PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A meeting of the Public Works Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York, on September 28, 2015.

***Members*:**
Legislator Al Krupski - Chairman
Legislator Tom Muratore - Vice-Chair
Legislator Tom Barraga
Legislator Kate Browning
Legislator Steven Stern

***Also In Attendance*:**
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Leg. Leslie Kennedy - 12th Legislative District
Jason Richberg - Chief Deputy Clerk
Robert Lipp - Director/Budget Review's Office
Bob Doering - Budget Review Office
Craig Freas - Budget Review Office
Bob Martinez - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Bill Shilling - Aide to Majority Leader
Debbie Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern
Katie Horst - County Executive's Office
Garry Lenberger - Director of Operations, Suffolk County Transit
Gil Anderson - Commissioner, Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Michael Leclerc - SILO
Kevin McAllister - Defend H20
Robin Mayr
Dawn Cookler - SILO
Philip Scholz
Tammy McLaughlin
Ecaterina Henter
Michael Bosco
Michael Jordan
Alice Young
Rick Brand, Newsday
And all other interested parties

***Minutes Taken By*:**
Gabrielle Severs - Court Stenographer

***Minutes Transcribed By*:**
Denise Weaver - Legislative Aide

(*The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m.*)

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. Could we all rise, please, for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Browning.

(*Salutation*)

Welcome to the regular Committee meeting of Public Works, Energy and Transportation. We'll start off today with the public portion. We have a number of cards. Bryan Rossi is first and on deck Kevin McAllister.

(*Public Portion*)

MR. ROSSI:
Okay. Still not used to using microphones. Hello, everybody. My name is Bryan Rossi, I've spoken here in the past. Actually today happens to be my birthday. For my birthday present I would just like people to listen to what I have to say on the subject.

I am coming, as I have many times in the past, to ask that non-drivers, particularly disabled non-drivers, like myself, be given the full service extensions of Sunday and evening and hours that we've been asking for for some time now, and this -- this pretty much impacts a lot of areas of our lives and I can definitely say this impacts our freedom of religion, I happen to be Unitarian and Pagan and have been unable, since I returned to Suffolk, to attend any house of worship, which meets on a Sunday or in the evening.

I can also say that this impacts our ability to go out in the evening, have any kind of social life, have any kind of dating or pretty much do anything that goes about past about something in the evening. And this Legislature in the past couple of years passed historic legislation to improve and alleviate this problem and we're still waiting for it to be fully implemented for all the routes for Sundays and evenings so that we can have full equal adult lives with dignity and a full ability to enjoy our freedom of religion and freedom to actually have a full 100 percent adult life rather than half of one.

So I hope that you folks will act to actually give us all the extensions that we've been waiting for. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you, Bryan. All right. Kevin McAllister and on deck Michael Leclerc.

MR. McALLISTER:
Good afternoon. I'm Kevin McAllister of Defend H2O. I'm here today to speak in favor of IR 1757, rescinding the pending Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of East Hampton for cost sharing on maintenance costs associated with the Montauk Shoreline Stabilization Project.

My expertise and experience is deep in the realm of shoreline management. Certainly over the years I've worked extensively in Palm Beach county on shoreline projects from beach nourishment to dune restoration. And let me start by saying this project, although it's called the reinforced dune, it is in fact, not a dune. It is plain and simple coastal armory.

Now I know the -- back in, I belive, it was April, the Legislature approved to enter into this agreement based on what was represented as likely cost sharing, what the maintenance costs would be. This is, again, over a course of 3100 linear feet is over 4000 geobags that will be stacked. It will be a three foot of sand veneer placed over the top and as represented at the time ultimately in the unlikelihood that these bags are dislodged or the sand removed, you know, ultimately the County would be responsible sharing costs with East Hampton, replace the sand. I'm here to tell you that this structure will do irreparable harm to the beach affecting both recreation, esthesics,

economics as it relates to loss of revenue associated with the loss of the beach.

A new development in the project, and this is of recent when it was, *Oh, yeah, we forgot to deal with the stormwater problem behind this structure* with, in fact, functions as a retention wall, the Town of East Hampton brought in an engineer to look at stormwater ultimately and had to deal with this, I belive the price tag was approximately $2 million for dealing with catch basins, etcetera. Ultimately, barking at that cost, the town instead decided to create a gap in the system, I believe it's 30 foot wide and ultimately to retain a -- I'll call it a sand plug nearby, so during heavy rains that sand plug and flooding would be removed to allow discharge from 33 acres of uplands onto the open beach. In addition, there's a stormwater outfall pipe. This never underwent any SEQRA review, it just matter of fact, let's add it into the project.

I'm telling you this in all sincerity, you're going down a road that ultimately you're going to regret both for cost implications and just the fact the liability associated with this project, when this beach unravels and the potential damages that are incurred, adjacent properties and behind it will been significant. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Michael Leclerc and on deck Robin Mayr.

MR. LECLERC:
Hello, my name is Michael Leclerc, a member of SILO's transportation committee, also a member of Third Eye Insight -- for the blind and ADAM, American's with Disabilities Awareness Movement. I'm here to speak about, again, about extended hours for SCAT, Suffolk County buses.

I'd like to reiterate what I said last month that I'm a musician and I work at night and it's not just a handicap issue because a lot of the people who work at establishments that I perform at are kitchen workers, so on and so forth, who are not visually handicapped, they take the buses as well. And, yes, we have the right to go out to the movies and do all the social things and church and everything else that everybody wants to do, but we want to work and I need the transportation to work. And, you know, a musician in Manhattan, can go anytime he wants; I can't and I know you don't want to chase workers out of your County, make me move because I can't do my work in Suffolk County. Want to hear the disappointing rumor that $6.2 million can get cut out of the budget and that's moving backwards.

We are -- I was told at the last meeting, *well, we don't have the money, if we had the money we'd gladly do it, you got to go to Albany and petition for the money*. Well, I'm willing to write letters to Albany, I'm willing to. And, SILO, we want to get a form letter sent to Albany, but we need you as well, Legislators, as lobbyists to support us as advocates because Albany may listen to me, as the individual, but they're more likely to listen to group of me -- of people like myself backed up by Legislators, congressmen, so on and so forth.

So we're willing to do it but we just -- we want your support, we want your help. And, again, I'm just looking to work I'm not looking for anything that anybody else isn't entitled to and thank you for your time.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Legislator Browning has a question.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah, I guess I can make it a blanket question for anybody because I know that we talked about the amount of money that Nassau receives versus what Suffolk County receives and, you know, I did recommend that you collectively go meet with your State representatives. Thank you, Tom, I'm glad Legislator Barraga is here and dug up the information, and DPW, and basically this, you know, Nassau County receives almost three times as much as we do but has anyone from your

organization met with our State representatives?

MR. LECLERC:
Alice?

LEG. BROWNING:
I mean, I don't want to put you on the spot if you have not but if any of the other speakers have and would like to kind of give us a --

MR. LECLERC:
Any guidance we can get from you would be greatly appreciated.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah, I mean, we have sent letters. We did a joint letter from the Legislature to our State representatives to work with us to provide more funding. I believe the County Executive did make a statement that he was looking to get more State funding. Where it's gone at this point in time, I'm not sure, I'm not holding my breath, but if anyone in the room who is going to speak has had any conversation, I'd be interested to know what the results of that meeting was.

MR. LECLERC:
We realize it's not overnight either, it going to take many --

LEG. BROWNING:
No, of course not, of course not.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Just to put it in perspective too, Suffolk County currently pays 30.3 million or 46 percent of busing costs while the State picks up 23 million or 35 percent. Nassau County pays 4.1 million or 3 percent of busing costs while the State picks up 62.3 million or 53 percent. Westchester spends 17.3 million and gets 51.3 million in State busing fund. We are getting the short end of the stick. The County Executive in his budget is proposing an additional ten million hopefully from the State of New York. This is a tremendous inequity, we should be receiving additional funding, this isn't even close, isn't even close. And it's something that probably hasn't been brought to the forefront over the last several years and based on your efforts and the efforts of the Legislators here and the County Executive, I would hope that this Legislature when they get back in January will take a long hard look at this and start giving Suffolk County some of the money that they should have been receiving in the past but haven't.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:
Thank you, Tom.

MR. LECLERC:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And as far as a lot of the comments are on service of the buses and I would like to take Commissioner Anderson out of order when we're done with public portion just to ask him about what's proposed in the budget and how that reconciles with the IR, I think it's 1729, that seems to increase the paratransit bus service, I'm just trying to reconcile that one so but we'll get through public comments first. Robin Mayr.

MS. MAYR:
Yes, I'm right here.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And on deck, I'm sorry, on deck Dawn Cookler.

MS. MAYR:
So, here we are again month after month, I feel look a thorn in your side, but I really don't care and I'm tired of doing this, I really am. And, honestly, Miss Browning, I think it's your job to do what you're asking us to do. I'd like to know -- it's nice that you guys say that *we're going to do, A, we're going to do B, we're going to do C, you know, well, hopefully we're going to do it, we don't know why there not giving us the money.* I'll tell you why they are not giving you the money because you're not advocating for a better lobbying system in Suffolk County and that's your job and if you do it maybe we will get better service. You have to stop thinking about this as a disabilities issue and start thinking about it as a civil rights issue. Maybe then we'll get somewhere. I just read this big long book about the ADA and how it got started and, yes, it took a long time, but let me tell you, I have a feeling living in Suffolk County that we're going backwards. You can't advocate for more money -- for money that's -- that's been due you for years if Mr. Bellone is proposing a 6 million -- 6.2 million dollar cut, I mean, you're either going to get it or they're going to take it away. It's your job to say, *no, we won't let you take it away*. So what are you going to do for us? I mean, I really want to know. I know you guys, you know, you're here, this is not your full-time job but you had been elected to do it so don't make us do your job for you, I want you to do it because if you don't you won't be reelected again. Thank you.

(*Applause*)

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you, Robin. Dawn Cooker and on deck Philip Scholz.

MS. COOKLER:
Hi, my name is Dawn Cookler, I'm on board of directors for SILO and I'm also on the Special Needs Task Force for the Town of Brookhaven and tonight I'm going to the Coram Civic Association because I'm trying to get a sidewalk built from my apartment to where the civic association meets because across the street from where the civic association meets is a Stop & Shop and I would like to be able go to the shopping center near my house to go food shopping and I do this in my scooter, like once a week I go to the Stop & Shop to go food shopping. And tonight the civic association meeting meets at 7:30 p.m. and it ends around 9:30 and I can't take SCAT because SCAT you have to be outside to wait for SCAT at 8:15 so I will not get to the civic association meeting if I take SCAT. So what I do every month is I go to the civic association meeting and then I wheel home in my scooter, it's about a mile ride on my scooter. I could do it because I charge the scooter but I have to wheel on the side of the road because there is no sidewalk and -- and there is no bus to take me home. So last month when I did it I got a police escort home cause it's dark at night and I'm on the side of the road and I'm praying that I don't get hit by a car, you know, it's a very big shoulder, it's almost the size of a lane, but I go to the Stop & Shop once a week to go food shopping and when I go to the -- when I go the supermarket I pass four or five wheelchairs on the side of the road doing the same thing I'm doing, so there's actually wheelchair traffic on the side of the road and it would be better if we could take the SCAT bus and not have to do that and I would, you know, I still going to be part of the civic association because I've been a member of that for almost a year now and I'm not giving it up, I'm still doing it, but I really would prefer to take a bus home rather than wheeling on the side of the road at 9:30 at night. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you, Dawn. Philip Scholz and on deck Tammy McLaughlin.

MR. SCHOLZ:
Good afternoon. My name is Philip Scholz, this is my second time speaking here. The topic hasn't changed. I am too looking for extended hours for SCAT coverage as well as Sunday service. Recent developments have given me a new perspective on this, I am now exploring the idea of getting my master's degree in criminal justice so that I may have a better opportunity in the job fields. However, the best criminal justice programs I can find are in Albany as well as in Manhattan, the John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Now I have explored the possibility of being a commuter since I live in Mount Sinai and I've gone into Manhattan on my own with the LIRR several times, never so much in the evenings, but this would be difficult to do for school because classes generally begin around 4:00. There are a few exceptions. A few begin early, but most of them begin around 4:00 and they're about two, two-and-a-half hours until about 6:00, 6:30. Now, Penn Station is on 33rd Street and the school is on 59th Street and anyone who's been to New York City knows regardless of what avenue these schools are close to you're not flying down 16 blocks in like 20 minutes or something, it's not going to happen. So for me to make it from school back to Penn Station and onto a train and back to Ronkonkoma, will be the easiest station for me to get to, to make a SCAT bus -- an 8:15 window for an 8:30 pick up, it just sounds ludicrous as I'm saying it. So and, I mean, I know there are stations closer to my house; Port Jefferson, but I know switching -- I've tried switching stations in like Huntington and Hicksville and that is very difficult for me to do 'cause I would prefer to go to Ronkonkoma and just take a SCAT bus home, but again, time-wise it's not possible.

And, unfortunately, I'm not the only one losing on this particular scenario. You folks are losing money on this. I'm more than happy to pay for $4.00 can get me home, ask any SCAT driver, I usually run errands on the way and you could probably make $8.00 off me. But, you know, if I can't commute I would have to dorm there and that, I looked it up, is about $12,000 a year. So we're looking at $12,000 a year for a school, not a penny of which you guys are going to see -- 300 in SCAT fares alone, not even counting the LIRR fares, which you will see definitely, for, you know, 12 weeks, three days a week on average, that's about $300 that you would see just on my schooling alone and I'm a pretty active guy, you know, I go the gym, I go the movies during the day, I'd like to go in the evenings, but again, there's no ride home, but, you know, that's just money you guys aren't seeing while I am unable to find a reasonably safe way to get home from school at night, and it's not even that late at night. Thank you very much for listening to me, have a nice afternoon.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Tammy McLaughlin, and on deck, Ecaterina Henter.

MS. McLAUGHLIN:
Hello. I'm Tammy McLoughlin, and you asked if anyone one of us spoke to the State; well, I did. I spoke to Ken LaValle, Senator Ken LaValle's office, particularly a woman named Laurie Griffiths, who is his aide, and she informed me that I was misdirected, that this is what you do to people who you wish to dismiss. You tell them to go to the State, and it's us doing your job. I really don't have much to say about it because there was nothing to be done. She didn't say anything but she'll get back to me, so I feel like I'm being hoodwinked. I'm coming before you, you tell me to go to them, I go to them, and they tell me to go back to you. Not a ping-pong ball.

I also want to discuss this three-quarter rule. It is a travesty, and I heard it's not a law, it's just a guideline so it could be easily expanded. On October 3rd, there is a walk for the blind. It's called the Long Island Vision Walk, and it's going to be held at Jones Beach and, let's be clear, the irony of the whole thing is I can't go because of your three -- quarter rule, I can't go. I can't even, in good conscience, ask anyone that I know to participate in something that I can't do myself because I don't have access. I want to be a part of this crazy collective community. I want to be an independent, vibrant, mature, responsible, productive member, and I don't have access.

Lastly, I just went to a session, and a lovely lady there, she gave me a drop-the-mike moment, and she said that -- well, I'm not going to try to quote her, but she reminded me that each one of us has

different talents and gifts to share with the world despite our disabilities, so not only are you denying me access to the world, you are denying the world the splendor that is Tammy McLoughlin. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you, Tammy. There's three more cards, and then I am going to have Commissioner Anderson clarify the three-quarter mile rule.

Ecaterina Henter and on deck Michael Bosco.

MS. HENTER:
Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Ecaterina Henter, I was here a couple times before and I don't see any changes since I was here for the first time and I'm looking forward to hear something positive. And we know Suffolk County is much, much bigger than Nassau or other counties and we still don't receive enough money and why is that? That's my question and what can we do about it. It's very important to all of us who are here and who are not here, can't be here for whatever reason. I not here to represent only myself, I'm here to represent every person with a disability in Suffolk County. This is very important to us. Today is us, tomorrow it can be you or one of your loved ones. We are not immune. And tomorrow -- we're asking today maybe you will ask next week. This is very important to all of us. I am a social worker. Here I am still looking for a job since I started to come here, I can't find a job. A lot of the social work positions are in the afternoon also and in the evening, SCAT, we know, it's running only until 8:30, which the window starts at 8:15 and Nassau is running until much later. It's a smaller county, they have public transportation, which is better than ours. Because Suffolk County's so large there are places where we can't go, it's impossible for us to take public transportation because I can't take two, three buses to go to a place and if it's too late I don't wish to take public transportation that late either since I'm blind. So what can we say, you know, can we do something about this, this is very important to all of us. I am still looking for a job and for me in order to be able to work until 10:00, 11 o'clock; I need SCAT bus to run until later. This is only -- not only for the weekend -- for the weekdays, but we also need four day Sunday service as long as possible because a lot of people need to go to churches, go to see family members, go to see relatives, friends. We have same lifestyle as you do and we would like to have everything that you enjoy as well.

Thank you so much for listening to me and hope to hear something positive by next month. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Michael Bosco and on deck Michael Jordan.

MR. BOSCO:
Good afternoon. My name's Michael Bosco, I'm the President of Digitally Impaired Persons of Suffolk and I'm here asking and requesting extended weekday service for SCAT and public transit and also for Sunday service. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

MR. JORDAN:
Good afternoon, gentlemen and ladies. Hi, my name is Michael Jordan. You know, sorry I didn't back to your aide yet, Mr. Krupski, I've been in the hospital for over a week, so, I'm out running around again.

I too have talked to my State legislator and my State assemblyman and they refer us to come back to you for some odd reason and my State assemblyman thought that Mr. Schneiderman said it's up to how the fiscal budget is to expand services but I just want to know is it in the realm can we

expand the fiscal budget or can we expand the service without adding money to it?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
We --

MR. JORDAN:
Excuse me?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
We can't expand the service without adding money to it because the buses and the maintenance, the drivers, everything, costs money. That's one thing I can answer right now. I'm going to ask the Commissioner when you're done with your statement about the system as it's being proposed for next year.

MR. JORDAN:
Okay, cause, you know, I just saw like a little thing that I spoke to John Sykes and I was explaining to him like maybe with the bus schedule, the bus drivers is -- finagling their shifts around to expand service in the evening. Being there's always a decrease of buses on the road after 8:30 anyway, you could finagle a few shifts to kind of expand without adding money, but just expanding two shifts, like the 2:00 to 10:00, you make it 4:00 to 12:00. You have a middle shift that's 11:00 to 7:00. I've talked to a few bus drivers so I got this down and maybe you just add 2:00 to 8:00 but there's always going to be decrease of buses off the road anyway after 8:30. You know, I don't see much of a population growing up and ridership the first couple months so it'll still be almost the same amount of buses on the road that are on the road around 8:30 till 10 o'clock anyway. But if we just finagle a few shifts around, you really don't have to add money, it's the same amount of people, the same amount of buses.

Now, I've worked for True Green for a couple of years and I've seen how you can operate a system like that. We had 40, 50 trucks on the road so, you know, I know how that operates, I know there's budget constraints and I know there's a lot of things but, and I'll go back to the senate, and they said, you know, they proposed an extra $10 million if you want to know that add, it to STOA fund for transportation, that's what Mr. LaValle's Office said, they're going to try to put in another $10 million this year for Suffolk County. Okay, thanks.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Can I get Commissioner Anderson up here and Garry you can join us. Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to clarify a couple statements that were made here and that I took exception to. Number one, and speaking for myself, I do not work this job part-time, this is a full-time job for me. My constituents from my office get over 10,000 man hours of service to them, so to come up here and say that this is a part-time job; you're out of line.

And, number two, to Tammy McLaughlin, I'm going to call that Laurie or Lauren, whatever her name is, in LaValle's office and argue with her or talk with her the fact that this body never dismisses any of our constituents, we work for you, we're here to serve you, we don't dismiss you and for her to say that is improper and she should be dealt with and I'm going to see that that happens because that is way wrong that she tells you we do that to you to dismiss you. We don't do that. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. I've got a couple questions and I'd just like to take this out of order because of the people who came here and they're very interested in the bus service. There seems to be a lot of not understanding how the bus system is funded. Could you please go through the basic budget and

how it's funded and we don't necessarily have to compare it with Nassau but it's funded from different sources and I think people need to understand the different funding sources and it'll help them understand, I think, what our flexibility and what our options are and I'd also like to ask you a basic, well, I got a bunch of questions so if you could start with that one.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'm going to let Garry provide the detail on the bus operations right now.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay.

MR. LENBERGER:
Good afternoon. The County transit operating system is primarily funded through farebox revenue of roughly $7 million a year. The STOA assistance is roughly $24 million a year. Federal aid is roughly only about a million dollars as year.

As you indicated the -- a good majority of our operating cost is funded by the County taxpayers and what was stated is correct; Nassau County and Westchester County do receive more funds in STOA allocation, which I really do feel is -- is unfair. For the past three years I look back on the percentage allocation of the increases for the systems and essentially what the State has done is increased everybody, the percentage allocation across the board. So, in other words, some years they were flat zero, okay, we can understand that. Some are 2 percent, which means that, you know, if Suffolk County is getting 2 percent increase on $24 million, we're going to get a half-a-million dollars. But if you increase 2 percent on 40 or $60 million, obviously you're going to have a larger number. And this is -- this is happened, we've gotten eight, I'm sorry, 9 percent across the board and, again, we've gotten shorted on that and I do think it's totally unfair.

And the -- the basis for the STOA funding is based on general sales tax, petroleum tax, long lines tax and one other smaller tax and I've asked the State numerous times as to why we are getting a flat across the board number and they said the Office of Budget Review passes that to the State assembly and the State legislature where they make that determination. And I could tell you honestly we've increased our revenue miles over the last few years by about three million miles a year with the addition of additional Sunday service and added evening service. The other counties, not to belittle them, but they've actually cut their service and their revenue hours and revenue miles. In particular, Nassau County, I believe, is somewhere around two to three million lower mileage. But, still again, they still get the same percentage increase year over year. Quite frankly, I don't understand it myself. It is a little frustrating to be honest with you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right, thank you. So then the question is if we want to increase the County side of the funding we would either have to raise fares or raise general taxes. Isn't that correct?

MR. LENBERGER:
Either that or lobby the State assembly or the State legislature, I guess, you know, and I'm not to be -- not to be farce on this or anything, but, you know, that's -- that's above my pay grade and, you know, I'd love to question them why, you know, it's been a flat percentage across the board for all the NYMTC counties, NYMTC is the Metropolitan Planning Organization that services our region, that's made up of all the five boroughs of New York City including MTA, of course, Nassau, Suffolk, Rockland and Putnam County and Westchester, I might add. And I just -- I really don't get it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. So there's a resolution 1729 here to increase SCAT bus service beyond the three-quarter mile corridor, which is required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. Did you say, so there were comments made that this not a -- this is not a law, it's a policy. Could you please -- could you please clarify that what this three-quarter mile corridor is and a what this 1729

seeks to -- seeks to do.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay. It's a requirement of the FTA that a minimum service be provided any ADA type of transportation such as we have in SCAT, you have to provide it within three-quarter miles of an existing bus route, which is what we do. We have -- what you see before you under IR 1729 is a request to approve funding that we've been -- funding that we've been approved for by the FTA for $2.5 million and the intent of the funding is to increase Sunday service, specifically -- I'm sorry, wait a second, that's the SCAT, okay this is the -- this is to allow us to increase the service routes for SCAT outside of that three-quarter mile limit. So this would pay for half of the costs for two years.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So what -- what would happen after -- so first of all, this is -- it's half of the cost and what would happen after two years?

MR. LENBERGER:
The -- it was a competitive solicitation and the funding through 5310 was not exhausted so the NYMTC advisors have notified Suffolk County that they will have an additional competitive grant solicitation next summer and it would be our intent if we did pass this resolution and cover the entire County that we would also go after a third year for a 50 percent coverage also.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Now, I'm looking at the budget for the whole bus system for next year and what's the difference between the proposed budget for 2016 versus the 2015 adopted budget for transportation for the whole system?

MR. LENBERGER:
The entire system is $10 million reduction would be roughly six-and-a-half million on the fixed route side and the balance on the paratransit side.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So if we -- so, first of all, we we're looking at a, I mean, a ten million dollar -- that's a pretty substantial reduction in funding for the whole bus system. Is that -- and I'll get into the question about the resolution 1729, but is that possible to reduce the system by ten million dollars? Aren't there contractual obligations with the drivers and the bus companies and how would you just cut that much money off of a -- what is -- 78 -- what is it a $72 million system? How would you cut, how would you trim that much money off it?

MR. LENBERGER:
The contracts with the bus contractors was bid and essentially what the result is -- is a reimbursement of the cost per revenue mile so the County is allowed to increase service at that rate or decrease service at that rate. There is nothing that we have to do regarding negotiating contracts with the unions or otherwise. That is something that the bus contractors would have to do themselves within their own unions.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So is it, from you mechanically, running the Suffolk bus system, how would you -- how would you decrease service, how would you decide where to decrease that many millions of dollars in service from one year to the next? I mean, this isn't a small -- this isn't a small proposal, this is a pretty significant decrease.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We would follow the same guidelines that the Cherwony report that was done probably about seven, eight years ago recommended. We would get the -- we would remove the routes with the lowest ridership and the lowest revenue coming in and start to work our way down until such time as we

got to the, you know, and it's going to be a significant cut, it would be more than ten routes would have to -- would have to go without any question.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
You mean, when you say the lowest ridership, so you're going to target the East End first for a decrease in service?

MR. ANDERSON:
Not necessarily, no, there's -- there's routes on the west end as well that would -- that would also, you know, be impacted.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay, so there's a -- so then my final question is, and I don't know my colleagues here might have questions also, so the system's going to be funded in the proposed budget $6 million less than last year and -- and yet resolution 1729 is going to -- what would the -- what's the financial liability of approving 1729?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, this is the -- 2.5 million is half the cost so it would be an addition -- I think it'll be a 2.5 million dollar cost to the County for this.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So, you'd have to factor that in so if we did this we'd increase the -- we would increase the SCAT service up to, well, it'd be beyond what it is today.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And then at the same time we would cut everything else to make up for that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct, but we -- we're still trying to pursue the service as best as we can, you know, provide the ridership to where it's needed and at this point we have a grant to help facilitate that. Right now, we're not getting the funding from the State on the other existing routes and, you know, while I understand your question there is -- there's a balance act that we have to -- we still want to try and provide the service where we can. It's almost like we're playing a game of chicken with the State and saying, *look, you guys gotta pony up* and really, that's what it's down to right now because as Garry illuminated and Legislator Barraga noted earlier, you know, there's a significant disparity between what we're getting and what Nassau County is getting.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. Anyone have any questions?

LEG. BROWNING:
No, it's just we have these people coming every week that we have a meeting here looking for an expanded bus service and we're going to cut the budget $10 million so it doesn't make sense and to the people that were here saying we're not doing our job, obviously we have to address that when we meet in the budget process but, you know, we're here, we're supporting their position and for the State legislators, and again, we have lobbied, contrary to what was said, we have lobbied and continue to lobby with the State legislators so for a member, an employee of the State legislator to say that they're being misdirected; that's horrendous what they said because they're the ones, the State is ones that holds the pursestrings. So, yeah, we can put in for this grant but there's no guarantees. So now we're going to cut our budget $10 million but there's no guarantee that this grant's going to come through, right?

MR. LENBERGER:
No, that's not true. It's an FTA grant, which is from --

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay.

MR. LENBERGER:
-- the U.S. DOT, Federal Transit Administration.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay.

MR. LENBERGER:
So the grant would be funneled to us and obligated to us.

LEG. BROWNING:
However, we're still short, you know, we need more money from the State so for us to cut $10 million, if we were just to keep ourselves the same as what we've been then maybe we could increase and improve the SCAT service if we get this grant on top of what we had last year. But to cut it this year by $10 million is -- it's insanity because now we're going to have these people are going to come again, actually, probably not be able to come at all because we're going to cut the service, I mean, I see what's going on in Nassau County, they're cutting their service. It's horrendous what's going on. They are so dependent on this service. Yeah, we should be working to build up on what we have, not take away. So, I know we're going to have a terrible time trying to figure out how to come up with the $10 million that the County Exec took away. It's going to be really difficult but, you know, again, I'm going to say to the people in the room, you got to lobby some more, I mean, we're doing it. But your State legislators are sitting back and not hearing a darn word from you and they're the ones who hold the purse strings. The governor's office and your State legislators have the purse strings, they're the ones who make that determination whether you get more money or not. You know, you can come and every week, I'm happy for you to come, I just think it's unfair and I see Marilyn's not here, you know, I talked to Marilyn because she was having a problem last time she came, couldn't get a bus home. So I said to her if you're coming, I'll give you a ride home. You know, that's how bad this service is for them. So, you know, it just -- it's insanity. We have to keep what we had last year and we have to get more, not reduce what we got, it's just insanity. I just -- I feel bad for them coming and I know the difficulty they have trying to get a bus home, you know, so I want to be able to say to them someday, *you don't have to come back* because it's all being taken care of. It's just not fair to them. So I'm going to talk to Marilyn and make a recommendation to her that I think might help.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thanks. Legislator Muratore.

LEG. MURATORE:
Commissioner, this resolution says you're going to extend it beyond three-quarters of a mile. How far?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There would be no limit based on -- the areas -- and it sounds larger than it is, but if you look at the map of the County and look at the areas that are not overlapped by the different routes; it's a small area. It's an area in Manorville, some of the extremities, maybe some to the East End but it's not -- it's not as massive as it sounds.

LEG. MURATORE:
Yeah, I thought it was going to be overwhelming. Okay, great, thanks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
Yes, I just wanted to clarify one of the -- the questions I was raising before. This is not -- we're not looking at the likelihood of getting this grant money, we have the grant money and this is procedural resolution in front of us to be able to essentially pull down that money but it's not like there's a possibility of not getting this grant money, this is something that we have secured. Correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's correct.

LEG. STERN:
Okay. It might be a part of the answer, Commissioner, that you just gave but is there a way to take a look at the coverage, as relatively limited as you made it just sound, and the dollar amount that we're getting from this grant money and how it relates to the additional investment that we'll need to make in providing the service. For example, I'm looking here; it says currently an estimated 7 percent of all SCAT trips are made to or from the areas which are beyond the three-quarter mile corridor as required by the ADA. So if we're looking at that 7 percent, how does that 7 percent of trips that go beyond relate to dollar amount that's in front of us?

MR. LENBERGER:
Well, right now we're not being reimbursed for that but we would be now so it would actually be a win situation since we're not getting reimbursed for those trips, we're actually getting federal aid for those trips.

LEG. STERN:
We're getting federal aid -- we're getting federal aid for 50 percent.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We will be once and if we accept this money.

LEG. STERN:
So the monies that are a part of this, the 50 percent that is the County contribution, which, of course, is more than worthwhile but that's a -- are you suggesting that that's a dollar amount that we are already funding and this just simply makes us eligible for a 50 percent grant, a little bit of help from the federal government?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's correct.

LEG. STERN:
Okay, all right. Very good, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is not my Committee, I just want to ask about the ten routes you're cutting. Do you know which ten routes will be cut?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
At this point we still have to develop it. We've come up with a preliminary list but, again, there's a long way from here to there. It would be the routes that would have the least amount of revenue, have the least amount of ridership. I know three or four of them at least were noted in the Cherwony report that we put out a couple years back. So, yeah, we have an idea.

LEG. KENNEDY:
When your list is completed can you please give it to all the Legislators.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We will circulate it.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you.

LEG. STERN:
Yeah, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just quickly, Garry, it's something that we've been discussing all throughout is -- is not just a question of funding but making the system more efficient as a way to be able to leverage at least what service we do offer so that it might be more meaningful to those that -- useable to those that are utilizing the service.

So I just wanted to follow up on Mr. Jordan, his suggestion, he's essentially saying, look, these are the dollar amounts that we're looking at right now, you could probably take a look at the system and look at efficiencies and maybe take a look at when ridership is up, ridership is down and at least better utilize the assets that we have. I would like to assure him, just like I would hope that all of us could be assured, that those are the types of things that you are looking at so that as we continue to press the case aggressively with the State for additional funding that at the same time we're utilizing the assets as best we can so that we can at least provide the meaningful service to those they utilize.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And one of the things we have talked about internally is to look at maybe reducing the number of routes along the same route so on the, I want to throw a number out there, the 105 Route, you -- you know, you have certain times of the day where it's not being used, maybe we can start to reduce those or space them out more often or less often.

LEG. STERN:
Was that the -- that would be one suggestion but those are the kinds of things that are being analyzed at this point so that there is some meaningful change in the system if that can be accomplished and provide, perhaps, a better service.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Okay, thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay. I have one more card for public portion, Alice Young.

MS. YOUNG:
Good afternoon, everybody. I am the facilitator of the transportation committee. Today we have very few people here to speak. I appreciate your comments of coming back of what you are looking to do to support our efforts but now I would like to, you know, go over a few of the areas with you.

First of all, concerning -- I have files of probably, now it's getting to be in the thousands of papers concerning transportation. All right. I'm not an expert concerning transportation but what I do find out and surround myself with the people that do find out the information. Well, you've seen the three articles that were in here, I think they were presented to you. All right. First of all, I had an hour long conversation with United Spinal Association President and Chief Operating Officer, James Weisman, who also happened to construct the ADA and wrote it and he talked about the three-quarters of a mile rule about it is just a guideline, it could be changed at any time for any area that's wanted to.

He also volunteered and offered that he would come and address the Committee to understanding cause he said understand this is the same issue forever, now it's just trying to present the information a different way. So I put that on the table. Conversation, coming to address and meet with the Committee here.

The next comment deals with Legislator Barraga giving us numbers of what took place last month of what Nassau, Suffolk -- in essence, it's the whole transportation system that needs to be fixed, one area dealing with the paratransit. All right. Now, you have said to us we should be more in touch with the State senate and such so now we're working -- beginning to work with that and we need, of course, I don't -- really having a lobbyist in Suffolk County, we don't have a lobbyist who goes in really up there, but this is what takes place. The New York State Senate Transportation Chairperson is Joseph Robach. His district is part of Rochester, part of Hilton and Grange (ph), another area, so he's district 56. The co-chairman happens to be Carl Marcellino, now he's right from Suffolk County and he represents -- he's the co-chairman of the transportation area. He represents Huntington, Lloyd Harbor, Northport, East Northport, Melville, Plainview goes into Nassau County.

Now, we all know with Huntington having the HART system so my question is as we attempt to reach out to people, as you're telling us that we need to write, call, that's all well fine and good, but here we have somebody right from Suffolk County who's the co-chair of this committee. Now, we are planning to have a trip up there and to go, what we need, without a doubt, your support efforts that this is a priority. It is a priority because it affects peoples' lives. Right now there are 300,000 people that we know of with disabilities and many more unnoticed. Don't you think most of them would want to ride the fixed route system if they could? Many can't. All right. So that needs to be taken into consideration. I am in very close contact with many people with Nassau County. I'm in contact dealing with Suffolk. I'm going to all levels of government because of this issue. I have people who do research, I appreciate the efforts of Legislator Krupski of trying to bring it together but the bottom line is of not getting anywhere at all except to come here and to hear that, well, we have an AVL system and a trapeze program and it's going to improve and, yes, the six new buses of the 44 now will carry 12 people taking our suggestions of what happened in December. But the bottom line is because of money there is no extension of services and when you talk about, you know, the costing of the bus ride, $42, well it's $42 one time, it's $52 the next time and it's depending on the ridership for the month.

Now, I have to let you know the fact that --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
I'm sorry, Alice, if you could wrap it up.

MS. YOUNG:
Okay. The fact that with our transportation committee I get numerous calls, one person shows, then no people show, then they call and I -- we're we very authentic, we give you the minutes, we pass everything to you of knowing but it doesn't go any further.

So, what I'm asking, again, is to set up a time to set up when Jim Weisman will come, he's the originator of it, with the three-quarters of a mile, whether it's a private meeting, however, but we

will be working hopefully with your support with the assembly and the senate and I represent these people, their voices, I could have hundreds of people here, we're not interested, you know the gig, you know what we're looking for, but how will you work with me? Now I have a million notes, so many notes today; look up, learn. This is vital for these -- for people. You know, I've ridden the SCAT bus, I took a ride, I don't use it every day. But you have experience, whether it's Legislator Browning, Al Krupski with the East End, Tom Muratore, Steven Stern, everybody and Legislator Barraga who gives us the most honest with the numbers because if you're dealing with Suffolk Bus they don't want to deal, you know, with you. They want to send a representative to the meeting and find out what -- what's on the horizon but these are people who work, who want to contribute, they're the citizens and the constituents. Next you have Stony Brook AARP, I could go through Office of Mental Health, I'm privileged that I get all this information from them. Ladies and gentlemen the issue of transportation, housing and employment is a number one priority on every list that I get. All right.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
I have to say Alice --

MS. YOUNG:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
-- but this isn't, unfortunately, the last time we're going to discuss this because this seems to be a major policy issue that we're facing here in the County. If we get a recommended budget that cuts that many --

MS. YOUNG:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
-- off of it, we've got to make a decision about -- of where that money's going to be spent.

MS. YOUNG:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
If we have a State that's unwilling to fund it properly or at least in parity with neighboring counties, that's -- that makes it all the more difficult, the only other way to fund it is through increase of General Fund taxes so everybody pays for it or else increase the fares so that the riders pay for it.

MS. YOUNG:
Right.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So we have some limited options here and some hard decisions here.

MS. YOUNG:
I would be open to be able to meet with you and discuss what the options are and to bring the people who bring the expertise and knowledge to you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
I'd be happy to speak with that gentleman, but we also have -- we're starting with the budget operating group --

MS. YOUNG:
Yes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
-- working group tomorrow, actually. Is that right? Tomorrow? So that's going to be one of the major --

MS. YOUNG:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
-- that's the first meeting after the budget's been released so.

MS. YOUNG:
Yes, all right.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Stay tuned and we'll see you next -- for the next committee meeting.

MS. YOUNG:
Yes, thank you.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Al, quick comment.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Please.

LEG. BARRAGA:
Yeah, with reference to the -- is she still here? With reference to what you just said the only caveat I would make is that I don't believe -- I don't believe Marcellino is any longer the chairperson of the transportation committee. When Flanagan became majority leader I believe he took Marcellino and made him the chairperson of the education committee. I don't know who the new chairperson of the transportation committee is, but, whoever it is, especially if it is a Long Islander, make every effort to see that person as soon as possible because transportation, like education, is a complicated issue, there's a learning curve. Whoever that person is that's chairing the transportation committee in the senate is open, is completely open and as soon as you get into see them, they will be very, very receptive because they are on a learning curve, they're trying to grasp the issues. So I wish I could tell you who took Marcellino's place but I cannot but I'm sure if you call the State senate they'd be more than happy to tell you and if it's somebody local please go in and see them.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. All right. We'll get into the -- into the agenda.

Tabled Resolutions

IR 1434 - Authorizing the Energy Utility Legislative Oversight Committee to intervene in the Public Service Commission proceedings relating to PSEG-Long Island's proposed rate increase. (Cilmi) I'll make a motion to table. Is there a second?

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So tabled. ***Tabled (VOTE: 5-0)***

MR. RICHBERG:
Sorry, who was the second?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Legislator Stern.

IR 1516 - Approving Ferry License for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC d/b/a Coastline Freight. (Pres. Off.) Needs to be tabled for public hearing. Thank you, George. Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Tabled for Public Hearing (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1517 - Approving Ferry Freight rates for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC. (Pres. Off.) Same motion, same second. Tabled for public hearing. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Tabled for Public Hearing (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1657 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to clarify affordable housing requirements at developments connecting to a County sewer district. (Calarco) Motion to table.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Tabled (VOTE: 5-0)***

LEG. MURATORE:
Mr. Chair, can I make a motion to take resolution 1741 out of order.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Certainly. Is there a second?

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Second by Legislator Stern to take motion 1741 out of order. On the motion. Would you like to make a motion?

LEG. MURATORE:
Yeah, can I make a motion to pass this -- approve it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Oh, I'm sorry. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved to take it out of order, yes. Okay, so now we have **IR 1741 - Authorizing transfer of decommissioned vehicles to the Nesconset Fire Department. (Kennedy)**

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Stern. On the motion, Commissioner, how's the -- what are these decommissioned vehicles from and how many are there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There are four -- there are four vehicles that we would be donating to them. I'm not sure exactly what the vehicles are but, you know, they are what we would consider decommissioned at this time.

I can't give you any more detail than that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Legislator Kennedy, do you have anything to add here?

LEG. KENNEDY:
Sure. These vehicles were placed before all of us and no one else wanted them and I think Nesconset is going to use them in their fire training.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. All right, I have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1663 - Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to County Center C-001, Riverhead (CP 1643). (Co. Exec.)

Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Stern. Anyone have any questions for the Commissioner? All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved.

IR 1664 - Appropriating funds in connection with Improvements to the Vector Control Buildings (CP 5520). (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second. What's the nature of the improvements?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This resolution requests appropriating $250,000 for construction of improvements to the garage within the vector control building. The doors are broken. Some of those will be repaired. Others that aren't needed will be actually just closed in with metal panel walls. We're also looking to construct storage area within the building in that storage -- on that garage area.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. All right. If there's no other questions we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1665 - Appropriating funds in connection with Improvements to Water Supply Systems (CP 1724). (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second. Does anyone have any questions? Hearing none; all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1672 - Calling a public hearing for -- oh, I skipped 66. Thank you.

IR 1666 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Renovations to Public Works Building, Yaphank (CP 5194). (Co. Exec.)

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
If I may, I would ask this one be tabled.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. Do I have a motion to table? I'll make a motion. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Oh, I need a little more detail on the project that we're looking to
move forward so I just wanted it tabled one cycle so I can get myself familiar with it. I know we're looking for 150,000 in construction but I don't know what the improvements are.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Is that a second?

LEG. BROWNING:
I'll second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Second by Legislator Browning. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Tabled (VOTE 5-0)***

IR 1672 - Calling a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 13 - Windwatch (CP 8123). (Co. Exec.) Would someone like to make a motion? Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Stern. Yes? Thank you. Anyone have any questions about improving the facilities? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1673 - Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 15 - Nob Hill (CP 8138). (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1674 - Calling a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 20 - William Floyd (CP 8147). (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second. Still setting public hearings. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1678 - Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 7 - Medford (CP 8150). (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1682 - Authorizing execution of an agreement by the Administrative Head of SCSD No. 20 - William Floyd with Beechwood Ridge LLC (BR-1684). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. Do you have any questions for the Commissioner? No? Hearing none; all in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1683 - Authorizing execution of an agreement by the Administrative Head of SCSD No. 3 - Southwest with 1466 Straight Path Clean One City Laundromat (1477.1-010). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1689 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the Restoration of Bald Hill School House and Grounds, Town of Brookhaven (CP 7510.128 and 7510.343). (Muratore) Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Barraga. On the motion, Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:
Is this County-owned property or because I know the Homan House in Yaphank, which is County-owned is being held up with funds so I'm trying to find out what this is.

LEG. MURATORE:
If I can explain along with Budget Review. The schoolhouse is a one-room schoolhouse built pre-Civil war. And it -- I guess, the late 20s. Back in 2000 there was an appropriation of 125 -- well, I'll let -- you know what? If Robert -- Dr. Lipp, if you can just explain what's going on with the monies.

MR. LIPP:
There was a project once upon a time but it was closed-out so in order to do this you had to do a new resolution, this being it and the cost would be 125,000, which would amount to about 10,000 a year in debt service.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
I think the question was that who owns the building and did they use a switch on Legislator Muratore when he was being bad.

MR. LIPP:
I could speak to the second question but not the first. Yeah, I'm not sure who owns the building. We would have to research that.

LEG. MURATORE:
I believe it's the Farmingville Historical Society. They're the owners -- so. It's right adjacent to the Farmingville park there, Farmingville Hills County Park.

LEG. BROWNING:
Not to beat you up, Tom, but I'm curious why we're using County funds for something that we don't own because I know that we have some County properties that have been held up for -- for improvements and fixing up.

LEG. MURATORE:
Well, I was told that back in 2000 there was $125,000 approved for this and the historical society was only able to spend at that time, correctly, $3,896. So there was still money left from -- it was closed-out, whatever the -- you know, I mean, according to Dr. Lipp so we need to get back the -- the 121,000 that wasn't spent.

LEG. STERN:
Maybe the sponsor or Gil, the monies that are being proposed here to be utilized would go for what? Tell me a little about this, the structure and what needs to be done here, what's going on.

LEG. MURATORE:
Considering the age it's in relatively good condition, it's to bring it more up to saving it to make sure that it doesn't like a lot of the historical buildings in the County, just fall down, so it's more for restoration and upkeep of the facilities.

LEG. STERN:
What's necessary? Does it need a new roof, does it need some siding? Is it HVAC -- the monies would be utilized for what?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't know. At this point I've only been advised by the Parks Department that the building itself is in good condition, I would assume that, what the Legislator said, it would be to further upgrade it. But beyond that, I really don't know.

LEG. MURATORE:
And keep it within the community so the community can enjoy it and other people throughout the County can enjoy it.

LEG. STERN:
What is it utilized for at this point?

LEG. MURATORE:
More historical. I believe -- just let me check; you know, they bring the schoolchildren through it

but now it's getting to a point that it could be a little bit faulty on the steps and the front patio, the front porch there so bringing the children in could present a problem.
So we're looking to save the building.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
I've got a question for George. How would we bond this if the County doesn't own the property?

MR. NOLAN:
Well, normally we couldn't, you know, normally County bond proceeds have to be used for something the County has some type of interest, ownership interest in. I don't know what the status of this building is. I don't know if we have any interest in the property, but typically we can only use the bond proceeds, you know, for something we have some type of ownership interest in.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. In that case, and I know I have a lot of historical societies in my district too that would come in for a, you know, for money to restore, you know, all the other buildings also. This makes it very difficult if it -- the County doesn't own it and we're bonding, we are bonding a lot of money here though, previous resolutions to fix up the County-owned buildings where, you know, either the public goes in or people, you know, the County employees work and we should -- we should be taking care of those because we own those.

LEG. MURATORE:
I believe this might -- the money might of been given to the historical society as a grant or as money to spend as they saw fit and they decided to take care of the Bald Hill School with it.

MR. NOLAN:
If, you know, it's different if it's -- if we're using cash, you know, then we can give grants out, but, I know bond proceeds are a little more tricky in terms in what they can be used for. So at the very least, I think, we should, you know, I don't know, I guess there would come a point where they would go to bond counsel with this resolution and say will you give us a bond, I don't know what he would do at that point.

LEG. BROWNING:
So it might be some kind of grant like downtown revitalization grant or something from the past. I mean, I'd be okay to discharge without recommendation and see if we can get a clarification exactly where the money's coming from, where it came from, I mean if it was downtown money or if it was hotel/motel tax money or if it was some kind of fund that can be used for that. They only thing, like I say, if you remember the -- the Homan House in Yaphank that -- I think it was like $300,000 and it's being held up because nobody wants to pay for it so, you know, if it was a different pot of money that they legitimately have and it's still sitting there, I mean, that's -- that's a different story, but it's a bond. Could it be downtown revitalization funds? I mean --

MR. NOLAN:
This is going to be bonded.

LEG. MURATORE:
No, it's not downtown.

LEG. BROWNING:
Cause sometimes the downtown money is bonded too.

LEG. MURATORE:
This 1286-2000 was way before me so I guess I'll have my staff do some more research on it and find out. Yeah, we can find that out. So why don't we do to -- you know, without recommendation, I mean, I'm good with that and that gives us time to answer the questions in front

of the -- or, you know what, maybe better still maybe we can change the motion to table and give me some time to research it.

LEG. BROWNING:
Like I said, I can support a discharge so we can get a clarification.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. All right, so there's -- so there's a motion to discharge and a second, there's a motion to table and a second. So which is -- George, what's the protocol here? All right. All in favor?

MR. RICHBERG:
Who was the motion to table and a second?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
To table it was Legislator Muratore and second was --

LEG. STERN:
I'm seconding because I'm supporting the sponsor's motion to table.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So all in favor to table, show of hands please. All right, so the resolution's tabled. Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay, I'll support the tabling.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1696 - Amending the Adopted 2015 Operating Budget in connection with the establishment of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 24 - Gabreski Municipal. (Co. Exec.)
Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Barraga. On the motion, Commissioner, this is to establish a new sewer district?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, the -- the sewer district number 24, which is Gabreski Memorial Sewer District was formed in January and this is the formalization
of the budget for that district.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And how many people are there that support the district?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
As of right now it's internal to Gabreksi Airport but that also includes the Air National Guard and then there are some nearby communities which are interested in hooking up to the additional capacity that's there.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
When was the plant built?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't have the exact date.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. Groundwater discharge?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1697 - Accepting the transfer of surplus Suffolk County Transit Vehicles to the Department of Public Works. (Co. Exec.) I'll make that motion. Is there a second? Second by Legislator Muratore. What sort of surplus vehicles are we getting?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
These are cars that were obtained through an FTA grant a number of years ago for different use by our bus operators. They were used for surveillance for different -- different purposes but they've reached their useful life as far as the FTA is concerned. So we took them back from the bus company. They're still usable vehicles. We'd like to take those vehicles, put them into our fleet for the ones that are aged and had well beyond on the miles that these are.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. I have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1701 - Calling a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 1 - Port Jefferson (CP 8169). (Co. Exec.) Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator Stern, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1702 has been withdrawn. Anybody have any questions about it? We're going to move on.

IR 1710 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Improvements to Buildings and Facilities Countywide West Islip (CP 1817). (Barraga)

LEG. BARRAGA:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Motion by Legislator Barraga, second by Legislator Muratore. Questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1718 - Appropriating funds in connection with the Rehabilitation of Parking Lots, Sidewalks, Drives and Curbs at various County Facilities (CP 1678). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved.
Approved (VOTE: 5-0)

IR 1729 - Authorizing the filing of a grant application for Federal Section 5310 grant funds for the provision of SCAT Paratransit Bus Service beyond the three quarter mile corridor required by the Americans with Disabilities Act. (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Browning, I'll make the second for discussion. We had part of this discussion before we got into the -- before we got into the -- the meeting here. I still have the same question. If we -- so if we approve this today and then we approve it at the general meeting, we will automatically get -- well, 2.5 plus million dollars a year for two years to increase the three-quarter mile limit for SCAT. Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
That's correct.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So that will start in '16 and '17.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So that will -- that means also that since it's a 50 percent grant it's going to cost us half of that 2.5 million each year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So how has that been budgeted for in a budget that cuts out $6 million next year? How does that all fit together?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The simple term -- many of these rides, we have in the past, there have been rides that have been grandfathered in for years and they're outside of the three-quarter mile limit. And as you see in this -- in written report, there are 35 to 40,000 rides a year that are given to people outside of the three-quarter mile limit. We feel that the increase to the budget would be negligible because there are only a few people in those small envelopes that aren't covered by this so it'd be a minimal amount of increase to what we're already providing, this would at least get us 50 percent of our monies back.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. Any other questions? So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1730 - Appropriating funds in connection with Improvements to CR 93, Lakeland Avenue/Ocean Avenue (CP 5535). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Stern. Some of these that we, you know, we go through all these but, you know, I sometimes I feel like it's our due diligence to ask you or some of these things that can be -- that can be put off or are these things that are really critical that need to be done this year?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This particular project would look to realign one of the turns or one of the curves through this intersection, it would make it a safer curve. It goes from a 250 foot radius down -- increases it to a 400 foot radius, makes it a much more suitable turn right now. If you drive down Ocean Avenue and you're heading down right before you get to where it starts to really get -- really get curved as you're passing say, Lake Ronkonkoma, there's a turn in there and this will make it a safer turn. I can show you a picture of it if it would help.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Sure. Thank you. We're all going to take a look at the aerial photograph, I am not familiar with the area.

MR. FREAS:
Mr. Chair, I write this project up for the Capital Budget report and when I first looked at the overhead you can -- you can kind of see the dents in the safety rail and at one point when you looked at the overhead you could actually see where a vehicle had gone through somebody's front

yard along the edge of that curve so it's -- it's probably something that needs remediation. We recommended it when it had come up a couple years ago.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. All right, thank you. So after reviewing it I've got a motion and a second. Do we? Motion and a second. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved.

IR 1731 - Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of considering proposed increases and improvements of the facilities for Sewer District No. 16 Yaphank (CP 8158). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. This is just for the public -- calling for public hearing. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1733 - Accepting and appropriating federally funded New York Metropolitan Transportation Council (NYMTC) grant funds for the purpose of preparation of the Ronkonkoma Hub/Nicolls Road Corridor Parking Analysis. (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second, same vote. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1741 has been done.

IR 1745 - Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to establish a Sustainable Energy Loan Program. (Schneiderman) Same motion, same second.

MR. NOLAN:
No, table it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
No, I'm -- oh, table it, I'm sorry. All right. Is there a motion to table?

LEG. MURATORE:
Motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Tabled (VOTE 5-0)***

IR 1746 - Authorizing transfer of decommissioned vehicles to the Dix Hills Fire Department. (Stern) Motion by Legislator Stern.

LEG. MURATORE:
Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1749 - Transferring funds from Assessment Stabilization Reserve Fund, amending the 2015 Operating Budget and amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with the Sewer Infrastructure Program to provide funding for Meschutt County Park wastewater upgrade (CP 8720.110 and .310). (Co. Exec.) I'll make the motion, second by Legislator Stern. Is this -- I do have a question for the Commissioner. How much money do we have in the assessment stabilization reserve fund? Ballpark.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I wouldn't even be able to hazard a guess. This is --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Bob, can you give us a ballpark number on that?

MR. DOERING:
I know the recommended budget came out. I think the estimate within that is something around $70 million.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you. I think this will cover that project. Thank you. It's good to do an upgrade, there is a leaking infrastructure of a septic -- old septic system on -- sitting right on Peconic Bay so this is a good project. Do we have a second, I mean a motion and a second, Jason?

MR. RICHBERG:
Yes, we do.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1753 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating additional funding in connection with pavement resurfacing of CR 100, Suffolk Avenue from the vicinity of Washington Avenue to the vicinity of NY 454 (CP 5599.315, PIN 076084). (Co. Exec.)
Motion by Legislator Muratore, second by Legislator Browning. Any questions?

LEG. STERN:
This is before us because there -- there was an addition.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. This was -- we're back asking for additional funds because the -- essentially the ADA requirements have been strengthened by the Department of Justice. In 2013 they came across with a ruling that resurfacing, which was generally always exempt from ADA, is now considered reconstruction and any time we come in and do a simple resurfacing job we now have to address any ADA deficiencies along that corridor. So this is asking for 2.195 million to address those concerns; sidewalk, curbs, ramps, things like that.

LEG. STERN:
Right. So the additional expenditure is essentially because these are requirements that we have to satisfy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, sir.

LEG. STERN:
Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

IR 1754 - Amending the 2015 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating additional funding in connection with pavement resurfacing of CR 83, North Ocean Avenue from the vicinity of Sunrise Highway (NY27) to the vicinity of LIE (I-495) (CP 5599.314, PIN 076083). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Browning, second by Legislator Muratore. On the

motion, Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
Yeah, I'll ask -- I'll ask the same question.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And it's a same answer, yeah, absolutely. It's due to the ADA requirements being strengthened and we're now addressing that and requesting 2.11 million for those changes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
And does the federal government come -- come up with the money to -- when they put out a mandate?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is 80 percent federally funded. Eighty percent --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
The additional also?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, yep.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
In fact, both cases.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay. All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
IR 1757 - Repealing Resolution No. 765-2014 - authorizing execution of an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of East Hampton in connection with the Downtown Montauk Stabilization Project. (Krupski) I'll make that motion, second by Legislator Muratore. So on the motion, Commissioner, you and I had a discussion -- conference call with the DEC and Army Corps of Engineers and could you tell the Committee about that conference call?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The genesis of that conference call was this legislation and we asked for their -- them to be and speak about the changes, if any, to the project from that which was originally agreed to by the Legislature earlier this year. As was discussed by the DEC and the Corps, that open cut, if you will, that is in the dune right now is they have a, as part of the agreement, to address that and to address the drainage concerns. There is an agreement that if a storm is coming, a large storm of any significance is coming, the town will have the facility and the ability to close the gap to allow the dune to function as a solid unit rather than having two units, if you will, that are separated by an opening.

So that would, there will be no cost to the County, no impact to the County, we're exempt from that agreement and it's totally borne by the town. So other than that everything else stands as it was agreed to however many months ago we agreed to do this.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
I had looked into the changes and I thought that because there were -- there were changes that I

would like, you know, everyone to reconsider this backing this project, I consider this shoreline hardening project on the Atlantic Ocean, which I consider to be a mistake anywhere because I believe it's going to lead to shoreline hardening anywhere else on the coastline, however, after the conversation with the Commissioner and the DEC and the Army Corps, they did convince me that it is not a change in the project and therefore I would withdraw this motion. Do I need a second, George?

MR. NOLAN:
You can withdraw.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Okay, yeah. So -- oh, yes.

MR. LIPP:
Pardon the interruption but I have some information that I wasn't sure of before concerning Legislator Muratore's IR 1689, the Bald Hill Schoolhouse, actually the County does own the building and in the past we have spent some money for restoration but it's been a long time. So I apologize for not having that information before.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Is there a second on the motion to reconsider?

LEG. BARRAGA:
I think we'll go with the tabling.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Yeah, I'll entertain it, there's a second by Legislator Browning to reconsider.

LEG. MURATORE:
We're back at 1689? Okay, can I make a motion to approve?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Oh, I'm sorry, thank you. All right. A vote to reconsider the motion 1689. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? No one abstained. So moved. All right, now you can make a motion. Thank you.

LEG. MURATORE:
Okay, motion on 1689 to approve.

LEG. BROWNING:
I'll second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
I've got a second by Legislator Browning. Now we can have a discussion.

LEG. STERN:
On the motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Go ahead.

LEG. STERN:
Commissioner or to Robert, maybe you could just take me through the numbers here because I see numbers that -- that tend to look a little different from the much smaller amount that we are ultimately talking about. So maybe you can take me through the figures here.

MR. LIPP:
Well, the cost is 125,000. I don't have the resolution up, but I believe it's approximately 10 percent is Planning money, so in terms of the construction, that would be a function of, you know, what the planning winds up happening. What exactly would be done I belive the commissioner wasn't sure yet and part because the planning hasn't been done. And just like most capital projects should the project come in at under budget then it would eventually go to capital closeout revenue several years down the road.

And actually the way the process also works is even though you're -- if you did appropriate the money, the 125,000, that doesn't mean that's what will be borrowed, it could be after the planning that the whole project costs, I'll say, 101,000 and that's what they would actually go to market to borrow.

LEG. STERN:
Understood. But bottom line here is this is all planning.

MR. LIPP:
No, no, only about 10 percent of it is planning, it's mostly construction.

LEG. STERN:
This is mostly construction.

MR. LIPP:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Well, that's what I'm not seeing here. All right, so.

MR. LIPP:
Oh, I'm sorry, it's all construction, I stand corrected. No, no, there is planning. There's 12,000 -- so, I was right, there's 12,500 is planning and the remainder 112,500 would be for construction. And, once, again if Gil's group determines that it's less than 125 he'll go out and he'll borrow that lesser amount, they won't have the ability to borrow more though. And actually the first bond will be just for the planning money and then when that's done, perhaps a year down the road after that's done, the construction portion would kick in.

LEG. STERN:
Right, but this is an approval for that entire amount right now.

MR. LIPP:
Correct. And that's typically how it is, you want to approve the whole amount because you don't want to have to come back and have money already spent and then the project derails.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
So this is on County-owned land and it's open to the public, the County public?

LEG. STERN:
It's physically located within the County park?

LEG. MURATORE:
I'm sorry, right on County Road 16 on Portion Road just on the north side.

LEG. STERN:
The monies are coming from where?

MR. LIPP:
The offset is 1755.

LEG. STERN:
1755 money.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:
Any other questions? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***Approved (VOTE: 5-0)***

Having no other business, we stand adjourned.

(The meeting was adjourned at 3:47 p.m.)