

PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION & ENERGY COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

Capital Budget Meeting

MINUTES

The Capital Budget meeting of the Public Works & Transportation 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 May 17, 2016.

Members Present:

Legislator Al Krupski - Chairman
Legislator Robert Calarco
Legislator Browning
Legislator Robert Trotta
Legislator Bridget Fleming
Legislator Steve Stern

Also in Attendance:

Legislator Leslie Kennedy - District No. 12
Legislator Kevin McCaffrey - District No. 14
Amy Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature
Robert Lipp - Director/Budget Review Office
Bob Doering - Budget Review Office
Joe Schroeder - Budget Review Office/Energy Specialist
Gil Anderson - Commissioner/Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Bill Hillman - Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Keith Larsen - Suffolk County Department of Public Works
Catherine Stark - Aide to Legislator Krupski
Debbie Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern
Bob Martinez - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Greg Moran - Aide to Legislator Trotta
Jason Hann - County Executive's Office
All Other Interested Parties

Minutes Taken By:

Gabrielle Severs - Court Stenographer

Minutes Transcribed By:

Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary

*(*The meeting was called to order at 9:39 a.m.*)*

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. We're going to open the public hearing here. We're going to start with the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Stern.

Salutation

Welcome to the Capital Budget Public Hearing for Public Works. I don't have any cards. Is there anyone who would like to address the Working Group besides the Commissioner? Please come up. Welcome.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good morning.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So, Commissioner, we went through a list of items that Budget Review had picked out and highlighted for us to look at yesterday so we're going to have questions on a number of those today, but is there anything that you'd like to start with?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Good morning and thank you for this opportunity to meet again. I'm glad to be here. I'd like to start off again by commending BRO in their report. It's a thorough and concise document. I haven't finished going through it, but as always it's well done and I commend them for it. As I said, I haven't gone through it all yet, but there's a couple of items I would like to note, primarily two; 1664 our recommendation, or my recommendation, would be to split between both the County Executive's recommendation and BRO's, and then for 1643, which is the North Wing of the Riverhead County Center, we'd like to keep it spread out as per our original recommendation if it's at all possible. And then that's it about right now. And I'm here to answer any questions. We have almost everybody here from Public Works.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. Thank you. So those were two, two of the questions that we had that we hadn't decided on. So we can start with 1643. So the question was is this something that's going to save us a lot of money. I mean, I think we all understand that the mechanicals, I think the description of it, 30 years old, et cetera. Are they in dire need of -- you said split it. I'm not sure what you meant by split it, because it has 18 on the proposed --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's 1643. We'd like to keep it to our original recommendation.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Which was?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

1643 we requested 2.5 million in '17. And then the County Exec --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

He pushed it off a year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. So you feel like that's something that -- are there going to be energy savings associated with

this project?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There are. There's a number of items involved with this. Obviously, as you mentioned, the equipment is, you know, well beyond the service life. There will be efficiencies there. We're at this point ready to go with an RFP so we feel we can, you know, get this out in a timely manner and make this happen sooner rather than later.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

What part of the building, and that was another question, what part of the building does this cover?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe this is the North Wing of the County Center.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

What's the -- like if you walk into the County Center, which part of it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'm going to defer to -- I'm going to ask --

LEG. FLEMING:

I think the question was is it the Health Center.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Keith Larsen, who is our Capital Program Manager, he can provide some detail.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Welcome. Thank you for coming. So is it -- we weren't sure like which part of the building it is.

MR. LARSEN:

It's actually the south end of the building, which is the Health Center and Mental Health Services upstairs. That portion of the building was never addressed under the previous renovations so the original mechanicals are still there. They are limping along. We've been doing some repairs. It's at the point where we can't control those systems. They are constantly breaking down, and the fact that we have the Health Center in there, which is now run by HRH, it's a little more concerning if something goes down, so.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Sure.

MR. LARSEN:

It definitely needs to be replaced sooner than later. We can probably limp along for another year, but ultimately we're going to see some energy efficiencies with the renovation and basically, you know, improved conditions for the patients there.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Will you also get efficiencies in operation?

MR. LARSEN:

Yes, by putting in the control systems we'll have basically a better, you know, control on the entire system so one guy can from his computer control everything, whereas now they're constantly reacting, having to go down and manually adjusting things and so on.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Thank you. Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

I appreciate your candor, but maybe the proposed budget reflects your point that you might be able to limp along for another year. Can you just tell us what that would look like?

MR. LARSEN:

So right now we're proposing I guess the money in 2018 versus '17, which just means that, again, we're going to probably be spending a little bit more money from an operations standpoint in having certain things serviced if they go down. We don't know what that is, but the equipment is, like I said, it's original, it's 1955, and it's far beyond its useful life. And we've been doing that for the last five, six years and nothing has gone drastically wrong, but we never know when that's going to happen.

LEG. FLEMING:

So -- but you're saying the operational costs will be more if you don't make the improvements.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, that's correct, they could be more. Again, they could limp along fine for next year, but we can't guarantee that.

LEG. FLEMING:

Appreciate that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

This is in the Health Center?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The Health Center, yeah, that whole --

LEG. TROTТА:

The Health Centers we sold so we could save money?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is part of our -- this is part of our building.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

We were going to do this whether we operated it or not this. This was going to happen because we own the building.

LEG. TROTТА:

Who negotiated that contract? Not me.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Leslie.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Thank you again for your straightforwardness. Bridget got most of what I wanted to say. This does not include any part of the Clerk's Office or the Legislative -- I don't understand how in that building heating and air-conditioning can be divided into multiple parts.

MR. LARSEN:

Right. The south end has its own penthouse up on the roof which just serves the south end and a small portion of the Legislature area. The rest of the building we actually replaced all the air handlers and so on for the Clerk's area, the Treasurer at the time and so on. And the other area we're doing, which is next year in a different project, is the Surrogate's Court, which has its own system also which we didn't replace under the previous renovations.

LEG. KENNEDY:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Anyone else?

LEG. FLEMING:

I have another, yes. Is there any way to sort of split the baby? Can we make improvements that don't cost the full 2.5 and realize some savings on those operational costs or is it all or nothing?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At this point we've split this, you know, again, this is a multiphase project. We've split this into three or four different projects. This should be the last one with the exception of Surrogate's Court, which is a separate building anyway, right?

MR. LARSEN:

It's attached, but separate.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah. So I guess the answer -- the quick answer is no.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. We're going to vote on this. This is Budget Review or the proposed. Oh, we can't. I'm sorry. Thank you. I'm way ahead of myself. Dr. Lipp was applauding me, but -- thank you. So can we go back to 1459, improvements to Board of Elections. I think that was a question mark also.

LEG. FLEMING:

And does it involve generators.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Oh my gosh.

LEG. BROWNING:

I remember this one. The storage room.

MR. LIPP:

So you're skipping over 1664, which is the other two projects that Gil had already spoken about?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Oh, I'm sorry. We'll do 1664 next. I just wanted to start at the top of the list and work back down.

LEG. BROWNING:

I thought we said we supported that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Public Works Capital Budget Meeting 5-17-16

There was support for it, 1664. So could we get a description of the different projects and the disparity between, you know. So Budget Review has made quite a different request from the proposed, so if we could get an explanation on why and the nature of the projects.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If I could. I will have to get you that information. The Chief Engineer for Facilities was unavailable to make this hearing, so I can get you that -- try to get it to you this afternoon.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Yeah, that's a -- that was a big question.

LEG. BROWNING:

Since we have Joe here, can we --

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I was going to say, Joe, can you lend us any insight into that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe Mike and Joe have spoken, so Joe I'm sure can answer and provide the detail.

MR. SCHROEDER:

We have been collaborating on a living list of projects for many years. The project list has received good support over that timeframe and we have achieved significant reductions in energy use during the past seven or eight years in particular. This year is the first year of a three year rate plan whereby PSEG, LIPA rates are increasing beginning 2016 and through 2018. Based on the rate filing that was submitted at that time last year, the Department of Public Service did not necessarily disagree with some of the rate requests that were made, but they felt that they were accelerating too quickly, so I anticipate, I think you should anticipate, that after 2018 the rates will continue to go up on the electric side.

January of this year, National Grid filed for a rate increase as well. Based on the filing that they have submitted, I did a simple analysis of some of our billing accounts, and across the various rates that apply to our accounts. The range in increase is anywhere from 39 to 52 percent, which if you apply that across the expenditures for natural gas in 2015, which totalled about three million, that's another \$1.2 million. That would go into effect January first of 2017.

So when the request was made by the department it was made before the National Grid filing and was -- did not benefit from our subsequent review of projects. And working collaboratively with facilities engineering we came up with a projects list and advanced investment into 2017 that was deferred through the rest of the capital program, leaving the eight million dollar proposed capital program intact and not exceeding that. We believe we can achieve significant savings in 2017 with the funding that was recommended in the review that will accelerate the savings and accelerate in the near-term avoided costs associated with increasing -- the increases in rates.

So we are reducing our energy use profile significantly. That's been in excess of 30 percent in most of the targeted facilities that we have attacked. That is partly due to the success of our collaboration. It's somewhat also due to the state of County facilities, which are typical of commercial facilities across the Island, and that is they are a target rich environment for improvement.

So we have been successful in applying these investments over the past years and it was our recommendation, the review of the budget, to advance money into 2017 to secure near-term savings, which will not be achievable if that money is not advanced in 2017. So we could catch up at a later date on some savings by applying investment, but we will lose time in terms of the increases in the electric side, which will compound the increases of 2016 in 2017, and we will lose

Public Works Capital Budget Meeting 5-17-16

ground on the natural gas side which, again, those rates are requested. The rate increase was requested, it's not yet approved by the Public Service Commission, but, you know, I would anticipate that there would certainly be some improvement if not the entire -- I'm sorry -- some increase if not the entire increase that was requested.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Anyone have questions? No? Okay.

LEG. TROTTA:

I have questions.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I'm kidding. Go ahead.

LEG. TROTTA:

They're saying the increase by 39 to 53 percent?

MR. SCHROEDER:

That's correct.

LEG. TROTTA:

Who said that?

MR. SCHROEDER:

That's based on the tariff adjustments in the rate filing that National Grid submitted to the Department of Public Service. I would note that the increases that LIPA requested on delivery charges exceeded 100 percent in some lines of the delivery charges. DPS did not agree with those adjustments and recommended lower adjustments. I'm not sure what DPS --

LEG. TROTTA:

What percent is -- the 39- to 53 percent, what percent is that of the bill?

MR. SCHROEDER:

The 39- to 52 percent is the increase in the bill. When I took an actual 2015 bill --

LEG. TROTTA:

That's impossible.

MR. SCHROEDER:

When I took an actual 2015 bill across several rates for each month of the year and I applied the rate adjustment that's been requested to those actual bills, leaving all other areas of the bills the same as what they were in 2015, the actual increase was between 39- and 52 percent, or approximately \$1.2 million for Suffolk County billing accounts.

LEG. TROTTA:

That's a piece of the bill or the whole bill? Are our energy costs going to increase by 39- to 53 percent or one part of it, the delivery, the gas.

MR. SCHROEDER:

Actually, this only applies to the delivery portion of the bill. The supply portion of the bill is subject to commodity markets which have been at historically low levels for the past year and a half. Those are forecasted by the Energy Information Administration of the Federal Government.

LEG. TROTTA:

What percent of our bill is going to go up, because that's -- it's sort of disingenuous to sit there and

say it's going to go up 39- to 53 percent when it's really not the whole bill.

MR. SCHROEDER:

That's the total bill. Leaving the power supply adjustment, leaving the delivery -- I'm sorry. Leaving the commodity cost of natural gas as it was in 2015 and just adjusting the delivery rates, the increase in bill is 39- to 52 percent depending on the billing account and the billing rate.

LEG. TROTТА:

Is that for residential also or is this just commercial?

MR. SCHROEDER:

On the residential side, that increase is closer to 18 percent.

LEG. TROTТА:

And this is in front of the PS -- the power -- whatever?

MR. SCHROEDER:

This is has been submitted to the Public Service Commission or Department of Public Services.

LEG. TROTТА:

They're not going to get that, that's what their dream is.

MR. SCHROEDER:

I do not know whether they will get it or not. I do not anticipate that they would get --

LEG. TROTТА:

You start raising people's bills that much, it's going to be a mass exodus, even worse than it is.

MR. SCHROEDER:

I can only tell you what's before the Commission.

MR. LIPP:

If I may, one way to look at it, which I think Joe is talking about, is he's sort of like holding the prices fixed at a certain level and then comparing the energy usage based upon what that cost would be. The real point here, as Joe has pointed out many times, is what we have control over is the consumption or the use, okay. We don't have control over the price. We don't set the price, that's for sure. The point is the projections, utility prices are very volatile, so savings could be a lot less or they could be significantly more, depending upon which way the rates go. The only thing that we could control, though, is the use.

LEG. TROTТА:

What upgrades are you doing, like LED bulbs? Give me an example of what some of that is.

MR. SCHROEDER:

We're doing a number of different things, included LED lighting upgrades that would involve a number of County facilities, including some facilities where we have long-term leases. Those improvements would also include lighting controls, occupancy sensors and things like that. In some of the buildings that we occupy there are actually areas of the buildings that don't have light switches so the lights are on 24/7. This would affect the energies at those facilities.

We're also doing boiler upgrades, building management system upgrades, to better control the systems in the buildings. We are evaluating a geothermal project at the Board of Elections building. We're looking at a couple of solar installations. This building here is a candidate that we're looking at right now, along with a number of other adjustments that we're making. We've also just completed a cogeneration project at the Dennison Building and the Cohalan Complex. We're looking

Public Works Capital Budget Meeting 5-17-16

at a couple of other facilities, but that's a very specific niche application and it doesn't apply well to all buildings, so we're looking very carefully.

LEG. TROTТА:

What are you doing there?

MR. SCHROEDER:

Pardon me?

LEG. TROTТА:

What are you doing at the Dennison Building and the Court Complex?

MR. SCHROEDER:

We installed a 75 kilowatt combined heat and power project, which is also known as cogeneration. So we generate a small amount, a very small amount of electricity compared to what the building actually needs, and the waste heat from that generation is used to offset the thermal load of the building. So we reduce our natural gas consumption at the same time that we're reducing the amount of money that we're paying to the utility for their electricity. So we're able to generate it because of the efficiency of that application at a lower cost than it would cost us to purchase it direct from the utility. So not only are we avoiding the kilowatt hour charge, we're also avoiding some demand charges, and that's the main reason why we're doing this.

LEG. TROTТА:

Have you looked into these power -- I forget what they call it. It looks like a tractor trailer but it's a -- help me out here.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You mean a gen set?

LEG. TROTТА:

No. I'm getting there. It's a, you know, it's the new thing that's like the size of a tractor trailer. You park it and it's like a power supply. It's not like a generator, it doesn't burn.

MR. SCHROEDER:

Are you talking about a fuel cell?

LEG. TROTТА:

Fuel cell.

MR. SCHROEDER:

Those come in a number of different configurations. It's a very expensive application. Yes, we have looked at that on several occasions. On all those occasions it has proved a very costly alternative to other things that we've been able to do that achieve a much greater return on investment for the County.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Good? All right. Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:

Thank you. So I have a couple of questions here because, you know, when it comes to these projects, and I can appreciate the need to try and invest in energy conservation because it does pay itself off in the long-term and actually in the not so long-term, but it's also weighing the priorities of doing all of the other things that we need to do in the County. So right now there's a million and a half sitting in the account for this budget line and you have a two million dollar -- in the budget for this current year. I think what we came to a compromise last year, we tried to move four million or

Budget Review recommended moving four million or so up until this year, was to spread it out two million a year, partly to allow DPW at the time to get the projects done. Clearly, if we have a million and a half sitting in the budget, then we have unspent money in the projects that have been identified but they haven't been able to be carried through yet.

So, Gil, I guess the question to you is if we give you five million dollars next year on top of the three and a half that you have in the budget, currently either appropriated or to be appropriated this year, can you get that many projects done in 2017?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The concern I was going to raise was in looking at this we had requested two million dollars and I think we could do a little more, but I certainly don't know that we could do five million on top of it. I appreciate what BRO is saying here but the, again, I would prefer to keep it as we originally requested. Our staff, I would think, put it in with their understanding that they could get that amount of work done during the course of a year. Certainly somewhere in between would be ambitious and five is going to be a big reach, with all respect to BRO.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. So you're saying I think a two million dollar commitment year in and year out that we've done, we agreed to do in last year's budget, really gives us a steady flow of resources into energy conservation, you know, at the same time weighing it against all of the other priorities that we have to have in the capital budget, including paving roads and other investments in the County that we have to maintain. But it also is something that is within reason for your current staff, which we know is at an all-time low, whether it be on the road side of the equation or on our building side of the equation.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, and I agree completely. I think, you know, again, as I said, I think if we keep it at two million we can handle that. If we go above that, you know, and I know my staff, and Joe, they're trying to do the right thing here to get us as much of a savings as we can, but the reality of it is I don't know that we have the staffing.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you.

MR. SCHROEDER:

I would interject that we have some projects that are a million dollars a piece and they're a single project, so two million dollars, while it seems like a lot of projects and activity, can be deceptive.

LEG. CALARCO:

Sure, but you got 1.5 in the bank right now that you haven't spent.

MR. SCHROEDER:

Based on my meetings and extensive discussions with facilities engineering, the 1.5 million that's available for this year added to the two million that's available this year, will be completely expended by the end of this year.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay, and you have another two million next year. It's just a matter of I guess weighing all of our priorities, Joe. It's not -- I appreciate what you're coming to us with and I know that it's a savings, but it's -- it's just like running a household. Everybody always says that, right, but you have to weigh each different cost versus what you -- the other things you have to pay for as well.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Bridget.

LEG. FLEMING:

I appreciate that point, I also appreciate the Commissioner's point with regard to what the department is ready, willing and able to do. I think we have to look at that also with the road reclamation in some later projects as well to go forward, you know, to push the departments in order to achieve savings may not achieve the savings if they cannot implement the project.

I guess I have a question with regard to your point, Joe, when you said some projects are a million apiece. Is there a plan that we can look at that identifies specific projects and that perhaps the staff or the Commissioner could look and say *yeah, we can do this, we can't do that*. Have you shared those particular specifics?

MR. SCHROEDER:

Absolutely. I do provide a project list for the Working Group every cycle. I do have a project list available for you today. I can distribute that to you before you leave here this morning.

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay, no, I appreciate that, but I'm just -- I assume then, Commissioner, that you've reviewed this list when you come to the conclusion that the requested two million makes more sense for what you folks can accomplish in the fiscal year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, yeah, I've seen the list. My staff works with Joe on a regular basis to develop the list and come up with a plan but, again, I go back to, and with all due respect to Joe and everybody, I am concerned with biting off more than we can chew right now.

LEG. FLEMING:

I appreciate that. I have to say I'm all for energy efficiency, but I also -- I support the County Exec's proposed on this based on what we've heard.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So I have a couple of questions. How much -- the two million versus the five million, is there -- can you -- will you be able to demonstrate the need for say if you don't think that the five million is going to go, that maybe an extra million would accomplish one specific project that's going to, you know, reduce our energy usage and save us that million dollars and we're going to get the payback over X amount of years which would, I think, be very helpful for the Working Group later on. These big projects, obviously County staff is not doing them, you're contracting them out?

MR. SCHROEDER:

Predominantly these are -- yes, almost exclusively these are done by outside parties.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Who specialize in this kind of work.

MR. SCHROEDER:

Absolutely.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

But the oversight is provided by who?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

DPW.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. All right. And I think that would be helpful if you could provide us with anything above the

two million. If you could demonstrate the savings moving forward then we could make a better decision.

LEG. TROTTA:

We're not paying people to change light bulbs, are we?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

No, they do it for free.

LEG. TROTTA:

We're not paying outside contractors to change light bulbs?

MR. SCHROEDER:

We actually have somebody touring the building as we speak to do an LED lighting upgrade on the fixtures that haven't been improved recently. Some of the LED replacements are being administered by Building's O and M staff because they can -- because of technology improvements they can actually replace the tubes with an LED tube as opposed to a florescent tube. So where that's able to be done simply it's our own staff just doing it as a replacement maintenance item, and then it spreads out the maintenance issues because those bulbs last a lot longer. But in some cases you have to replace the entire fixture because the existing fixture is not adaptable to the new technology.

LEG. CALARCO:

When it comes to just replacing a bulb, and I know this whole thing isn't just replacing bulbs, but why aren't we just doing that as we, you know, need to replace bulbs? As a bulb -- as we have a fixture with a bulb that needs to be replaced because it goes or what have you, why are we not just saying okay, we're going to just start buying the more energy efficient bulbs where possible. Like I understand that five million dollars is not going to bulbs only, but.

MR. SCHROEDER:

We are doing that but the technology existing in most of the fixtures, in most of the florescent fixtures, includes a ballast which converts the electricity from AC to DC so it can be used in a lamp. If you don't have the right kind of ballast in the fixture, it's not adoptable to the LED.

LEG. CALARCO:

You're actually talking much more of actually replacing the fixtures themselves, right? This isn't just bulb replacement, right?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

The guts.

LEG. CALARCO:

So that you can put in the more energy efficient bulb or the LED bulb or something along those lines.

MR. SCHROEDER:

What we've been targeting is the lowest cost effort for the greatest gain, so where we can do it, we're replacing lamps. There are additional savings to be had by upgrading the fixture because the ballast cost in terms of energy consumption goes down by half when you replace the new fixture with -- the old fixture with a new fixture. So we're achieving some of the savings at extremely low cost by simply just doing it as a maintenance item, replacing the lamps. Where that's not practicable and at a longer-term planning stage we are also looking at the fixture upgrades which gives us a growing amount of savings.

LEG. CALARCO:

That's what we're talking about in these projects, not replacing bulbs.

MR. SCHROEDER:

It's a combination.

LEG. CALARCO:

I hope we're not bonding bulbs.

MR. SCHROEDER:

We're not bonding bulbs, but in order to get --

LEG. CALARCO:

My colleagues around this horseshoe like to complain about what we bond, but I hope we're not bonding bulbs.

MR. SCHROEDER:

Let me explain why we're doing this as a project. In order to qualify for utility rebates, which cover, in some cases, more than half the cost of these upgrades, you have to demonstrate that those improvements are being done at the same time. If we buy an inventory of LED lamps and they're simply replaced as existing lamps go out, then you don't qualify for the rebate because they can't measure when you've installed that new bulb. So they can't give you the rebate because the rebate is based on the improvement. So we're balancing what we can do simply at the lowest possible cost with what we do to get the greatest possible return for the County, which includes utility rebates.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Thank you. Sure.

LEG. FLEMING:

Do you have -- is the plan that you said, does that include savings that we're going to realize, operational costs that we're going to realize, operational savings that we're going to realize if we make these capital investments sort of, you know, plan by plan so that we have that analysis as we vote on --

MR. SCHROEDER:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you. No further questions. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. You're all welcome. Okay. So thank you, Joe. I think that's it as far as the -- a lot of the other questions for the Commissioner are going to be related to highway work. There is -- I do have on my list 1459, improvements to the Board of Elections, and I know there was some questions about that relating to storage versus office versus other. We seem to have been presented with one option. Are there other options there that you could do, you could put on -- and some of us were discussing this yesterday, putting on a storage building, just dry storage for the equipment, and then doing the work on the building for the electrical and window upgrades for a lot less money than the proposal, which is to build a lot more I think office space. Has any alternative been considered beyond what was presented?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Certainly. Well, they just built a storage facility in the rear, or we just built a storage facility in the rear, a couple of years ago.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Does that -- is that sufficient for all the machines and so they don't have to be moved twice?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, I believe the request is looking to upgrade the electrical and mechanical systems. There's also a request for additional office space up in the front to upgrade, and that's generally something that gets pushed back annually. Could we separate those two? Yeah, I think we could.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Anybody have any questions?

LEG. FLEMING:

What does that look like in terms of the dollars if we separate the two, because I thought they were considered together, the 65,000 additional square feet and the electrical upgrades.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Let us take that back and look at it. I mean, right now, their office space, they're pretty tight. There might be some savings to not not doing that, but I'm not sure. We'll take this back and we'll get you information on that.

LEG. FLEMING:

And just to be clear, it looks like BRO has suggested that we move the planning moneys up a year and the construction is still in the same subsequent years. So what I was wondering is, you know, that's the planning and the construction of the entire additional square footage plus the upgrades to the mechanics, and I'm wondering if there's any breaking that -- those out. I'm obviously not an engineer.

MR. LARSEN:

I'd just like to say that, you know, like Gil said, a few years back we did add on to the building with the new voting machines coming in thinking that there'd be plenty of space now. Now that they got rid of the old voting machines there seems to be a great need for the ancillary booths that accompany the voting machines, so they're storing those off-site or renting space for those partitions, those privacy partitions. So that seems to be the need storage wise. It may actually be cheaper to continue renting space for that rather than building a separate addition, whereas the office space is original. They're very squeezed in there. There's definitely a need for some expansion there and renovation, and that includes the air-conditioning system in that front of the building. We could do that separately certainly, but there's also a possibility of adding that office space over maybe basement space and creating -- getting two things at once with that, you know, giving them more storage room.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Kate, you have a question?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah. Yesterday Benny had mentioned that it was costing us \$60,000 a year for rental space for those privacy booths. So I'm assuming it's not -- for the privacy booths you don't need a temperature controlled type building, correct? So let's say you built like a Morton type building, right? Would that be sufficient for what you're looking for for the privacy booths?

MR. LARSEN:

It's certainly a possibility, although right now adding on -- if you did a separate building, that's a possibility. Right now adding on to the building with more warehouse space would actually create a situation where the building is right now maxed out in terms of fire sprinkler coverage because there are no fire sprinklers in that building, so just by adding a warehouse we'd have to, you know, add the sprinklers throughout the building. But we could look into a separate building, but it still costs --

LEG. BROWNING:

It's just, you know, something like that that doesn't really need to be so temperature controlled. I understand for the other machines but, you know, \$60,000 a year over a couple years, the building is going to pay for itself. So I would assume that this would be the better route to go.

MR. LARSEN:

You probably need to have a heated space at least, maybe not air-conditioned, to maintain the materials. But, you know, it's costing us, you know, upwards to \$300 a square foot to build a facility like that. We're pricing a similar facility right now for the Sheriff and, you know, doing the math you could end up spending, you know, a couple of million dollars on a small public type building.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So if we could get an estimate on the square footage of what we're currently renting, I would -- I think that's something that would help us to make a decision, but I just hate the thought of us renting something when we could be owning something.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. We can get you that information. I think the only other thing I'd like to point out is recently PESH came and mandated some warehouse space in the back of our building that's used by, you know, the dredging crews to have air-conditioning installed and upgraded. Only because, you know, at a certain point when it isn't just like a -- you know, it's not like a storage unit where you're just putting them in and walking away. They may wind up coming in -- if BOE gets in there on a regular basis then you do have to -- and we're mandated to put AC into it as well. But we'll get you the prices on the buildings and the square footage so you have it.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Thank you. All right. The next thing on my list would be -- this goes to the highway. Intersection improvements to County Road 19, Patchogue-Holbrook Road at Old Waverly Avenue. I sorry, 5040, that's the number.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I apologize. Was there a question?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay, sure. I'm sorry, 5040 is the number. Could you give us a description? I'm trying to remember the question on it.

LEG. CALARCO:

I think this one fell into the category with a whole bunch of the others which was the issue of planning moneys not being included in the budget, so that Budget Review in some of the road projects included planning money and left the project as it was, in some cases they moved the project up with the planning money, in some cases they, like this one, they pushed it back because the planning money hasn't been included in this.

MR. LIPP:

Right. So the question was whether or not they could do it in-house. If the answer to that is no, which is what we assume, then conceptually you would consider advancing the planning -- adding planning.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This project specifically was not one that we had planned on doing in-house only because of the

roundabout and some of the other ancillary issues that are involved the project.

LEG. CALARCO:

So I think the issue -- there was a couple of issues and we could talk specific to this project, but I think in terms of the larger picture with a number of projects, I think there were probably eight or nine road projects that were in the mix that didn't have planning money in them. Is that about right, Dr. Lipp?

MR. LIPP:

Approximately.

LEG. CALARCO:

And I guess that's why Budget Review is kind of making suggestions and either you have to move some back and move some forward. It was also brought to our attention yesterday that you had a number of SCINs that were signed recently to help provide you with additional staff within your engineering unit, so maybe you can speak a little bit to that and how you think that impacts the need for planning moneys in these various road projects.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There were seven projects -- there were nine projects that we had anticipated doing in house, but because of staffing levels we weren't able to include them and we were looking to bring in consultants.

(Legislator McCaffrey entered the meeting)

But we have gotten SCINs signed and are working with the County Executive's Office to bring on new engineers that will work specifically on those nine projects between 2017 and subsequent years.

LEG. CALARCO:

Could you tell us which nine they are, because I think that would help us as we go through these.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Sure. They would be, and Bill, yell if I'm missing any, but 5090, which is reconstruction of County Road 86 from the vicinity of Grange Street to Cuba Hill Road; again, 5090, rehabilitation of CR 86 from the vicinity of Glen Place to Old Field Road. These are in 2017. 5190, which is drainage improvements to County Road 52, Sandy Hollow Road from County Road 39, North Road to County Road 38, North Sea Road; and Capital Project 5497, construction of sidewalks on various County roads. In 2018 we're looking at CP 5138, which is CR 21, Middle Island Yaphank Road at Longwood Road; and then also under CP 5138, CR 21, Yaphank Avenue at 495, North Service Road and Long Island Avenue, Yaphank. And then lastly for that year would be Capital Project 5497, construction of sidewalks on various County roads. And then in '19 we're looking at 5497, construction of sidewalks on various County roads. And in subsequent years, again, 5497, construction of sidewalks on various County roads.

LEG. CALARCO:

So let me make sure I followed you correctly. 5090, 5138, 5190 and 5497; those are the numbers?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

MR. LIPP:

I think we have a list if you want to look on the board. I could e-mail everybody.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I was going to ask that.

MR. LIPP:

Right. So there's a list here that has seven projects.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay.

LEG. CALARCO:

So for those seven projects the -- we may not need to make the changes that Budget Review has recommended because you think you will not have the staffing capacity to handle those planning projects in-house, the planning portions.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. That's very helpful.

LEG. FLEMING:

Robert, can you e-mail those to us?

MR. LIPP:

I can, but it's not a complete list. There are a couple of others. This was just the major list by the one analyst in our office that had that responsibility, but there are a couple of other extraneous ones.

LEG. CALARCO:

Can you have it to us for the Work Group?

MR. LIPP:

Sure.

LEG. CALARCO:

Immediately following this meeting?

LEG. FLEMING:

So I think it's that plus you mentioned two others, right? Or they're not the same.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, the capital projects, some of these are reoccurring annually like the sidewalks one. So it was 5090, 5138, 5190 and 5497.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. That's good. All right. We'll keep going through the list here. Could we look at 5048? It mentions -- oh, I'm sorry. I thought we were done with 5040. Go ahead.

LEG. CALARCO:

With 5040, Gil, you guys actually requested planning money in '17, construction in '18, correct, and it was pushed back by the County Executive.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Under 5040 the \$300,000 in planning -- oh, wait a second. I'm on the wrong one. I apologize.

LEG. CALARCO:

5040 is County Road 19.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That one the construction was pushed back and the planning money was removed.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. This is one where we actually had some recent discussions and we're hoping to move some of this, the planning money to get it actually started this year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So 5048, construction and rehabilitation of highway maintenance facilities. There's a big difference for '18 in the proposed Budget Review -- could you give us some insight into what needs -- and where is the Riverhead equipment garage? What's the location?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's -- I believe that's the one right behind your building. A little garage.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Oh, yeah, that's vintage.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

It needs a roof, it needs windows. The squirrels actually and pigeons will be very disappointed if something happens to that. And raccoons. I do know that that building is actually heavily used. It's full of equipment and material and what's the -- I mean, is it -- if it's safe you could patch it. If it's not safe for the long-term then you want to replace it. Is that the goal?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, in many cases the Riverhead one, I'm not speaking necessary about the Riverhead one. We're still looking at that one. I still think that's a project we could do in-house.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. That's just dry storage, that's not heated or cooled or anything.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. But it's, you know, the proximity to the gas pump, the gas equipment, the pump equipment that's in the building, that take a little bit of, you know, concern, but the building itself is a simple masonry structure that, you know, I think -- and I'm hoping we can try and do that in-house.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

That would be great.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The other projects, our large concern obviously in '16 is, you know, the design of the Centereach garage salt storage, portion of that garage. The whole garage has been pushed back over the years. We're looking to construct that in next year's program. Similarly, we're also looking to design our Yaphank -- the dome that collapsed a couple of years ago, I don't remember if it was under Nemo or one of those storms, the dome actually caved in. So we normally have two domes at Yaphank that we're able to store material, but right now we're just down to one.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Who regulates salt storage? Is that DEC or is there a standard -- or is that the County Health Department.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If it's covered it's generally there's no concern. If it comes out it's DEC. The Health Department maybe, but I know DEC would definitely come down on us pretty hard.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Is there a standard design for these storage facilities?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

They are multiple designs. I mean, the state uses concrete wall structures. They were trying that sprung structure material. The town uses that with a concrete wall with strung structure over it. The state's getting away from strung structure. In our particular case we've been looking at possibly reusing the existing foundation of the former dome, but we're in a little bit of a disagreement internally as to whether or not it's viable and it would be of any savings.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. All right. Anyone have any other questions about this? Okay. Yes? No? Good. All right. This is not a highway one, but it's on my list here, 5060. It's the assessment of information system and equipment for Public Works and Budget Review wants to advance some of that money into '18. We were all sort of unclear as to what that means.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Drive is a home built information system. It was developed by DPW. It's in our system. We use it for permitting, for much of what we do on a daily basis, you know, all the traffic analysis, everything else. And the system is in need of upgrade, so we're requesting that the system, you know, the funding be provided so that we can maintain the Drive system and keep it upgraded. To have to switch to an off the shelf system would set us back probably a couple of years. At this point, you know, this has been a system that we've developed. It's been developed for our needs so, you know, we feel it's -- and it's a very good system.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. So does anybody have any questions? Does anyone understand what he said?

LEG. CALARCO:

I have no clue.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We would be glad to show you the system if anybody wants to come down.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

5060, it's the information system.

LEG. FLEMING:

So it's a license agreement with a software vendor.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is not an issue of software vendor. This is, again, this was built in-house, the system, developed in-house, and what we need is we need support from outside vendors, consultants, to maintain and upgrade the system.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Good, Bridget?

LEG. FLEMING:

So these outside vendors don't have -- it's not a proprietary system. They don't know what the system is but they will be assisting you in upkeep?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. It's a larger project than our IT staff could handle and we feel, and I believe IT would degree, that we need the outside assistance from IT --

LEG. FLEMING:

Experts.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes.

LEG. FLEMING:

And they're able to provide fixes and patches to the system that was designed in-house and you think it's the most efficient way to handle it, the most cost effective.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Absolutely. It's a great system.

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay. I'm good. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Okay. And this next one, I'm not sure if you addressed it with the hiring of the engineers or not, and if you have please just let me know the next few here. 5168, it's the County Road 11, Pulaski Road. Is that one of those that you addressed or not?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, that was not.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. So Budget Review has requested advancing money for planning into '17. Is that important? I mean, do you think that's important or is that something that's not going to happen in '17 anyway.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If we -- we recommended -- when we requested 225 and 150,000 in '18, I'm assuming those are design funds. I mean, if we requested it, you know, again, does -- I'm a little confused, I'm looking at this. I'm going to -- if we requested it certainly, you know, we would put it out if the funds were provided in 2017. Could it wait another year, yeah, it could wait another year.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

LEG. CALARCO:

Would it be okay if you had the -- it looks like you needed both for planning and for land acquisition costs. Would it be appropriate to put all those funds into '18 so that he could still complete construction in '19?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The land acquisition can be -- again, the land acquisition -- if you could put them all together that's fine in '18. That would certainly give us the ability to develop the plans and determine what land has to be acquired and give us enough time to acquire it.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. And then the next one, if no one has questions on that, is -- I think it's the same question on 5172, Motor Parkway. It's the same question. Budget Review has recommending 450,000 in '17. The proposed does not have anything in '17 or '18. So it's the same question.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, in that particular project we requested 450 and it was removed. Certainly we need that 450 to design the project.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Right. I mean, I think the -- so I think the recommended was there's no money for that. It's just recommended for '19 to do the project.

LEG. CALARCO:

So would it be appropriate to, again, it's kind of the same question. When do you need that planning money. Clearly you're -- this is not one you identified as doing in-house, so you're going to need planning money at some point. Is that '17 or would '18 do if we left the construction in '19.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, if we pushed it back a year it wouldn't be the worst thing, so we could live with it.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

The next question I have is 5201, about the replacement of the dredge support equipment.

LEG. TROTТА:

I just had a quick question on the other one.

LEG. KRUPSKI:

Go ahead.

LEG. TROTТА:

Just out of -- do you even know what Motor Parkway -- I'm not saying that -- how do you know what's wrong with Motor Parkway. I'm not asking you to know, you personally know, but.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. Generally if you -- you know, at a certain point the road starts -- we have our foremen that go out there and check the roads every day and they start to develop and anticipate when -- how long a road will last. So if we, you know, if we start to see that pavement is starting to split, drainage is starting to fail, issues are starting to come up that we feel we need to -- we're going to need to make those repairs at some point. Is it a year from now, is it three years from now, but

you start to see and you gauge how long a road is going to last. Repaving generally lasts anywhere from five to ten years. The surface life of a road is anywhere from around 20, 30 years, could be longer. Again, you have to assess the condition of the road.

Ahead of time we start to develop a program to say *okay, look, we know that this portion of the road is in this condition, how long do we think it will last. Looking at the pavement right now, it's ten years old, but it's not separating, it's in good condition, there's no potholes or there is potholes.* So you start to assess that. Our staff has looked at this on Motor Parkway. We've done sections of it over the past ten years that I've been here, and this one we feel now is getting to that point where it needs to be done.

LEG. TROTТА:

Dug up and new drainage?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That could be. Yeah, that's part of it. It could be full replacement, it could partial replacement, upgrade of drainage, curbs. If there's no sidewalks we now have to put in sidewalks in accordance with ADA, so, you know, there's a lot of things that have to be assessed.

LEG. TROTТА:

All right. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Dredge support equipment. So the difference is Budget Review actually recommends less money in '17 and '19. 5201. So obviously the dredging is -- the dredge has to be -- we understand there's a tight window, there's permitting, there's easement restrictions, there's a lot of -- there's so many factors that play into dredging, and of course the biggest one is weather. So why is there such big disparity do you think between those two numbers?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would guess -- I had conversations with staff earlier. They probably spoke with us to -- we are now looking at replacing the existing dredges with a new dredge. We've just started speaking with the -- one of the companies. I don't know how many companies there are that actually make dredges, but we've started to have discussions with them and to see what new technologies have been brought forth.

One of our dredges is around ten years old, the other one is probably a good 30 years old. There are benefits to the new technology. We're still looking at it. To be frank, we put this out for discussion purposes. We still need to do a little more analysis on this, so if this got pushed back, the purchase of the dredge, got pushed back a year we would be okay with that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Go ahead, Bridget.

LEG. FLEMING:

There was some discussion, because in my community clearly there's a concern because, you know, the window is so short for dredging and the equipment, whether it be private equipment, which is often relied upon on the East End or the County dredge, there's a lot of demand. And so even though -- I guess my question for you, this is a serious question as to whether replacing it with a more efficient dredge, which is what the discussion was at the Working Group, would lead to the ability to do more projects in that short window than it's something that we have to take very

seriously. But if you think there isn't going to be a significant upgrade in how many projects can be done in the short window, then I think it's a different discussion. What's your thought on that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Certainly the new technology will allow us to do more dredging. We're also looking at possibly going to a larger dredge, from an eight to a ten I believe it is, but we're also -- one of the simple factors that was pointed out to me this morning was that the way we secure the dredge currently is we have two anchors that go out. And to set those anchors and then maneuver with them, sometimes the anchors pull, that's -- you know, again, I'll use the term that's the old way or the way we're doing it right now. With the new dredges, basically they come as you've seen I'm sure in Dockville and companies. They come with a pile that will drop down immediately and they maneuver using the pile system. It's quicker. That simply allows them to, you know, maneuver better, quicker. There's obviously GPS in the newer equipment, things like that. But, again, we're in the preliminary discussions to see what's out there and see what the benefits are.

We believe it's time. I mean, certainly the 30 year old piece of equipment, you know, every off season we basically take the engines apart, we break them down and we rebuild them every year to make sure that they'll function come the new year and we have two dredges. You know, if worse comes to worse we have to take from one to rebuild the other we'll do that.

LEG. FLEMING:

I guess I wonder if there's any -- considering that it impacts the economy out east, you know, in the short season that there is to make money, either as a small marina or, you know, baymen, what have you. If we can put some numbers on it in terms of how much more efficient it would be I think that would be very helpful to us. I also wanted to talk to the Trustees out east and just see if they think, because if it is affecting the economy -- I get so many complaints about the dredging schedule. So if we can put some numbers on it, it would be helpful to me.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We will be able to. I wouldn't anticipate we're going to double production, but it's going to be an increase in the production.

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

LEG. CALARCO:

Quick question.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Go ahead.

LEG. CALARCO:

Gil, the dredges that we own and operate, we primarily focus them on the East End, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. They mostly focus on the Peconic.

LEG. CALARCO:

So the efficiency is going to maybe be able to allow us to get one or more projects done out there

but it's not going to avoid having to do any of the contract work on the West End, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. It's different materials. Generally it's, you know, there's a different treatment. Certainly we got the permitting which is always an issue.

LEG. CALARCO:

Well, permitting is a nightmare, I understand that. Okay. And I'm fine with that. I mean, if we can get an extra creek done on the East End, because I know they fill in just as fast as we fill in, and once that happens you create some havoc.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Unfortunately it only takes one storm.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Okay. We had a question about the reconstruction of the Shinnecock locks, and so there's some, you know, disparity in what Budget Review recommended over the proposed budget, but --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

What capital project is that?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I'm sorry, 5343. Is there any chance of getting state funding or having the state take over the locks or is that just a totally dead issue?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

When we used to send up Home Rules and we were asked for a Home Rule Message to send it to state, we would annually put in that the state -- request the state to take back or to take the Shinnecock lock, because it's the only non-state run lock system in the state, and all we heard were crickets, so we stopped asking.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Maybe we could ask the town.

LEG. FLEMING:

I would be interested to know, though, whether there's any coordination between the County and the lock system and the development project that's about to be undertaken there. It's an enormous, you know, development project that's happening on either side of the canal. It's in litigation right now, but I don't know if there's any discussion with the developers. I know part of the PDD that we approved when I was on the town board included public access to the canal right where the locks are. So I'm not an engineer, I don't know what the interaction is, but I think it would be good to have some communication with the developers there as we're figuring out what work needs to be done to upgrade the locks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We have had discussions with the developer, certainly not focused on in any way transferring that over to the developer. I don't see why they would ever want it. I don't know that we'd want it, honestly, because right now we have and we do maintain that daily.

LEG. FLEMING:

It's too late. We maybe should have but we didn't think of it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, we have the system there. There's staff there on a daily basis. So -- but yeah, we did

discuss that area. Certainly we came to the recommendation of the realignment of that intersection just to the east of the development.

LEG. TROTTA:

Did you say this is the only lock that the state doesn't control?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. FLEMING:

It's the only one on Long Island. It's the only one that exists on Long Island.

LEG. TROTTA:

This might be a stupid question. What if you took it out? What would happen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's problematic for boating travel. When the tide's coming in and you're trying to get out it's incredibly difficult and vice versa. There's a lot of flow through there so that's the reason they were installed, so that boaters, whether they're commercial or private, could get it and out.

LEG. TROTTA:

It would just be a rip through there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Pretty much, yeah. I mean, when we've unfortunately had issues where a gate came down and the locking system itself -- you had to wait, and I can't tell you whether it was incoming or outgoing tide, but you had to wait if you were going in the opposite direction.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

You'd have to wait for a slack tide. It's just so narrow it would be unnavigable.

LEG. TROTTA:

There would be like a raging river going down?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, yeah. Half the side flows naturally, so if you tried to go during the high tide or the low tide when it's moving, it's very difficult to go in the opposite direction. So that's why they have the locks there.

LEG. FLEMING:

It's tricky to even navigate the locks.

LEG. TROTTA:

Did you say half the side is natural?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. Half the lock system -- it's split, so the half on the western side is controlled and raises and lowers mechanically. The other side has regular tide gates which just flow naturally.

LEG. TROTTA:

I have been through there like 50 times and I have never noticed that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I'm pretty sure that's what I saw.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Let's not get stuck on this now.

LEG. TROTТА:

All right. Keep going. I'll talk to you later.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Sorry about that. Like I said, I'm going to go through my list. There was an -- oh yeah. 5382, the reconstruction of the FIMI project. There is a big -- I mean, there is a big difference in the proposed. Budget Review says deferring the 1.5 million would be just fine because we're not quite sure where that money is going to be spent. What is the need for that 1.5?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At this point it's -- it's very unclear. We put this project in as a place saver. Right now, to give you an update on where the project is, Smith Point has been completed. That's contract one. Contract two, which extended from Robert Moses State Park to Saltaire, while not completed, is over. The work that wasn't completed is going to be folded into contract three, which extends from Fair Harbor to Seaview, and that one is out to bid right now. So the actual construction of that contract will begin in the middle of September. We're, the County, is pursuing the real estate for everything else, which is from Ocean Bay Park to Davis Park. Our plan, our goal, is to get all of that in place by the end of this year and go into construction next year.

And why am I going through all this? We don't really have an O and M -- we haven't developed, fully developed, the O and M procedures. We don't know -- we're as a County going to try and give as much of that back to the local communities as we can, as they can handle. Right now we know we have to do engineering, we have to survey every year to make sure nobody's building a house on the dune, things like that. But it's undefined whether or not we're going to need a breach response or a response in general to any type of damage to the dune, so that's why we created this project, because at some point there is going to have to be some type of maintenance done as part of this program.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

But who's going to define what level of maintenance and who is going to be responsible?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, it's something we'll have to agree with with the state and the federal government.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Which is unlikely that's going to happen, I would think soon, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. Right now we've committed that we are going to, you know, we'll do the engineering, we'll do the surveying as needed. Again, part of the caveat with everything was if, God forbid, we get another Sandy that comes in and wipes everything out, the Army Corps can come back in, providing there is federal funding, to make all the repairs.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

But, I mean, I think the range is huge between normal erosion and Sandy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. Correct. That hasn't been fully -- we're still in discussion with everybody.

LEG. FLEMING:

But this is now -- it's been reconstructed so it's an asset under FEMA regulations and would be FEMA reimbursable.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No.

LEG. FLEMING:

No?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Once the Army Corps took it over, this will always be, until Congress de-obligates it, this will always be an Army Corps project. So similar to west of Shinnecock Inlet when Sandy hit, that was an existing Corps project. They were able to come right in and make the repairs that were needed because Congress provided funding for that. With regard to the dune and the berm, this will always be an Army Corps project. FEMA can certainly come in any point north of there and help the communities, the County, towns, whatever, for any repairs north of that. But this is now -- the project area is always defined by Army Corps.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay.

LEG. CALARCO:

So the money that you requested that Budget Review's recommended we take out, this is because you're not sure what our obligations may be for smaller type of projects?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct, yeah.

LEG. CALARCO:

So if we have like a just a natural Nor'easter that comes through during the winter that kind of takes a wallop on one of our beaches, this is so that we would have some resources to do repairs.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If needed, yes.

LEG. CALARCO:

Because it wouldn't be eligible for FEMA reimbursement.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

But based on what the agreement is that we don't know who is going to be responsible and at what level of response it's going to generate.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Anything moving forward that's Army Corps sponsored is going to be an 80-20 or I think it's 70-30 with the -- but, I mean, that's still -- again, that all has to be --

LEG. CALARCO:

Yeah, but I guess the question is -- so the argument for taking the money out of the budget was, you know, we really don't know if or when we'll ever need it, and if that happens, because it's going to be federally aided to repair, we're not going to, you know, it's not like we have to find some offset. We can just do the work. Is that the case or is there something where if something happens we're going to have to do the work and there's a possibly there may be work we have to do on our own.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There is a possibility we may have to do some work on our own, that's why we --

LEG. CALARCO:

You want a cushion.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We want a cushion but, again, because we don't know, there's so many uncertainties at this point, we're not -- we're comfortable if this gets taken out. As long as we've got a -- we know that there's a capital program, and that's really why we put this in. You know, this is new with the capital program, so that we had something we can start --

LEG. CALARCO:

Yeah, but I don't feel comfortable taking the money out if you're saying there's a possibility, even if it's remote, that a storm happens, the beach takes a really bad hit, and we're on the hook for fixing it and the Feds aren't going to give us any money, which is the argument that was made yesterday.

MR. LIPP:

Just so you understand, we're talking deferring it to subsequent years. We didn't take it out. If you want to take it out that's fine. Our approach has always been, which you don't have to agree with, is if it's unclear what's going on --

LEG. CALARCO:

I don't -- yeah, but it's unclear because we don't know when the storm is going to hit. If the storm hits in 2018 and the money is in subsequent years, it doesn't do us any good.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

That's the same with any beach, any County.

LEG. CALARCO:

No, I understand that, but the difference being now, and the argument was made yesterday during the Work Group was that whenever we had an incident in the past it was always heavily aided to be repaired, and if we're facing the situation now where there are potential problems that aren't heavily aided to repair and aren't going to get federal reimbursement, then we're going to be on the hook. And if we don't have a project to go to then we're going to have to find offsets in order to pay for it.

MR. LIPP:

The problem here, though, with BRO's recommendation and with the other -- with the requested and the recommended, is it's in 2018 not 2017. If something happens next year, you'd need an offset. You couldn't use this.

LEG. CALARCO:

When's FIMI going to be done working, Gil? I don't think they're going to be done with their work until next year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That contract -- the actual -- this contract, the newest one, will not be completed until next year. The one that's following will not begin until next year and may actually go into the following year.

LEG. CALARCO:

So if a storm hit today we're under old rules. If the storm hits in 2018, we're under new rules.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. It's all new rules. I mean, we haven't -- again, they haven't been really developed, but they -- again, I'm with you. If I could have that money in there so we know it's safe, I'd prefer --

LEG. CALARCO:

And it's also we haven't -- we're only talking right now the only part of the project that's been done is in front of our park, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

And the state park and two of the communities, Kismet and Saltaire.

LEG. CALARCO:

Aren't they kind of in the middle?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, they're actually -- well, overall yes, they are in the middle, but the way the Corps did it, they did Fire Island first -- I'm sorry. Smith Point first and then they came back and they did Robert Moses, the Fire Island Lighthouse track, and then the first two westerly communities, which are Kismet and Saltaire.

LEG. CALARCO:

Oh, they are right next to Robert Moses.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

They're right next to the Fire Island Lighthouse track, but yes, generally.

LEG. CALARCO:

Okay.

LEG. FLEMING:

So I'm sorry. The new rules are 70-30?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That still has -- the existing -- it could be 70-30. Again, 70-30 would be with the Army Corps and the state, and then that 30 percent we have a portion of, so it generally works out to around 10-, 12 percent would be the County's share.

LEG. FLEMING:

And those are the new rules. So we're 12 percent.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

That's based on Sandy. That's based not on a Nor'easter.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

And everyone's going to say, well, you know, it's going to --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We're in discussions, if you will, with U.S. Fish and Wildlife and the Army Corps about what our response is going to be. So under a small, you know, under a small storm, to be frank, they've done Smith Point, and a lot of that has been in the beginning of the year was eroded by -- the dunes are still there but a lot of the berm is gone. But it wasn't enough that the Corps was going to come -- or that Congress was going to authorize the funding, because the Corps can't do anything without the Congressional Organization. So, you know, again, a lot of that, as I said, we're still in discussions with everybody about what O and M is going to really mean.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

And it's really important because there's so many variables.

LEG. FLEMING:

But so how did you come up with the figure, 1.5?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I think what we looked at was previous projects that we've done. Smith Point we did two dredging projects, and in anticipation of what those cost us to do we assume that this would be the County share of it.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Okay. So we'll move on, 5515. It's improvements to County Road 46, William Floyd. Budget Review recommends deferring the three million from '19 because there's no planning money for engineers now. Is that going to be included in your project if you hire engineers? It's the same for --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, no. We would need to bring in, you know, procure consulting services to do the design of this project.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

And what about 5532?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Same thing here.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. And is it the same for -- oh, 5548 refers to some land acquisition.

LEG. FLEMING:

Did you have questions on that 5515, the William Floyd Parkway?

LEG. BROWNING:

Is that the one up by Police Headquarters? That's that intersection. I don't even know. I know it goes between you and me.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I don't think so, but I don't know.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. That's looking at William Floyd between the Long Island Expressway and Moriches Middle Island Road.

LEG. BROWNING:

Is that the reconfiguration you're looking to do for the industrial site?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe so.

LEG. BROWNING:

For the access? So you wouldn't --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We'll let Bill come up. He can --

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So that would not be an in-house, because there's no planning money in place. So generally that's what Robert's issue is is if there's no planning money, then clearly it's not moving any time soon or?

MR. HILLMAN:

That's correct. The project is for Moriches Middle Island Road, improvements at that intersection.

LEG. BROWNING:

So when do you propose to start that project?

MR. HILLMAN:

When funding becomes available.

LEG. BROWNING:

So then we should be -- okay. So then you've requested -- let me see. Can I find it again? Okay. Hold on.

MR. LIPP:

It's on the board also.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, I changed pages. Okay, so you have three million dollars in 2019 and BRO recommended putting it in subsequent years. So if we're to leave the money in 2019, shouldn't we be putting planning money in 2018, correct?

MR. LIPP:

Well, it's a possibility.

LEG. BROWNING:

Well, because the planning is not going to be done in-house; yes or no?

MR. HILLMAN:

At this point, we're estimating that the planning will need to be done with a consultant.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So if we keep it in '19 and we move some planning money, is the \$3 million dollars, that includes the planning?

MR. HILLMAN:

No, the three million is for construction only.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So then we need 300,000 in '18, I'm assuming?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We had requested 500,000.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I can't find it.

LEG. BROWNING:

We see three million in 2019.

MR. LIPP:

It's on page 251.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm going by our sheets.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We've requested 500,000 in '17 and three million for construction in '19.

MR. LIPP:

You could see that on the board under the second column requested.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I'm familiar with this one because you went to the industrial site and the issue for exit and that at that industrial site is a problem, so I know that's something that we should talk about.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

But it was complicated because --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

But that isn't part of this. This is really for the -- I was incorrect.

LEG. BROWNING:

Oh. Sorry.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Oh. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is specific to the intersection of Moriches Middle Island Road and William Floyd.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Okay.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So what are you doing there, besides taking out the red light camera? No, I'm just joking.

MR. HILLMAN:

Safety and capacity improvements are being proposed at that intersection.

LEG. BROWNING:

So what about the other project by the industrial site. Where's that?

MR. HILLMAN:

Under the property is going to be --

LEG. BROWNING:

Oh. That's right.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Yeah, it's a complicated type of property.

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, I forgot about that, yes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Really who's going to pay for what, I think.

MR. HILLMAN:

We're waiting for the developer to come in and say *Okay, here's the property*, because it benefits the industrial park directly.

LEG. BROWNING:

Right. Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

And still no movement on that.

MR. HILLMAN:

Correct. We have no discussions with anybody about the property.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. So 5548, there was a question, I think, on land acquisition. Is that -- would you clarify that?

MR. HILLMAN:

The land acquisition portion of this project is County Road 83 and Route 25; additionally, County Road 83 at CR 16. Both of those intersections will likely require right-of-way to make improvements, capacity and safety improvements.

LEG. CALARCO:

In what year do you need that right-of-way acquisition?

LEG. FLEMING:

So you just note that BRO suggests that we defer the land acquisition funding from 2018 to 2019, and is that consistent with what you're seeing the project status currently?

MR. HILLMAN:

That would be acceptable to the department.

MR. LIPP:

This is an issue of planning funds. That's what it is.

LEG. CALARCO:

You guys recommended -- the department requested 250 in '17, 700 in '18, and then two million in '19 and subsequent years, and the Exec brought over 500 in '18 and two million in '19 and two million in subsequent years. Budget Review's just saying pushing the whole -- two million -- do the whole four million in subsequent years. Are you saying the project should be pushed back that far or are you -- I mean --

LEG. FLEMING:

Is that realistic in terms of the status?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We're comfortable pushing the project back a year.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So 5057, what's the status on that?

LEG. TROTТА:

I have a question before -- back to 5548.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Go ahead.

LEG. TROTТА:

Am I reading this right? You want to put up sound barriers?

MR. HILLMAN:

The department does not want to put up sound barriers. The community would like -- the adjacent properties owners would like sound walls, as would the Legislator in the district.

LEG. TROTТА:

Has the County done that anywhere before?

MR. HILLMAN:

No, we've never installed a sound wall.

LEG. TROTТА:

One is saying yes, one is saying no.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Is there anything that would prevent --

LEG. TROTТА:

The state did. Okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

The state did, but the county doesn't.

LEG. TROTТА:

We shouldn't be getting involved in this.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Is there anything to prevent the private property owner from putting up their own sound barrier?

MR. HILLMAN:

Sound is a tricky business to try and control. One property owner could not put up anything within his property to deaden the sound. It will go right around it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I'm not familiar with the properties there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The area we're looking at is between Moody Pond Road and Granny Road. It's up on the hill and basically -- while we're not talking about doing the sound barriers where, you know, the town

facilities are on either side, but along that stretch of road where there's homes right up against there. We'd be looking for federal funding on this, and the only federal funding you could get is when we're doing an expansion or adding of a lane you can include sound barriers and they'll hopefully reimburse us. So that's the discussion we've had with Legislator Muratore and the reason we're progressing this.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Ok.

LEG. CALARCO:

When you're in the area of Selden and parts of Coram those homes are practically on the road and there's not as many lights, so the speeds get up there and the value kind of get high.

LEG. TROTTA:

And guess what? They were built after the road was there. Buyer beware.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. So, anyway --

LEG. CALARCO:

Some were and some weren't.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. So a question on the Riverside traffic circle. Budget Review recommended a million dollars and 17 for construction. What's the status on that project?

MR. HILLMAN:

Presently the cost estimate is \$4.2 million. We'll probably need another 7 to 800,000 for inspection. So we need five million. We presently have four million in '16, so the one million in 2017 is definitely needed.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

At the very least we need, you know, we need -- before we can go out to bid we need to have all the funding. Bill mentioned it's currently estimated at 4.2. The remaining funding will be used either for construction, inspection or, you know other services.

LEG. FLEMING:

So I think some of my colleagues had a question with regard to the total price, whether it was four million, in this currently five million. Is there a reason why this additional million is now necessary? And I guess you're saying you need all five allocated in order to even go out to bid. I mean all budgeted I should say.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, keep in mind construction is, you know, it involves a lot of -- there are a lot of different things that affect construction right now. So we're estimating, we originally estimated we'd have enough money with four, but construction prices have gone up, so our current estimate has put it at 4.2. It may actually even go higher. We can't go out to bid without at least knowing that we have the money for the construction of this. Similarly we need inspection services and that's part of the funding request that's here.

LEG. FLEMING:

Have inspection services gone up in cost?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Generally they're about the same. It's the construction costs. You know, the work that's involved,

you know, while you'll have some increase in fees, just like we get raises they get raises, but construction is relatively volatile. It depends on materials, it depends on labor costs, it depends on where you're doing the work. This is going to be a tough project to do.

LEG. FLEMING:

I know from an engineering standpoint this is a magilla. It's a really tough project because it's five feeder arteries, there are private properties all around that need to be consulted, As we know, because now we're in Riverside, two times a year. The traffic circle is very, very important and it's going to be -- I know -- I understand from discussion with the bill it's going to be a really project. So the million dollars that is being asked for is because construction costs went up, because of the complications of the project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, as we get into final design, you know, our construction estimates become tighter and tighter. There's nothing to say that it's not going to come in higher, there's nothing to say it's going to come in lower. We're anticipating right now 4.2 million.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Thank you.

LEG. CALARCO:

There's no more land acquisition needed here, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There might be some.

LEG. CALARCO:

So I know the Supervisor of Southampton promised us this project that costs four million. Do you think he'd cough up anything extra?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't know.

LEG. CALARCO:

That's a joke, Gil. That's okay.

LEG. FLEMING:

But I think he said 4.2, but I don't think it's 4.2. We have the four in the '16 budget, and then I think -- didn't you say it's at least s another 750 or a million, right? I don't think it's 200.

MR. HILLMAN:

The construction cost estimate is 4.2 million. The other seven or 800,000 are for inspection services. We need the full five million.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So we have a number of other questions. I do, anyway. I have one, two, three, four, five, six, but some are about roads, some are parking lots, some are Vanderbilt. If you want to just go into the -- could you stay for the Working Group and we could see if you could answer questions during the Working Group and just move through it at that pace?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I have to leave by 12 to 12:30. I have a meeting at one that I'm committed to. So, I'll stick

around.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I appreciate that. I asked in the very beginning if anyone wanted to address us at all. I know your whole staff is here to answer questions.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If it's possible I'll stick around and if I can't answer the question I can bring it back to them and then can get it, this way they can get on with their day if that's okay.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Yeah, that's fine. So we're just going to close the -- if there's no objection we'll close the hearing and go into the Working Group.

LEG. FLEMING:

Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

The public hearing is concluded.

*(*The meeting was adjourned at 11:17 a.m.*)*