

**PUBLIC WORKS**  
**of the**  
**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**Operating Budget Minutes**

A special meeting of the Public Works Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on October 22, 2014 to discuss the Operating Budget.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Legislator Krupski - Environment, Planning & Agriculture/  
Public Works, Transportation & Energy/  
Veterans & Seniors

Legislator Schneiderman - Economic Development/ Government Operations,  
Personnel, Housing & Consumer Protection/  
Parks & Recreation

Legislator Robert Trotta - Education & Information Technology/  
Budget & Finance/Health/Human Services

Legislator Kate Browning - Health/Human Services/Ways & Means/Public Safety/  
Public Works, Transportation & Energy

Legislator Robert Calarco - Government Operations, Personnel, Housing  
& Consumer Protection/Ways & Means/Health/ Public Safety

Legislator Barraga - Environment, Planning, & Agriculture/  
Public Works, Transportation & Energy/  
Veterans & Seniors

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature  
Jason Richberg - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
Debbie Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern  
Tom Vaughn - County Executive's Office  
Bob Doering - Director, Budget Review Office  
Christina DeLisi - Aide to Legislator Schneiderman  
Gil Anderson - Commissioner, Public Works  
All other interested parties

**MINUTES TAKEN BY:**

Gabrielle Severs, Court Stenographer

(\*The meeting was called to order at 9:37 a.m.\*)

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I would like to call this public meeting for the budget for Public Works to order. Could we all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Browning.

(\*Salutation\*)

Legislator Muratore has an excused health-related absence.

We have -- to begin, we have one card; Richard Kubeck, if you would like to address us.

**MR. KUBECK:**

Good morning. My name is Richard Kubeck. I'm chair of the Welfare to Work Commission of this legislature, and I think you know that we spend a good deal of our time looking at issues related to poor people, working poor people, supportive services, childcare, for example -- we released the report this year -- and always transportation. And so we were part of the coalition that worked with Legislator Schneiderman several years ago to get Sunday service, and I'm here authorized by the commission to support a concept he has floated with us, and I'm sure if you haven't yet, you're going to hear of this concept, to raise the county bus fare 25 cents and to use those funds to extend service in the evening and to expand to two, possibly three, Sunday lines, critical lines, and we think this is a good idea for a number of reasons.

We're always reluctant as a commission to put additional burdens on working poor people; our purpose is quite the opposite. But history has demonstrated with this particular issue that the riders vote with their fares. And so when the bus fare in the east end was increased by 50 cents several years ago for Sunday service, the Department of Public Works predicted -- they have a formula to predict ridership was supposed to go down and in fact it went up. And I think also through some of my affiliations, we were doing some surveying and Brentwood, for example, a couple of food pantries surveyed riders and 90 percent of the 600 people said, We'd pay the extra fare for the extra service.

So this is an opportunity, the commission feels, to get additional service with 25 cents. It will bring the fare to \$2.25 countywide. I had personally forgotten that the east end folks were already paying 2.25. We're still less than New York City and Nassau, which is 2.500. By increasing the fare, here's what we get: We're going to get two more critical lines, some evening service, the disparity between the east end and the rest of the county and the fare will go away, and -- I think this is very important: The groundwork will be set for us to return to the state and to say to the state, Listen, the County has done due diligence, the County has done everything possible that it can to increase our service. We're not getting our fair share of transportation funding, particularly compared to Nassau, so it's time for you to do something.

So while we're reluctant to burden riders because we recognize many of them are poor, again, history has demonstrated, you know, with additional service, they will pay the fare and the ridership will increase. So this is moving forward, hopefully with you, and I just want you to know the commission is in full support of the idea.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Could I ask you a question?

**MR. KUBECK:**

Sure.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Last year, Legislator Schneiderman, or earlier this year, proposed decreasing the fares to match -- on the east end to match the west end after it had been raised to account for Sunday service, and I suggested maybe we should raise the fares throughout the whole county because the bus system operates at such a deficit. Now what you said today was that you are in favor -- you and your commission are in favor of increasing the fares. Are you in favor of increasing the fares to bring it up to the level with the east end, to two and a quarter, period? Or are you only in favor of increasing the fares to bring it up on parity to the east end if it results in greater service?

**MR. KUBECK:**

The latter.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Now what about, okay, have you considered increasing the fares -- supporting increasing the fares to be on parity with Nassau County to \$2.50 and increasing the service at the same time?

**MR. KUBECK:**

No, we have not considered that. That would be quite a jump because I know our fares were frozen for 20 years, but when we went from 175 to 2, I think it was, so to go from 2 to 250 within two years is really, really a burden, and I don't think Nassau County should be the model for what we're doing here in terms of bus fare, bus service.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

No, no, you have to consider the economics of the riders. You have to consider the economics of the taxpayers who are subsidizing the whole system. I think those are the balancing things there. You know, the cost of operation is what it is. If you're going to increase service, you're going to increase the cost of operation.

**MR. KUBECK:**

Yeah, well, I think the key is the state at this point. I think the state fell short of what they should've done. I think when you compare, and I can't explain the differentials, for example, why did Nassau County get nine million in childcare and we get 600,000; and why did we get 500,000 in transportation and they got -- I forgot how much more.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Right.

But I think this has to be, as we said, a springboard to return to the state and to say to the state, What's going on here?

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I'm familiar with some of these transportation issues, and I give Legislator Schneiderman a lot of credit for really promoting the Sunday bus service because public transportation has to be convenient for people; otherwise, I don't care if it costs a nickel. No one's going to ride it if you can't get to the bus and it doesn't run at the times that you need it. It's more convenience and usability than the price, I think.

**MR. KUBECK:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Legislator Schneiderman, you had a question?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Thanks, Dick, for coming out. So years ago, we actually studied the bus system and found that there was about 24 routes that needed service, critical, that there was a high demand. Right now, we have roughly 10 of those routes going, so there's like 14 more to go. We believe it's about \$10 million more to get those routes going and to get the system at a decent level. We went to the state. We asked -- you know, 'cause I don't really want to see rates go up, either, for the bus riders. We asked for \$10 million more from New York State. We are getting a significant less than Nassau County gets, and it's actually more difficult in our area to run a bus system because it's more rural, and in a more urban environment, there's some economies of scale.

Anyway, that did not come through. That did not come through. The rate actually used to be a \$1.50. We raised it to two dollars a couple years ago without providing any additional service. The 10 routes that we have going is when we did get a little bit more money from the state. We were able to match it with a JARC grant, a federal grant so we ended up with \$2 million that we were able to get those additional nine routes going. The east end was already paying for their route.

So this discussion -- this has not been discussed with the workgroup yet. The idea of a 25 cent increase to go from two dollars to two and a quarter just on the general fare. The reduced fare would stay the same; senior fare would stay the same; SCAT fare would stay the same. Just the general fare would go up by a quarter. That would raise enough money to do possibly up to four Sunday routes, and what I'm going to propose that the work group discuss is not to necessarily specify what those routes will be but to do this in a similar way to what we did last time is to allow the Department of Public Works to figure out how much money that would be and what the greatest extent based on need for that would be; like the S45, which goes to the South Shore Mall, is not running on Sundays. It's a critical route. We anticipate it having the highest ridership. There are other routes that go to Stony Brook Hospital, Gordon Heights, Patchogue that we think are really important, and there's several routes that need evening services. So rather than specify which routes would go on Sundays or later in the evening to allow the department to come up with a plan working with stakeholders such as the Welfare to Work Commission, and thank you, Dick.

Again, my biggest concern here and why I haven't publicly called for this rate increase before this moment is that we would be, you know, painted as trying to do this on the backs of the poorest county individuals who are depending on this. And I've had a number of conversations with bus riders. I went to your group because I know you do a lot of work with the food pantries and Jobs With Justice and Welfare to Work to try to get the pulse of those that this would affect. Welfare to Work actually voted on this concept, right?

**MR. KUBECK:**

Yes, they did.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And what was that result of that?

**MR. KUBECK:**

Thirteen yes, three abstentions.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

All right, so overwhelming support. So I'm willing to bring this to the work group, Rob, to have this -- there's no budgetary impact, zero, because it's fully funded by riders. But I believe that even though it can be done any time during the year, it should be done through the legislature, I

believe, as part of the budget process. That's really the only question, I have.

**MR. KUBECK:**

You know, you mentioned Jobs with Justice. That's my day job. I work with Long Island Jobs with Justice. And last week, you may have read in Newsday that one of our young organizers who organizes the bus riders union actually took the busses from right through Nassau County out through Orient. Did you read this little piece? Aaron Watkins-Lopez, and he was telling us that in Suffolk, one of his jobs was to talk to the riders. He mentioned to the riders, Well, I wasn't around when they got Sunday service, but this is one of the things that Jobs with Justice advocated for, and the riders said, You do that? He said, I'm a divorced dad and I don't drive, and because of the Sunday service, I can see my kids now. That was a moving moment. He said, I never knew who to thank, so now I'm extending his thanks to you because it's an important concept.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**MR. KUBECK:**

Thanks.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay. We have another card. Tawaun Weber. Good morning, how are you?

**MS. WEBER:**

Most of you know me. I'm Tawaun from Vision Long Island. I don't want to keep you long. I'm not even going to use the full three minutes. I'm just echoing what Dick was saying. I think one of our main concerns and our main focuses is that we really make sure that the funding we give this increase does return to bus service. But, you know, sometimes the fares have an increase and have been used to fill other budget gaps. This is really important that we make sure that this fare increase goes back into the bus service, and I think what Dick was saying is key. You know, we've talked about a lot of things when it comes to Complete Streets and things like that to have you guys where you're at a level where the county is providing what they should do in their fair share in making sure that the bus is running, and then this way, we can go back to the state and say, You know what? You need to do your part, and we can bring that issue to them. I think that the increase for a quarter is reasonable. I don't think the 50 cents at this point. We are seeing some feedback in that if you're using Nassau County as a model, it's kind of mellowed out their ridership because of them fare increase, and it really hasn't been better service.

So we want to make sure that you do two things: you do a small increase and that you do better service. So evening and Sundays are very important. We have a lot of young people, especially for economic development, they rely on the busses for jobs. Seniors rely on the busses for doctors' appointments and things like that. It's very important for parents. We were talking about the dad who has the two kids. For a single mom, it's very important to be able to get to and from work and remember picking up the child from daycare; sometimes they need those extended hours. And a lot of our routes are missing -- Kate knows, Rob knows -- the Gordon Heights line is very important, the route to South Shore Mall, Smith Haven Mall, Stony Brook, to the colleges. It's really been an issue to make sure that we have the evening and Sunday services because the Sunday services allow for the continuing-ed classes at Suffolk County Community College. They allow for the students to work during the day and take evening classes. It's really building a better Long Island, a better quality. We don't really think about the bus doing all that, but it provides parents that can get to daycare and work seven days a week, and it provides for our seniors to be able to get to medical appointments. It provides for our youth to get safely to different places, jobs, and schools. So we're seeing how important the metro system is all across the Island. We want to get people out of cars. We've all sat in the expressway. Nobody wants to sit on the expressway anymore.

Let's make it easier for people to not have to rely on their cars.

So this is one of the things you can do, and a quarter increase is very reasonable. I think that you will see a very positive response from it.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you very much for your comments. You know, you talk about a quarter increase. This has been, and I've got to give Legislator Schneiderman a lot of credit for addressing the Sunday bus service in the beginning and the getting it and having the perseverance to see it through and then to keep expanding it. So this should be a constant discussion about service and cost, the riders and the taxpayers. It should be a constant discussion, and I really appreciate your input.

**MS. WEBER:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Just one question to BRO. I had out in a bill to eliminate the extra 25 cents during the course of 2014. I felt it was very unfair that riders in AI's and my district, on the S 92 were paying more for the general fare than everyone else even though the services were identical. So in other words, once we got Sunday service funded through the state and federal money, the east end was continuing to basically pay on their line at least 25 cents more for that service; and the problem I had when Robert analyzed this, he said, Look, if you take that 25 cents away, the budget unfortunately anticipates that money and you need to offset it, and obviously finding offsets when you have a deficit is very challenging.

So I don't know if you can answer this question, but does the county executive's proposed budget continue to have revenue from a 25 cent higher fare on the east end? Because either way, whether we bring everybody up, which is what I would like to see happen, and increase service levels, either way we cannot have the east end continuing to pay more than that rest of the county.

**MS. GAZES:**

I'd have to check to verify whether that's included in the budget or not, and we'll get you an answer ASAP.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right. If it is, we have to fix that too, one way or another; either bring everybody up or get rid of that 25 cent increase.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I think there's consensus for looking at the big picture, though.

So I don't have any other cards. So, Commissioner Anderson, could you join us?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Good morning.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Good morning. Do you have anything to offer for this hearing?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

That's a loaded question.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Suggestions, tales from the youth, anything.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

First off, as always I want to -- I haven't been able to get through all of it yet, but looking at public works recommended budget, as always, this is a piece of work that we will use ourselves again, both documents. With snow levels and things look that, we've been able to, through housekeeping, you know, maintain the budget properly and get everybody paid and get the work done. You know, I can't tell you what this winter is going to be. I can only hope it's not going to be anywhere like last winter, but I am confident that if you go with the recommended budget, we'll be fine.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay. Thank you. I've got a question about, and it relates to 477 and I asked this to Dr. Tomarken yesterday. In the past, the county's made a practice of pillaging the 477 water quality funds for infrastructure for salaries, and I'm trying to take at least -- because right now, that fund for water quality projects is almost zeroed out, and there's almost 80 positions that are being funded out of this fund, and I don't think it's a healthy practice. You know, we had the discussion yesterday at the hearing about how some of these positions are appropriate to be taken out of here. I have no doubt that their function is related to water quality. It's the source of their funding that I don't think is.

Now I'm asking every department, whether it's the Health Department or your department or Parks or -- actually, Economic Development has some in these positions coming out of this fund. To make it a policy of every year taking one position each and funding it through a different funding line, so is that -- and I don't know -- because you're managing your department, so I don't want to be the one to make the suggestion, Oh, it should be this person or that person; but do you have any suggestions along those lines of how we could free up one salary that's being funded out of 477?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The folks that work for our department that are funded through 477 funds are -- we keep them working on water quality projects. As far as whether they are funded through general highway funds or through the 477 funds, I don't see that as an issue if it's worked every year into this. Again, that's a policy decision. That would probably be best discussed with the county exec's office. As long as they're getting paid, I don't have a problem.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

George, could you give us the legal definition of how this money's being used and how it could be used differently, what the intent of the law was, rather, and not necessarily how it happened but the intent of the law and how the money should be spent.

**MR. NOLAN:**

Well, I think when it was originally enacted, and this is quite a while ago; I don't know precisely what the legislature's intent was at that time. I think since I've been here, all the legislators have repeatedly stated that they would much prefer that the money go directly to the projects to fund the brick and water as legislators often put it and less towards personnel. But since I've been here, at least, more and more has been directed to personnel, paying salaries. It's legal as long as these employees are working on water quality-type projects, but I can't say it's really something that the legislature has been happy about, but it's been really a testament to, you know, the budget issues and finding a way to pay people without raising property taxes.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Legislator Schneiderman, please.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Well, yeah, I mean, it has been a sore point because the program really was initially created for brick and mortar; there's no doubt, and when we were facing vast layoffs during the recession and we really didn't want to see these positions eliminated, it was either this or nothing. Either they were going to get fired or we were going to fund them through 477, and we did put additional positions in. There's been two bills through the years that I have pushed in this regard. One has actually been turned into law, which is a requirement that the proposed budget identifies all those positions that are 477 funded and what percentage of their time is on water quality, so that is in the proposed budget, not in BRO's report but in the Bellone budget.

The other bill that I have tried, I think, on multiple occasions to pass at this body is to cap how much could go towards salaries of the 477 fund, and I've suggested no more than 50 percent of the moneys could be used towards salaries and benefits. I think we're at a point where we've actually crossed the 50 percent line. We're using more than half of the money, so, Legislator Krupski, that may be something we want to revisit as well to see if we could establish a cap, a threshold by which we could not go beyond. And I understand, certainly, your desire to go back and start to restore these funds to their original intent, and I think at least if we could establish a threshold and then maybe move it in the direction you're suggesting at some time in the future, that would be good.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I don't know if a threshold -- and I don't know if this is the last resort. I mean, raising revenue is always a sore point with any government because no one wants to be accused of raising taxes; but on the other hand, the option is either raising enough revenue to pay for your operating expense, which salaries are operating expense, or taking the money that was allocated for something else and paying salaries, and that's what was done. So there are other options there other than taking this money that could be used for water quality, so I wouldn't even support a cap because I think we should just have a policy of starting to remove these positions and we'd have to work with the department heads in this case to say, Okay, how could we fund -- and I have a list of the positions. But again I don't really want to be the one to say -- because you're running the department, it would be a lot better for you to say -- this position here, we could take out of 477 and fund it over here. And, you know, it's really, I could make a suggestion, but it might not fit into your work plan.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I think with regard to the recommendation of taking one at a time or two at a time each year and moving it over, the folks that are funded through 477 work in our highway engineering department whether it's the labor crew leader and his staff or it's the engineers that are doing the water quality projects. And, in any event, I don't see them moving because of the funding source. They'll stay in the same area, most likely work on the same projects, maybe a little less water quality, a little more highway; you know, that still remains to be done, but I think that's a discussion that, you know, we can have and each year.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I'm not suggesting moving them physically. I'm just saying how would they're paid should be changed (sic) so that the money is freed up for water quality projects.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I understand, yeah. Again, that wouldn't impact the task that they do on a day-to-day basis.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

No, I'm not suggesting it should.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

I have another idea that could bring a couple hundred thousand dollars, I believe, and maybe BRO can work on these numbers into the 477 fund that could be used for brick-and-mortar projects. Quite a number of the positions that are 477 funded are reimbursable to a certain extent, some 37 percent, some of the health department positions, 36, 37 percent. My understanding is that that reimbursement is not flowing back to the 477 fund but going to the general fund, and if there was a requirement that -- if those reimbursements, since the money was paid out of 477 came back to 477, that would generate hundreds of thousands of dollars, I believe, 'cause we have millions of dollars in salaries coming out of 477 at this point.

Does BRO -- do you have any of those numbers?

**MS. GAZES:**

There was the discussion yesterday in health about that, where the revenue was going to the general fund. We'd have to look at each of the other departments individually to see what reimbursements were afforded to those positions, if any, in fund 477.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

If we could quantify that, and at least moving forward, have that money flow back to 477, that would create a substantial amount of money for those brick-and-mortar projects.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

But money's money, so that still leaves a hole somewhere else. If you're going to take that money, you're still taking it from somewhere.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It'll leave the general fund short, but it's really money that doesn't belong to the general fund.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

That's exactly my point.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Yeah, so that could actually allow these positions to be funded by 477; and then also when those reimbursements come in be used for the brick-and-mortar type projects that you're talking about. It's no small amount of money, and I honestly don't understand how it's proper to have these reimbursements not go back to 477.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I mean, there's -- in Public Works this year, there's a total of -- well, this year, there's a total of 19 positions so. In Parks, it's 34 positions. In Health, 17; in Economic Development and Planning, 8. So there's a total of 78 people being funded out of 477 at the expense -- basically at the expense of the whole fund.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So, Roz, BRO, would you guys be able to provide us with that information to see what the reimbursement on those 477 funded positions is --

**MS. GAZES:**

Yes, we'll --

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

So we at least would know the amount and then we could make a policy decision as to whether or not we want to allow that reimbursement to go to the general fund or back to 477.

**MS. GAZES:**

Yes, we'll do the research.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Okay. I appreciate that.

**MS. GAZES:**

To chime in on your question about the bus fares that you had earlier, that extra 25 cents for those east end routes that is assumed in the revenue that's recommended for 2015.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

It is, okay. So if we take it out, we have -- the working group would have to replace that money.

**MS. GAZES:**

That's correct, assuming that everything else stayed the same.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Right. I think that's an important issue that the working group is going to have to discuss, either bringing up everybody to 25 cents or eliminating the 25 cents on the east end.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. All right. Anybody else have a question for the commissioner?

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Can you put that in your notes for the working group?

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Legislator Trotta, please.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Thank you. I didn't get a chance to go over it in detail. Is there any money in there for Smithtown or Kings Park sewers for the next year or so.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I mean, we have for the district itself, as it stands right now, it is budgeted. For the capital work, for expanding the district itself, that would go under the capital program rather than the operating.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I'm just reading in today's Newsday that, you know, the lethal water around -- this has nothing to do with you. I'm just talking out loud. Around my district, Doc Spencer's district, Kate Browning's district, Legislator Schneiderman and Krupski's district is lethal water, you know, and I'm questioning why we're not sewerage them, and, you know, if water quality is the number one thing, why are we buying open space in the middle of Long Island when sewers are polluting what's going on? It just seems odd to me.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Actually, what I thought was pretty cool about the article too is if you look at the map that's showing the island, and it's showing the different areas, the two green areas are right in front of where sewer district three, southwest sewer district is.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I saw that myself. That's where the water's -- that should be telling us something.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Yes, please, Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, I'm looking here. I know there's some new positions, and maybe Robert wants to jump in there, anything at this time. The two wastewater treatment plant helpers and the two laborers, do we have anyone on the preferred list laid off that fill those titles? I don't know if you would know, Gil. And are they -- obviously I see it's going to come out of the sewer moneys to pay for their salaries, correct?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Correct.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I'm not going to tell you. I know we need them.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, that was when we created sewer district four or when we accepted sewer district four and started operating it. Part of the planning was that we needed the staffing. I don't know about any wastewater operators or our laborers are on the preferred list, but we would be required, if they were, to bring them back first or give them the offer first.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. Because I know the laborers are -- they're non-competitive civil service, so there's no test list.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I don't believe there is any preferred list, but I would defer to BRO.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right. And is, because obviously they're here and yesterday, you know, we did see some positions. We got a list of positions for other departments, but while we're putting the positions in there, but we're not filling them, so is there an intent to fill these positions?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yes, there is.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. Thank you. Robert, do you -- I guess you wouldn't --

**MR. LIPP:**

New positions, are you talk about? I'm sorry.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Well, I was just curious --

**MR. LIPP:**

The only new positions that we're aware of is from resolution 798 of 2014 that have the four new positions for a galleria.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay.

**MR. LIPP:**

Seems like everybody is on the same page here.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Yes, we are. Thank you.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Commissioner, can I ask you about dredging? There was -- and this may relate to that recommendation from BRO for more overtime money, but it was kind of a sore point on the east end that in the past, because overtime wasn't being approved, dredging projects, to keep that dredge moving and to be able to dredge all the areas that needed it and the short window we have environmentally of time to do it, town boards, town trustees on the east end were asked to pay the overtime costs for the county work crews. They did it, but it was somewhat of an embarrassment for me. I want to make sure that that's not going to happen in the future. It's not going to happen in this dredging window, and it's not going to happen next year in the dredging window. Can you comment on that? I want to make sure that you have adequate money that we're not asking -- and I know that some of these dredge projects are million-dollar projects. We're only asking for 10- or 20,000, but we've got to find a way to pay for that through overtime.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

This year's dredging program, which is already underway, we have not asked for any of the towns to reimburse for the overtime. We are authorizing the work on overtime to get done. I would anticipate that what we did over the past two years, we will not do again as long as, obviously, the economy continues to move upward and our budget's okay.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you, because that something -- I mean, we've had that discussion just last week. I've had that discussion with the towns in my district that were concerned about that. Again, it's the perception -- it is the money, but it's also the perception that east end towns are having to pay the west end towns -- don't have to pay for overtime for dredge projects, so it's just a matter of parody. It's kind of like the bus fares. It's parody.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

And the distinction there, which really fell on the backs of the east end, is that we typically use, at least on the smaller dredge projects on the east end, we use the county dredge, so it's a county work crew in western Suffolk. Almost all those jobs are done with private contractors, so there is no county labor involved, and that's why it ended up hurting the east end more than anywhere else because it was county labor; so I'm happy to hear that that's not going to happen, at least in the near future.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, this policy was initiated almost, I want to say, under the last administration but whatever it was, when the economy -- you know, when the recession hit, when we were having trouble, we had that huge deficit in the, you know, the county's budget. So it was felt that, you know, we were cutting back on overtime and --

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Right. I was with the town at the time, and we felt that everyone was hit the same way with the downturn of the economy. So we weren't happy that the county was trying to --

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Fair enough.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

-- pass it on.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Right, and as I said, we were not doing it any longer --

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Right, no, and I really appreciate your sensitivity to that.

Anyone else have any questions? Well, thank you very much.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I'll make a motion to adjourn.

**LEG. SCHNEIDERMAN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

All in favor? Opposed? Abstained? Okay.

*(\*The meeting was adjourned at 10:13 a.m.\*)*