

CAPITAL BUDGET MEETING
of the
PUBLIC WORKS and TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE

The Public Works and Transportation Capital Budget Meeting was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, Smithtown, New York, on Wednesday, May 19, 2015 at 9:30 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Jason Richberg - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature
Robert Lipp - Director/ Budget Review Office
Roslyn Gazes - Budget Review Office
Bob Doering - Budget Review Office
Jill Moss - Budget Review Office
Gil Anderson - Commissioner/ Department of Public Works
Bill Hillman - Chief Engineer/ Department of Public Works
Catherine Stark - Aide to Leg. Schneiderman
Bob Martinez - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Deborah Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern
Katie Horst - County Executive's Office

TAKEN BY:

Gabrielle Severs - Court Reporter

(*The meeting was called to order at 9:42 A.M.*)

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Good morning to the Capital Budget meeting for Department of public Works. If we could all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Stern.

Salutation

This is a public hearing. We do not have any cards. If there's anyone from the public who would like to address the committee or ask questions of the Commissioner? And seeing none, I'd ask Commissioner Anderson to come up and give us an overview of the proposed Capital Program.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to speak briefly. I would say in general, we recommended -- requested, generally, a program similar to last year's program. In total, the 2016 Capital Budget totals about \$536 million. It covers the full gamut of County facilities and projects, as we have. One nice thing this year is we don't have the jail and Phase II; it's been held off or postponed for now. So as a department, while we do enjoy building things, we're glad that we don't have to do that one.

We have this year in the budget, you'll see a number of sewer projects that are State and Federally funded, 383 million, for the areas of North Babylon, Great River, Oakdale, Patchogue and Mastic, and those are Federally aided. And we look forward to discussions. I would, as always, commend BRO for their proposed capital -- review of the proposed Capital Program; it's as thorough as it is every year and we look forward to the discussions.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Does anyone on the committee have any specific questions for the Commissioner?

LEG. STERN:

Good morning, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN STERN:

So the sewer projects are very promising, and I know that you share your excitement with everybody else that these are projects that are going forward. \$383 million; just break that down, the 383 and the source. And ultimately, for that dollar amount, with all of the projects that you had mentioned, is -- what is that number intended to cover or not cover, if anything?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, I'm going to ask John Donovan to come up to give you some detail on it. He's been -- has certainly been right, as welcome, if John feels.

MR. DONOVAN:

Good morning. Three hundred and eighty-three million is 300 million in grants and 83 million in EFC low-interest loans. The 300 million grant is a combination of both FEMA money and HUD money. What that covers, and we're dividing that up into four project areas: Carlls River, which is Wyandanch, North Babylon, West Babylon; Connetquot River, which covers Great River; Patchogue River, which is going to be a small project in Patchogue to connect homes; and the Forge River which is Mastic/Shirley area.

Public Works Capital Budget Meeting - May 19, 2015

The breakout -- I don't have the exact numbers, but it's roughly about, I think 136 million in the Carlls River area, 196 million in the Forge River, about 30 million in Connetquot, and 16 million in Patchogue. Was I right?

MR. LIPP:

That was pretty good.

*(*Laughter*)*

LEG. TROTTA:

What page is that?

MR. LIPP:

Page six.

MR. DONOVAN:

Page six.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Of the BRO review.

MR. DONOVAN:

Yeah, these numbers don't add up to the full amount because we separated out planning and design into a separate Capital Project; it's 8197, I believe.

LEG. STERN:

That's what I was -- I was trying to check my math, and so I'm glad you brought that up, because I was running through it three or four times, it didn't add up. So the number that's not included there is planning money?

MR. DONOVAN:

Yeah, is the engineering/design money, we put that into a separate Capital Project for all four areas.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Eighty-one ninety-seven is on the bottom of the table and it shows for --

MR. DONOVAN:

Well, it does show 22 million for the Capital.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

-- 22 million.

MR. LIPP:

This year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right, for this year.

MR. DONOVAN:

I don't know why these numbers aren't adding up.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, this -- again, this doesn't include -- this is the design, and that's 2015 proposed modified.

LEG. TROTTA:

There's other projects.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And if you look at the 2016 which is this, that's what it comes to 352.

MR. DONOVAN:

So that's still 374, it's a little short, unless this 10 million gets us -- we've got 384; yeah, okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

MR. DONOVAN:

It adds up to about 384.

LEG. STERN:

With the planning and design?

MR. DONOVAN:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

So the numbers are proposed -- well, there's 2015 adopted and then there's 2016 proposed. And with right now, nothing in the out years?

MR. DONOVAN:

Correct.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. So from the budget numbers, then, can you tell me when the work is proposed to begin and when it is anticipated that it will end?

MR. DONOVAN:

Yes. We are looking -- we made application for the money, it's being reviewed by FEMA and HUD. We are looking to put out RFPs to hire design consultants this year, we're looking to get it done sometime this summer, we're working on those RFPs. So once we get a design consultant, they could probably start designing come this Fall, and we have an aggressive schedule, we have deadlines with this money, so we're looking to give them about a year to design and get it out to bid. So we're looking for hopefully bid it by the end of 2016 and start construction soon thereafter.

LEG. STERN:

And then anticipated time that it would take to do the project?

MR. DONOVAN:

Well, we're looking. It should be about a four or five-year project for all the areas combined total, at once. I think we're trying to expedite it into three years. The deadline for the grant money -- which is not written in stone, we're told -- but it's 2019, September of 2019, that's why we want to get this going by the end of next year.

LEG. STERN:

2019 is the deadline to have pulled down and utilized all of the available funds, or a deadline for the project to be completed?

MR. DONOVAN:

To bill all the funds; you have to bill all the funds and to do that, you have to complete the project.

LEG. STERN:

All right, very good. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. I've got -- and I guess I have other questions about infrastructure, but we're on the sewer path here, so we'll stay there. We're in the pipeline here.

How are you going to coordinate all this with czar Scully and will he be part of the Capital Budget, you know, talks? Will he be an integral part right away, or is -- what role is he going to play in all of this.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

He will have a very important role. He will be -- it is anticipated that he will be -- oh, I thought I was pushing it, sorry.

He will be a very integral part of all these projects; essentially, the interface between the State and the Feds and our department. You know, he'll be the first line of communication and then we'll facilitate discussions and moving the project forward from there.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I mean, I assume there'll be a lot of details, especially by people whose areas and neighborhoods and whatnot are going to be directly affected by these projects. Do they get addressed by you or do they get addressed by Mr. Scully? How are we going to coordinate all those little -- because the devil's always in the details. You know, we talk about a hundred -- 380 million or whatever, and it's going to -- if you say it fast, it sounds very easy it's going to happen by 19 -- 2019 and all that, but there's going to be a lot of things along the way that we have to pay attention to. So who's going to be in charge of addressing all those things?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

My understanding of it, Peter Scully will be the gentleman in charge of everything. Obviously everything works its way downwards. We will be doing the work on the ground, we will be -- you know, certainly with respect to construction, construction is intrusive, it will be in everybody's faces and getting in the way. It will be, you know, a disturbance. As John mentioned, there is a very aggressive time schedule on this that the State's enforcing, so -- which is good, because you don't want these things to drag out. Similarly, you know, there is -- there will be a referendum required, whether voted on or not. So there is that process. Again, a lot of this is -- you know, will be developed in detail as we move forward.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. As far as the referendum goes in notifying the public, I was at a meeting over a year ago in Moriches and I think it was a public meeting, and two of the people who were going to be affected were there. It was a very poor turnout. Who's going to be -- as far as setting up a sewer district, who notifies the public? How is that -- how is that done? And if you have 150 people who are property owners in the sewer district and you have a vote to form the district and three people show up to vote, and two vote for it and one votes against it, does that mean everybody's in the district?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

First there's -- okay, it's not necessarily going to a voter referendum. We generally would first handle public hearings. If the -- and again, those are advertised through the County's papers as well as we would make an effort to have this -- you know, publicize it as much as we can because of

its importance.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Assuming everything -- everyone who comes into the public hearing is positive about this, then it would be essentially a permissive referendum. We wouldn't actually have to go out to do a voter referendum. If there is opposition, then there would have to be a vote, a referendum voted on by that district, or the proposed district. And at that time, if it was voted on, I believe it was fifty percent?

MR. DONOVAN:

Yeah. Well, if people object to the district, they have to file a petition. If 5% of the people in a voting area or a hundred signatures are gathered, then it goes for a full vote on the November ballot. So that's what's happening right now with the Melville Sewer District, the people in that district. There was some opposition to us taking it over, they got the required signatures and now it's slated to be on the ballot in November for everybody in that voting area of the sewer district to get to voice their opinion, and then it's just a majority, 50%.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Fifty percent of the people who vote.

MR. DONOVAN:

Fifty percent of the people who vote who are in that area.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. So who's going to be in charge -- I guess we'll start with Mr. Scully. Who's going to be in charge with notifying the people who will be affected and what information -- because that's always the key thing, it's what information they'll be given. How is this going to affect you? I mean, that's important, the message.

MR. DONOVAN:

Well, part of the grant money and low interest loan money we are receiving, we have to set up a schedule of public information meetings in all the areas. So once we get a consultant, we will start doing that and try to keep people informed of what's going on. So there will be active public informations going on through the course of the project. When the district is formed, as the Commissioner stated, you know, we notify -- it's posted in the papers and basically it comes before the Legislature to create a district, and that's where public comment can be made and if people want to file a petition they can file it at that time.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay, thank you. And just switching topics off the sewer, and I know Legislator Trotta has a question, but just one second. Is it related to the sewer?

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Oh, go ahead. We'll finish up that topic.

LEG. TROTTA:

Who picks? I mean, these are going to be new sewage treatment plants, I'm assuming. I mean, there's a lot of money being spent here. Who picks where they're putting these?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Actually, only one area's getting a new sewage treatment plant, that would be the one in Mastic. The other areas are expansions. We have -- North Babylon goes into Sewer District 3, as would the Oakdale/Great River section, they would both go into Sewer District 3. Patchogue River, Patchogue Village actually recently expanded their treatment plant and they have capacity, so the only new one is the one in Mastic. We have worked with the Town of Brookhaven to develop a site which is at the southwest quarter of the Calabro Airport.

LEG. TROTTA:

And this is basically all homes that are being sewered, not business areas?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There are -- in the Mastic area there is -- along Montauk Highway, there will be a business district that will be sewered as part of the, you know, overall area we're sewerage, but for the most part we are sewerage residential areas.

LEG. TROTTA:

How many houses, like in the Mastic do you think you're going to be able to do?

MR. DONOVAN:

About almost three thousand in Mastic. I think about 2500 in Carlls, 500 in Great River and 650 in Patchogue.

LEG. TROTTA:

I don't see Kings Park on here. I see there's some money in it for the other thing. But, you know, I have a plant, I have a pipe running across Main Street, and for a decade we've just heard talk. Is there any plans to actually get that going?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At the present time, no, there is nothing. We've had -- we've done planning on that, but I believe currently we are waiting for the Town to develop some overall zoning district that would allow for, you know, the transit-oriented development and then we'll bring the sewers in.

LEG. TROTTA:

They actually say they're waiting for you, whatever. I mean, the problem we have here is you're doing homes. You know, people are leaving here, we need downtowns revitalized. Doing someone's home really doesn't do anything for the economy. I mean, I'd like to see more downtown sewerage. Here's an opportunity to do -- you know, I have Kings Park, I have a plant at half capacity, I have a pipe running across Main Street. And this, I would think, would be a higher priority because you're going to generate businesses and apartments. I don't understand why this isn't higher.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, this funding was a result of Hurricane Sandy, so the areas that we received this funding for are trying to mitigate the impact of future storm damage. So that's where we've been able to gain this large sum of money. Certainly, you know, we're in agreement. Where we can, we're trying to bring sewers into commercial areas, transit-oriented development areas, so that we can stimulate the economy, as well as, obviously, the environmental benefits of sewerage as well. But in these particular cases, this is funding that was based on storm mitigation.

LEG. TROTTA:

I know, that's why I asked about, you know, other commercial areas. And I'm pretty sure that Sandy did not affect, you know, Route 27 in Mastic, there was no water there, there was no problem there, yet they're going to be getting sewers.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, actually the way we've gotten the funding, because Mastic was significantly -- you know, not Montauk Highway, I agree with you -- but Mastic itself was significantly impacted under Sandy, so the funding was put towards Mastic. The intent of the sewerage will improve, you know, and reduce the level of nitrogen going into the Great South Bay which will, you know, in turn improve the wetlands which will strengthen Mastic. You know, it's a cyclical thing. So that's where the funding was able to be put to Mastic.

LEG. TROTTA:

All this funding should free up other funding that we've had for other projects, I'm assuming, because we have all this extra money.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The funding itself -- you know, again, we've always gotten to that point where we say, Yeah, we know sewers are going to be a help, they're going to be great, they're going to stimulate the economy, but then, you know, again, put that type of funding into the Capital Budget, you know, it's a big under --

LEG. TROTTA:

All the engineering plans are done for Kings Park, correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. TROTTA:

So we spent all this -- how much did that cost us?

MR. DONOVAN:

One point seven million.

LEG. TROTTA:

All right, so we spent 1.7 million, probably years ago now, so it's all ready to go and we're doing nothing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. You're talking 17 or \$20 million that we'd have to do the sewerage in Kings Parks.

LEG. TROTTA:

I don't think it's 20 million. I mean, I've heard from six million, or it was actually as low as two million to ten million.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

John just said 17, so I through three million on there just in --

MR. DONOVAN:

(Laughter) Inflation.

LEG. TROTTA:

All right. I mean, what do I have to do to get it done? What do I have to do?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, my suggestion would be to reach out to the County Executive's Office about including it in next year's Capital Program. Certainly, you have the ability to introduce it into this year's, you know, as part of the Legislature.

LEG. TROTTA:

Okay. I'll talk to the sewer czar.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right, I've got -- Legislator Calarco has a question, but I've got a brief question for Robert here. On page one there's a FEMA line that's zeroed out. Why -- first of all, why is it all zeroed out? And second of all, if it's all zeroed out, why is there even a line?

MR. LIPP:

Why there is no money in that funding source really is a County Executive question. We're just -- what we're showing you is what's in the proposed program. So basically the way we always looked at the FEMA money is it's just a subcategory of Federal aid. So from the perspective of from what the source of funding is, as far as I'm concerned, it doesn't matter if it's F for Federal Aid or FE for FEMA, which is also Federal Aid.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. So why is there even a line there then?

MR. LIPP:

Because what we're looking at is a comparison. Not only are we looking at, you know, what's in the Capital Program, and these are the various funding sources, but just as important, we are doing a comparison to last year to see what's there. So last year there was a fair of FEMA aid; for I guess about three years, I want to say, running, there was FEMA aid. And then for whatever reason, they decided to -- the County Executive decided to alter the funding source. In fact, what we did mention on Friday's Capital Working group meeting, that the analysis of a comparison to last year is maybe a little difficult because there are a couple of new funding sources, there's one being eliminated, that's this one, and there's an expansion of other which is basically including what has been spoken about here; a combination of EFC, low-interest financing and several State-type grants.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If I may, a lot of the -- after Sandy, there were a lot of applications made to FEMA various Hazard Mitigation Grants that haven't moved, they're still in for review, but there's been no movement, so I believe that was the initiative to just stop talking about it until something actually happens.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Thank you. Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:

Thank you. Good morning. Gil, I appreciate you being here this morning. I wanted to ask you about these projects, because I was just trying to find out exactly where they are, where they stand, you know, how far along are we in this processes, what are we expecting to be coming out, you know, how quickly will we be ready to move on each individual project? I know some are going to

be different than others.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, the -- we're at a point now where I believe -- and John can clarify, but we've worked with the State for a year now and getting the grant applications, reviewing the grant applications, and we feel within a month away from the actual approval. Once we have that approval, we will initiate the RFP process, go out to hire consultants to do the design of the four projects and I think we're talking about a year or two to get that completed.

LEG. CALARCO:

When you say the grant's approval, we've already received approvals from the State, but this needs to go back to the Feds; is that the case?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's more of we know the money's out there, it's basically getting into the details of where exactly we're working, what we're doing. While we know we have 383 million, you know, we've been developing what's going to where.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay, that was going to be my next question. And I apologize if you've already answered. Do you know how the money breaks out in terms of what goes to which projects and how much is EFC money going to reach individual locations?

MR. DONOVAN:

Yes. On page six, which is up on the screen, it gives the breakout of the design money and the construction money that's going to be needed for each area. Roughly, it's 191 million, 92 million in Forge, 128 in Carlls, 29 in Connetquot and 16.6 in Patchogue.

LEG. CALARCO:

Do you have the breakout in terms of what -- how much is EFC funding out of each one of those categories versus, for instance, straight grants?

MR. DONOVAN:

Yeah, the -- the EFC portion is 83 million out of the 383, and the 22 million in 8197 is for the planning and design of all four projects. That is going to be EFC money, and the reason we did that is because it can get us started sooner. EFC doesn't have all the controls and requirements that the State and Federal government has and we looked at doing that to try to get us going sooner, being time is of the essence. The rest of the EFC money will be divided up amongst the other projects, all the projects.

LEG. CALARCO:

Amongst all four projects, or just three?

MR. DONOVAN:

Well, yeah, it might not be for Patchogue, but it would be for the Forge, Carlls and Connetquot.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. And then those respective districts would pay those EFC bonds back, or loans, I guess.

MR. DONOVAN:

Part of the requirement is that all the areas have to pay an equal portion, even if they're not receiving the money; they have to pay an equal portion of the EFC money back because it was all one pot, so everybody should pay the equal portion.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. So Southwest will cover half and the new Mastic district will cover a quarter of those costs, and then you'll charge back to the Patchogue Village Sewer District the other quarter; is that how it will work?

MR. DONOVAN:

Yeah, basically. There's roughly 6800 or 7,000 total lots, businesses and residents that will be connected from these project, so that number will be used to divide into the 83 million and every --

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. So all of those property owners who will be connected will get allotted some sort of charge that goes to paying those EFC bonds back.

MR. DONOVAN:

Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

MR. DONOVAN:

Whether they use them or not.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay, very good.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right, I've got one more sewer question.

LEG. TROTТА:

I just have a technical question.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Yeah, go right ahead.

LEG. TROTТА:

Do you have to be connected? Let's say I don't want to be connected; do you have to be connected?

MR. DONOVAN:

Yeah, once we create a district, everybody is supposed to be connected. And we have it in our Sewer Code; if you are notified after sewers are available, you have one year to connect.

LEG. TROTТА:

And if you don't?

MR. DONOVAN:

If you don't, I don't know the legal ramifications, it's never happened.

LEG. CALARCO:

But I think the important part of this is what would those -- under this project, the way they're being designed, is there a cost to the homeowners to connect, or to the property owners to actually do those connections?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, the way the project's being developed right now is that the connection is part of this cost. So if you are a homeowner and you don't take advantage of the connection, you will -- you know, after the year you're going have to pay for that connection on your own dime. So right now the County will be coming in and doing the connection work, but if they don't do it in a timely manner, they will have to pay for it themselves.

LEG. TROTTA:

So the odds are they'll do it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, I would think.

LEG. TROTTA:

There might be some crazy ones who don't do it.

LEG. CALARCO:

And what potential cost will be to a homeowner to connect?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, right not --

LEG. CALARCO:

And if they decided to wait the year and they did it on their own.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Three to thirty-five hundred.

LEG. TROTTA:

That's not bad.

LEG. CALARCO:

Because I know Patchogue's a lot more.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. So we're talking about a nitrogen reduction and treatment of waste water. Does any of this include treating -- you know, more advanced treatment of the waste water so that it could be discharged into the ground, discharged onto County golf courses, like at Riverhead, so that you wouldn't have to put extra fresh water into the Atlantic Ocean that's not treated enough to land apply, so you know it's not -- it's treated, but it's not safe enough to use to put into the aquifer.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The only one that will receive that level of treatment will be the one in Mastic, the new plant. The others are all going to Bergen which is Sewer District 3.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So why wouldn't this include an upgrade to Bergen so that we could use that effluent into the -- put it back into the aquifer instead of putting it in the ocean?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

One of the things we looked at in the outfall project was for a plan recharge, and the cost was exorbitant. I don't know the number off -- I can get that for you, but it is an exorbitant cost to run, to find an area where you can recharge, but then you also have to, as you mentioned, upgrade the treatment level to tertiary.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

But while you're -- you know, while we're going through this exercise of hooking other places up, and wouldn't it make sense at that point to go through the exercise of saying, *Okay, the treatment level is going to be X amount*, because you're going to have to distribute the treated waste water back upland at that point. You couldn't discharge it all on that one location, obviously. So shouldn't that be a part of the same exercise?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

-- where you would distribute this treated waste upland?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, I would say keep in mind that this -- these funds were -- have to be mitigation -- directed towards mitigating future storm events. So while something as you're recommending is, you know, laudable, that expense is not something that the Federal government is willing to, you know, pay for right now. They're willing to pay for sewers to, you know, eliminate the nitrogen, to improve groundwater and certainly wetlands, but the upgrade to that level, they weren't willing. You know, we had a much larger proposal which didn't include your suggestion, but we got the 383 million and this is what we can do with it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. I mean, at some point people are going to say, well, that's not good enough because we're still putting it out into the natural environment, whether it's a couple of miles off shore or whether it's closer to home. Of course, if you can't see it, you know, it doesn't really happen, right?

All right, changing off of that sewer topic. Infrastructure; as far as -- how are you doing the prioritization of infrastructure? Because there is a lot of work that was, I think, put off. And how do you schedule the amount of work that's done? I mean, obviously some of the -- you know, you made a very good case for the bridge at Smith Point at the last meeting, that it's a big project and it's critical that we address it.

There's other infrastructure that -- projects, a lot of road work, you know, fixing intersections, they work today; could they be better? Probably, but it's not critical that they be done right away. You know, if you look at the long-term debt, I think you have to -- how do you go through that priority level of saying what should we fix -- what needs to be fixed immediately, what would be nice if we fixed it but it really doesn't need to be fixed immediately. You know, what could be put off?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

In the recommended budget you'll see a lot of -- many road projects that were pushed off a year, and we're okay with that, given the workload we have right now. You know, we didn't feel any were imminently threatening; certainly, if we did, we would be back here.

You know, we're a little concern with the Shinnecock project. The Shinnecock Canal is always an issue, and we'd love to give it back to to State for a really cheap price.

Other than that, I mean, it's really -- for the most part, we're -- you know, we're comfortable with pushing those back. Our program is generally a maintenance program as much as we can -- you know, we anticipate the -- you know, as our infrastructure ages, it starts to deteriorate, it takes over time. We'd like to, you know, keep current with that. We monitor that, we try to do these programs so that in a few years we have the projects ready and we can go out to bid in a timely manner. As I mentioned, we're comfortable with, you know, the ones that have been pushed back a year.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right, thank you. Just one more question about dredge equipment. So the replacement of the dredge, all that's on schedule just to maintain your current operation? On page 249.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, it's -- again, this is -- the dredge, like the Locks, you know, is under severe, works under severe conditions continually and it has to be replaced. I don't -- what exactly are you asking?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

No, just want to review it, that's all.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Oh, okay. Yeah. I mean, we have next year, in 2016 we're looking at an excavator to remove {shulls} and sandbars, a dozer, and then generally the replacement of dredge parts, you know, mechanical parts of the dredge.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. If there's no other -- you have no other comment for the committee?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

None.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Legislator Trotta?

LEG. TROTТА:

I just have a quick dredge question. Like the Nissequoque River, is that on a schedule like every four years or is it as needed?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Generally it's as-needed. We anticipate -- we get a 10-year permit, we anticipate we're going to have to do it at least two or three times. Nissequoque we did '06/'07 and then a storm came through and basically we had to go back in there and do it again. You know, you could never -- I mean you could do it one year and it's -- you know, it's --

LEG. TROTТА:

It changed dramatically in the past year because of the way the Sunken Meadow Creek runs out now, and it's much better. The bluff is -- there's much more land. So I think that if you -- you could probably get away this year, but you've got to start looking at it because --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

LEG. TROTТА:

I think it will last a lot longer now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay, there you go.

LEG. TROTТА:

Is that in the budget for this year?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, it's in 2018.

LEG. TROTТА:

Hopefully we get there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's our plan right now.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

On the previous page, I guess it's the contracted dredging. The requested is quite a bit less than the Executive recommended; is that going to be an adequate number? Page 248.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We will do and we will spend whatever you give us.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

And I understand it's a function of the natural conditions; some years you're going to need more and some years it's not going to fill in.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So I understand that. Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. If there's no other questions, then we stand adjourned.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you. Have a good day.

*(*The meeting was adjourned at 10:20 A.M. *)*