

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 December 23, 2015.

Members Present:

Legislator Al Krupski - Chairman
Legislator Tom Muratore - Vice-Chair
Legislator Tom Barraga - Excused
Legislator Kate Browning
Legislator Steven Stern

Also In Attendance:

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Jason Richberg - Clerk of the Legislature
Lora Gellerstein - Chief of Staff
Amy Ellis - Aide to Legislator Anker
Catherine Stark - Aide to Legislator Krupski
Debbie Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern
Bill Shilling - Aide to the Majority Leader
Michael Pitcher - Aide to P.O. Gregory
Bob Martinez - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Gil Anderson - Commissioner of Public Works
Bob Doering - Budget Review Office
Rick Brand - Newsday
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken and Transcribed By:

Gabrielle Severs - Court Stenographer

(The meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

All right. Welcome to the regular committee meeting of Public Works, Transportation and Energy. All rise for the pledge of Allegiance lead by Legislator Stern.

(Salutation)

The first part here is public portion. We do not have any cards. Is there anyone who would like to address the committee?

MR. RICHBERG:

We do have one card.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Kevin, welcome.

MR. MCALLISTER:

Good afternoon, Legislators. My name is Kevin McAllister of Defend H2O. I'm here today to speak to you about your 2016 vector control plan of work and implore you to make one item change to that plan, and that's the restriction or renewable of the use of methoprene over coastal waters. I know some can argue that the science is not settled. I will submit to you back in 2007 when this county went through the EIS and long-term plan, a \$5 million study, at the time 21 peer-reviewed studies were omitted from that. Within the body of the record for that ultimate process, it was brought forward that New York City has banned methoprene in coastal water bodies, part of their EIS; New York State DEC has restricted methoprene use on state-managed wetlands for some reason with an exemption or, I'll say, laissez-faire with Suffolk County's wetlands for some reason.

I'm here today to bring forward, and I believe this legislature is aware of, Connecticut's ban on methoprene again in coastal areas. That's roughly two years old. Ultimately, in recognizing the science that came out of University of Connecticut, they issued this ban with the exception of the presence of West Nile Virus, and there's actually a caveat for, I believe, 100,000 in populous or greater for the use.

More recently, U.S. Senator Christopher Murphy had provided a letter to -- sent a letter to our governor asking for New York State to follow suit with the ban.

I'm not casual about this. With respect to my, I'll say, information gathering as a scientist, you know, there's certainly as to the adverse impacts of both crustacea and nontarget insects; and again while we watch Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maine all have enacted some form of restrictions on methoprene, we continue to use it. Roughly two weeks ago, I appeared and made a statement to the CEQ to try to encourage again a hard-look examination of methoprene and ultimately a removal from the work plan, and at the time, which is often the case -- the County process allow Mr. Ninivaggi to rebut my statements -- he suggested that the Connecticut ban was politically motivated, that it wasn't based on science. Well, if you examine the 2'16 work plan as to the evidence of bites, if you will, for applications of pesticides, its phone calls from the public and its phone calls from legislators, that's not science.

I'll finish up in 10 seconds. You know, while this county not too long ago lauds the restriction or some of the restrictions on microbeads in the aquatic environment, I find it disingenuous that you turn a blind eye to methoprene while we blanket spray and poison these wetlands year-in and year-out. There's BTI. There's an alternative product that can be used for the larval suppression.

For some reason, it's represented that it's not good enough, that we need methoprene. Well, I'm not trying to dismiss -- or I should say I'm trying to highlight Connecticut's action here. When a U.S. senator is communicating to our governor asking him, Please, New York, follow suit with this, you know, this goes beyond Kevin standing before you and suggesting that this is poison in our wetlands, so please do the right thing.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Kevin, I've got a question for you based on what you said. You said Connecticut's got a ban. Is that an all-out state ban, period?

MR. MCALLISTER:

Yes, it is, in coastal areas.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

How do they define coastal areas?

MR. MCALLISTER:

I guess if there's some form of conveyance to basically saline waters, so this would be the tributaries that would lead into Long Island Sound area.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Under the EPA law for waters of the United States, that would be everything so that's -- do they go by that --

LEG. MCCAFFREY:

Actually, I do have the -- oh, let me get that for you. I have Mr. Murphy's letter, and I omitted to suggest to you or share with you both East Hampton town trustees as well as Southampton trustees have asked that Suffolk County lead toward this ban as well. May I give that to someone? I'll provide that legislature. It's right in my file.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Okay. I'll ask that question later on. How long has the ban been in place; is it two seasons?

MR. MCALLISTER:

That law was passed, I believe, the summer of '13, if I'm not mistaken.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

So '14 and '15, there was no methoprene sprayed?

MR. MCALLISTER:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Do they do population surveys on the mosquitos?

MR. MCALLISTER:

I'm not sure how rigorous their mosquito program is with respect to monitoring. I can't answer that question accurately.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. MCALLISTER:

And I'll give you the legislation that was passed, and please take a look at Senator Murphy's letter. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Is there anyone else who would like to speak during public portion to address the committee? Seeing none, there's a request to take **IR 1886, Authorizing execution of reciprocal easement agreements with Gurwin Jewish Healthcare Foundation in connection with the reconstruction of a County recharge basin in the vicinity of CR 4 Commack Road (Stern)**, out of order.

LEG. STERN:

I'll make that motion. Motion by Legislator Stern. Second by Legislator Muratore. Is there a motion to approve?

LEG. STERN:

Motion to approve.

LEG. STERN:

Motion to approve.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Same motion, same second.

MR. RICHBERG:

You didn't vote on the take out of order.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Oh, thank you. This is to take out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved to take out of order. Now we have a motion and a second to approve. So on the motion, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is a longstanding project that DPW's been involved with for at least five to seven years that I know of and we've -- Gurwin Jewish Healthcare Foundation reached out to the county to ask whether or not the county would agree to allow them to reconfigure an existing recharge basin off Commack Road. We've worked with them in preparation of the documents that are here. We do not lose any capacity. The capacity is still there to protect our roadway and, in fact, if it ever did overflow, it actually overflows onto the Gurwin parcel. There's always that possibility, but as I have said, we've been working with them for some time for them to come up with a layout, us to create the easements, and it's ready to move forward. We're in favor of the proposal. They will maintain the recharge basin for us, and there's not much else to say about it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Does anyone have any questions?

LEG. STERN:

Yeah. So, Mr. Chairman, just to summarize, I thank the commissioner for his comments. But here it would provide for Gurwin maintaining the functionality of the recharge basin. They would assume responsibility for future maintenance of the reconstructed recharge basin. The county would continue to have access as well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We would still own the recharge basin. We would just have the ability to transform it into a site feature, if you will, a pond, but the capacity will still be there. They will maintain it on a daily basis, but we still maintain ownership.

LEG. STERN:

So providing its public purpose would be maintained, but it would actually be a benefit to the community as well.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Will they take advantage of the groundwater recharge and the stormwater control that it provides?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Their only feature they're really adding is some type of waterfall to the west end of the recharge basin and then to give it a natural recharge basin look.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Sounds like it goes under the category of improvement.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, I would say so.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. All right. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga)**

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

And in light of county staff here, I would like to make a motion to take **IR 1894** out of order, **Approving the Vector Control Plan of the Department of Public Works Division of Vector Control pursuant to Section C8-4(B)(2) of the Suffolk County Charter (County Exec.)**. Motion by Legislator Muratore. Is there a second? I'll second the motion to take it out of order. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. We're out of order. Is there a motion to approve? Motion by Legislator Muratore. I'll second that. On the motion, some questions were raised during the public portion about Connecticut's ban. If maybe Dominick Ninivaggi could provide some insight into that.

MR. NINIVAGGI:

Hi. Dominick Ninivaggi, superintendent of vector control. I want to thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak. Yeah, I took a few notes on what Mr. McAllister had to say, and they're very similar to the things he's been saying for quite a few times. At the Council For Environmental Equality, the Council itself noted that legislative action is not scientific evidence, and we base our program on scientific evidence. Some of the claims that he made about 21 studies that were submitted in 2007, all those studies were looked at by the county at that time and were found not to raise significant concerns about methoprene. He claimed that methoprene is not allowed on state lands; that is outright false. We use methoprene on state wetlands just as we do on county wetlands, town wetlands, privately-owned wetlands, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service federal lands, so there is no distinction. All the landowners, all the wetlands are protected in the same way, so that's just not true.

He's claiming that there is some sort of scientific evidence of adverse impacts from University of Connecticut. We've asked him to show us this information. He hasn't. His claim that there is a certainty of adverse impacts, again, you know, as a scientist, we don't see anything close to that

and certainly if there's a certainty to adverse impacts, you would think that the state DEC or the U.S. EPA would have something to say about this considering this material has been in use since the 1970s.

Just as far as claiming that some of the criteria we use are not scientific for treatment, that's simply not so. For instance, you know, obviously as a public agency, if legislators alert us to a mosquito problem, obviously as a public agency, we respond to that. We certainly do not spray automatically if a legislator asks us to, as many of you know, we still have to go through our process, go through our scientific criteria, and there's good reason for that. Calls from the public, again, they are part of our surveillance, and again, it's a big part of it because we can't be everywhere. So if the public calls us and says, We've got a mosquito problem, that's valuable information that goes into the mill, goes into our surveillance.

The claim that BTI is some kind of perfect alternative that renders the use of methoprene unnecessary again is not so. This program was one of the first in the country and, in fact, in the world to use BTI as part of its program back in 1982, and what we found over the years of using that material is that it works really well under certain circumstances. It doesn't work under every possible circumstance, which, when you think about it, what tool does? What product does? What medicine does?

What we did find is by adding methoprene to the program and using methoprene when it's appropriate and BTI when it's appropriate, we were able to drastically improve the efficacy of our program, and basically what it allowed us to do is to deal with the mosquitos while they were out in the marshes and away from the people, and this is important because that's the environmentally sound way to do it, and that's the best way to protect the people and also it prevents the need for us to go out and use pesticides among the people and the residential areas, so it actually reduces the risks of exposure to pesticides by dealing with the mosquitos out on the marsh, and we did drastically reduce our spraying of adult control materials in residential areas from 90,000 acres when I first got here in 1994. That does seem like a long time ago. Now we're at maybe 10- to 15,000 acres a year, so we follow through, and we prove that, yes, by using this material, we spray the residential areas less.

I think it's important to recognize that this is an integrated program. All the parts work together as a whole, and you can't just arbitrarily pull out a major part of the program and then say, Okay, you know, go out and do your job. It doesn't work that way. If we were to arbitrarily say, Okay, we're not going to use this particular active ingredient, we would really have to reassess the entire program. One of the things we have to reassess is whether we'd have more mosquito problems as a result of doing this and whether we have to spray more in the residential areas or whether we'd have more mosquito-borne disease. All those things would have to be looked at.

Fortunately, that's not necessary. This product was thoroughly reviewed when it was registered by the state and federal government. It was thoroughly-reviewed by us before we ever used it, and it was reviewed in our long-term plan, and again all the studies that were brought to us at that time were looked at. We continued to look at the literature for any new studies and again Mr. McAllister's has never brought any new studies to our attention that would change it, and so basically there's really no need to change a program that works very effectively to protect the people both from disease and from the quality-of-life impacts. So that's basically what we're up to here, and I appreciate an opportunity to talk about that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Well, Legislator Browning has a question. I've got a few also.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. We are, I guess, before the end of the year, we have to have this approved by the end of the year, yes? And why?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

That is correct. Basically because in order for us to operate legally, we have to have an annual plan of work. It's in the county charter.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm continually hearing -- I pulled up some information here on methoprene and continually hearing about alternative uses, and you're saying that this BTI is not effective or it is effective?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

It's effective if you use it under the right circumstances, and we've had about 12 years of experiences trying to use only BTI, and those years are characterized by, basically, enormous numbers of mosquitoes reaching the residential areas, particularly in areas in southern Brookhaven and very high rates of having to spray for adult mosquitoes. I vividly remember my first year on the job here when we were only using BTI, and we had larvae out in the salt marsh, we went out and did our BTI application, and the head foreman came to me the Friday before the Fourth of July weekend saying, I went out there and looked, it didn't work, you can expect Tuesday when you get back to be black Tuesday; and we took over 250 service calls in the first couple hours of that morning. We basically had to block off the entire south shore of the county to treat that by helicopter with adulticides to bring that under control. It was a mess. In 1996, we did our first applications of methoprene, and we looked at this over the next few years, and it reduced the numbers of salt marsh mosquitoes reaching the residential areas by 80 to 90 percent or more, and our need to have to spray those areas went down as a result. So if we were to arbitrarily dropped us out of the program, data suggests that there could be five to ten times as many mosquitos reaching the residential areas, which I don't think we want. And again, it's not necessary; if there was any kind of serious scientific evidence that this was a problem, we'd have to reevaluate that, but it's just not there.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. It is serious when you're applying pesticides to the marine environment. Anecdotally, you know, we don't have lobster populations on the south shore in Peconic Bay, but the blue claw crab population is, you would think, be affected by this if it could be.

MR. NINIVAGGI:

Yeah, we looked at the land ingrates over the years that we got from New York State, and they're up, they're down. There's no trend. In fact, they're slightly lighter then they were before we started using methoprene, and I'm certainly not going to claim that methoprene is some kind of crab vitamin. But again, this is exactly where you would expect to see the effect of something like methoprene on crustaceans, and you just don't see it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I've got a couple questions. Connecticut's ban, is it a full ban?

MR. NINIVAGGI:

No. There are certain areas where they are allowed to use it in certain circumstances, and again the technical people there, our counterparts and their department of environmental protection and their health department, would strongly oppose this, but they were overruled by the legislature. And again, when you start looking for things like -- for instance, it's kind of a myth that lots of methoprene ever went into Long Island Sound. That never happened because mosquitoes don't

breed in the sound. There's a little bit of mosquito breeding in some of the wetlands, but one of the things that we did in our projects is we looked, and USGS actually looked -- they followed us around -- the methoprene doesn't get out of the salt marshes in any measurable amount after we use it to kill the mosquito. So the idea that there was lots of methoprene going out into the sound and somehow that killed the lobsters is kind of a myth. It never happened, but what we do know is that, particularly in 1999, lobsters were subject to temperature shock, which was more than enough to kill them off, and lobsters in Long Island Sound are basically a victim of climate change. I think the science is pretty clear on that, and that explains what happened to the lobsters without having to invoke things like methoprene or pesticides.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

There's no question. I do believe you on that count as far as the lobsters and the water temperature go. I worked for years with a lobsterman out of Mattituck, and that was his analysis. That's someone who worked the water. In fact, the lobsters were at the southern end of their range. The couple degrees of warming in Long Island Sound due to climate change, global warming, whatever you want to call it, was enough to push that population further north.

MR. NINIVAGGI :

Yeah, and you see that, of course, in Maine. Basically the center of gravity of the lobster population has moved north.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

So another question I had: So with the restricted use in Connecticut, do they continue to monitor their populations?

MR. NINIVAGGI :

They monitor the mosquito populations. I don't know what they found there. That's not something I follow very closely. They don't have quite the extent of salt marsh mosquito problem that we have on our south shore. Their marshes are like our north shore marshes; they're more heavily flushed. One of the things that they do and that we're emulating here is using improved marsh management to eliminate the need for any kind of pesticides in the salt marsh and we've done work at Wertheim Refuge to demonstrate the proof of concept. We now have brought in federal funding to use these techniques on hundreds of acres of the marshes, and that's what we plan to do. So again, it's an integrated program; it's not just one thing, and even now we're very confident in the safety of our pesticides, we want to go as much to non-pesticide techniques as possible, and that's one of the things we're doing, and we actually went out and got money to get that done.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Well, I only have one more question. You know, you said you used to spray 90,000 acres and you've reduced that a great deal. If someone, a private owner of the wetlands, whether it's another municipality or a private property owner, can they deny you the access to spray?

MR. NINIVAGGI :

Not under state and county public health law because basically mosquito control can't work if individuals could set up little preserves in their own property because basically the mosquitoes don't stay on their property. If a landowner were to say, My marsh is special, you can't touch the mosquitos there, that would be fine if the mosquitoes stayed there but they don't, particularly salt marsh mosquitoes that fly 5 to 10 miles inland. I live in Nesconset, which is pretty much the center of Suffolk County, and I have a mosquito trap in my backyard, and we actually did pull a salt marsh mosquito out of that trap, so they fly a long way. So I think the state and county law have it right in that you can't have effective mosquito control if all the sources are not your best.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Any other committee member have any questions? All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga)**

IR 1903, Authorizing the County Executive to enter into an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of Smithtown for the maintenance of Harned Road from the vicinity of CR 67, Motor Parkway to the vicinity of SR 25, Jericho Turnpike (County Executive). Is there a motion?

LEG. MURATORE:

Motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Motion by Legislator Muratore. Second by Legislator Stern. On the motion, Commissioner, what's the intermunicipal agreement about?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is a longstanding IMA. This is memorializing a longstanding agreement us and the Town of Smithtown. This is a road that the town maintains for us on a regular basis: garbage pickup, plowing, stuff like that. We do the larger capital program repairs. This particular year, 2015, we just did \$395,000 worth of road repair. South of Jericho Turnpike to the entrance of where the Northern State exit ramp is. Next year, we plan on doing another \$350,000 worth of repair on the road as well. This just memorializes an agreement that's been longstanding since the 80s.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Is there a time for the agreement to end, or is it just a year-to-year agreement?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't believe there is a date where it ends.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Ten years. I have heard recently 10 years. All right. Anybody else have any questions? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga)**

IR 1906, Accepting a donation of twenty to twenty-four (20-24) bike lockers from the New York State Department of Transportation. Same motion, same second. What are we doing with New York State's old bike lockers?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is an agreement whereby the State of New York Department of Transportation is giving the county some excess bike lockers that they have. They are effectively getting out of the program I believe, and I'm going to ask Darnell Tyson, deputy commissioner, to come up and speak on that. He can give more detail than I certainly can.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Welcome.

MR. TYSON:

Thank you. So as Gil mentioned, State DOT has been operating, administering, and maintaining a number of bike lockers around Suffolk County, and they would like to get out of that business, so

they have a number of lockers, approximately up to 24 lockers that they want to transfer to Suffolk County. A number of them have been -- they are at locations at the railroad stations, most notably Central Islip and Ronkonkoma. They've been there for years, but basically State DOT wants to turn them over to us and we would maintain and administer the program, and there are a number of other locations that we could install them at.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

What is a bike locker?

MR. TYSON:

A bike locker is sort of a large case. It's a close case that --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Steel?

MR. TYSON:

Plastic or -- a plastic case. It's not metal. It's a case that goes around the locker. You can put your bike in it if you're traveling to the rail station and then lock it up. You get your own key and then use the rail.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

So how much maintenance is involved in this and going forward?

MR. TYSON:

So, in general, what we understand is that the maintenance associated with the lockers is minimal. Basically, the locker has to be installed once the locker is activated and turned over to someone, but over the course of a year, basically someone needs to go to the locker twice a year to lube the locks, make sure that the locker itself is not vandalized, and, if necessary, remove graffiti. But as long as I have actually been dealing with this, which has been almost about a year, we've received only minimal calls for maintenance associated with the lockers.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Okay. So we're going to take these over, and if they get just damaged or destroyed, we're not going to bother replacing them?

MR. TYSON:

Yes. The only reason we are taking these lockers as they are is because they were already purchased by State DOT. If we had to do it over again, we probably would go for a different style locker.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

What's the use? Are they being used now? Is it adequate use, or was it something that was put in and they are not being used much?

MR. TYSON:

The locker usage varies from location to location. In particular, there are lockers installed in Sayville location. There's eight of them, and four of them are in use and four of them are not, so that's the kind of usage that you have around the county, sort of 50 percent, maybe, and up.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

Thank you. Anybody have any questions?

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm actually looking at a picture of a plastic bike locker. I don't even know that I've ever noticed any of these.

MR. TYSON:

Yeah, they don't stand out much.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'd be happy to show you what it looks like, what I'm looking at.

MR. TYSON:

Yes, and that's most of ours are painted neutral. You can't even see them as well as that. The ones in Sayville are like a beige-ish.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Do people pay to use these?

MR. TYSON:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

So but then I'm wondering why the state doesn't want to do it. Are they not making money on it?

MR. TYSON:

Well, so what they did was, they probably acquired them under a grant, and they actually rolled in the maintenance and the operation of the bike lockers. There's a part of a larger agreement, and so the bike lockers were just a part of a larger thing that they actually subbed out to a company, so that company, though, is no longer in the business of performing the maintenance. So it's not a situation where they're not making money; I think it's sort of a just a deal that they want to get out of, and so their stance is to pass on the equipment, convey them over free to other municipalities to assume as opposed to just throwing them away.

LEG. BROWNING:

Tell me why the county wants to do this and not maybe Town of Brookhaven, Town of Babylon, Town of Islip that they wouldn't want to --

MR. TYSON:

Right, and actually so the county would take probably out of the 24, they would take the great majority of them, but at some of the locations, like in particular the Sayville location, we would look to partner with the Town of Islip to take the lockers. The ones that we have or we'd keep are the ones that would be installed on county property, so that's Central Islip, Ronkonkoma. We would also look to install some at the Yaphank location and actually one here in the Hauppauge vicinity if it makes sense.

So to your point, we would actually like to partner with the towns, and some of the lockers that are out there that DOT actually acquired are with the towns.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So if it's going to become costly to us to maintain them, we're not going to move forward keeping them, right?

MR. TYSON:

Yes, exactly. If they become an issue -- indications are that the -- like the administration costs on

the planning side are approximately just \$600 a year.

LEG. BROWNING:

Are we going to use county workers to maintain these?

MR. TYSON:

For the one or two times a day that we go out to move the locks, yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

That will be your people, Gil?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, it would.

LEG. BROWNING:

What, a maintenance mechanic or a...?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Probably highway staff. The lots that Darnell mentioned are generally maintained by our highway crews, anyway, so when they go out, whether it's to pick up the garbage or straighten out an area, that's when they'd do it.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, because I don't want them having to do more than what already are doing because they are doing more with less.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

A lot less.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Good point. Any other questions? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga)**

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Legislator, if I may, just to go back to the previous resolution regarding Harned Road, under section three in article one, term of agreement is 10 years.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. So we'll go to tabled resolutions, and we only have one I think that hasn't been closed, so we'll move through those.

IR 1516, Approving Ferry License for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC d/b/a Coastline Freight (P.O. Gregory). I'll make a motion to approve. Second by Legislator Muratore.

MR. NOLAN:

I just wanted to put on the record that we've been waiting for one more piece of documentation from the applicant that they have permission from the Town of Brookhaven to dock at Davis Park to

do the freight service. We haven't received that yet. That's part of both resolutions, but I would suggest we discharge this from the committee because it's going to be stricken on December 2, and hopefully before either the December 1 meeting or the 15 meeting, we'll get what we need from the applicant and we can approve the petitions.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Can we approve it?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes, you may.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. All right. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga)**

IR 1517, Approving Ferry Freight rates for Beachcomber Freight Service, LLC (P.O. Gregory). Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga)

I'll make a motion to table **IR 1657, Adopting Local Law No. -2015, A Local Law to clarify affordable housing requirements at developments connecting to a County sewer district (Calarco).** Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Tabled (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga).**

IR 1857, A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 13 – Windwatch (CP 8123) (County Executive). Same motion, same second. On the motion, Commissioner.

I'll make a motion to approve. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This resolution as well as the next five were all the results of public hearings held at the November 17 legislative meeting. This one in particular is specific to sewer district 13, Windwatch. We're looking to rehabilitate tankage equipment, and the building within the sewer district, total estimate right now is 1.5 million, but this is really just to make certain the findings and determinations that occurred at that public hearing.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga).**

IR 1858, A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 15 – Nob Hill (CP 8138) (County Executive). Same motion, same second to approve. On the motion, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This resolution looks to make certainly findings and determination pursuant to the public hearing that took place at the last legislative meeting. Our hope is to construct a bypass within the influent pump station so that service can be maintained at all times if we have to do some work to that pump station. Right now, sewage enters the pump station and it's curvated directly to the wastewater treatment plant. The project is being designed in-house, and construction will occur

both with DPW staff as well as the contractor, and estimated cost of about \$250,000.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga).**

IR 1859, A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 20 – William Floyd (CP 8147)(County Executive). Motion by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Stern. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This project, we're hoping to construct an equalization tank within the portion of the existing tankage by adding aeration in that specific area. Additionally, structural members of the final settling tank and denitrification filters require rehabilitation. It's a \$3 million estimate, and this would, as in the previous resolutions, would look to make certain findings and determinations in issuing an order to move forward with the project.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

I hate to ask, but where is Sewer District 20?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Oh, I'm sorry. Ridge Haven. It's --

LEG. BROWNING:

It's actually not in my district.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe it's just to the north.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, it's up around the Ridge area.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I think it's out of my district.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I thought you is had a question about the equalization tank.

LEG. BROWNING:

No. It's just the district number tells me nothing, so I was just curious if that was one in my district or not.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

We might get to one in your district if we keep going.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The actual name of the district is William Floyd, but Ridge Haven is one of the components of that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga).**

IR 1860, A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 7 – Medford (CP 8150). Motion by Legislator Muratore. Second by Legislator Stern.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This project will look to improve sewers and force mains within 30 miles of gravity sewers and force mains within the district number seven Medford sewer district. The project is estimated at \$500,000. This will be for construction.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Do we have a motion and a second? Any discussion? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga).**

IR 1861, A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 16 – Yaphank (CP 8158) (County Executive). Motion to approve by Legislator Browning. Second by Legislator Muratore. On the motion.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This will project looks to rehabilitate portions of a sewer system originally constructed in the 1970s within the Yaphank district, district number 16, which services county facilities in Yaphank. We'd be looking to spend about \$250,000 each year in 2015, 2016, and 2017. This is strictly for construction of those replacement sewers.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. All right. No discussion. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga).**

IR 1862, A resolution making certain Findings and Determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 1 – Port Jefferson (CP 8169). Motion by Legislator Muratore. I'll second the motion.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This project is to construct a new influent screen building. The estimated cost is \$1 million. It'll house two new screening devices, which will remove screen material to be compacted and disposed of offsite. It's pretty exciting stuff.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 4-0-0-1, Not Present: Barraga).**

Thank you, everyone. There's no other business. We are adjourned.

(The meeting ended at 2:47 p.m.)