

Public Works, Transportation & Energy 2-22-16

**PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION & ENERGY COMMITTEE**

**OF THE**

**SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE**

**MINUTES**

A 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 February 22, 2016.

**Members Present:**

Legislator Al Krupski - Chairman.  
Legislator Tom Muratore - Vice-Chair  
Legislator Robert Calarco  
Legislator Kate Browning  
Legislator Steve Stern  
Legislator Bridget Fleming

**Not Present:**

Legislator Robert Trotta - Excused

**Also in Attendance:**

Legislator Sarah Anker - District No. 6  
George Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature  
Amy Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature  
Joe Schroeder Budget Review Office/Energy Specialist  
Bob Doering - Budget Review Office  
Darnell Tyson - Deputy Commissioner/SC Department of Public Works  
Bill Hillman - Suffolk County Department of Public Works  
James Ingenito - Suffolk County Department of Public Works  
Raymond Muxo - Suffolk County Department of Public Works  
Gwynn Schroeder - Aide to Legislator Krupski  
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory  
Alyssa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn  
Bob Martinez - Aide to Legislator Muratore  
Greg Moran - Aide to Legislator Trotta  
Debbie Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern  
Robert Braun - County Attorney's Office  
Katie Horst - Director/Intergovernmental Relations  
Jason Hann - County Executive's Office  
Ben Zwirn - Suffolk County Community College  
Steve Cuzzo - Americans with Disabilities Awareness Movement  
Linda Jones - Americans with Disabilities Awareness Movement  
Joseph Delgado - Suffolk Independent Living Organization  
Paul Pressman - Suffolk Independent Living Organization  
All Other Interested Parties

**Minutes Taken By:**

Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

**Minutes Transcribed By:**

Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary

*(\*The meeting was called to order at 2:06 P.M. \*)*

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

All right. Could we bring the meeting to order. All rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Calarco.

***Salutation***

Welcome to the regular committee meeting of Public Works, Transportation and Energy. Legislator Trotta has an excused absence and we will miss him today. We'll start off with Public Portion and then we'll go into the presentations by Joe Schroeder on large scale solar projects. So number one, Steve Couzzo, and on deck Paul Pressman.

**MR. COUZZO:**

Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen of our great Suffolk County Legislature. My name is Steven Couzzo and I'm a cofounder of an advocacy group for the disabled called ADAM, Americans with Disabilities Awareness Movement. Again, I would like to thank you for your efforts last year on eliminating the three-quarter mile rule. It's affected many lives in Suffolk County to be able to use the system. It's unfortunate, though, that the 20,000 plus members or riders that use the system have not been notified at all of what was done and how to use it, so it's not really being used to any extent. I believe that the Suffolk County Office of People with Disabilities are eventually going to roll out a statement and send it to the riderships like myself so that we actually understand what's available and how we could use it.

The other item I'd like to mention once again is the budgetary cuts that are coming up in our new budget from our County Executive Steve Bellone, over \$10 million worth of budget cuts. My opinion, and I'm not alone, is that Suffolk County -- our County needs to maintain what they do financially for the aged, the disabled, the vets and the low income in our County. Digging a hole as deep as \$10 million into a budget, there's really not coming back from that. The fallout from that will be tremendous, and no matter how you try to fill the holes it's not going to be whole again. And if there is any additional monies it should be used to making the system better.

I'm going to rely on you again to use your best judgment in the needs of the community. We've contacted a lot of different agencies, the Suffolk County Department of the Aging, the Suffolk County Department of Veterans Affairs, the Suffolk County Department of People with Disabilities. Other interested groups, the AFL-CIO, the TWU Local 252, SILO, Suffolk Independent Living Organization, Helen Keller and the members of ADAM are all going to try to make phone calls and petitions so that you understand what the constituents and what this will do. Once again, I appreciate everything that you can do and your consideration. Thank you.

*(\*Legislator Fleming entered the meeting at 2:10 P.M. \*)*

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. You know, you mentioned the service and everything. We had Holly Rhodes-Teague in here, who operates the Office for the Aging in Suffolk County, and we asked her in a committee earlier how that \$15 minimum wage raise would affect her programs. She said that's something they're trying to calculate. A lot of the programs you mentioned, I wonder if any of those will be affected by the proposed increase in minimum wage.

**MR. COUZZO:**

I guess we'd have to address that individually with each one. I know the drivers are probably well over that, but we got to take it on a base by base -- it could. That's going to -- that's going to affect things. I actually have an appointment this coming Monday with Senator Flanagan and Senator Robach and Senator Martins and Senator Marcellino up in Albany. And, yeah, we all have to try to provide for our residents and constituents that have needs, and the needs are, like I said, the low income, aged, vets, disabled, and it's going to take a joint effort from all, the County, the State and even the townships. I come from the Town of Huntington. The Town of Huntington has a bus system called HART. Smithtown has just started one two years ago with two buses. And it's all of us, our families. Even me with my family, I have to rely on them to help also. It's not just a one person thing. It's all of us. But if the County takes away that type of money, this -- I don't know how we can come back from it, you know.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay. Thank you.

**MR. COUZZO:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Paul Pressman and on deck, Linda Jones.

**MR. PRESSMAN:**

Good afternoon, Legislators. I'm Paul Pressman. I live in West Islip. I work a little bit with SILO with the transportation system. I believe everybody received a copy of my comments that Legislator Krupski's assistant, Mr. Stype, e-mailed to everybody. I just want to bring up a couple of points. It's very good what happened with the three-quarter mile rule. It helps me a lot as far as getting around and everything else, and I appreciate all of that. But I called up SCAT on Sunday, didn't realize they opened at eight instead of seven. When you listen to their recording, they're recording is still stating about the \$4 increase in 2013. What should be on there is the recording that the three-quarter mile rule is no longer in effect and that SCAT is available to every senior citizen and every disabled person in Suffolk County. And I don't understand why it's not there. And I spoke to somebody there and they said, "*Well, it just went into effect in the beginning of January.*" Well, supposedly there's only 60 days. We're already at the end of February. That should already be in effect and should be on the phones and people should know about it.

I mean, and then the County wants to take away \$10 million and how -- and if you want to get that \$10 million back, well, Mr. Bellone's going to say, "*Well, where's the ridership?*" Well, how can we have the ridership if nobody knows about it? You know, you've got to make sure that the County people know about it. If they know about it, they will use it. We've been fighting for it for the longest time.

And the next thing that has to be done with the SCAT service is it has to run longer. There are a lot of things we can't go to. I wanted to go back to school and the course I need to take is from 6:30 until 10 o'clock at night. I can't take it because I have no way of getting back. The regular buses don't run and the SCAT service is finished by that time of the night.

The other problem is we've got Nassau County, in their wonderful wisdom of cutting bus service, actually cut service in Suffolk County and nobody has taken over to pick it up. There is no bus service now from Babylon Railroad Station to the Sunrise Mall along Montauk Highway since the N-19 bus was cancelled by Nassau County that used to go from Freeport to Babylon. That's a big area of a lot of residents, a lot of businesses. The S-20 bus that goes from Babylon to Sunrise Mall along Hoffman, to be honest with you, would have three times the amount of people on that bus if they even cut out that route and put it along Montauk Highway.

## Public Works , Transportation & Energy 2-22-16

Now, I've had conversation with Mr. {Catterton} and they're talking about taking the 20 bus and trying to run it through to take up the 19 slack. It can't work that way. Between Hoffman Avenue and Montauk Highway it is too long of an area and you'll end up having a two hour, two-and-a-half hour bus right ride just to get to where you have to go. They could take two to three buses and that's all they would need and at least provide some service. Obviously you need a half hour -- it should run every half hour like the S-40 bus does, but it doesn't, you know. I mean, even Nassau County messed that up. The 19 used to run every half hour and then they cut it to an hour except during morning and afternoon rush hours.

The other big problem that the County has is when they're going to revamp everything and they're going to put that third line in for the Long Island Railroad, when bus schedules are revamped they need to be also included with train schedules. You have buses now that -- and even the buses other than the 40 bus that goes to Babylon, any other railroad station you've got a bus running every hour and there's no -- there's no time that it matches with any of the railroad. And it becomes a big, big problem.

The other thing is, too, even on the holidays when they schedule the holidays for the buses, the S-40 route is running every hour instead of every half hour when there are no Federal buildings on that bus route whatsoever and it's the third biggest bus route in Suffolk County.

Things have to change, they really do. And I've had more drivers complain about that AVL system that everybody's waiting for to make this decision. Well, it's been 35 years and nobody's done anything in 35 years and now they're going with this big thing. For that \$100,000 that they spent on the AVL system, they should have taken that money and put it towards the 10 million and got new buses and fixed it up. I'm telling you right now I could sit down with Mr. {Catterton} and I guarantee you, in less than five hours I could figure out the bus schedule for him and help him do it.

### **CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

I think we would welcome any help, so your comments are appreciated. The first one that you made about the -- I saw a lot of people writing when you mentioned your first comment about the message being the wrong message, so I'm sure that will be corrected soon.

### **MR. PRESSMAN:**

I appreciate it. I really do. And I know you guys are trying and I know that it's not a big -- it's hard for a lot of the Legislators and a lot of the people to understand about the buses if you don't take it. And that was one thing that Mr. Schneiderman was very good about, to be honest with you. I had a conversation one day. He was supposed to come and meet me here at 9:30 in the morning and he had to call me on the phone and tell me that he got hit with traffic. And then he says to me, he says, *"And you know, if I took the bus I wouldn't get here until tomorrow."*

### **CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

Sure.

### **MR. PRESSMAN:**

He all understands it, and I think I would appreciate one day if somebody would just from their office go somewhere on a Suffolk County bus and see what happens when you have to transfer, and if the bus is two minutes late and you miss the next bus and you have to wait an hour, that ruins your whole day.

### **CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

Sure.

### **MR. PRESSMAN:**

So I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

Thank you. Take care. Linda Jones.

**MS. JONES:**

Good afternoon, Legislators and attendees. I'm Linda Jones and I'm here representing ADAM, Americans with Disabilities Awareness Movement. I just thought I would like to just tell you a little bit about myself, because a lot of times we come and we want all these things and we say to you, *"You don't know how we feel, you don't know we feel."* Well, of course you don't, but maybe if you knew us better then maybe you could understand.

I was ten years old when I started night blindness and I drove a few cars when I got older and had three accidents and decided -- I didn't hurt anybody, I hurt myself -- I decided that it was not a good idea. So I didn't drive, then I had to use the SCAT buses and everything like that eventually. And the buses are so important to us.

For instance, I don't have to repeat everything that they just said to you, but even -- even the Nassau -- where they cut the buses -- all right. I found out recently that I'm deaf, too. Anyway, I'm going to be going to the Sands Point -- Helen Keller in Sands Point in Port Washington in the fall for school. I would like to get the SCAT bus to the mall like I did once before and then get on the other bus, the NICE bus or whatever, and go -- they wouldn't -- they have the three-fourths of a mile still so when I got to the nursing home down the road then I had to call a taxi. Yeah. But now I called up to get the bus and they don't have it; they closed that route so now I have to go on the train. So this is fun. From Northport I get to Huntington. I may have to change. I get to Jamaica, I have to get off there and go to another place or Hicksville, and then I finally end up at Woodside and then I have to wait for a train to Port Washington. It's really hairy when you don't see or hear too good.

You know, what I was trying to say is we want all this. We don't want to lose what we have. We -- we don't -- we need our independence, our self-esteem, our dignity. And when we have to stay home and not go anywhere and nobody will -- you know, people will come but you're always waiting, waiting. You know, people get annoyed after a while when you're asking them like that. That's why the SCAT is so important. Could you please, please, don't let Mr. Bellone take these routes away from us. Once these things are taken away we're never going to get them back. Please. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

Thank you, Linda. All right. Is there anyone -- those were the three cards. Is there anyone else who would like to address the committee who hasn't filled out a card? All right. We're going to go into the presentation. Joe Schroeder, Suffolk County's Energy Specialist from Budget Review, is going to give us an oversight of large scale solar.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Good afternoon, Legislators. This presentation is an effort to keep you up to speed on the many things that are ongoing in the energy industry, not only across the State, but here on Long Island. This presentation focuses largely on large scale solar PV projects but includes other issues as well.

So there's been a deliberate effort to support the proliferation of renewable energy technologies by State policy and also local policies here at the Legislature, those adopted by LIPA as well. The 2015 State Energy Plan is calling for a 50% of all electricity used in New York State by 2030 should be generated by renewable energy sources. LIPA, back in 2012, adopted a goal to add 400 megawatts of renewable energy generation to its resource portfolio, and they in turn issued some requests for proposals to develop such projects out of 280 megawatts of requested resources. However, they got nine projects totaling about 96 -- these are numbers from DPS. The numbers that I have are closer to 113 megawatts. So when you look at where those projects were sited, they were -- from a numerical value the project total were sited overwhelmingly in Suffolk County and 97 1/2% of the

## Public Works , Transportation & Energy 2-22-16

capacity that was installed as part of those projects is located here in Suffolk County. These projects also include the enXco projects here at the County facilities and also the Long Island Solar Farm at Brookhaven National Lab.

In 2015, PSEG released several RFP's. One for the South Fork specific to the South Fork, which you may have been reading about in the paper. That's looking for 63 megawatts of peak day capacity. There is also a 2015 renewable RFP that seeks 210 megawatts of additional capacity along with 40 megawatts of fuel cell technologies. And in addition to that, there's a third component that focuses on smaller scale projects, less than one megawatt, between 200 kw and less than one megawatt.

If you'll notice, however, all of these requests for proposals call for the projects to be connected directly to the utility grid, so they're not going to be serving local loads and then sending extra back to the grid. They're sending the entire production value to the grid. There's a wide variety of resources that proposers can include in their project development schemes. Predominantly those have been solar PV projects.

So where are those projects being sited? Well, because they have to tie directly into the grid, the ideal location for them is to site as close as possible to an available substation. Of the available properties in proximity to substations, developers are looking for the lowest first cost properties. So some of the parcels that have been developed, as also you've heard in the paper, include sod farms, golf courses and several wooded lots as well. Approximately 153 acres of woods were cleared for the 35-megawatt project that was installed at Brookhaven National Lab.

So in addition to that, Suffolk County requested bidders to build carports on several of our parking lots and at a couple of railroad stations on property that we own. So -- but those are the only carports in terms of large scale that have been developed thus far.

Now, when you look at development in the region, the brownish areas of this aerial view of the Long Island region are highly developed areas. So you'll notice closer to New York City there's a lot more brown than there is as you move further east on the Island where there's a lot more green. However, there's enough asphalt and concrete and buildings that's part of the development of our suburban environment that we have experienced a growth in what's called the Heat Island Effect for the region. So summer temperatures are much hotter than they used to be in our region because during the daytime that asphalt and concrete absorbs the heat energy, and it radiates that heat energy back into the environment as the sun goes down at night and well into the evening hours. And what that does is it extends the cooling periods, the cooling load for our air-conditioners throughout the day.

So this becomes an issue that's somewhat heavily debated in some quarters and there's a narrative that there are more trees on Long Island now than there were 100, 150 years ago, so it doesn't matter if we clear wooded lots. You know, whether or not that narrative is believable or correct in fact, it's hardly relevant given the proliferation of concrete and asphalt that's part of our suburban environment.

So I did seek out some earlier day descriptions of the Long Island region. There's a book that was published back in 1902 called The History of Long Island and it does state that certainly there were more woods precolonial days than there were in the late 1800's, early 1900's, but there was vast forested areas on the Island here. And so descriptions of the Island being this barren wasteland of treeless area is not an narrative that plays well.

This is a zoomed-in view on the Long Island region that shows on the left there, that's the Dennison Building in that large rectangular area. On the left side of that there's solar panels in the parking lots in that area, and the building to the right of that is the State office building. And if you look at the image on the right hand side there, that's the thermal radiance of those properties. And as it

## Public Works , Transportation & Energy 2-22-16

compares to the area that's within the Blydenburgh Park area, you can see it's a much warmer area. There's also to the left of the Blydenburgh Park is the North County Complex and south of that is the Hauppauge Industrial area. And there's another image there, there's a lot of white roofs in the Hauppauge Industrial Park. This particular building that you see centered in that rectangle there is a white roof that has a well-insulated area underneath it, so it's emitting less heat back into the environment. So the County has a cool roof policy, and that's a good policy.

This is the solar array that was developed at the Brookhaven National Laboratory. It's the Long Island Solar Farm. On the left there you can see the solar panels and on the right there you can see the thermal image of those panels as it compares to the surrounding wooded area around those panels. As you move to the left and up towards the north, you can see building developments and how the solar panels have a similar thermal footprint to those other developed areas.

In fact -- and all of these images, by the way, are all on the same day. It's July 31, 2014. That date was selected because for gathering the overhead images and the thermal imaging you had to find a day that had low cloud cover, and it was just a day that presented itself well.

So this was data that was collected at Brookhaven National Lab on the solar farm, on the same date, the same 24-hour period, and if you notice the green light there is the ambient temperature underneath the panels. And at the height of the day -- at the height of the temperature of the day, the temperature reached about 83 degrees. The red line above that is the temperature reading from the back side of the panel. So the back side of the panel was approximately 115 degrees, while the ambient air temperature around it was 83 degrees. The surface temperature of that panel is likely hotter than that, but I have no data to reflect that. But judging from field data that we've collected from various solar arrays around the Island, the surface temperature of those arrays seems to be consistent with the surface temperature of parking lot areas. And during the daytime those temperatures can get up to over 140 degrees. And anyone who's walked across a parking lot in their bare feet in the summertime will attest to the fact that they can get pretty hot without quantifying it.

So the utility industry in this country has undergone a number of changes, and back in the 1990's New York State adopted the deregulation that was moving across the country. Not all states have done that, but what deregulation did was it separated for electric utilities the power generation from the wires, and if you were going to remain in the electric utility industry you had to divest of your power generation if you wanted to retain ownership of the wires. That's what happened in New York State and that's what happened here on Long Island effective 1998.

Beginning in April of 2014, the State has embarked on an initiative called Reforming the Energy Vision. I presented some material on that at the last meeting. We've been discussing this here for the past year and a half. It's a complete restructuring of the electric utility industry as it relates to distributed energy resources, so competing energy generation from traditional sources. It also includes a number of other technologies and programs, such as demand side management, time of use rate structures and locational based rate structures. But predominantly the REV proceedings support distributed energy resources and a large component of that is solar PV.

So in terms of where those resources get developed, doesn't matter where they're deployed to Suffolk County. How will the success of those installations be measured, is it just going to be based on the total megawatts of capacity that are installed, or is it going to be based on some broader wholistic goal that service the greater needs of the area. And what impact are those projects likely to have on the Suffolk County region, given that most of the projects are developed within Suffolk County.

So this is an attempt to simply illustrate the change that's going on in the electric utility industry. The traditional model, one through five there is the power plant generates electricity. It sends power by transmission wires to substations. Those substations step down the voltage and that

## Public Works , Transportation & Energy 2-22-16

power is then transported into communities where it serves end users; commercial, industrial and residential buildings.

The new market is a two-way street. So we have rooftop solar panels that have been installed for years now and they benefit from a program called Net Metering. So the energy from those panels feeds into the house first, or into the building first, and then whatever excess energy is not used by the building flows back to the grid and turns the meter backwards, figuratively, but it reduces on the same retail value the number of kilowatt hours that you are charged for at the end of that billing period.

So what's happening now with ground-mounted systems, and as we saw earlier, that connect directly to the grid, similar to the enXco projects out here in our parking lots where there's no direct benefit to these buildings from those panels. Power goes into the grid and it feeds back out as the grid decides or as decided by the system operators. The problem is the wires only have certain amount of capacity, and as you increase the two-way traffic across those wires, there's less and less potential for adding new projects. This is something that's happened here in Suffolk County. It's continuing to happen here in Suffolk County and it's, in fact, happening all around the world. So this is not a unique experience in the industry. This is happening everywhere that these kinds of projects are developed, where specific to Suffolk County we proposed to develop a 6.8 megawatt project at the infield area at Gabreski Airport. When the utility evaluated the feeder cables from two separate substations that would have served the interconnection to that array, the total project scope was knocked down to 4.2 megawatts. So there's a limit based on how much travel there is across the wires. And this is a self-limiting strategy by virtue of that, because if you are not serving the end loads first, the only place for that energy to go is back across the wires.

Last year we participated in the Department of Public Service proceedings relating to the requested rate increase by PSEG Long Island and LIPA. We submitted comments that supported building these types of projects, these solar PV projects, as carports on parking lots that are adjacent to buildings, serving those loads as a priority, and then feeding the excess back into the grid similar to a net metering configuration. We also suggested that LIPA and PSEG develop a standard platform to support those types of arrays so that those ratepayer funded projects, because ultimately those costs flow to the ratepayers, don't incur reengineering costs every time a project is proposed. So, you know, by adopting the uniform solar code the industry benefitted because all the townships adopted that code. Last year the Suffolk County Planning Commission recommended a code for these large scale projects and townships are adopting that.

So what we propose is to work with the utility and the local townships that have jurisdictional authority over building codes to develop this standard so that it would reduce the overall cost to ratepayers and promote carport type installations as opposed to greenfield installations.

In addition, there's now a program called Community Net Metering, that you may have also read about. Community net metering is for people who would like to buy into the development of a project and benefit from the net metering experienced by people who have solar on their roof. So if you can't put solar on your roof for any reason or you just don't want to put solar on your roof, you can buy into a project that's being built anywhere on LIPA's service territory and benefit from the power that's generated from that array. This type of program could be used to buy or to incent communities to host these types of projects. There has been some community backlash to some of the project proposals and some of the projects that have been developed in the recent year, and this might be a way to overcome that objection.

In addition, and to assure that the County's position is not thou shalt not cut down a tree, we advocated for evaluation of land use so that we can be sure that the proper type of bundles of properties were being utilized that would benefit the community as a whole.

## Public Works , Transportation & Energy 2-22-16

So just a quick comparison. If you're developing a solar array on a greenfield project and you have to remove a lot of trees versus a carport array on a parking lot, typically greenfield areas are remote from loads, where parking lots are typically adjacent to buildings which have electric loads. The utility circuits get congested when you have an increase of two-way traffic from greenfield arrays. As an alternative, if you were serving the building loads first, say you were at a large shopping mall or industrial complex and you were serving the electric loads at that facility before the power was turned back to the grid, there would be at least a portion of that energy would be consumed locally, and it would reduce the two-way traffic on the grid, preserving circuit capacity for additional projects which, in turn, could result in even more penetration of these technologies.

In addition, with all the parking areas that we have right now as the thermal images illustrated before, there's a significantly higher cooling load on Long Island than there needs to be, and we could reduce that by building carports, which even though they have a similar operating temperature during the daytime hours, cool off much more quickly as the sun starts to go down because they don't have a lot of mass. So if the sun goes down at eight or nine o'clock at night in July, they start cooling off very quickly as opposed to a parking lot, which is going to radiate heat into the atmosphere and into the community through the later night hours. So it extends your cooling day by having a parking lot, a large parking lot, next to your facility.

Also, trees absorb carbon dioxide. Certainly we want to be reducing the amount of carbon dioxide there is in the atmosphere by public policy, if not by desire, and reducing the amount of trees reduces the sequestering of carbon dioxide. Now, even if there is a net gain, a net positive resulting from the installation of a solar array when you remove a lot of trees, why net out the carbon reduction that you could still get if you develop those arrays on parking areas where there are no trees.

One of the reasons the REV proceeding is -- has been adopted is because across the State electric grid is very inefficient. The Department of Public Service identified in the recent proceedings that LIPA's grid is the least efficient in the State; it's 44% efficient. They've had a peak demand day back in 2011, which I would remind you was a period of significant economic downturn, so they had a peak day of 5700 megawatts, almost 5800 megawatts, and their summer load is not nearly that great. I'm sorry, their winter load is not really that great. In fact, the peak demand that was recorded since 2004 was in 2004 and that was 3600 megawatts winter demand.

Now, this is LIPA's typical annual profile in terms of energy passed through to consumers. As you can see, it's a summer peaking utility, but we have to have power plant capacity to meet that summer peak demand and we maintain that infrastructure all through the year, even when consumption is much lower. That's the inefficiency that is being targeted in the REV proceedings and that is what is costing ratepayers a lot of money to support the grid.

There are other factors associated with the peak demand situation that we have here on Long Island, and it is well documented that traditional power plants consume fresh water. It's also not disputed that on severe hot days there's an increase in demand for water, fresh water, and this results in demand on our groundwater system here on Long Island.

This is the same electric profile that I just showed you matched with Suffolk County Water Authority's throughput profile for the same year. So you can see how closely matched those utilities are in terms of their peak demand periods.

Another thing to consider is that many of the studies that have been done that compare the economic or speak to the economic benefits of some of the renewable technology that we're installing base their calculations on the U.S. average generation blend, which is heavily weighted with coal. Bituminous coal is the most common coal used for electric generation, whereas on Long Island 90% typically of the energy that we consume is produced by natural gas. This, in fact, is the Energy Information Administration's printout for today. This is the fuel use or the fuel blend for

generation on Long Island today as compared to the rest of the nation. So we're more than 90% based on natural gas today. We have some fuel oil generation in the mix, and there's non-hydro renewables, which are solar, biomass, wind and we don't get much or any hydropower here on Long Island, and that is evident in that illustration there. But you can see the rest of the country a significant amount of the power that's being consumed today is being generated by coal. So we just want to be sure that when we're looking at the environmental benefits that these projects are proposing, is that we're -- the context is relevant to our region and not to the rest of the country.

I want to close by saying that when we install projects that help to reduce our unit cost of energy, we do save on the marginal cost of that commodity, but what we have been doing here in Suffolk County for the past seven or eight years is to embark on a very robust efficiency upgrade program for our facilities, and that has resulted in a reduction in expenditures for energy of approximately \$5 million a year. If you include the fuel switching from fuel oil to natural gas, those savings are over \$11 million a year.

Our focus is reducing the amount of energy that we use, not reducing emissions or anything else actually. So we've made substantial reductions in electric energy that's consumed at our facilities. We've also made significant progress in reducing the amount of natural gas that's used in our facilities. As a consequence of those energy use reductions, we've managed to save a tremendous amount of carbon dioxide emissions into the atmosphere as well. But we've done that with a focus on the energy used to improve the efficiency of our facilities. That concludes my presentation.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Joe, that was really good. Thank you for that. Does anyone on the committee have any questions?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I do.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Legislator Fleming.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you, Joe. This is also important to ask, and I think it's very confusing to a lot of people, so I think it's one of the reasons why it doesn't get addressed as critically as it seems to need to be addressed, because it's just arcane. It's hard to follow. But I had a couple of questions for you just with regard to this congestion, you know, the prohibition or the obstacle that you find feeding back into the grid with the two-way -- with the two-way movement of energy. Is that a technical problem or is that a policy issue? I thought that utility companies throughout the country might feel their bottom line threatened by folks being able to provide their own energy back in and, you know, we hear -- we've recently seen reports that if -- that we may -- ratepayers may have to pay higher rates because less energy is needed. And so if you have that two-way flow of energy and folks are feeding in, then obviously that's going to affect the utilities company's bottom line.

So when I hear this pro -- I don't want to say prohibition, but this obstacle that people like you mentioned at Gabreski, where people aren't able to build the larger -- the larger arrays. And by the way, I've heard about it in Hawaii as well. The question is, in my mind, is this technology or could that technological challenge be met if there was the political will to feed more energy into the grid.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

It's more of a practical consideration than a policy consideration. If you imagine a plumbing system, when you start to deliver water your pipes are larger, and as you get closer to the end use your pipe size goes down. It's the same thing with the wires. The available capacity that's brought into the neighborhoods is not the same as what's feeding to those neighborhoods. So it's a practical consideration. It's a technical evaluation that is done on the available capacity of the

wires. It's not necessarily a policy issue.

I would add that the cost of energy, our cost of energy as consumers, is a direct passthrough for the energy provider. They're not losing anything on the bottom line. We pay for it one way or the other. The fact that we demand less energy may result in a higher unit cost on the charges that are levied on us to maintain the infrastructure, but they don't affect us in terms of any other aspect of providing energy service.

So in other words, if it cost a hundred dollars to maintain the wires going to your house and you use half the amount of energy next year than you used last year, it still is going to cost me a hundred dollars to maintain those wires. I have to collect that from you one way or the other. So you might see a higher unit cost, but if you're using less units, you can still save money.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I just wonder if, you know, looking at the whole regional problem, you know, regional problem, we're working on education efforts to convince people that they don't need to use as much energy, they don't have to make as many demands. There seems to be a reverse incentive built in there if you're still going to pay for it regardless, because we're protecting the utility company's bottom line. That was -- I may be wrong, maybe I'm being too cynical, but it seems to me that that may be one of the reasons why we haven't seen movement on this in such a long time.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

I've been in this industry for 35 years plus and it's been a constant battle to convey that message, and the message that I have been repeating for many years now is the cost of energy is out of your ability to control. You can control how much energy you use. If the cost goes up and you're using less, you have at least avoided the increased cost. Does that make sense?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

No.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

As the cost of energy goes up, there's an avoided cost that you realize by using less energy. So if the cost goes up a hundred dollars and you don't change how much energy you use, you're going to pay a hundred dollars times how much energy you use. If the cost goes up a hundred dollars and you use half as much, you're not going to pay as much at the end of the year. You've avoided some cost.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

But if you're looking at it from the supply side and the supplier is going to net as much by supplying less because the cost per unit has gone up, then from a cynical perspective one might think that that's sort of why things have ended up where they are.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

So then it's important to realize that under a traditional regulatory structure, utilities have earned a return on investment based on their capital investment and infrastructure, not on the amount of energy that they pass through the system. So there's no gain to the utility by passing more energy through the system. Their gain is realized on the capital investment -- return on investment and capital investments that they make in the infrastructure. So -- I'm sorry.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

No, that's okay. Is that unique to New York or is that nationwide?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

No, that's typical, and in fact, that's one of the things that they're looking to change with the REV because they want to incent private sector investment in infrastructure or infrastructure alternatives

that should ultimately provide a net savings to ratepayers.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

And how can we help moving in that direction?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Well, the people of Suffolk County are looking to you, I think, to lead with policy on these types of issues and to work collaboratively with other municipal partners who have jurisdictional authority over the siting of some of these projects, and also I think the population is looking for all of us to work collaboratively together. So the utility and the government should be working together to formulate a wholistic plan whereby these projects are not only well sited, but well suited for the sites that they're located on.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Just in connection with that, or sort of related, you talked about the South Fork RFP, which is something that I'm familiar with having sat on the Southampton Town Board. One of the things that was of concern to us in Southampton was certainly that LIPA, in reviewing the bids for the RFP, was not necessarily looking at the zoning regulations within the particular available sites, and so we had sort of piecemeal folks coming to us, vendors with some crazy projects, you know, 500-gallon tanks of diesel in a, you know, residential Southampton neighborhood, that kind of thing. It wasn't -- it seemed sort of upside down that the utility company didn't work with the zoning authorities to first find out -- this might fit with some of the concerns as you've come up against -- to find out whether what they're asking for is appropriate to anyplace. And, you know, so it seems a little bit backwards. I don't know how we can address that problem.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

So some of that may be unavoidable because the array of available -- array of technologies that they're soliciting is not all inclusive and they're open to suggestions, and so there certainly could be things that come up that don't fit neatly into a zoning package, but that's precisely -- what you're talking about is precisely the point I was making earlier, in that if we're working together collaboratively and this communication is open and the process is wholistic, then those should be minimized. Those issues should be minimized.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Is there somehow that the LIPA Oversight Division could maybe solidify the relationships with those local authorities to -- it took us by surprise these -- this one presentation in particular, but LIPA had already entertained the bid. It wasn't awarded, but it had been entertained. It was in our neighborhood and it didn't fit in current zoning nor would it have ever been appropriate. So I wonder if there's some way County LIPA oversight could be more effective in trying to bridge that communication gap.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I can maybe take a shot at that, Joe.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thanks. And, Bridget, that's the conversation that we had just before lunch, Kate was there and Joe, to try to come up with a standard code on some of these. Like Joe mentioned I think on page 16, a standard formula of engineering design for carports. We have so many paved parking lots in the County, and that's where you should be putting all the solar. Even standardized for ground rod. I don't know -- if that town for town if they have standardized for ground rod installation. And -- but you'd have to really start with the towns and that's, you know, I've got that on to speak on Wednesday to the East End Mayors and Supervisors group to see if they're interested in forming

some sort of subcommittee to work on -- if you had a standard approach to the utilities and the installers I think -- I'm sure would welcome what.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

I'd also like to point out if I was a developer proposing one of these projects, I'd be looking for the same types of properties that they're looking for, because they're the easiest projects to develop. To develop a carport on property owned by somebody else is going to require a lot of extra effort, and to invest in an infrastructure to support that carport is going to be more expensive. If by policy, however, that's the preferred option, then that's the game in town.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Right, exactly, because that is the standard then and to go that way is the path of least resistance if you're going to develop solar. So you set the rules and that's what happens. Otherwise it's willy-nilly and then you get surprised. Any other questions? Rob, go ahead.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Joe, you kind of hit on my question right there in your last comment regarding the cost. If we're the only place that has carports on the Island where they actually develop them on Suffolk County property, the question is what is that cost to develop it in that fashion, and does it become something where in the immediacy for a company it seems to be cost prohibitive to try to take that route.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Well, that's where adopting a standard platform could alleviate some of the cost concerns. If the utility -- if LIPA, PSEG adopt a standard that is acceptable to the local townships, then there's a relatively known capital cost requirement for those projects. It doesn't have to be reengineered every time somebody proposes a project. There are any number of ways to build these carports. The enXco projects that were built in our parking lot is probably the low end of the scale in terms of how you'd want to build these things. There is a carport that has been installed at SUNY Farmingdale that's probably at the very high end of the scale. Somewhere in the middle is where I think there would be a happy medium.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

But there's an added cost to doing the carports, right? So what is that added cost to the developer of the project, and then does it drive up the cost of the energy that they would be selling back to the grid or providing to us, the consumer.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Well, that's one of the reasons for stating a preference in terms of if you put out a request for proposals and you're going to prefer that these types of projects are your preferred projects, then you're not going to lose out because your project is more expensive than a ground-mounted system on some wooded lot someplace. I don't know what the incremental cost is, but the footings and the rails that the panels sit on are all the same. There might be some slight differences. The difference is the elevation between the low ground-mounted systems and the carport systems. There could also be some difference in how you want those facilities structured so that you minimize the issues with plowing, you minimize issues with drainage, you minimize issues with people bumping into things. That's part of adopting a standardized design.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

But what is that cost? Like what is it -- what is the cost of enXco to have the project that they built for us versus the cost for somebody that's looking to do the project in Shoreham where they're just putting them on sod farms? I mean, there is a quantitative amount there that we know and what does that do to the cost to providing energy to the grid, because we know that the carports here in Suffolk on our properties is providing electricity at a higher cost than, you know, say Caithness is producing power out of their plant. And so that's part of the equation in terms of what it costs the

ratepayers to carry that electric. And certainly I think while like private property owners are willing to put it on their rooftop, but aren't willing to, you know, go into having somebody build carports on their property, which would require presumably some sort of a lease agreement between the provider and the owner.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

So the enXco projects were built under the first feed-in tariff arrangement, which was 22.9 cents per kilowatt-hour plus a capacity payment. That's the same payment that the Long Island Solar Farm got for building a ground-mounted system. So the revenues were structured the same. The revenues that they're getting on average, my estimation, on a per kilowatt hour basis is about 30 cents a kilowatt hour. Presently a typical residential consumer is spending about 21 cents a kilowatt hour for electricity, bundled cost to LIPA. So the cost is a direct passthrough to consumers, and we certainly do want to minimize the cost, but the cost of developing these projects on sites that currently provide cooling to the region also has a consequence. So if you extend the cooling period and you increase the cooling load, you have also indirectly increased the cost of energy to local consumers. So there's a balance that has to be struck.

I do not have an absolute scientific answer for you, Legislator. I don't know what the cost to enXco was to build these projects here, and I don't know what the incremental cost would have been if there was a ground -- if it was a lower ground-mounted system. We could possibly get that information, but that's a LIPA contract, that's not a contract with the County. We only have a land lease with them.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Okay. And I guess the issue is you're right, the cost is always going to get passed through to the ratepayer, but on the front end of the developer, whoever is building that system, they're going to want to build it at the cheaper cost then having to building it at a higher cost and then flip it back to the ratepayer in some fashion or another.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Absolutely.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Thanks, Joe. I mean, it was a very good meeting. As I told you, this is not something I have a lot of knowledge about, but slowly but surely I'm learning more. And I think what's important is it's not just about this solar project that's going on in the County, but to take a look at a bigger picture. I'm kind of looking at this as Suffolk County right now with this Yaphank and the Bellport project and Riverhead. It's being done in a bubble and not really looking outside and saying, you know, a couple of things. We should be leading by example because we're buying all this open space, we're preserving open space, yet when we have open space that we currently own, we're knocking down the trees to do a project that the bottom line is the money.

So what I'm trying to say is that also is these -- you know, the community net metering. I know that we are going to be meeting with the local school district and I know that the meeting that we had with Solar, and, okay, if you're going to do this in North Bellport, why wouldn't the people in North Bellport and the businesses in that immediate area be able to benefit from a community net metering. They could certainly use it.

So my biggest concern is, is that we are piecemealing everything, doing it inside the bubble, not really looking at what's going on around Suffolk County and, as you said, most of the projects are happening in Suffolk County. And if we want to lead by example by doing energy projects like this and smart energy projects, then we should be encouraging people to do what we do, like parking

lots. Because I can tell you I know that there's a gentleman that came to me about cutting down trees in Brookhaven, north end of my district, and there's a lot of outrage. You know, no green for green. I've had conversations with the Supervisor in Brookhaven, who is looking at solar projects within the Town of Brookhaven, on town property, but he says not one tree will be cut down. He's leading by example and I think that's something that we need to step back, take a look what's going on around Suffolk County. Because I know even in the Brookhaven Lab, we all know what was going on there, and it's kind of disturbing and upsetting when you look at that property and you say, "*That was all trees and now look what's going on.*"

So I just think that we are really being very foolish here in Suffolk County if we want to keep moving forward with this. Granted, some of the parts of the project are okay, but to cut down how many acres, 40, 50 acres of trees to do something like this is just insanity. It's pure insanity. And I kind of laugh, too, at that narrative about with more trees today than we did 100 and 150 years ago. If I'm not mistaken, I don't think the Dennison Building was here or any of this industrial park was here, so what was there beforehand? Trees. You know, once you knock them down you're not getting them back.

Too often I hear from people in Suffolk County, "*I moved here from Queens, I moved here from the City, I don't want to live in the City, that's why I'm here.*" So we have to be responsible when it comes to protecting our environment, protecting our surroundings, because that's a big -- we talk about the East End. We've heard it many times from Jay, you know, our environment is one of our biggest draws for visitors.

I certainly appreciate what you've done. You've certainly given us a lot of great information. I know I have a bill in Ways & Means. We really should be looking at these things. We really should be looking at this and saying is this is the smart thing to do. And if people want to support just knocking down trees for solar, you're going to be sorry. You're going to be sorry someday, because I guarantee, somebody 10, 20 years from now is going to come back and say, "*What were they thinking?*" Because we're going to be running out. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thanks, Kate. Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Joe, you said that you're looking at encouraging our partners in other levels of government to develop other, you know, codes to deal with this because obviously it's something that's outside of our purview in terms of that code. What are other parts of the country doing, because we're certainly not leaders in this particular topic, I don't think. Is there other parts of the nation that have developed codes that say carparks or alternative types of processes, or is this something that would be us encouraging the towns to take first steps that haven't been taken before.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

I'm not aware of a coordinated effort that's being suggested here that's being done elsewhere. I am aware that in other parts of the country they are running into problems with utility grid circuit congestion, and it is resulting in a moratorium in some areas on new projects. But, no, I am not familiar with a model that suggests what -- that does what is being suggested here.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

But when you say circuit congestion, the reason the developers of these projects are looking for properties near substations is to avoid that problem; correct?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

No. They're looking for properties near substations to minimize the cost of connecting to those substations, because the RFP's require that that's what they do, connect to the substations.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

But does connecting to the substation avoid a congestion issue because a substation could then handle that load in a different fashion than just feeding into the line or no?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

No. In fact, it was the feeder cables from two separate substations out at Gabreski that were examined by PSEG and were determined to be constrained enough that the project capacity had to be knocked down.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

And it doesn't make sense to just run extra cable?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Very costly, and then the substation would have to be modified to accept the additional cables as well.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Sure, sure. But it's all valued at a different cost, right?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Yep.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Thanks.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay. Legislator Fleming.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I just had one stupid question, another stupid question. When you talked about the peak demand rule, I don't know where it comes from and I don't quite understand it where the amount of capacity that needs to be supplied during peak demand also has to be available at times when there isn't peak demand, or maybe I've got that wrong. Could you just explain it more clearly for me?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

You might be confusing two separate issues. If the Long Island -- if LIPA customers record a demand for electricity that's 6,000 megawatts, then LIPA has to have that 6,000 megawatts to supply that demand. You can't take that capacity offline during the rest of the year. It's still there; it has to be maintained. So you're talking about infrastructure that has to be built to support the demand, and then it has to be maintained to support that demand even when you're not using it.

What you might be thinking about is the independent system operator for the State of New York sets a reserve margin, a reserve capacity that's necessary, and so they have to not only have the 6,000 megawatts, they have to have a percentage above that, and that's determined on an annual basis based on what the projected demand is going to be.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

But isn't there some controversy around that level of capacity?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

I'm not sure.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Didn't LIPA adjust the capacity after -- I think it was after the RFP's -- certainly the South Fork RFP. There was a whole hue and cry that we needed a great deal of energy and it had to do with peak

demand and then they finally needed to adjust that a couple of times. I'm not really clear on where the mistake was made and why it was corrected.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

So I don't know that it was a mistake. It was a difference in opinion. I haven't seen the resource plan that was done by PSEG Long Island, but in their determination the previous planners, on behalf of LIPA at LIPA, were over-planning for resources that were required. Now having said that, one of the things that PSEG noted in its earlier opinion on that matter was that we didn't need a 750-megawatt plant that was proposed by Caithness because we were going to be served during peak demand periods from a 500-megawatt plant that's up in New Paltz, New York, or Newburgh, New York, which is a 1930's vintage coal fired plant that was damaged during Superstorm Sandy that was brought back on-line when capacity markets improved payments to them and then they converted it to natural gas, and now that plant is online and can serve us during peak demand periods, but we're talking about a 1930's vintage plant.

So there's still capacity that was required. We still have a recorded demand for the Long Island control area of just under 6,000 megawatts. That's not going away. It hasn't been revealed since then because the weather conditions have not been the same to reveal that demand. And, again, I would add that was in 2011 during a period of severe economic downturn, so that demand was recorded largely by the residential marketplace. If we get any kind of commercial rebound close to what we're hoping for here in Suffolk County, then the growth in commercial demand is going to compound the demand that's already evident in the residential marketplace, and so your demand could be even higher. Now, again, I don't have a copy of the resource plan that was done by PSEG, I'm not challenging their assessment, but I do have questions.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

You have questions in which direction, that they're not considering enough capacity?

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Well, I have questions as to why -- what their resource mix is here for Long Island and why they determined that to be the best mix here for Long Island.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

There's no other questions. Joe, thank you very much. You're a wealth of information and I feel this is going to be an ongoing process here.

**MR. SCHROEDER:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

All right. Tabled Resolutions.

**Tabled Resolutions**

***IR 1027 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to clarify affordable housing requirements at developments connecting to a County sewer district (Calarco).***

I'll make a motion to table for the purpose of Public Hearing.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

I have a motion and a second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Trotta)**

**Introductory Prime**

***IR 1049 - Approving renewal and extension of ferry license and fares for Tony's Freight Service, Inc. (Pres. Off.).*** Motion by Legislator Muratore to table for purpose of Public Hearing.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

Second by Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Trotta)**

IR 1078 --

**MR. NOLAN:**

What about 1077?

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

Oh, here we go. ***IR 1077 - Authorizing execution of an amended agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 22 – Hauppauge Municipal and Bar Louie (SM-1696)(Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

Motion by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Trotta)**

***IR 1078 - Authorizing execution of an agreement by the Administrative Head of SCSD No. 11 – Selden with 1671 Route 112 - Coram - Retail (BR-1664)(Co. Exec.).*** Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Trotta)**

***IR 1102 - Authorizing the County Executive to enter into an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Town of Babylon for installation and maintenance of pavers and streetscape improvements within Suffolk County's Right-of-Way along CR 2, Straight Path from the vicinity of Mount Avenue to the vicinity of Washington Avenue (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :**

Motion by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Second by Legislator Muratore. Is there anyone here from DPW who could give us an explanation of the terms of the agreement or the conditions? Mr. Hillman, welcome.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

Hello. Good afternoon. In conjunction with the Wyandanch Rising project, the town would like I'll say an upgraded portion of the CR 2 in the immediate vicinity of the Wyandanch Rising project, such as park benches, trash receptacles, brick pavers, street lighting, decorative street lighting, things that the department generally does not install on our roadway and have limited resources to maintain. So the town was willing to maintain those appurtenances, and this is just an agreement allowing us to execute the installation of those streetscaping.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

And what are the terms of the agreement? It's not like a ten-year agreement or something.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

No, it's -- I believe it's in perpetuity, but it can be canceled. I think -- Bob do you have any?

**MR. BRAUN:**

I'm sorry, I don't.

**MR. HILLMAN:**

No. It may be able to be canceled by either party. Usually it has that language, but clearly if it was canceled by the town or they didn't, you know, maintain it in an appropriate manner, the appurtenances would be removed from the right-of-way.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. All right, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Trotta)**

We might have another question for you.

***IR 1107 - Accepting New York State Marchiselli funding; amending Resolution No. 1262-2010 in connection with the replacement of CR 16, Horseblock Road over the LIRR bridge, Town of Brookhaven (CP 5850)(Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. MURATORE:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Trotta)**

***IR 1135 - Accepting and appropriating 100% New York State Department of Transportation Accelerated Transit Capital (ATC) Funds for the purchase of public paratransit vehicles and amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program (CP 5658)(Co.***

*Exec.)*.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion by Legislator Fleming.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Second by Legislator Stern. On that motion, and there's another one with it, if you could just briefly. How many buses are we buying? And is this -- are we -- will the fleet be up to speed on the new buses?

**MR. HILLMAN:**

I believe Deputy Commissioner Tyson can answer those questions.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Welcome.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Thank you. Good afternoon. So the two resolutions, IR 1135 and 1136, combine to potentially purchase about 50 paratransit vehicles.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay. And then how many more will we need to replace the old ones?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Right. I mean, I think --

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Ballpark.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah. They both sort of go to meet the goal. That actual number, the total number, I don't have it. I have to get it.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay. All right, thank you. So we have a motion and a second on 1135.

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Trotta)**

***IR 1136 - Accepting and appropriating Federal and State Aid and County funds for the purchase of Public Paratransit Vehicles (CP 5658)(Co. Exec.)***.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Trotta)**

**IR 1158 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law amending provisions relating to the administration and enforcement of the Uniform Fire Prevention and Building Code (Pres. Off.).** I'll make a motion to table for Public Hearing.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Trotta)**

Is there any other business to be had here? I move to adjourn. Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

I'm sorry. I just wanted to make one quick comment.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

So I know that a couple of the speakers earlier mentioned the loss of the S-20 along Montauk -- I'm sorry, the N-19 along Montauk Highway.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Yes.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

And actually starting today the S-20 started covering that portion of the route.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Oh, thank you.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

You know, so to operate hourly it won't operate as late as the, you know, as the N-19 did or seven days a week, but it's a start to recover service that was lost in January.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

How do you do the outreach on something like that? I mean, now I know, but that's not going to help anyone.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah. I mean, that information is up on the Suffolk Transit website if you go there. There is a link that tells you about the S-20 change.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay, good. Thank you.

All right, we're adjourned.

**(\*The meeting was adjourned at 3:21 P.M.\*).**

{ } Denotes spelled phonetically