. There are 25,000 systems in the ground in -- in Maryland, Rhode Island and to some lesser degree in the Cape and in New Jersey. So those -- the performance of those systems are being tracked on an ongoing basis. There are dedicated software infrastructure programs that are evaluating and keeping track. And then from a Legislative standpoint I think, again, that's your bailiwick, ladies and gentlemen. There are various incentives and provisos that can be brought to bear that have to some degree been brought to bear elsewhere. It's notable, for example, in Cape Cod where there are no real incentives or provisos they don't have much of a program going.

So on that note I will hand it off to my colleagues.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
You know, they said that when I came to the County that people were really sophisticated and high tone, but I never thought you'd be quoting Erma Bombeck.

(*Laughter*)

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Thank you, Legislator Krupski, Members of the Committee for the opportunity to be here. Walter Dawydiak, Director of Environmental Quality within the Health Department.

I had the pleasure of being on being septic tour one, which was much less ambitious than Sarah's septic tour two. Back around the year 2000, we in the Health Department, took a day trip to Rhode Island and did a conference call with New Jersey. And at that time we had a very big problem on our hands but we had a easy out because the technology had just not gestated enough. There were a few hundred systems at that time, many of them did not work, they were either getting poor performance data or were being dlisted or having all sorts of growing pains.

At that time we had just gotten over the experience of a Suffolk County innovative alternative modified subservice sewer disposal system, which was a beautiful passive system, was relatively inexpensive, worked perfectly during its pilot. The next 400 went in the ground, virtually not one of them did what they were supposed to do, to remove nitrogen so we were bitten by a very bad experience. A number of things went wrong there from contractor training, lack of O&M, lack of followup inspection. The State took away our ability to approve innovative alternative onsite systems back in the 1990s. And we as an institution have been a little gun shy to get into this costly and uncertain field until, again, recently when it became a very high priority County problem.

Groundwater nitrogen, in a nutshell, has gone up by 40% in the upper glacial, 90% in a magothy. The nitrogen levels in the groundwater are ten times higher than what's needed for healthy surface water ecosystems. It's affecting not only dissolved oxygen, but wetlands, shellfish, eelgrass, things that affect coastal resiliency. Our entire quality of life and our economy depend on these healthy waters and they're dying before us. There's virtually no eelgrass left, the wetlands are degrading.

We've done great things with new development. We have more private sewage treatment plants

than any other county in New York State. We have great toxic hazmat storage requirements, unsewered development density restrictions under the sanitary code. But the 800 pound gorilla in the room is all of those lots and it's about 74% of the County population or 1.1 million people who are still not on sewers. We knew in the 70s they needed to get advanced wastewater treatment and it just hasn't happened. About two-thirds of the parcels in the County are a half acre or less, about one-third are quarter acre or less. These are way too dense. These are actually violating groundwater drinking water standards in some cases and are way too high for the estuary.

So we're faced with what to do about this problem. And sewer when you can is the ideal solution as Mr. Dale indicated. It's way too expensive and not practical in all areas so we're going to have to look at decentralized clusters and individual onsites as alternatives.

So what we found with this septic tour is in the last ten years they've gotten the technology right quite honestly. There are now 17 systems which are either fully approved or under testing, 17 technologies. Over 13,000 systems provide full advanced alternative nitrogen removal to a standard of about 20 parts per million or less. And they're working well. They're monitored, they track, they need O&M, they need oversight. They need a responsible management entity. It hasn't been perfect, but by and large the universe out there is functioning really, really well.

The other number that Mr. Dale cited has to do with leaching. I think there's another 10,000 or so in Rhode Island with advanced leaching, which is a hydraulic issue to get rid of your wastewater. There's also some with nitrogen removal with shallow, narrow drain fields and leaching devices, but what I'm speaking to is the upfront technology, the nitrification, denitrification in a mini-sewage treatment plant.

So I'm not going to bore everybody with the details. There is about a half dozen systems that are widely used in virtually all four of these jurisdictions. Those are primarily fixed film activated sludge combination processes whereby the sludge is acclimated, they provide the microbial bacteria necessary to break down the waste. You provide oxygen to convert the ammonia to nitrate. There's some sort of media and a lot of this is mousetrap stuff where they have little balls or they're textile membranes. There's different ways to grow your microbe -- your microorganism farm, so to speak. So you can denitrify in the absence of oxygen. The nitrate goes off as nitrogen gas and you come out with the highly purified effluent.

So these systems work. The latest generation of these are membrane bioreactors also used in full-scale systems. These not only denitrify but they can remove other contaminants like pharmaceuticals and personal care products that are also a groundwater concern.

So what have we in the Health Department learned in terms of technology and how to do this? One is the marketplace is out there and we have a bigger market and a bigger problem than anybody else. We have 360,000 systems, 210 of them are in a priority area. That's more than the entire state of Rhode Island, which has 150,000 septics and only 40 to 50,000 in a priority area. That's almost as much as Maryland. Maryland only identified 17,000 in their critical priority total maximum to daily load area. Out of that they've upgraded less than a third over their 10 to 15 year time period.

Jersey and Massachusetts, again, much, much smaller than us in Long Island, so. We also have three different estuary systems that are hydraulically connected to the groundwater. Each and every one of those is impaired and getting worse waiting for action on this non-point source, which is so difficult to control.

So what we learned, our big mistake with the old denite system is that we didn't have any followup. What other states are doing is piloting systems so they'll limit it to 10 or 15 systems for the first

year; then they issue provisional approval for a couple of years for another 50 systems. After you've worked out the nuts and bolts, show that the performance data works, that there's no public health nuisance, you open it up to general approval and you got to keep monitoring a subset of these to make sure that they continue to work. And they do work if you have annual O&M and the maintenance continues.

The other thing is data management, which is a system we have to gear up for up front, not under the tail end. There's some very good tracking systems that have automated this process and made it a lot easier for the responsible management entity. Training: the Rhode Island model is especially successful because they have the best training program. They license their professionals. It's a degree lower than a full-scale sewage plant operator. You need qualified and skilled people to make sure things are being cleaned and replaced when they need to so these things continue to work.

The other thing I wanted to mention was that the Massachusetts test center is a real great place for evolving technology. They're looking at things like carbon injection under a leaching pool to provide a less expensive media to grow bacteria to remove the nitrates. That's in the RNV phase but it looks promising. Shallow, narrow drain fields and membrane bioreactors to reduce a whole suite of technologies.

A lot of great work going up -- going on up in Massachusetts. And we hope to emulate that model somewhat in Suffolk County to pilot and test technologies on our properties. Things like low energy distillation, electrolysis and {zero} light absorption. Physical and chemical permutations on the classical biological model are being promoted. And somebody's got to figure this problem out. I don't know whether it's a year or ten years down the road, but if we don't push the marketplace with policy, the technology's not going to improve. So we're looking to get some of these in the ground, test them and improve them and begin to come up with solutions to a very big problem.

I thank you for your time. Mr. Rukovets probably has good information to add on the technology. And I'm happy to answer questions if you have any.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. We will.

MR. RUKOVETS:
Thank you, Mr. Dawydiak, Chairman Krupski and Members of the Committee. I would like to add my perspective to this tour. I'll be speaking from a perspective of a person who is a project manager of a number of sewering projects in the County that a number of you are involved in as well.

The tour, which was an eye-opening experience, really underscored the point that the alternative treatment technologies viable alternative to sewers in those areas where sewers are not feasible and where we have areas with less density populated -- population. So they do make sense. And evaluation of available technologies really show that those technologies are clearly on the mark to achieve the reduction. Maybe not that low -- high level of reduction as the sewers could be but clearly close to what is needed for the County to reduce the nitrogen pollution and improve the water quality.

I guess, one additional point is that having the wealth of information that we've obtained throughout the tour from four different states tells us that there is a good body of knowledge we could leverage in deciding on what kind of alternative technologies we want to consider for the County, again, assuming they are feasible. We don't want to start from the scratch. At the same -- at the same time knowing that there are technologies that have been approved and tested by both the EPA and

NSF, National Organization, I should say International Organization that does testing of the technologies, it still makes sense to do a pilot of those technologies in the County for a number of reasons. Most of those technologies were also studied by individual states, different conditions. And it couldn't be -- the impact of the communication to the public through pilot testing, it couldn't be underestimated. It's a big difference when the people see the testing technology, the pilot, alternative technology in the neighbor's backyard or front yard and they know that that technology works. So it's -- it's a good move to do an alternative pilot study that Mr. Dawydiak was referring to. At the same time taking into account the information that we've obtained from the tour.

And, I guess, the last but not least point here is the funding that Mr. Dale was referring to. People want to, in general, want to do the right thing, but as you know, funding is a make or break case for -- for alternative treatment technologies. So there are different models that we've observed during the tour. They really gives us some considerations for what to consider. And I would say that I've observed in addition to the -- to the grants that have been used in Maryland, the use of clean water funds, in other words, the funds that are given by the Federal Government to the States, and in New York State those state revolving funds, that are low interest loans is clearly a consideration, especially if those can be obtained at the very low interest. And the fact that we had on the tour, too, a representative from environmental facilities corporation, an organization, as you know, that underwrites those funds, those loans to the communities is clearly encouraging. So that is one of the avenues that could help to design the program. But there's a number of other things that needs to be considered.

From my perspective I think the conclusion of this tour for me was the systems may work. They need to be put in place with obviously consideration what is the most bang for the buck. And the pilot study is the next and logical step to deciding which systems would work for the County and ultimately how much they're going to cost. Because we have the range of costs but the technologies that we're going to recommend will have their own price tag that we could discuss further. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. That was really good. Sarah, did you want to add anything?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
I just wanted to say in conclusion I'd like to thank Legislator Hahn for joining us on the tour as well as -- as the next step we will continue to work on this. We're close to finalizing a draft summary of the tour. It's close to 40 pages right now. We're just -- we look to release that to you in your Committee later this week.

And also as a follow up to this to continue or begin the implementation of some of these recommendations. We have -- Suffolk County was just awarded a smart cities challenge through IBM where -- and we will be introducing a resolution at the next legislative -- full legislative meeting. And that's where IBM will donate staff time, kind of like a think tank of five or six staff members who will donate in excess of $500,000 worth of their staff time to work with us in June to look at refining our analysis of where we should install these demonstration septic technology pilots as well as begin to explore the financing options and other items for this effort.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. So you said that they -- you're going to use the IBM technology to know where to install which pilots. Would you consider installing two pilots at one location so you'd have like identical soil conditions, identical microclimates and everything?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Certainly one of the things on the table is public properties. And to the extent that we can find an

area where we can either split a flow or have two similarly situated properties with two separate flows, we would absolutely consider that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay. What size pilots are you looking at? Are they going to be sized for single family residences or are you going to look at anything other than that?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Primarily what we're looking at is single family residences or potentially their commercial equivalence. Anything over a thousand gallons per day is a different body of management and we already have systems approved for that flow range. We're looking at flows under a thousand. So residential are potentially slightly larger.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Were you able to -- if you put these pilots in, will you be able to extrapolate out for a larger like a small subdivision type of thing as a new installation?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
Is the question if the pilot is successful, will we allow a number of these on a subdivision?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
No, to use one as a community treatment facility for a subdivision.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
For a cluster decentralized you mean. Yeah, absolutely. We already finished a stage of our evaluation. We called it the first phase of our onsite study where we identified several additional technologies. It used to just be the Cromaglass. Now it's the Nitrex and the Best and a couple of others that are available out there. If anything new comes on the scene that's promising for larger flows, we would absolutely look at that for cluster decentralized as well.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. And are you reaching out to the towns to see if they're interested in any -- any municipally owned parcels for the pilots?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
Yes, as part of the engagement with IBM we'll be doing that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Anyone have questions? Anyone want to sign up? You have a backyard?

LEG. BROWNING:
You know, I know that, you know, when I'm talking about my district and the overdevelopment, the poor planning has made it very difficult to figure out where you're going to put anything. I mean, when I look at my district with all of these systems that you looked at, would you be able to tell me what type of system would work best, say Mastic Beach, Shirley, where there's pretty much not much land left to put anything.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
First and foremost a sewer would be nice, and I don't mean to be facetious, but when you're dealing with those sort of densities and groundwater conditions and --

LEG. BROWNING:
Right.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
-- impacts, sewering is always the first option. The County Exec has proposed exactly that as part of his plan for overall wastewater management. Director Lansdale has identified low-hanging fruits in terms of highest densities, greatest impacts, greatest benefit for costs and those are on the table. We're continuing to look at the wastewater options.

I should point out that we have this other thing floating around out there, which is the County wastewater plan, which is a Quarter Percent project. It'll dovetail with the IBM initiative on smart cities where we'll take those results and leverage those working with a groundwater modeling consultant to figure out exactly what's going to happen to the groundwater if we do nothing and what happens under these different options and what the surface water impacts are going to be on a watershed by watershed basis. So we'll be able to provide you with good cost benefit information about ever community, is it a {BUCE} system that's got to go in the basement because you have tight space or shallow groundwater conditions in an area? Is it an artifical wetlands on the East End where you have more room because they're cheaper and they work better? That's the kind of detail we hope to drill down into in the next phase of our evaluation and that's about a year away.

LEG. BROWNING:
Right, but what I'm saying is I know that we're working on the sewer project for my district and obviously we're looking to put the sewage treatment plant and that's -- that what we should be doing. But again, even Center Moriches, you know, Al and I have been working with the Center Moriches community and we're even just looking just to try and do the downtown areas, to sewer the downtown areas for, you know, also the economic reasons. But it, you know, realistically to say that we could sewer the entire tri-hamlet community is probably not possible to put to in -- to sewer every single home in the community.

So, you know, what I'm saying is is that when I have the people who live in Shirley and say, *well, why can't we get sewers?* And we can't tie them into a sewage plant, you know, we're going to have to look at these different type of onsite systems. But, again, when I listen to you, Dorian, it's sounds like none of this is affordable.

MR. DALE:
Yes, at first blush I think it's a caveat emptor but not necessarily. Because as I've began to articulate there are value propositions in doing this. I think if we have a County wastewater management district, for example, we would proceed to do the same kind of assignment we do with benefit assessments. So if you're getting sewers in, your constituency are going to see X amount on their tax bill, you know, over the course of time. It's not a recourse loan, it doesn't go on their, you know, on their credit rating. So if it is, in fact, assigned to the property tax it does several things. First of all, it spreads it out over 20, 30 years. That's number one and that means it's very small. And number two, it's tax deductible.

So, I think, you know, as we begin to construct these kinds of frameworks it's going to look, I would suggest, a lot more accessible because that's our objective here. Because it's pointless, pointless to come up with a program that doesn't really address middle class needs.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Sticking with that theme, and if you look at the way to pay for these with different technologies in different parts of the County at different densities and different systems, is the -- and you talk about setting up special districts, is the IBM program going to look into that, consider that scenario, the different technologies for the different densities, different townships, different school districts, I don't know how you'd want to, you know, how you'd break that up, different watersheds?

DIRECTOR LANSDALE:
Yes, we're -- we're looking carefully at what the State of Maryland did in their assessment of -- statewide of their priority areas for septic upgrades and how they looked at it in relation to which areas should be sewered, which areas should be decentralized clustered and which ones should use individual onsite technologies. So we hope to use Maryland's statewide analysis as a model. And we have a lot better data than Maryland has so we can better refine their analysis with our information.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So they -- they mandate which system to put in. And is it -- is it new construction or reconstruction, you know, retrofitting old. How do they move -- how do they move that forward?

MR. DAWYDIAK:
I believe that in Maryland it's basically for all new construction, significant expansion if a system fails or if somebody voluntarily comes and just wants to, there's a dedicated fund and a series of tiered priorities where the highest priority area essentially gets the system itself paid for. So that ten to $15,000 piece, which is, the treatment plant gets paid for by Maryland, they do not pay for the leaching area and some of the incidentals; so the homeowner still bears some of the expense. In Maryland they have an array of approvable systems. And the homeowner, I believe, can determine which one of those to choose from subject to State approval of continuing viability.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So it's the waterfront property owners who'd get the most financial help.

MR. DAWYDIAK:
That's the way it works out in Maryland.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Any other questions? All right. Well, thank you very much. We'll anxiously await for the draft.

All right. Next we have a presentation by Climate Smart Community Committee, Neal Lewis. Welcome.

MR. LEWIS:
Okay, okay. Sorry about that. Once again it's -- my name is Neal Lewis, Executive Director of Sustainability Institute at Molloy College. Let me have my colleague introduce himself.

MR. BERG:
I'm David Berg with Cameron Engineering.

MR. LEWIS:
So thank you for this opportunity to give you a report on the work of the Climate Smart Communities Committee that was formed. We should recognize that we were formed in 2013 when this Committee was somewhat differently constituted in terms of who was in charge of energy and such. Legislator Wayne Horsley at the time had put forth the legislation for Climate Smart Communities and he asked me to serve as chair of the committee.

In the course of 2013 and now two meetings this year we've had approximately eight meetings of our committee. And on page -- pretty much it's the first page. If you open it, you'll see the outline of who was appointed by the Legislature and how those positions were filled similar to how a number of committees are handled here in Suffolk County where various members of the Legislature, chairs of various committees made some of the appointments.

I should point out a number of the people in the room today have been participants in this process including Legislator Hahn who's participated throughout the process. And I should also point out that Wayne Horsley was a very active member during the time that he was still here in 2013. But also Dorian Dale who you just heard from is a member of this committee. And Joe Schroeder has been invaluable to this process and so you could see the full list here but I did want to mention that a number of these people are people that are very active on these kinds of energy issues.

The eight meetings of the committee, you know, sometimes when you Chair you got to kind of say, *hey we have a deadline, let's try and get something done here* because there's a certain sense in which this process could go on. So I kind of reached out to your office and suggested that perhaps we give a report. And then I told it to the committee as, *come on guys, we got to get it a done* product. So I pushed hard to get this done by this date. We did have a meeting last week. We more or less agreed that we have the essence of a plan, but nonetheless it is a draft plan. And depending upon any feedback we get today and maybe perhaps we'll speak with you more directly afterwards we could decide whether we need another meeting. But basically the committee felt that we were basically there and that we were -- we were directed to add some items such as a executive summary, which you don't see in the draft that's handed to you today. So, but it was agreed that perhaps those additional items, like a direct executive summary, there's also some case studies that we intend to have attached, some of which are here and some are not yet added, that perhaps that last action could be all pulled together and the committee could vote by having reviewed the items through the e-mails and read and approve kind of thing.

So we think we're very close depending upon the feedback we get today as to whether or not this is something that we can turn over to the Legislature. The process, I'm going to -- I'll have David Berg say a few more words about the process and he's going to dive into a few of the highlights from the report. But one of the aspects of the process was that NYSERDA, in creating Climate Smart Communities as a statewide program, encouraged those municipalities that adopted the climate smart pledge to then create a committee to develop a climate action plan, which is where we're at today, and then bring that plan back to the Legislative body. So if it's at a town level, it would be the town board; and then here, of course, the County Legislature.

So we are asking that the plan would be sent by this Committee onto the Leg for actual adoption by the Legislature as a plan of the County.

I wanted to point out the process that we went through in terms of how when we structured this plan. When we started to meet something that was very well known to me because I've been involved in these issues for a number of years now is that Suffolk County's clearly a leader both on Long Island -- and I think that this process will demonstrate really statewide Suffolk County is a leader in promoting energy efficiency in its many facilities. It is very, very impressive how much how has been accomplished here.

So in working on this plan it's great to look forward, but if our plan's going to be compared to plans from Onondoga County or, you know, any place Upstate New York and when -- there's some element of we need to have a starting point to be able to have an intelligent comparison. So we thought it made sense to discuss the recent past accomplishments, which is essentially like the last five to ten years, particularly the last five years.

So what we did with the structure of this plan is we came up with -- and if you glance at the table of contents, you see that we structured it so that the first section, main section, is municipal facilities and operations. These are the things we directly as County taxpayers can come to the County Legislature and say, you guys control the buildings and such, what have you done with the buildings? That's very different than what happens in the community at large. So we felt that those two should be separated. And so the whole first section is dealing with buildings, all the

buildings the County owns and the various projects. And the way to explain this, if you look at number two, is renewables. So if you're talking about renewables as it applies to a homeowner, that's not in this section. This section is talking about renewables that the County has at County facilities. So that was how we sort of organized the first sort of sweeping structure.

So the first section is municipal facilities and operations. We then put the Suffolk County Community College in its own section because it's such a big and important facility at the County with several different, you know, several different campuses and many different facilities. So it got a whole section unto itself. But you'll see it largely follows the structure setup that we used for the other County facilities in section one.

Then when you go to section three that's where we introduced the things that have an impact on Countywide sort of community initiative. So, for example, I worked very closely with Dave Calone from the Suffolk County Planning Commission on encouraging municipalities. We got all ten towns to change their code and permit requirements for solar. Well, that wouldn't be in the first section; it'd be in this community-wide section. So that's the structure that we came up with.

And the fourth and last category is everything having to do with adaptation. So that's a point where I should point out that all the motivation behind NYSERDA creating Climate Smart Communities is driven by the issues of climate change and efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. So anything that might seem like it should be in here but isn't, ask yourself first, does if have a direct greenhouse gas impact? If not, it may have been left out. So some water issues, for example, were left out for that reason like stormwater runoff; doesn't really have a direct greenhouse gas. So that was part of the structure. And the funding is either to reduce greenhouse gas emissions or funding can go for those things you do to improve your resiliency and adaptation so you're prepared better for the next storm that's going to come; no matter what we do, it's just a question of whether we can minimize the impact on global warming.

So that's the overview of that aspect of the structure. Then within each of the four broad categories, what we did was we took the various items and we said, *let's not forget what we've done in the past.* So for each one you see a past, current and a future. So the past is past actions and achievements. So for buildings, for example, again, really remarkable how much effort has gone into renovating County facilities and documenting the success of those efforts, by the way. And when you do get a chance, I realize that the Committee Members are getting this plan for the first time. It's, you know, 30 pages or so. Although I do, you know, encourage you to dive right into it. I recognize you haven't read it yet, but if I could read one line from page one: *The County's commitment to smart and efficient energy use through facility improvements has resulted in direct energy savings compounded by significant reduction in maintenance costs. At the time of this writing, direct energy use reduction at targeted facilities documented by measurement and verification of system performance and year over year actual energy use has resulted in approximately $5 million of recurring annual savings and expenditures for energy use, which also equates to approximately a 25% reduction in energy use and 30% reduction in gas for heating.*

Those are really impressive accomplishments. And I would hope that, you know, I'm not the PR guy, but I would hope that as you guys adopt this and take it to the Legislature, that someone really makes those points known to the public because these are -- these are impressive accomplishments that didn't happen overnight. It's a long-term commitment that the County has had to this effort to make buildings more energy efficient. And, frankly, we can make the case for energy efficiency without ever talking about global warming or the impact that our air quality is driven by how much burning of fossil fuel goes on.

So there's a series of arguments we could make that we don't have to make. We could just make the economic argument. The economic argument is compelling. And we hope to, as we complete

this process and get all this information to you, that by making it better known to the public that such good investments are being made on behalf of the taxpayers by renovating County buildings, that that helps get the message out to the general public. They should do the same thing with their own homes, with their own businesses. And I should tell you that I've seen the County Comptroller at an event. And I said to him he should do an analysis of this tremendous success story here in Suffolk County to further make it known to the general public. I've heard that he's interested and he's asked to see the report when it's ready.

So, you know, so my goals for today was to give you the overview, say a few words about the process. Essentially, we are looking to get this adopted by the County. How it fits into the overall NYSERDA process, some of that is still evolving, they're going through a -- they're creating like a certification mechanism for future years under Climate Smart. They're also looking to have a Cleaner, Greener Grants Award Process that'll take place in the next couple of months. And it's our understanding that it, when -- if the County was -- and I know you just had the Planning team up here, so they often do grant proposals. So if they're writing a grant proposal and they can say that one of the ideas they think should be funded is something that's identified in this plan and the County has adopted the plan, then it's something that gives greater strength to that grant proposal. The State won't say there's any guarantees, of course, but this is part of a process. And we think that there's a value to what we've engaged in here both to make the public known of what's been accomplished but also to hopefully be in assistance in seeking funding under various competitive grants and other things that are going to be available.

So with that said I thought perhaps I would turn it to David Berg if that's okay with the Chairman to say a few words about some of the highlights, some of the things looking ahead. Clearly, the past accomplishments are already accomplishments. So it there; it's just a question of documenting it. But in those three things of past, current and future, I want to point out current is defined very broadly. So you may laugh when you see the way we worded it, but we wanted to be -- we wanted to capture everything that might be currently under play. So if something is under consideration, any kind of active sense, let's say it's -- a feasibility study is going on, an RFP is going on, we would consider that current. Even though the Legislature may not of made a final decision on funding, we consider it currently under consideration so we called it Projects and Policies Currently Under Consideration, Development and Implementation. And by doing it that way, what that leaves is for the future actions those are things that are truly not yet making their way through the pipeline. So they are referred to as potential future actions. So I want to put the emphasis on potential. The committee did some brainstorming. By no means do any of the items in here lock the County into anything. It's very clearly marked as potential future actions. So with that caveat David may draw attention to a few of those items as we look ahead.

MR. BERG:
Thank you, Neal. Just a word stepping back just briefly so this is -- this initiative is led not only by NYSERDA, but also by four other State agencies. And it's funded by the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative, which is a carbon tax on nine State large utilities so there's a renewable source of funding for the program. It's anticipated it's going to continue at least for one -- one more year and perhaps several more years. And because there are multiple agencies on here, when the consolidated funding application comes out, they're all going to look to see if the proposed funding entity has a Climate Smart Communities plan or not. And as Neal already said, you know, communities that have these plans and they are looking forward will presumably get more attention in the funding process.

So Neal already gave considerable background. What I thought I would do is just highlight a few of the items listed as potential future actions and initiatives. So these are things that have come up at the committee and discussed more or -- at great length or just have come up as concepts that need some further exploration. One of the most intriguing ones -- and I should step back one second

and talk about anchor projects. The State has also said if you have a project that is unique that saves an inordinate amount of energy that could be a model for other communities across the State, then bring it forward as an anchor project and we'll take special care to look at it during grant funding.

So we have a couple of them in here that we've identified. And one of the ones is this Real Time, this is on page eight, Real Time Energy Management and Building Dashboard Information. So the County already has a few building energy management systems in place that monitor energy use, whether it's gas or electric or other. They want to bring that forward to a lot of the County buildings and then have one central place where -- web-based location, where all this information is gathered and analyses done. So once you have all this data, you can actually make better decisions about where to spend money. And I have to say that Joe Schroeder's been very helpful. I believe he's here, in -- in documenting energy savings and return on investments by the County. So we spent so much in capital projects, we saved so much in energy, your operating costs. And there's a table at the very back that shows a number of capital projects going forward. So anyhow, this Dashboard system would be a wonderful way to really gather the data needed for future decisions.

Another one, the second bullet there, a self-sustaining Climate Smart fund for municipal departments. If we're saving money by installing energy efficient systems, then perhaps some of those savings could be put into a dedicated fund for future energy efficiency improvements.

So flipping to -- I wasn't going to talk about wastewater but given the presentation that we just had, we do have a number of things under wastewater and solid waste. And one of the first things that's listed here is to explore the feasibility of a single Suffolk County wastewater district. So rather than have individual districts in each of the towns and small little districts here and there, a single district where everyone who is producing nitrogen, which is basically all of us, is contributing to the solution in some way. That's one of the things that's listed there for further discussion.

Flipping further along to operations, one of the things that apparently was proposed some years ago back in 2009, and you'll find further details in the appendix, was to develop a pilot project for a four-day workweek at certain County facilities. A four-day workweek means that we can close the buildings for three days and generate that much more in energy savings. It would a be a full 40 hour four-day workweek as a pilot to see how employees and employers respond to such a thing. There are further details in that. That was proposed a few years ago, maybe it's time to take a second look at that.

MR. LEWIS:
So if I could jump in there in terms of operations, one of the other items we looked at is something that was mentioned by one of the speakers during the public portion comments on carbon monoxide, which I know the Legislature's very involved in, it's an issue that I've been speaking at, I spoke to the Health Committee on that issue. And, again, it's under the potential future actions and has qualifiers such as explore and consider. But one of the ideas is to establish best practices that could be taking place at County buildings that could also become best practices that we would encourage people to follow at, you know, their own private homes and businesses. So best practices include things like, you know, that energy audits should be somewhat consistent such as a ten year revolving schedule for full energy audits of buildings. It should be pointed out when an energy audit is done properly, especially under the law that Wayne Horsley had helped draft just a few years ago that I worked with him on, if you call something an audit in Suffolk County, not in Nassau but in Suffolk, it must include combustion safety tests of all the combustion sources in that facility. That's the law here in Suffolk County that I hope the rest of the State would look adopting. So we want to encourage those energy audits more frequently.

But separate from that is that the tune-up and cleaning of combustion systems should be -- it's

understood as a best practice, but it's not always followed, that that should be done once a year at the beginning of the heating system -- season. And I think that the County does that and makes it known that that's a policy it's following, It helps to establish that best practice and that's what we're suggesting here.

Also, when a repair person comes to a facility and does work on a system, if it's a combustion system and was worked on by a mechanic, the mechanic should do a CO test before and afterwards. And we've heard too many horror stories where someone could do some work and just leave something a little bit inappropriately -- incorrectly set up and you can get a release of carbon monoxide. They're working with a deadly gas. They should do a simple test before they leave. Again, that's a best practice we think should actually be law. But we could make it a code, a rule for all County buildings.

And, of course, lastly is the one that has been the focus of a lot of attention and that's the requirement both that all buildings have carbon monoxide detectors, but that we look to install carbon monoxide detectors with digital readouts. Because we're concerned that people can be living in a -- working in a building for a long period of time where there's a low level of carbon monoxide and nothing's being done about it because no one knows it. And the detector won't go off until it crosses a certain line, which is about 70 parts per million. So we recognize that that's being looked at by the County. And there is some legislation along that line. So we wanted to mention that in the potential future action section for operations.

MR. BERG:
Okay. Just a few more items and -- so we're back to sewers again, we just love sewers. Under a community-wide policies, under residential buildings, is page 29, a concept -- the County has control over sewer connection fees. The County also has for years been a supporter of smart growth, downtown revitalization, so why not incentivize or disincentivize smart growth development, downtown revitalization, by lowering sewer connection fees in the right places and raising them in the so-called wrong places for a revenue neutral program that the County has control over. So that was another thought-provoking item.

The Suffolk County Community College, another anchor project, is their proposed Renewable Energy and Stem Initiative, which we think fits very, very nicely into the Climate Action Plan. And we would hope that the Committee would be supportive of that. There's a description in here of that.

I also wonder just off --

MR. LEWIS:
Page 35.

MR. BERG:
Page 35 there's a little description. I also wonder if Suffolk Community College because their training technicians might also be an interesting place for a alternative sewer pilot program and also a training program for those that would be examining and certifying onsite systems. That's a total aside, it's not even in here.

So let me just speak very briefly about climate change. There's a section in the back on climate change adaptation and mitigation. This is just the beginning of this section. This was written during the New York Rising process. As I'm sure you're all aware, New York State developed a program for the 100 plus communities in the State that were impacting by Sandy, Irene and -- what was the third storm? I forget. So anyhow, there are eight communities in Suffolk County. That process has just been completed. In fact, there's a big rollout of the results this week? Next week? This week. So anyhow, so that's just completed. So what you see here is some of the

bones of that process. We want to flush this out with some of the recommendations that were made by the New York Rising process as well as you have the DEC's own -- because New York Rising was DOS. DEC did their own climate resiliency process so we're going to talk more about that in here. The County is in the process of updating its hazard mitigation plan, which also speaks to climate change and preparations for storm events. That needs to be in here as well.

So this document is still in draft form and -- and it's the kind of thing that will evolve. But as Neal said, you know, if -- if we could at least adopt this as the initial plan, we can keep working on it in the subsequent year and have a followup draft where some of the things that are in the potential actions perhaps move up to the under consideration portion. So it's an exciting document with a lot of good ideas and we hope you all feel the same way as we do. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. I did have -- I was fortunate enough to have an opportunity to take a look at it this weekend. And it is a -- it is pretty impressive. It's impressive, like you said, going back in the last few years to what the County's done and currently, you know, what your engaged in.

You talked about, you know, all the extra work that you're going to put into it going forward. And it is a living document. You also talked about us adopting it. So could you put it -- is it possible to put it in a form that we could adopt as a plan and then keep, you know, continue on the work?

MR. BERG:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
That would be, I think -- I think everybody would agree to do that.

MR. LEWIS:
Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think we could get it back to you, let's say, within a month if we could make sure those other case studies that were mentioned get added in there; and then the executive summary; and really just maybe some minor tweaking, any other feedback you were -- anybody else has but otherwise we should hopefully be ready for you pretty shortly.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Good. Very good work. Does anyone have any questions?

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you, Mr. Chair. Yes, Neal, you guys did a terrific job compiling this together. I didn't get a chance to read it more thoroughly, but I did -- I was able to quickly look at some of the past actions. And if you refer to page ten -- ten and eleven of the report, to me, it begs the question, if you look at, say, the projects that are listed, like the first one there is the police headquarters, what is the, you know, what's the threshold as far as return on investment? Because if you look -- just some quick calculations, if you look at the Police Headquarters Project, NYSERDA grants, 260,000 it's a 50/50 match, the annual savings are $10,841, the cost to the County is 260,000. The return on investments's going to take 24 years. I didn't do the second one. I skipped that one. But the Riverhead County complex, cost to County $235,200, annual savings $4600, 51 years it'll take to -- I mean far beyond what the bonds -- and that's not even including the interest on the bonds that would pay for it. At what level do we say this project is not cost effective for us? Fifty-one years, I think, we would want a shorter term on our investment.

MR. LEWIS:
Well, there is a spreadsheet that attempts to capture some of that and I do see Joe coming to our

rescue in terms of some of the numbers you're referring to. We should point out that it may be good to have year dates on some of these because PV has changed dramatically in the -- in the few years since the County did its first solar photovoltaic system. The cost has come down dramatically. They're not giving as much as an incentive but it still has really changed quite substantially. The most recent efforts have been to do it under the feed-in tariff where there's no out-of-pocket expense for the County. So if the County was to be successful in its most current effort to get solar, it would really be a completely different program.

So a lot of this has changed. Of all the -- the efficiency stuff is always a better return on investment than solar. So solar's always something we got to look at more closely. And this solar is a little bit dated in terms of that. But with that said, I don't know if Joe --

MR. SCHROEDER:
Legislator Gregory, you're correct in -- in your assessment of the cost benefit of renewables. They have been more costly to install and do have a lower return on investment. As we have been compiling our living projects list in recent years, we have been bundling those projects so the aggregate has a return on investment that's acceptable to us when we go forth with these projects, when we recommend to do these projects. And on an annual average our return on investment has been above 25%.

P.O. GREGORY:
And that's -- so what -- what is the threshold? Is it 10 years, 15 years that we're looking at or is it just a certain amount per year that we're looking at in reduction?

MR. SCHROEDER:
In the industry, because of the age of the -- the existing inventory, buildings that we have, things like replacement windows, renewables, things like that, don't have a very good payback. And what's recommended practice is bundling a very high return on investment projects with much lower return on investment projects; so that on balance, you're able to fund those projects that otherwise would not look attractive.

And so that's what we have been doing is incorporating our prize winning projects with our less than attractive projects so that -- that in the whole, those projects give us the return that we're looking for. We don't have a magic number that's a threshold. A lot of our projects are driven by need and other considerations so it's not just a return on investment yardstick that we're using. But, again, in the -- in the living projects list that we've been putting forth on an annual basis, as it happens the return on investment has been in excess of 25% and that has included some recent solar projects.

P.O. GREGORY:
And what you're saying, return on investment, you're talking about savings. The costs are going up. Are you calculating what the interest and -- on the bonds and all that?

MR. SCHROEDER:
Yes. We look at the cost of debt service and the projected savings. And then we go back and measure and verify those savings. And what we have found is that we have yielded a savings net of debt service in the first year after we've implemented our projects.

P.O. GREGORY:
Right, okay. I mean, I'm just saying these numbers are so high that those -- those very good projects have to be almost within two years or several years.

MR. SCHROEDER:
We have some projects that have a return on investment in excess of 60%. So, yeah, we have some very good projects.

P.O. GREGORY:
Okay. All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Any other questions?

LEG. BROWNING:
It's funny, I was showing it to Al the -- oh, did I lose the page, about leasing land controlled by the County, the young farmers, to preserve the population of farmers. And I'm sure Al will agree that it's not an easy job and it's very hard to get young people to want to continue to farm. But can you kind of elaborate on that when you're talking about leasing land for young farmers?

MR. BERG:
This came up actually at our very last meeting and -- that the County had a variety of different properties, some of which were dedicated parkland, dedicated preserves; but other properties that, in fact, were in the past farmland that didn't necessarily need to go into preservation or into parkland, but perhaps some of those could go back to farmland. And it seemed to us to be something worth pursuing. Not to say that we should diminish the preservation program, the Open Space Program, but we should do both.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Yeah, that would certainly enhance it.

LEG. BROWNING:
Well, I know that when we do, you know, a preservation of farmland and, you know, when we're talking about our environment and -- and, again, the use of pesticides and fertilizers and trying to encourage more organic type farming, is -- I guess this would be something that we could be looking at is to encourage more organic farming than, you know, the use of the pesticides. But, again, it's getting that population of farmers to continue to want to do it. And so I think that's something that we should be looking at when we're doing preservation of land; and maybe not doing preservation where it can't be used for anything but maybe looking at organic farming.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And I think it's good to look, not just going forward but going back, the parcels that the County does own and how these could be used productively. We're looking at one in Riverhead now to see if can be reused, not for agriculture but for different uses. The parcel that's -- it's a large parcel that's just sitting there becoming overgrown. Then it becomes a liability for either Parks or DPW to maintain it. You can turn that around and have someone make use of it and at least -- at least maintain it for the County. And we have had some -- actually inquiries about using open space acquired by the County for agriculture. We haven't gotten very far yet but we are -- there's a couple of parcels that people have interest in.

LEG. BROWNING:
I'm just saying does the Community College have anything that, you know, in the college with the students, you know, as far as -- I guess they don't have any kind of agricultural programs.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Program? No, no.

LEG. BROWNING:
That would be strictly Cornell.

MR. LEWIS:
We do acknowledge that this item is perhaps not as fully flushed out as perhaps would be helpful for you. This was something that was added at the very last meeting. Part of the thinking when it comes to the issue of greenhouse gas emissions is to encourage where people shop, you know, for produce and vegetables locally. And so if -- if we can get more local produce into the food chain, that's a good thing. So this was embracing that.

Now, as an environmentalist, I've been very active on alternatives to pesticides. And I believe strongly that Long Island should really be promoting organic farming as a key aspect of our personality, our brand. And, I think, that that's where we should be going. We live over our drinking water. I really wish we could rewrite the entire program for how we preserve development rights of farms and just make them all organic and it would be -- it would fit into the culture of Long Island, it would fit into visitors coming out to see the farms and the vineyards and all that kind of stuff.

So I'm totally with you on all of that. We didn't elaborate on any of that because it's not directly related to greenhouse gas emissions. So the issue really here was to promote local. And maybe there's ways the County could play a more active role of encouraging young people to take up the trade.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And as far as restricting its use as farmland, if the County owns it then, in fact, they can put any restrictions they wanted to on it. So that would be -- that would be very easily done as opposed to -- as opposed to Farmland Development Right Program where the farm is still in private ownership.

Anyone else? Well, thank you very much.

MR. LEWIS:
Thank you. Mr. Chairman, we'll follow up with your office but we'll see if we can get this back to you very soon.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Very good, thank you. It's a lot of work there.

We'll get back to our agenda.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

IR 1117 - Adopting Local Law No. -2014, A Local Law prohibiting the sale and use of hydraulic fracturing byproducts. (Spencer) Is there a motion to approve it?

LEG. BROWNING:
After the presentation, I kind of would like to make a motion to table. I know it's something that's going on. And, you know, when I'm hearing that there's a possibility that, you know, while it's kind of controversial, the hydrofracking, but, you know, if it is going on and there is some use for the byproduct, I guess, if that's what you want to call it, I'm not prepared to support it right now based on, I guess, two things: We had the presentation. And also maybe I -- I feel like I need to have more information. I don't -- I don't know where our Commissioner is on this, but if there's a possibility that some of these products could be used, you know.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Let's ask our Commissioner first.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Good afternoon. I think the first statement I would -- I would make is the fact, and tackle something that the young lady that spoke earlier referred to, is that this is still very far away from actually being something that can be used. First off, just getting the material here doesn't make it something that we would look to do in any event. The likelihood that it's going to get here is very slim so, you know, it's not a -- this is not of big importance to us. We will, at this point, go either way. If it becomes a situation where this is cost effective and it's environmentally safe, we could certainly go back and change the legislation at that time if you want. So, you know, we would go in either way with your recommendations.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. And that's kind of how I feel about it. We did hear a lot of people speak against using the byproducts because of the various chemicals that are used to separate the gas from the shale. And also because of the naturally occurring radioactivity.

I think what she didn't mention in her presentation was that the amount -- the presentation says that the amount of naturally occurring radioactivity is within, oh, here it is, it's within allowable limits. That's with, I would assume, with one application. But if you're going to do multiple applications you're going to -- you're going keep increasing the concentration there and that soil adjacent to your roadways and then it will eventually make its way into your groundwater. So I think that's -- that's one of the big concerns.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And just one more statement just to echo a comment that was made earlier. We do use brine currently. We don't use it exclusively. The brine that we do use is produced from regular, you know, salt, road salt. It's just a -- it's just a method of treatment, not necessarily the product itself.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Potassium chloride? What do you use? What kind of salt do you use?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe it is potassium chloride, but I'd have to get back to you.

P.O. GREGORY:
I just think with the -- you know, the topic of the day, you know, being water quality, when we have a substance that could affect the quality of our water, I think we should err on the side of being cautious. This bill would ban the sale of it. Right? Not the -- and the use -- and the use?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
I think the use also.

P.O. GREGORY:
And that affects the towns as well as --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Yes, uh-hum. Yeah. And I think it comes to the point where if New York State makes the decision on their draft environmental impact statement on this, I think it would -- it would open it up to the County having an option or it would open it up the towns being able to use it on their own. That I'm not sure.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Again, I think because of the proximity we're so far away from any of that material, the likelihood that it getting down here is so slim. Certainly, if this legislation is passed we could always revisit it another time and, you know, then change the legislation accordingly, but given the sensitivity of it, you know, I would say, my recommendation would be to pass it. Then if something changes, if the State comes through and says, yeah, this is great stuff, we could always relook at it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Anyone else? All right, so I've got a motion to table. Was there a second?

LEG. MURATORE:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay. And is there a motion to approve?

LEG. STERN:
Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And a second. All right. So we'll do the motion to table first. Show of hands all in favor? All right. Motion to approve? What's that? Okay, I'm sorry. Opposed? Opposed to table?

All right. So the motion to approve. All in favor? Four. Opposed? Okay. So that motion passes with one abstention. All right. **APPROVED (VOTE: 4-1-1-0 Opposed: Legislator Barraga - Abstention: Legislator Browning - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

IR 1247 - Requiring installation of carbon monoxide detectors at County Facilities ("The Steve Nelson Safety Act"). (Kennedy) There's a motion, is there a second? Motion to approve; right? Okay. This was just recently amended. Is there any comment on the legislation? Does anyone want to make a comment?

LEG. BARRAGA:
Well, this is a self-imposed mandate and I'd like to know any idea of the cost factor associated with the installation of these detectors. And have we ever had an instance in the past of carbon monoxide poisoning in any of our County buildings?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
To the question about poisoning, no, we have not, to the best of my knowledge we have not. We do -- we have in the past but only the recent past installed them where during where we have constructed new --

LEG. BARRAGA:
New facilities.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
New facilities. We did work with the Legislator to come up with the program. It's based on the size of the building. Each year we will look to where we can install them based on the size of the building.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Well, this would mandate that you put them in every single building we own. Right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'm sorry.

LEG. BARRAGA:
This legislation mandates that you put them in every single building that the County owns. County facilities.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. We changed it. I'm just trying to get the exact wording -- verbiage.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I guess my question is what is the cost associated with it and where does the money come from? I mean, are we transferring funds from a certain section of the budget to this, you know, any idea of what the cost is?

MS. MOSS:
The legislation did not identify where their funds were from. The fiscal impact was on the original legislation and it was estimated at $530,000.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I'm sorry, how much?

MS. MOSS:
Five hundred --

LEG. BARRAGA:
Oh, $530,000.

MS. MOSS:
Correct.

LEG. BARRAGA:
All right, so, but there's no indication as to where the 530,000 is coming from to -- to do this program, to implement this program.

MS. MOSS:
It's not identified in the legislation.

LEG. BARRAGA:
All right, thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:
Can I ask George a question?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:
I mean, I'm not opposed to making sure we have CO detectors in our buildings and I think especially because we have old buildings with older systems where it's most likely where you're going to have a carbon monoxide problem. But when we have a resolution where there's a financial impact, aren't we supposed to provide -- I believe that was your bill, Steve.

MR. NOLAN:
Yeah, but, Legislator Browning, the bill is being phased in in three phases starting in, I think, 2015. So they don't have to provide an offset in this year's budget. So it's not an offset issue. In terms of how it's going to be paid for, having established a policy, I think the Department of Public Works will have to figure out if they're going to do this through the Operating Budget or through a capital project but that's down the road apiece.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
A lot will be determined on the way we install it. If it's a hardwired system, it'd be something we would do under -- under a capital program. The -- if it's something that is simply the same that you and I would get if we went into a hardware store and put a battery in and put it up, that would be something I would assume would come out of Operating Budget.

From what I see the legislation directs us that *Public Works is hereby authorized empowered and directed to install and maintain carbon monoxide detectors, which provide digital readouts of carbon monoxide levels, in all buildings owned, leased by or leased to the County of Suffolk, which are regularly occupied.* And that's pretty much the limitations. I would anticipate the price still to be about the same over three years based on the way the legislation establishes how we should look at the buildings and then, I guess, the funding would have to be determined how we get it.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Could you use the systems that are over the counter on -- on some of the buildings?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Again, yeah, a lot depends on the hardware that exists within the buildings themselves. If we don't have, for lack of a better term, a control panel, we wouldn't put in a hardwired system. It would just be too cost ineffective. We could certainly use that if it's a -- if it's a residence that somebody's renting from the County we could use it -- similar to you and I in our houses, you know, 30, 40 bucks go out and pick up a system. Then it just has to be turned on and left in the appropriate location.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And then, going back to reference the last presentation, the Suffolk County Climate Action Plan, they mentioned monitoring of the existing systems when the system is serviced. Is that being done currently for CO?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, I think they were referring more towards the -- the remote monitoring systems, systems that we can operate. They would be part of that if it was in a hardwired system and it did go back and, you know, we were able to remotely see that from Public Works. That would be one of the things we'd be able to locate. How many we have currently that are in that -- in that phase of development, I don't know, couldn't be much more than a handful, though.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

LEG. BARRAGA:
To your knowledge, are you aware of any other counties that are doing this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I read recently that Nassau was trying to implement some type of program but I didn't read the article.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Is that for the County buildings or for businesses?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, I didn't read the article.

LEG. BARRAGA:
I have a feeling it was for businesses. All right, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Anyone else? I have a motion to approve and a second. All in favor? Against?

LEG. BARRAGA:
I'm against.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE: 5-1-0-0 - OPPOSED: LEG. BARRAGA - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

Resolution 1275 - Directing the Department of Public Works to partner with the Town of Brookhaven to establish a Single Stream Recycling Program at Suffolk County Facilities. (Anker) Is there a motion?

LEG. BROWNING:
I guess I'll make a motion to approve but I'd like to find out what the --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Do I have a second? And we have a second, okay, on the motion.

LEG. BROWNING:
Can we have a financial impact, I mean, is this -- do we -- are we going to benefit from this? Do we get any revenues road or is it going to cost us?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
At the current time we are in the process of implementing a pilot program based on the County Executive's directive at Yaphank County Center in conjunction with the Town of Brookhaven. There is no cost to the County at this point. Eventually we would anticipate that there would be a reduction in our solid waste disposal costs. To what extent, at this point, I don't know. My concern as the department -- is more the implementation and the ability to implement such a program given the staffing, given the facilities. That's why we started with our building and with the old infirmary across the street as the first pilots to do under this program.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Could you describe exactly what -- how it's going to start and run?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We -- the Town of Brookhaven is going to provide us with two dumpsters; one at each facility. We will go through and collect all the -- essentially all the, you know, recycles. And they will be put into the dumpster. And as needed the Town will come and will collect them from us. So other then

the manpower to do the work, which we have in place, and which is why we picked those two locations, there really should be no costs to the -- costs to the County. Again, because this is such a vast county and we do have so many, over five million square feet of buildings, we wanted to, you know, as with any pilot program, you want it to be, you want it to succeed, you want it to do the best we can. So we figured this was the best locations to put it to be able to implement some type of program. You do it Countywide we'll never be able to do it, it's just too big.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
If you have -- why wouldn't you -- if someone's picking it up for free, why wouldn't it serve the needs?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We still have to collect it. You know, there still is the -- the issue now, what will happen is our custodians will have to come through in two shifts. You know, they come through once, do the recycles; come through a second time. So that takes time. And there's only limited manpower to be able to do that. So depending if you're in the County Center where you do have a lot of people, there is a -- it is an office situation, you are going to generate a lot of paper waste, as well as, you know, glass waste. Minimal amount of organic waste. You should see a reduction in your costs. We should be able to implement. When you start getting out to the satellite parks, satellite offices, things like that, it gets a little bit tougher.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay, thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:
I hate to go back because when you talk about custodians, I know I've had that conversation with you is the -- the severe shortage of custodians. And so now you're going to ask them, I know the one that comes to my office doesn't get to come that often, like they used to and how many buildings that custodian has to go to besides mine. And so now you're asking them to now, we're going to have separate containers in each office for the recycling and garbage and -- so, I mean, to make it simple, when the custodian comes to my office and has to empty the garbage, I mean, we separate the paper in our office anyway. But at the same time now, what is he going to do? He has to come in, take that separated garbage and what is -- where does he go from there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
As I said earlier, the program we're looking at is only at the two facilities; DPW building as well as the old infirmary.

LEG. BROWNING:
But this bill is -- is doing it Countywide so that would include us. No?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, not in the beginning, no.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This building's really -- this is really only to look at the feasibility of implementing a program. We're starting out with a pilot program starting very small and if we can we will grow bigger. If we can't, obviously we'll identify in the report to the Legislature that, you know, our weaknesses and our strengths if there are any.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay. I don't have my folder, I'm sorry, to be able to read the bill itself because it says Suffolk County facilities, which I assumed it would be all of our DOs.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Is there a time?

MS. MOSS:
It was amended and it says Yaphank County Center now.

LEG. BROWNING:
Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Down in the first resolved.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay, so it's -- okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
For a one year pilot.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Anyone else? We have a motion to a approve and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstains? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

IR 1283 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 11 Selden and Crescent Club Apartments (BR-1655). (Co. Exec.)
Is there a second?

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Can we a description of the project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is an existing apartment complex, which is asking to connect into our Sewer District number 11 in Selden for -- for a daily total of 41,670 gallons per day. The sewer agency has reviewed this request and has approved it. And we recommend it for its approval as well.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Any questions? Motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

IR 1284 - Authorizing execution of agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 11 Selden and Middle Country Meadows (BR-1640). (Co. Exec.)

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Can we get a description on that one?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Sure. Similar to the last resolution this is a connection request into Sewer District 11 at Selden. This is for a new subdivision. It's Middle Country Meadows. It's asking to request -- sorry, connect at a rate of 19,000 gallons per day. We have not seen plans yet but we are advised that there is the requisite affordable housing portion of the program as well and we will make sure that that does happen.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Any questions? Motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

IR 1292 - Authorizing the execution of an agreement between the County and the New York State Department of Transportation for Federal and State Aid Funding for the continuation of the HOV Bus Service on the Long Island Expressway for 2012 and 2013. (Co. Exec.) Do I have a motion to approve?

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Is there a second?

LEG. BARRAGA:
I'll second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
On the motion.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is a hundred percent State funded program that essentially takes commuters from certain locations along both Nassau, sorry, Suffolk County as well as Nassau County and brings them into the city and then back -- back from that. This is actually funding for 2012 and 2013. It reimburses us for that -- for those funds that we've already expended.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Any questions?

LEG. BROWNING:
Nope.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

IR 1293 - Appropriating funds in connection with Suffolk County District Attorney Building 77 Bathroom Project (CP 1649). (Co. Exec.) Is there a motion?

LEG. STERN:
Motion.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Motion and a second. That seems kind of self-explanatory.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's rehabilitation of bathrooms in the District Attorney's Building. We're designing the work inhouse. We expect to go out to bid this summer and complete the construction before the end of the year.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Sure.

P.O. GREGORY:
Any further developments with their move? I know they're looking for space. I know we spoke, I guess, a couple of months ago.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right, yeah, no. None -- none as of yet.

P.O. GREGORY:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

IR 1302 - Authorizing the illumination of the H. Lee Dennison Executive Office Building in recognition of Cystic Fibrosis Awareness Month. (Kennedy) Is there is motion? Is there a second?

LEG. BROWNING:
He did.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Motion and a second. Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

1304 - Authorizing use of County property in Yaphank by the GOOD Foundation for a 5K Run. (Co. Exec.) Is there a motion?

LEG. BROWNING:
What's the County property?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
The County property in Yaphank.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, it's at PD headquarters.

LEG. BROWNING:
Oh, that's that 5k. Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
There's a motion. Do I have a second?

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
There's a second. All in favor? Opposed? So moved. **APPROVED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)**

IR 1310- Authorizing reduction of bus fares on two routes to achieve fare uniformity. (Schneiderman) Is there a motion?

LEG. BROWNING:
Do we have to --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Well, this is a --

LEG. BROWNING:
I'll make the motion --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Actually.

LEG. BROWNING:
-- and if you want to --

LEG. BARRAGA:
Let's get the explanations.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Well, let's get the explanation first --

LEG. BROWNING:
I'll know we're supposed to make motions -- something.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
-- from Commissioner Anderson. No, we can ask for an explanation.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay. This resolution looks to direct a reduction in full bus fare for Suffolk County bus routes the S92 and the 10C, which are on the East End from 2.25 to $2.00 effective January 1st, 2015 based on the last Operating Budget we increased our rates by 50% across the, you know, on the -- across the entire County. These two fares had been increased under previous legislation and this legislation is looking to reduce that, reduce that rate coming next year in the next Capital, I'm sorry, Operating year.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And the other -- is that because there's other bus service, Sunday bus service in other parts of the

County now?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, there are other routes that run on Sundays. Not every route. I believe it's a total of ten routes that run. They charge $2.00 a fare. And there was just -- this was -- this was -- the reason it was across the board 50 cent hike on every bus route to pay for the Sunday service, these two, the increase -- the previous increase of 25 cents was to cover the costs of just these two the prior year.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So wouldn't it make more sense to increase the fares to pay for the bus service everywhere else since we're operating at a deficit on the bus service.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes. ***(*Laughter*)***

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay. So is there -- any -- anyone?

LEG. BROWNING:
I'll make a motion to table because I thought we had to make a motion of some kind for the discussion. But, you know, again it's not fair so you're talking about there's two East End bus routes that are paying more money than ones that are west, yes, than some of the bus routes on a Wednesday and why -- why do they have to pay more? And, I think, in Suffolk County it should be the same bus fare for everybody. I mean, the people using the buses on the East End are not wealthy people, you know, otherwise they'd have a car. So it's -- I get what the Legislator's doing but I think maybe he should authorize an increase of bus fares.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
To achieve uniformity.

LEG. BROWNING:
Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, we have on a number of occasions acknowledged the deficit that our transportation system runs on, I would also point out that something to be considered is that the -- that those two routes run on holidays as well during the summer, summer months. So that actual cost of running those days, those holidays, could be borne in the additional costs that those two routes pay. No other route is going to get that service just the 92 and the 10C.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. So I have a motion to table and a second. Is there any other motion? All right. So all in favor? Opposed? So moved. **TABLED (VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)** And I'm sure we'll be discussing this further.

IR 1313 - (Authorizing alteration of rates for Davis Park Ferry Co., Inc. (Pres. Off.) Do I have a motion to table for a public hearing?

LEG. BARRAGA:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All in favor? Opposed? So moved. Motion to table. **TABLED FOR PUBLIC HEARING (VOTE: 6-0-0-0 - P.O. GREGORY INCLUDED IN THE VOTE)** That concludes the meeting.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
If I may?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
If I could just have one word briefly. I just want to take a moment to introduce the newest member of our team. Darnell Tyson is the newest Deputy Commissioner of Public Works. He comes from a long career with New York City Department of Transportation. And with his expertise in transportation we look forward to his being part of our team and wish him continued success with the Department of Public Works.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Well, you're certainly welcome. Would you like to say a few words? It doesn't have to be about the bus service or the fares. Yeah, come on. Yeah, come on up.

MR. TYSON:
Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Yeah.

MR. TYSON:
Okay. Well, definitely, Gil, thanks for that introduction. I guess only one minor word of clarification: I actually worked with New York City Transit, the MTA agency. And we did work in close partnership with the City DOT, though, on Bus Rapid Transit, basically rolling it out around New York City. And it's a process that I've been engaged with them for four years.

So I look forward to taking that expertise and coming out here and bringing -- bringing that forth to sort of engage in a, you know, the decision making process on what makes sense out here. So that's it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay, thank you. Yes, you have any questions?

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah. You are a Suffolk County resident?

MR. TYSON:
I am. I live in Lindenhurst.

LEG. BROWNING:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And just don't mention any affiliation with the MTA and you'll be fine, I think.

MR. TYSON:
No problem. I will never mention it again.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right, all right. Meeting adjourned.

THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 4:01 PM
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY