

**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 February 1, 2016.

**Members Present:**

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

**Excused:**

Legislator Tom Muratore - Vice-Chair

**Also In Attendance:**

George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature  
Jason Richberg - Clerk of the Legislature  
Amy Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk of the Legislature  
Catherine Stark - Aide to Legislator Krupski  
Robert Lipp - Director, Budget Review Office  
Laura Halloran - 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 without a stenographer present.

Stenographer present at 2:07 p.m. for following portion of proceedings\*)

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

First, Linda Jones; and on deck, Steve Couzzo.

**MS. JONES:**

First of all, I would like to wish you all a happy new year; and second, I want to thank you so much for abolishing the three-fourths of a mile route so that I can take the bus on Sundays. I have been using it now, and I can go places on Sunday, and it really meant an awful lot to me, and I just want to thank you from the bottom my heart. It really, really has made a difference for me. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Steve Couzzo; and Derek Baiz.

**MR. COUZZO:**

Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen of our great Suffolk County Legislature and Attendees. My name is Steven Couzzo, and I'm a cofounder of an advocacy group for the disabled called ADAM, Americans with Disabilities Awareness Movement; and as Linda said, it's a great day. I don't know if you realized how many lives you have changed over the last year with a single decision, but it's in the thousands. People that had had no access to paratransit now do during the week, and on Sundays when they didn't have paratransit or access to it, now they can go to church, doctors, meetings, work. It's just amazing. It's amazing how something that you heard -- you heard us, you listened, and the difference that you have made. Truly a great thing. The community thanks you. I would like to thank you. Have a good day.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you, Steve. Derek Baiz.

**MR. BAIZ:**

Hi. My name is Derek Baiz. Thank you very much for your time and attention today. Last year, I spent six months of not being able to drive myself, and if it wasn't for the Suffolk County public transportation, I would have had a great deal of expense and inconvenience with trying to utilize either family members or whatnot to be able to get to all of the doctor appointment and physical therapy and such. So even though on many of my trips I would have to use multiple connections -- sometimes I would be on at least six different routes in a day to get around -- but I'm very grateful that it was there for me when I needed it. I'm fortunate that it was only a temporary situation for me.

In addition to that, I was able to utilize SCAT, okay, which, for me, was absolutely a wonderful experience, and I got to see how a lot of other people really depend on that program, okay, in addition to the regular buses, so I was fortunate that I could use both, which I did on a daily basis, and thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Thank for your comments.

So the first thing is to mention that Legislator Muratore has an excused absence. He's not with us today. And the second thing is, Joe, if you could, if I could take your presentation last. We have two resolutions on. One will be tabled for a public hearing, and the other one, you can certainly

help us comment on; so if we can go through the agenda first and then we'll go through presentation afterwards.

The first resolution **IR 1022, Authorizing the County Executive to enter into and execute a "Municipal Agreement" relating to the Sustainable Energy Loan Program (Krupski)**. Do I have a motion?

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Motion by Legislator Stern. Do I have a second? Second by Legislator Fleming. Commissioner, on the motion, do you have any explanation; or Joe, do you have -- would you like to --

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

The County agreed to establish the energy loan program last fall. This is an intermunicipal agreement that has to be executed so that the County can participate with the energy investment corporation and other communities within the County.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Does anybody have any questions about this one? If not, we have a motion and a second. All in --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I have questions.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Oh.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Can you explain how it works?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

The loan program is intended to offer financing for energy projects at privately owned facilities in the County, and then the loan would be assessed on the property taxes of those entities. That's basically --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

If they don't pay it.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

No. It's assessed on the taxes. So the total loan is assessed on the property tax.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

From day one.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So the property tax would be increased.

**COMMISSIONER WILLIAMS:**

Correct.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Are they doing this anywhere else in the state?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

It's already in effect in others areas of the state, yes; but it's a beginning program so it's early in the program's history. I don't have any history to share with you.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So we don't have default rate or anything like that?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

I think it's way too early for defaults to have occurred. Based on my understanding, it's a very new program.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

And what is -- I know you can't give me a number, but what does one of these systems cost, let's say?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Well, it depends on the type of system that's installed and the magnitude of the system and also on the work that's done. So my understanding is this will assist in making energy efficiency upgrades, installing solar arrays on the roofs of certain facilities. As you're probably familiar with, a large number of the commercial properties are not owner-occupied; they're on some sort of long-term or near-term lease, and that's a big hurdle for a lot of energy projects to be cost justified by most businesses because they don't own the building, so this makes it so that the improvement stays with the building and it is assessed on whomever is the owner of the building; and then if it's a tenant-occupied building, then that cost would be shared with future tenants.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So the owners of the building apply for this.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

As it's assessed on the property tax, yes. That's how I understand it.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

And then if they defaults on the taxes, we get the building.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Well, there is a fund that makes the County whole for the entire loan that is at risk. However, you have to exhaust all your options in terms of trying to remedy the default on taxes before you could access that fund. So my understanding is that might be a 5- to 7-year process.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Mark, would you like to add to this conversation?

**MR. THIELKING:**

Hi. I'm Mark Thielking. I'm the executive director of the energize program. Some of the questions that were asked are questions that we get every County that we go to. The size of the typical transaction is about \$200,000. We have an underwriting standard that is used for every project that, essentially, they have to meet certain criteria around the financial viability of that project. There are two components. The first is the project itself will be able to pay for that extra tax charge, so the savings derived from the energy improvement must again pay for that extra tax charge on the property. The second is a number of financial criteria related to the properties: tax

paying record, if there are any bankruptcies over the past seven years, the existing loans on the property; so we again create a very robust framework around the projects that are able to be accessed to this program in the first place.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

How many buildings in other counties around the state do you have?

**MR. THIELKING:**

We have 50 projects in process, totaling about \$15 million. We've closed seven, totaling about a million to date. We launched the program last spring, and again we're just rolling it out county by county. Again, another question you had was related to default risk. Connecticut's had the program for the last three years. They've done about \$50 million in projects and not had one single delinquency or default yet.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So this has to pay for itself or it's not worth doing?

**MR. THIELKING:**

Correct.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

And you figure it out for the customer; is that what your job is?

**MR. THIELKING:**

We require energy assessment done either by the local utility -- in this case, PSEG -- or by NYSEERDA; and that would then qualify the project to move forward, and those savings predicted in the energy audit would be the way we determine the criteria for the project to move forward.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

How many buildings did you say Connecticut had?

**MR. THIELKING:**

Say it again?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

How many projects does Connecticut have?

**MR. THIELKING:**

Connecticut's done over \$50 million in financing so it's about 200 projects.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Okay. Thanks.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Legislator Fleming.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Hi, Mr. Thielking.

**MR. THIELKING:**

Hi.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you for coming in. I remember you from when you presented at Southampton Town for the solarized. It was well-received in the Town of Southampton. Is this set up in the same way where a percentage of the fee goes into the reserve fund that is set aside for potential default?

**MR. THIELKING:**

Yes. So the reserve fund is meant to protect our members for permanent loss on collection. We have about a million dollars in that fund already from federal sources, which is a requirement of the program from the state statute; and then we have also charge the borrower an additional 35 basis points to continue to fund that. Every project we do continues to fund that reserve, yes.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

So if it were to come to the place where the County has to make whole because of the default, in fact, if the participants have already contributed to the extent that there would be reserve to cover that default; is that the math?

**MR. THIELKING:**

If there's permanent loss on collections, so it's an important element, so the County has to move forward foreclosure just like they would on the property, anyway, because, remember, this tax line is grouped with all the tax lines on the property. You can't pick which tax line to pick, so we're assuming that again all action has been taken to foreclose on the property to sell that property, and once that sale is made and the revenues from that sale would be accounted for, and if there is a loss that the County has received on this particular aspect of the tax charge -- on this program, then we would reimburse the County.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

You good, Bridget?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Yes, thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay. Legislator Stern.

**LEG. STERN:**

No, I'm good.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

You're good? Okay. Any other questions about this? We have a motion and a second. All those in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **Approved (VOTE: 6-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore).**

**IR 1027, Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to clarify affordable housing requirements at developments connecting to a County sewer district (Calarco).** This needs to be tabled for public hearing.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion to table by Legislator Calarco. Is there a second?

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Second, Legislator Trotta. All those in favor? Opposed? So moved. **Tabled (VOTE: 6-0-0-1, Not Present: Muratore).**

Now, if we could get -- oh, Commissioner.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Thank you. I just briefly wanted to -- since this is the first meeting of a new year, we have a new makeup in our committee, I had asked division heads to attend just so I could introduce them, as many as were available, and if I could just take half a minute to introduce everybody.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

You have your customary two hours. Go right ahead.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

There you go. And if everybody who is here would stand when I call your name. My two deputy commissioners are Phil Berdolt and Darnell Tyson; and I see there's Craig Rhodes, director of operations and management for our building division; Gary Lenberger, director of transportation; Bill Hillman was behind him. He's our chief engineer of highways. Mike James is our director of fleet. Dominick Ninivaggi is our superintendent of vector control; and I believe that's it for now. Everybody else was tied up in meetings and could not attend, but I'm sure you'll be meeting them before long, and welcome, and I look forward to the year. Thank you. I got everybody I'm not in trouble.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Okay. That concludes the regular agenda.

Joe Schroeder is coming in to talk about some of the utility regulatory proceedings and initiatives. We attended the REV hearings in Riverhead last week, and, Joe, please fill us in.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Good afternoon, Legislators. So there's been a lot going on relating to our energy utilities, which I monitor on a daily basis. I just wanted to give you an update on some of the most recent and some of the new happenings. So as part of the three-year rate plan that was just adopted by LIPA and PSEG, one of the issues that was addressed in that rate case was a storm-hardening collaborative to include the counties of Nassau and Suffolk along with New York City and other partners in a collaborative process to review PSEG plans to invest some \$700 million of FEMA funds for storm hardening, and also to help inform, from our perspective, on subsequent projects that would be done through their capital program.

So as I understand it -- well, recently I participated in a conference call with New York City and our county attorney's office. They were attending a meeting with PSEG back on January the 19. Subsequent to that, I understand that I will be working with DPW on that storm hardening collaborative, which should include input from other partners around the County. I have no formal direction from the legislature on that at this time, but that's just for your information, so that's an ongoing process as we speak.

As you mentioned, there are ongoing proceedings relating to the statewide initiative called "Reforming the Energy Vision." That's a set of proceedings that was begun in April of 2014. It's being headed up by the public service commission or department of public service, which will create new rate structures for a new REV marketplace, and it's also being led in cooperation with DPS by the NYSERDA organization, which will be developing new programs that will enable private sector partners to engage in energy-related activities and projects within various service territories. That

will, it is hoped, bring a net benefit to ratepayers so that by doing those projects, any system upgrades that might have to have been done based on utility assessment of their own infrastructure might either be put off for a period of time or not have to be addressed at all. That's a case-by-case basis, and it's still very much in the formative stage.

There are recently-announced proceedings relating to rate structure, economic incentives for utilities and for utility partners and a host of other issues, and those, as I understand it, will be developed for utilities that operate in the rest of the state, not here on Long Island, but as those programs and those guidelines are formulated, the Long Island programs will be brought into compliance with those statewide programs. So if Suffolk County wishes to advocate on its own behalf or on behalf of the constituents of Suffolk County, we need to be involved in those proceedings now because we won't be able to address the formal structure of those programs at a later time. You'd only be able to address cosmetic things relating to Long Island programs.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

What steps would we have to take in order to be involved in those proceedings?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Some of the proceedings, there is just a question of participating in ongoing venues, some of them have listed that you need to become an active party in the process, so there's variety of different requirements. Mostly it's time and effort on our part to participate in that process, and that's quite demanding, and it can be even more demanding as -- as these proceedings evolve, they generally wind up with subsets of proceedings within those various proceedings to address details, so there's a lot of time and effort that could be need to be devoted to this. At the very least, we need to be looking at this on high level so that we are informed as to what is happening, if not influencing how it happens. That's the REV proceedings.

There are some items specifically that they're looking to address now. I have them highlighted on a handout that you should have in front of you. They're looking at modification to net metering for solar arrays that are on existing facilities. They're introducing a community net metering program, which means that you could benefit from net metering even if the system isn't installed on your property. Let me just back up for a second, make sure everyone understands. "Net metering" is, if you install solar panels on your roof and it generates a certain amount of energy during the day, that energy is fed into your electrical panel any energy beyond what you use goes back into the grid and turns your meter backwards so that at the end of the year if you put into the grid more than you've taken out of the grid, you wind up with a zero charge for energy but you do pay for your basic service charges. That's an ongoing charge throughout the year. You're allowed to bank those charges through the year, but you're not allowed to carry them over to the next year.

They're also looking to make revisions in the PSEG-based Utility 2.0 program, which is essentially a Long Island version of the REV programs. PSEG was required by the LIPA statute to publish this plan, and they have to revise it on an annual basis. They're also looking to develop a retail access program so that Long Islanders who currently are not able to because of rate structures can purchase electricity through third-party providers rather than bundled service through the utility. That could be a pretty complex and very complicated process to participate in. Some of the ratepayers who have been participating in those programs that have existed across the state have not really wound up saving money so there's an amount of education that has to go into this process, and as this program is developed, it would be beneficial to local ratepayers if someone were advocating on how those structures were created, how the rates were structured so that if we were going to participate in something like that as the County or as individuals within the County, there wasn't an advantage to us to do so.

There's also expansion and modification to some of LIPA's demand/response programs, and also

they're looking to develop a community aggregative program, so they would like to encourage local municipalities to purchase electricity on behalf of all of their constituents. This is done in part right now through other demand response programs where private-sector companies come in, and the County is a participant in the New York ISO program. We participate through an aggregator who also has other customers and then they go to the ISO with a large number of avoidable generation that can be taken off the grid during peak hours when the independent system operator calls. So it's not a new concept but it's new concept in terms of municipalities providing electricity for their constituents. They're also looking to go make this available for private-sector entities as well.

So again this is something that requires a great deal of education on the part of the consumer because this is very complex marketplace. Just as illustration, the energy we're using right now was purchased 24 hours ago, so this -- depending on how these programs are developed, they could be quite complicated or they could be simplified, but when you simplify something that's quite complicated, you generally don't get the margin of savings that you could get if you were very aggressive with the program, so how these things are structured is very important. Again, having a voice in the process is key.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Legislator Stern has a question.

**LEG. STERN:**

Yeah. Thank you. Joe, real quick: For purposes of the community net-metering program, how would a community be defined? Is it a couple of homes, is it a couple of block, is it a township? How large does the community need to be in order to be effective and make it a real option?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

The only limitation that I'm aware of at this point, Legislator Stern, is that the project has to be built within the same service territory that you're a consumer. So, for instance, if we're going to build a one-megawatt solar farm and we're going to make it available to consumers, constituents, to benefit from net metering from that, they might buy electricity from that or they might contribute to the project costs or however that's done, and then they would get the benefit to the extent that they've invested in the project. You could do that without customers investing in the project too. If you were going to have a project in a community that was bit necessarily inclined to host such a project, you might offer to a community benefit. I'm theorizing here, but it seems to me these are ways that you could structure a community net metering program. You just have to have sufficient capacity so that watt for watt, you're generating electricity and it's turning back a meter the same amount. You can't generate half the amount of energy that you apply to turning back meters. It doesn't work that way.

**LEG. STERN:**

And from an organizational standpoint, is that the type of thing that, say, a civic association could get behind and take the lead on for a community, or is there a different entity or structure that would be required there?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

I believe the lead entity in that is going to be the investing entity, so if a community organization is going to be investor in the array, then they could structure a program for their base.

**LEG. STERN:**

But if it's the type that is not making that kind of investment, who would take the lead on that?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Well, again, we've made several suggestions over the years on how to develop these large-scale

solar projects in the County here. We have talked about doing a lot of projects through the county's paper utility, the Suffolk County Electrical Agency, which can serve as an aggregator or host to -- a sponsor to some of these other types of programs. There's any number of ways. But how the rules are written can determine what parties can participate and how they can participate, and that's the point of this briefing for you is that the rules are being promulgated now, so if you to have a voice in the process, we have to be involved in the process.

**LEG. STERN:**

I see. Okay, thank you.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Just to demonstrate that not all the action is on the electric side, National Grid just filed for a rate increase on Friday. Their last rate increase was effective January 1, 2008, and it was a five-year program, five-year rate plan, so this is the first rate increase that they're filing for since that plan expired. I haven't had a chance to look at the details of that document. There's a voluminous amount of material that they have to go through; again, it's the time and effort. And also, that would be a formal regulatory process so if the County wanted to be a party in that process, we would have to file for active party status.

In addition to the regulatory process, PSEG and LIPA have -- or PSEG on behalf of LIPA has issued a number of requests for proposals for large-scale renewable energy projects. There are several that have been issued already and some that are pending. Back in 2012, LIPA adopted a goal of 400 megawatts of new renewable energy generation. They issued a large-scale RFP to secure 280 megawatts. Initially, they have not achieved that 280-megawatt threshold. Recently, last year in June they issued a south fork RFP for 63 megawatts of peak capacity to be installed between 2017 and 2019. Some of the project proposals that they received were for battery storage, biofuel combustion turbines, distributed energy resources, which can be a distributed solar array; it can be a combined heat and power project; it could be a number of other things. There were fuel cell proposals and an off-shore wind proposal.

In addition, in 2015 in December, LIPA issued an renewable RFP for an additional 210 megawatts of renewable energy capacity. All of these projects have to feed directly into the LIPA grid. They don't serve customers first, which can be problematic given where these projects might be installed because they increase the amount of two-way traffic on the grid, and so you're not using that energy necessarily close to the load. You're feeding it into the grid, and it's going indiscriminately -- or it's being directed by various circuit controls. In addition to the renewable RFP, PSEG also issued a fuel cell feed-in tariff for up to 40 megawatts. This is, again, for all of the service territory; and they've also issued a request for proposals for commercial feed-in tariffs, solar feed-in tariffs, so the projects under that scenario would have to be at least 200 kW but less than one megawatt in size. Again, this would be similar to the enXco projects instead in our parking lots where they don't feed into the County buildings, they feed directly into the grid, and that is a very brief summary of the many, many other issues that are pending in the energy industry. Just wanted to bring these to your attention.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. I appreciate that. Does anyone have any questions?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Hi, Joe. The south fork RFP, I assume these projects are the projects that were the responses that were due December 2nd.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

That's correct.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Have the bids been awarded?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

No.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

And when do you expect the bids will be awarded?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

I expect that it will take at least the better part of six months to a year before they award a project out there. Again, they want these projects to be installed between 2017 and 2019.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Are they taking comment on those projects?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

I don't know.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

And when you talk about the REV, what is the relationship between REV and Utility 2.0?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Utility 2.0 is Long Island REV. LIPA customers do not contribute to the systems benefit charge. The REV proceedings are covering those service territories where NYSEDA offers the energy efficiency and other programs. LIPA administers their own programs through PSEG. Actually, now PSEG administers through Lockheed Martin. So we have our own Long Island programs, and that's why the revised LIPA statute required PSEG to publish a Utility 2.0 plan in anticipation of the REV proceedings. My understanding is that Utility 2.0 will be renamed "REV Long Island." I don't know when that might occur, but in my conversations with local DPS staff, the programs that are -- the program guidelines and the programs as they're designed for the rest of the state will be similar to what we get down here, so any Utility 2.0 programs will be adapted to what the rest of the programs in the state look like.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

So in other words, the new Utility 2.0 will have to replicate what is required by the REV statewide?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

The programs that are offered on Long Island will conform to the programs that are offered in the rest of the state. The state wants one common platform or at least one set of standards. They do recognize, however, that there will be program differences within different utility service territories and even across those service territories.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Well, I hope there will be some kind of recognition about our unique needs on Long Island with vulnerability to service interruptions, coastal resilience, and the incredibly high prices that our constituents pay for electric. One would hope that those would be given special consideration. There was so much dissatisfaction with Utility 2.0. That's what I'm trying to understand. Has anyone heard us? In terms of this REV, is it being put together with the recognition of the concerns that went into the protests around Utility 2.0?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

I believe that is the purpose of these proceedings. If we want to have our voice heard, we need to

be involved in the proceedings.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

So tell us how we do that, Joe.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Well, there is a proceeding that just started that we should become active parties in. There are a number of other ongoing workshops and other venues that occur elsewhere in the state that if we want to participate in, we have to have a presence in.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Okay. I guess we need to understand more fully what that means, but I know one of the central focuses of the dissatisfaction with 2.0 came out of that 280 megawatts, and the fact that, you know, the wind project fell off the table and the 280 megawatts weren't awarded. We only had, I think, 120 megawatts worth of contracts were awarded under that in terms of renewable energy, and we don't have any focus yet on wind, and so that's why I'm trying to figure out how all those pieces fit together.

If the south fork RFP includes some of those projects, how does that fit, and Utility 2.0 is supposed to have some influence on the REV, how do these projects that were offered in response to the RFP in December fit into REV, and will they survive this REV process, and how can we ensure that they do survive it?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Well, part of the problem is, Legislator, that the two processes are going ahead at the same time parallel to each other. I am not aware, but I hope that the RFPs that were issued by PSEG were informed via the proceedings that have occurred thus far and so that in the way the RFP was constructed and in the way that the projects get awarded, they will conform with what's happening in the state, but as a processes are happening at the same time and parallel, I can't answer that question.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I do think it's something we need to keep our eyes on, but thank you for the information.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Sure. Anyone else? Thank you, Joe.

All right. If we have no other business, we are adjourned.

*(\*The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 P.M. \*)*