PUBLIC WORKS, TRANSPORTATION & ENERGY COMMITTEE

OF THE

SUFFOLK COUNTY LEGISLATURE

MINUTES

A meeting of the Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee of the Suffolk County Legislature was held in the Evans K. Griffing County Center, in the Maxine Postal Legislative Auditorium, 300 Center Drive, Riverhead, New York on May 2, 2016.

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Leg. Al Krupski, Chairperson
Leg. Thomas Muratore, Vice Chair (excused absence)
Leg. Robert Calarco
Leg. Steven H. Stern
Leg. Robert Trotta
Leg. Bridget Fleming
Leg. Kate M. Browning

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:
Leg. Leslie Kennedy, 12th Legislative District
George M. Nolan, Counsel to the Legislature
Jason Richberg, Clerk of the Legislature
Amy Ellis, Chief Deputy Clerk/Legislature
Robert Lipp, Director/Budget Review Office
Gil Anderson, Commissioner/Department of Public Works
Katie Horst, County Executive's Office
Michael Pitcher, Director of Communications/PO
Catherine Stark, Aide to Leg. Krupski
John Stype, Aide to Leg. Krupski
Gwynn Schroeder, Aide to Leg. Krupski
Robert Martinez, Aide to Leg. Muratore
Deborah Harris, Aide to Leg. Stern
Elizabeth Sutton, Aide to Leg. Fleming
Robert Braun, Deputy Bureau Chief/County Attorney's Office
Dave Schwartz, Newsday
Chris Pickerall, Director/Cornell Marine Program
Carolyn Sukowski, Water Quality Program Coordinator
George Bartunek, Town of Riverhead
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:
Diana Flesher, Court Stenographer

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER AT 2:03 PM

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Trotta.

SALUTATION

So welcome to the regular Committee meeting of Public Works, Transportation and Energy. I don't have any cards. Is there anyone in the public who would like to address the Committee before we start? Seeing none, we do have a presentation from Cornell about stormwater.
Welcome.

PRESENTATION

MR. PICKERALL:
Okay. Well, first I want to thank you all for actually coming out east. I really appreciate that. It makes it a lot easier for us. We have our main office in Riverhead, although we're throughout Suffolk County, my office is right out here. So, it's nice to have you out here and I really appreciate that.

What I wanted to do before I start, my name is Chris Pickerall. I'm the Director of the Marine Program at Cornell Cooperative Extension of Suffolk County. As you probably know, Cooperative Extension is a contract agency of Suffolk County. We get our core funding from the County, so thank you for that. We match that with a number of grants and contracts to basically multiply it by five times so we're creating jobs out here.

Within the Marine Program we have about 50 full-time employees, again, working throughout Suffolk. So today we're going to focus on stormwater, the work we do with Suffolk County, but I do want to bring your attention to some other thing just quickly: That being, where we're located. Obviously we're in Riverhead today but we have sites throughout Suffolk, north and south forks as well as the north shore and the south shore. So we're trying to spread as much as we can throughout the County and get that coverage. We realize the bulk of the population is on the West End so we need to service them as much as we can so we're trying.

In terms of programs within the Marine Program, I'm not going to really spend much of any time on this. I just wanted to make you aware of the breadth of what we do on a daily basis throughout Suffolk County. We can speak to any one of these issues in the future if you are interested for any reason, but our programs basically focus on a number of things. Near and dear to my heart is habitat restoration, so things like eelgrass restoration, salt marsh work, we're doing a very large project in the Shinnecock Indian Reservation right now, working with them. Actually I just changed from my work clothes to these clothes to make a presentation. We work with the fisheries as well so commercial fishing throughout Long Island and the northeastern region so New England as well. So the fish that are caught offshore are caught by fishermen from New York and Rhode Island and Massachusetts and we all work together.

We do things like help to remove derelict lobster pots from Long Island Sound, which we know there was a strong lobster fishery back in the day, but not so much anymore so we're in the process of helping to remove those. Aquaculture: You may have heard of our spat program where we get adult volunteers involved with raising shellfish and creating stewards. And we had the scallop project, again, funded by Suffolk County. Thank you for that. And then all of our work involves education, citizen science so we try to bring that into play. So we have horseshoe crab monitoring as well as work with, like I said, the spat and marine meadows.

And then finally water quality. Without water quality none of this exists so we have a water quality lab at Cedar Beach in Southold looking at choleriform bacteria. But with that I'll get over to the reason why we're here today and hand it over Carolyn Sukowski.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
Good afternoon. Thanks, Chris. First, I'd like, again, to thank the Committee for having us today to present. I'm Carolyn Sukowski from Cornell Cooperative Extension of Suffolk County's Marine Program. I am the Water Quality Program Coordinator. We work with various municipalities across Suffolk County to provide our expertise in stormwater management. As for the Suffolk County Stormwater Management Program, we coordinate with the Department of Economic Development and Planning as well as the Department of Public Works to ensure that the requirements of the Phase II USEPA Program are met here in Suffolk County.

I'd like to thank Suffolk County for their continued support of the Stormwater Management Program through the Suffolk County Water Quality Protection and Restoration Program. As I mentioned, we work closely with the Department of Public Works who oversees all stages of stormwater remediation projects from concept to completion including design, permitting, implementation and inspections while Cornell Cooperative Extension assists DPW addressing all other aspects of the Stormwater Management Program.

To review, the Cleanwater Act was passed in 1972. In 1987 it was amended to incorporate stormwater discharge management. Thus came about the USCPA's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit Program, which made it illegal for municipal and industrial entities to discharge stormwater without a permit. This permit requires that municipalities with separate storm sewer systems, otherwise known as MS4s, they're all based on water management plan that is designed to reduce or prevent the discharge of contaminants from their storm sewer systems and to document, evaluate and report on their stormwater programs.

Municipalities must include the six EPA minimum control measures indicated and which I will go into in a bit more detail shortly. The requirements of the USCPA's national program are delegated to the states. And the priorities of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservations MS4 Program include shellfish fishery closures, which as everyone here knows, many productive shellfish beds are closed due to pathogen contamination. In Suffolk County there are 86 impaired water bodies due to stormwater run-off. More than 50% of Suffolk County estuaries are impaired due to stormwater. All but one of these are classified as SA waters, meaning that these are shellfish harvesting waters.

Beach closures are another priority. Unquestionably beaches are vitals assets to Suffolk County's tourism industry. And it is for that reason that when they are closed due to stormwater contamination, it should be a concern to all Long Islanders. Beach closures and the reasons they close not only have a direct adverse economic impacts, but if the beaches are not open quickly and the causes of the closure's not remedied, this can damage public perception of Suffolk County's resources and water bodies.

All impaired waters are priorities, most of which are impaired due to pathogens and nitrogen. I'd like to make a note than when the MS4 Program was first implemented, municipalities were not really built to handle all aspects of the program. Most municipalities, including the County, did not have an internal mechanism to be able to meet all mandates of the MS4 permit. Cornell Cooperative Extension has served a need as a collaborator with the Department of Public Works and coordinator for the program.

It is important to remember that anything that enters the storm sewer system is discharged untreated into our harbors and bays that the public uses for swimming and fishing and into

groundwater that provides our drinking water. So the first two control measures required of MS4s are to educate and involve the public in this problem. Because while local governments are tasked with meeting the MS4 requirements, individuals can make a difference as well.

So Cornell Cooperative Extension educates the public on these issues by offering programs at schools and libraries; and also by manning displays at fairs and festivals among other methods across the County.
We talk about things like how to reduce run-off from a homeowners property through the use of rain barrels, rain gardens; pesticides and fertilizers should be used sparingly; auto leaks should be repaired quickly; everyone should be reminded to always clean up after their pet and why not to feed water fowl to name a few things. With the great burden of compliance on municipalities, a little help from residents can go a long way.

Additional outreach efforts include the Suffolk County Stormwater Management Demonstration Site at the Suffolk County Farm in Yaphank, which features a rain barrel and native plant rain garden, a green roof, examples of permeable pavement and homeowner -- as well as educational kiosks. In more recent years we have implemented the Rain Garden Installation Program where our educators visit a local school to install a rain garden on-site with students. We also maintain an extensive website for the Suffolk County Stormwater Management website.

Elicit discharge detection and elimination, otherwise known as IDDE, is the third EPA measure and a key requirement of the MS4 Program. As part of the IDDE Program, Cornell Cooperative Extension collects storm sewer system data and conducts monitoring of stormwater outfall pipes and structures to identify if elicit discharges are occurring. As Chris mentioned, our unique stormwater program allows us to track bacteria sources to identify the origin of any fecal contamination.

This map indicates the County surface water outfalls as well as priority water bodies and watersheds set forth by the New York State DEC. I'd like to add that this map does not include all impaired waters, just those prioritized by the New York State DEC. CCE has increased effort for the IDDE Program within these watershed improvement strategy areas by increasing monitoring and sampling efforts.

Cornell Cooperative Extension's GIS specialist, Mike Sautkulis, has maintained the Suffolk County stormwater management database so that to date all outfalls and associated data have been mapped. All structures such as catch basins and piping and associated data have been mapped; in addition stewardship delineations have been completed. Having this data in a database in a useable form allows us to be able to assess problem areas as well as hot spot -- to identify hot spots and to (inaudible) to the required watershed modeling. This data also allows the County program to better understand how it fits in with other municipalities within our watersheds.

The fourth and fifth EPA measures involve controlling stormwater run-off at active construction sites as well as to implement a stormwater retrofit program. As I had mentioned earlier Department of Public Works implements these remediation efforts through water quality projects while Cornell Cooperative Extension focuses on creating guidance documents and on producing materials for contractor training, to educate on how pollutant run-off can be controlled during these activities.

CCE also aids in tracking efforts in creating structure inventories. This map indicates stormwater structures located within County sewer sheds that have been installed as part of water quality projects. This inventory of what are known as post construction structures is a requirement of the MS4 Program but also aids in inspection and maintenance tracking. In an effort to determine pollutant loads to impaired water bodies from Suffolk County storm sewer system, watershed data and information on County stormwater management practices has been collected and input into the watershed treatment model. This is a model that is a tool -- a management tool of the New York

State DEC.

The sixth and final EPA measure is pollution prevention and good housekeeping for municipal operations. All county DPW and Parks Department staff have been trained by Cornell Cooperative Extension educators in stormwater best management practices for municipal operations including municipal vehicle maintenance and washing grounds and parking lot maintenance, materials, management and storage as well as spill response and prevention. Draining is conducted on a scheduled basis.

Additionally CC has continued working together with DPW and Parks Department staff to conduct site assessments of Suffolk County municipal operations and maintenance facilities in order to assess stormwater best management practices. A self-assessment checklist has been created and used in evaluating practices at Suffolk County's Stormwater Department of Public Works facilities. Stormwater pollution prevention plans, otherwise known as SWPPs, have been developed by CCE for each county DPW facility based on these assessments. We are currently working together with the Parks Department staff to develop SWPPs for parks facilities as well.

I'd just like to conclude here and say that these aspects of the Suffolk County's Stormwater Management Program that Cornell Cooperative Extension is assisting the County in are measurable. Progress towards meeting pollutant reduction goals is being made as a result of our program. This measurable progress towards reducing pollutant loading to our harbors and bays in Suffolk County through the continued implementation of this program with CCE's assistance not only improves water quality, but is an efficient use of resources to address our water quality issues pertaining to stormwater run-off.

The implementation of this program by Suffolk County and Cornell Cooperative Extension of Suffolk County's Marine Program has been a successful partnership. I'd like to report back to you some feedback that the County Stormwater Management Program has received from the New York State DEC and that is "the County Stormwater Program is among the best on Long Island. It is good example of intelligent planning, wise management and dedicated professionals. The County stormwater staff are highly respected."

Thank you again for your continued support and for having us here today.

MR. PICKERALL:
Thank you. Any questions?

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Oh, okay. (Laughter)

MR. PICKERALL:
You don't have to.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
I was going ask if that was Legislator Stern on the shovel earlier. (Laughter) Does anyone have any questions?

LEG. TROTTA:
I do. I notice only one little dot up on the north shore like in Fort -- what is that, Fresh Pond up there?

MR. PICKERALL:
Let me go back to that.

LEG. TROTTA:
That one (referring). There's nothing where I am. You're not doing anything in the Nissequogue River?

MS. SUKOWSKI:
This map indicates where we have the Suffolk County stormwater sewershed areas, which means that these are water quality stormwater management practices where -- that connect to an outfall to a surface water. So, no, there are no outfall locations in that area.

MR. PICKERALL:
That's a good thing actually.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
Yeah (laughter).

LEG. TROTTA:
What are you talking about, like where the road run-off runs into the --

MR. PICKERALL:
Exactly, direct beeline for the water.

LEG. TROTTA:
Does it have to be on a county road?

MR. PICKERALL:
Well, in this case we're contracted with Suffolk County to do that. So this is covering the County portion of what's going on.

LEG. TROTTA:
Well, there are -- there's many in Kings Park where it runs right into the Sound.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
From town and village roads.

LEG. TROTTA:
Yes.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
Yes, that would be under the jurisdiction of the towns and villages.

LEG. TROTTA:
So it's only County roads?

MS. SUKOWSKI:
Correct.

MR. PICKERALL:
We're contracted to do the County work. We're working with you guys specifically to do that.

LEG. TROTTA:
So I guess the County road turns into a town road down --

MS. SUKOWSKI:
Correct, yes.

LEG. TROTTA:
All right.

MR. PICKERALL:
And also the differences well up there is is the moraines. So most of the water seems to be heading south from the Island obviously unless you're close to the bluffs and within the watersheds.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Again, thank you for your work, Carolyn, and Chris. I'm very familiar with your work and the way you work with DPW. And also, you know -- and I don't know if you said it earlier or not, but I just want to repeat it, or if you didn't say it, that some of this stormwater work has resulted in opening of shellfish lands that have been previously closed to contamination. So it's very important. I know the Hashamomuck and also the Mattituck Inlet, it's -- the County's made some improvements there that have resulted in shellfish opening. So that's -- that's really appreciated. So that nice quote from the DEC is definitely not overstated. This is very important work.

I have a question about the priority for eliminating the outfalls. Do you -- is there a -- do you work with the municipalities to say this is an important -- this is an important area? Because, I mean, obviously you can't do all 372 next week. So how do you target the next one that's going to be worked on?

MS. SUKOWSKI:
We -- we do actually visit all outfalls within these watershed improvement strategy areas annually to monitor and identify if there are any focused areas to focus in on. If there are areas, because it can change year to year, if there are significant problem areas or anything that we find through our monitoring efforts or something that could imply that there is elicit discharges or any kind of pollutant entering the system, we do sample and those outfalls are visited on a scheduled basis throughout the year.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:
I can never complain about the work that you guys do, especially Bellport Bay, the aquaculture, you're doing a phenomenal job. But I know our Commissioner's here. And it's funny, just as I was leaving my office, you know, we're in the process of working on our capital budget. And William Floyd Parkway, as it -- the drainage, as it's gone out, there is a pipe that goes out to the Unkechaug Creek.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
U-hum.

LEG. BROWNING:
Are you guys monitoring that one?

MS. SUKOWSKI:
If it goes into the -- if it does go into the creek, then yes.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
It's that yellow dot there, Kate. (Laughter)

LEG. BROWNING:
There's a lot of yellow dots in my district.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
Here it is. That would be over -- over in this area, correct.

LEG. BROWNING:
No, no, we'd be way down south down -- probably -- actually one of those two dots, or three dots, whatever those dots are.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
Yes, at the end of William Floyd. I apologize. Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
So -- right, because there's, you know -- and that's funny, I was just talking about it before I left my office about a drainage program that's been proposed for William Floyd Parkway.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
And it keeps getting pushed back and pushed back.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
A-hum.

LEG. BROWNING:
And -- so I'd -- I'd like to see any information you have regarding the Unkechaug Creek because that is -- the stormwater mitigation program that's being proposed for William Floyd Parkway does have an effect on that. So, I appreciate it. Thank you.

MS. SUKOWSKI:
Sure. Of course.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All right, if we don't have any other questions, thank you very much.

MR. PICKERALL:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Keep up the good work.

MR. PICKERALL:
Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All right onto Tabled Resolutions -- before we start Tabled Resolutions, is there -- and I know people came in a little later, is there anyone here who would like to -- we'll extend the Public Portion -- address the Committee with any concerns? All right, yes. And, George, if you can fill out a card later.

PUBLIC PORTION

MR. BARTUNEK:
Yeah, my name is George Bartunek and I was a Riverhead Town Board member. And I've been working with the -- what they call the Alternative Transportation Advisory Committee in the Town of Riverhead. And as you are probably aware, we've been trying to finish a recreation path, passive recreation path around EPCAL. And I just want to thank this Committee. I assume, Mr. Krupski, that the -- this is the committee that probably reviewed our request for a grant from the County initially. And I just want to thank you for that grant. You may be aware that we did apply for a grant last year through the federal trade -- through the Federal Trails Program for $200,000. And that was declined. That was denied. And we would -- naturally the plan is to use the County money as the matching, which would be required for any kind of a grant like that. And just for your information we are applying for another grant again in June. But, again, I want to thank this Committee for supporting that. It will be a great trail when it's -- when it's finally completed.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
George, thanks for your work on that. Because that is, like you said, that's a great safe off-the-road trail when it gets done. So, thank you for that.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

All right, so we'll move onto 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).** Motion to table Legislator Calarco. Is there a second? Second, Legislator Trotta. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1247, Amending Resolution No. 1053-2015 to accept a donation of twenty to twenty four (20-24) bike lockers from the New York State Department of Transportation. (Co. Exec.)

LEG. TROTTA:
Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Motion to table. Same motion, same second? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1322, (Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A) Local Law to further incentivize the creation of affordable housing. (Calarco) Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

INTRODUCTORY RESOLUTIONS

Onto the new resolutions. **IR 1342, Calling for a public hearing for the purpose of increasing and improving facilities for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 16 Yaphank (Municipal) (CP 8158). (Co. Exec.)** Motion by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Second by Legislator Stern. Do we have any questions for the Commissioner? Hearing none, all in

favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1356, Appropriating funds and accepting Federal Aid (80%), State Aid (10%), and serial bonds (10%) for the purchase and installation of bus shelters (CP 5651). (Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Fleming; second by Legislator Calarco. On the motion, Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:
If I could, through the Chair, ask a question of the Commissioner. So when we're going to be installing these bus shelters, to what extent does a community have a say in design and location of the shelters?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Generally the community or the ridership will actually give us an idea of where exactly we're going to place them or where they're needed. We'll get a written request, if an actual shelter's needed there. If this is a whole new stop, obviously that's a little more involved and that, you know, there's change to the bus route, a lot of those things that need to be taken into consideration. But specifically for a bus shelter, if we know we have a shelter that warrants placement at a location, we generally try to, if it's on a local road, make sure that the municipality is okay with it, that they're willing to help us with maintenance of it, things like that. But in general the placement -- specific placement, whether it's five, ten feet off the road would depend on how wide the right-of-way is from, say, the curb line back to the property line, if we have to get additional land, things like that.

LEG. FLEMING:
And some of the feedback that we get and some of my colleagues as well who aren't on this Committee ask me -- a colleague asked me to put the question as well, I think we can improve community outreach with regard to ridership and where those -- where those shelters need to be. I know resources are limited. So to the extent that we can improve communication with the community on that, I think, it would be -- you know, everyone would benefit. Going through the local municipality is probably a good place to start. I know from Southampton, for instance, working with the Director of Transportation, you know, the folks who have sort of their finger on the pulse of the public ridership may be able to give you some input. So I'd appreciate careful attention to that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Sure. And certainly any type of written documentation with a request, you know, you can forward that to me, we'll make sure it's looked into so that we can at least before we start the discussions, you know, vet any potential construct-ability issues.

LEG. FLEMING:
Are there any notice provisions? Do you notice the ridership at all when you're considering that kind of an investment?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I honestly don't know. I don't know. I know if it's a new bus stop, we have to notice the ridership, you know, 30 days in advance but an actual placement of a shelter, I don't know.

LEG. FLEMING:
Understood. Thanks. Another colleague had a question with regard to design, does the local municipality or -- is there any protocol for input from the local municipality or from the community?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Generally I wouldn't think so. We have a standard design that we have gone out to bid with. In some cases if somebody wants to construct a bus stop shelter, we'll consider it as long as it has

enough sufficient room, ADA access, things like that. But for the most part we have a standard design we've been using. Certainly if there's issues that we can address, you know, we'll try to do that.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
You see, the Commissioner told me, as far as the design goes, they all agree they should be the same. It's a coincidence. (Laughter)

LEG. FLEMING:
Well, I would like to pass that onto at least one other colleague who may be in touch with you with regard --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Sure.

LEG. FLEMING:
-- to the design. I mean, I think what we're looking at today is just approving the resolution for the acceptance of federal and state funds -- oh, no, we're bonding it as well. Well, I hope before Tuesday we'll be able to get in touch with you if there are any further concerns.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Sure.

LEG. FLEMING:
Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:
I was up in Terryville, Port Jeff area on 347 going on the west side of 112.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay.

LEG. BROWNING:
And all that new construction that was done there, there's the nice solar lighting in the middle of the road. And I noticed the bus shelters. And I said "look how much nicer they look." Who put those in?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
New York State DOT.

LEG. BROWNING:
They're state ones?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yep.

LEG. BROWNING:
They look a lot better than what we have and --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, I would tend to disagree. We have a different design. Their's is a lot fancier, it's got, you know -- but, again, then it becomes to -- as to who is going to maintain them. Our ability to maintain a photovoltaic light is limited, you know, the structures -- they didn't really ask for a lot of

input from us. This was the design that they --

LEG. BROWNING:
No, the bus shelters.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The bus shelters, yeah.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay. Because they -- they certainly do look much nicer. Some of the ones that we have are decrepit and I know -- I do get people who will call and say *get rid of the bus shelter because people are sitting on them.* I know you've traveled in other countries and you'll see bus shelters where they don't necessarily have seats but they have kind of like a bar that --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
-- people can kind of rest against.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yep.

LEG. BROWNING:
But it prevents people from sleeping at night on them.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. BROWNING:
So, have you looked at things like that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah. And I know firsthand we looked at that compared to the small bench that we have on there now that has those little bars across them to minimize anybody sleeping on them. So we have looked at both of them. The design we came up with is, you know, certainly the one we felt was adequate. We could look at the state one and compare it. But right now the current contract we have is for the one that we put out, the one we can maintain. The state's, again, there was no real discussion on their part. They were just putting this in. This is where they put it up. I mean, their's is a capital project as is this, but we feel ours is adequate. If you'd like us to look at it, we'll be glad to look at it.

LEG. BROWNING:
I think so. I mean, when you're driving down that road since they've done the reconstruction, you know, the solar lights in the middle, it all just looks so much better, more uniform, cleaner. I just think that sometimes our roads are looking so haphazard and, again, I'm not going to criticize you for this. I know it's a staffing issue. But the sand buildup on the roads, you know, and people shouldn't be dumping their garbage, but it's happening. And I don't know the last time I seen a street sweeper on William Floyd Parkway. And the sand is building up outside the funeral parlor. It's, you know, it's getting shoved out onto the grass median there on the sidewalk. And, you know, it's -- everything is just looking so horrible. And I'm getting a lot of complaints about it. But, you know, the bus shelters, that's another thing, they're ugly. And so we really should have something a bit more pleasing looking.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, let me ask you, have you seen any of the new bus shelters that we put up?

LEG. BROWNING:
I don't think I've seen them, no.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I can get you pictures.

LEG. BROWNING:
I don't think they're in my district. (Laughter)

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
They're gorgeous. They're better than the state's.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay, well, hurry up and get me some. (Laughter)

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay.

LEG. BROWNING:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Maybe I shouldn't say this, then, but thank you for the new bus shelters, Commissioner. (Laughter) But as far as any kind of answers, what both my colleagues were talking about, the timing and the -- and how it is to put -- what it takes to put a shelter in and the amount of -- there was a group of students that were in high school, and they formed Project Bus Stop and they, you know, they approached us and they said, "look, is it possible to put in a number of bus stops throughout Southold Town?" And we said, "oh, you know, absolutely, we'll work with the Commissioner." And I've worked with the Commissioner on these issues before. And it was only last week that a couple of them went in. And it was a cause for a great celebration because it was good to have students see that -- you know, government at work because you had, you know, New York State DOT; you had DPW, who really did the work; you had, you know, private landowners; and then you had all that community involvement. So it was really a good process, but certainly not a short one. And I know there's a few other -- of the really nice, beautiful high-tech bus shelters that are going to go in, too.

LEG. FLEMING:
So, I guess my question with regard to location, really was about the ridership and not so much the aesthetics. So it sounds as though, you know, if you're working with the transportation and you know where the bus stops need to be, then that's what makes sense. But, I mean, this a real -- not only a quality of life, this is a safety and health issue for folks who don't have any choice but to sit at a bus stop if there isn't a shelter and they're rained on; or if there's not somewhere to sit and they can't stand for a long period of time, that's a serious health issue.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Absolutely.

LEG. FLEMING:
So that's really where my question was. And I've had groups come to me even in the short time I've been on the Legislature saying we need a shelter in this location or that location where they're

not. So I hope we can come -- I think we can always improve the protocol for outreach to the community, especially in an area where it's the community that depends so much on the specifics of the installations. And to the extent that I can be helpful, I'd love to; but I know we have great advocates for public transportation in the audience today, who I'm sure you may or may not know, but if you need more information on it, I'd love to help. We gotta make sure the shelters are where they need to be and they're actually doing their job, which is sheltering people while they're waiting sometimes a very long time for the Suffolk County bus.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay.

LEG. FLEMING:
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Thank you. So did we pass that? We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

And no stranger to the bus shelter discussion, Supervisor Russell came in. Would you like to address the Committee, Scott?

MR. RUSSELL:
I'm here to listen.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
No, no, no. On anything?

SUPERVISOR RUSSELL:
Actually I'm here to listen.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Okay. All right. Very good.

All right, **IR 1358, Appropriating funds in connection with Water Quality Protection and Restoration Program Nissequogue Tributary Headwaters (CP 8710). (Co. Exec.)** Is there a motion?

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Motion by Legislator Calarco; second by Legislator Trotta. Any questions?

LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah. What is this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is a request for funding to allow us to construct the next phase of the northeast branch of the Nissequogue River cleanup. We've been -- Legislator Kennedy -- Kennedys have both been very much involved in this project. This is now taking it from the Village of the Branch section of the river

and bringing it into the County lands. And we've worked through the design. We've built design ready to go to construction. And this is requesting this 1.273 million is --

LEG. TROTTA:
What is it? What are you going to do?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Essentially what they're doing is over the years a lot of sediments have gone through and raised the riverbed, you know, six inches, a foot, whatever, based on how far they are away from actual roadways. A lot of the sand that was mentioned earlier goes into those, you know, directly. So it's -- we're not allowed to deepen or widen the riverbed but we're -- basically what we're doing is removing all the sediments that were -- off the roads, if you will, and impacting the flow of the river. And the intent is that improving the flow will move water through the area and reduce any potential flooding damages to the homes that are nearby.

LEG. TROTTA:
Has it been working?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I would -- from what I've been told, yes, the areas that are up in the Village of the Branch have been successful. They've kept it out. I would suggest, you know, reaching out to Legislator Kennedy.

LEG. TROTTA:
So you can't touch --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We can't go beyond --

LEG. TROTTA:
Wider or deeper?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, we're not permitted to.

LEG. TROTTA:
How do you know what it was?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
They do cores and the material's different. The sand, say from the sweeping sand is usually very fine material whereas the -- the original riverbed will have different gradation of stones, different types of stones.

LEG. TROTTA:
We hire someone to do this, I'm assuming, they come in and clean it out?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, there's going to be a contractor that's going to have to come in and do it, yeah. Generally the -- one of the -- one of the previous projects was a small handheld dredge that basically came down the river and removed the material.

LEG. TROTTA:
So this is like in Blydenburg Park in there?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's to the -- you know where Mill Pond is? Where Maple --

LEG. TROTTA:
Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's from Mill Pond across 111, a little bit into the Village of the Branch.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
Yeah, thank you. So this is a phase --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. STERN:
-- of the overall project. This -- the total number here is almost 1.3 million.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. STERN:
How many more phases do you anticipate? Is it part of one big overall project that's going to be implemented over time? Or is this just an ongoing? Is there always another phase to be done?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, it's probably two answers to your question there. Will there always be a need for this type of work? Yeah. Yes. Your -- you know, always -- the sediments are always going to get into the -- into the riverbeds. The state and as you heard earlier the County, we're putting in facilities that will collect that material before it gets downstream so hopefully that will be minimized. But at some point, 30, 40 years from now, somebody may have to go back in there and open up these streambeds again.

As far as future phases, getting further down the river is something that's been talked about. I don't know honestly whether or not there's another phase planned at this point. This was the -- we went up to the weir on the Mill Pond. And I don't think we've planned on going any farther to the north from there.

LEG. STERN:
Do you think at this point that this -- the dollar figure that is the subject of this appropriation will be the total number for this phase of the northeast branch?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. STERN:
Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1359, Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating additional funds in connection with Pavement Resurfacing of CR 100, Suffolk Avenue from the vicinity of Washington Avenue to the vicinity of NY 454 (CP 5599, PIN 076084). (Co. Exec.) Is there a motion? Motion by Legislator Stern. I'll second the motion. Could we change it to New Suffolk Avenue and get that paving done? (Laughter) Any question? No, no, questions, all right. I don't sense the support for changing that so, all in favor? Opposed? Abstention? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1360, Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Strengthening and Improving County Roads (CP 5014). (Co. Exec.) Same motion, same second. No comment? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1374, Appropriating funds in connection with Energy Conservation at Various County Facilities (CP 1664). (Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second.

LEG. TROTTA:
On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Legislator Trotta, go ahead.

LEG. TROTTA:
Do you have any specifics about this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. Bear with me. These are miscellaneous -- $2 million for miscellaneous energy projects; one of them being the photovoltaic systems on the Leg building; chiller upgrades at Police Headquarters and the Labor Department. And then a building management system installed at various buildings as well as improved lighting through LED lighting at various buildings.

LEG. TROTTA:
This is this project, the guy that we have who comes around and says "this is how you save energy."

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. This is actually more -- our in-house staff has looked at this and said these are improvements that we could make to our facilities that wouldn't -- there would be cost savings. Whether it's through the LED lighting, the new chillers, where we actually in this facility, at our Riverhead County Center we've been putting in new HVAC systems that are more efficient and save the County money.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
These are really long-term investments.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
So, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

1375, Appropriating funds in connection with the Replacement/Clean-up of Fossil Fuel, Toxic and Hazardous Material Storage Tanks (CP 1706). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Stern.

LEG. FLEMING:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Second by Legislator Fleming. Is anyone interested where all these tanks are? Okay, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Let's make sure I get to the right one. Sorry. Yes, these -- as the title states, this is requesting $200,000 for construction or removal of oil tanks at Cohalan Courts, Medical Examiner's Building, the Labor Building and the Old Infirmary. It's an ongoing Capital Program that we, you know, we look for funding every year or every other year depending on our needs. And there's, you know, with five million plus square foot of buildings that we have, we're always finding new underground tanks as well as needing to upgrade or retrofit the existing package.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Thank you. All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1376, Appropriating funds in connection with installation of Fire, Security and Emergency Systems at County Facilities (CP 1710). (Co. Exec.)

LEG. BROWNING:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Motion by Legislator Browning; second by Legislator Stern. Any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1377, Appropriating funds in connection with improvements to the Riverhead County Center Sewers, Pump Station and Force Main (CP 8142). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Fleming; second by Legislator Trotta. Any questions? Seems self-explanatory. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1378, Transferring Escrow Account Revenue Funds to the Capital Fund, amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest Outfall Project Construction (CP 8108). (Co. Exec.)

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Motion by Legislator Calarco; second by Legislator Stern. No questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1379, Transferring Escrow Account Revenue Funds to the Capital Fund, amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for expansion to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest Expansion Project Construction (CP 8183). (Co. Exec).

LEG. CALARCO:
Motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Same motion, same second. Is this expansion -- what are we expanding on, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is part of the expansion of the Southwest Sewer District Treatment Plant at Bergen Point. We're looking to -- and we are in the process of actually adding on tankage, getting ourselves an additional ten-plus million gallons per day of capacity at the plant. And this funding is for some additional work that we feel we can do to, you know, improve the -- improve the process as well as needed maintenance work on the facility.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Is it a different level of treatment or is it just a volume improvement?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
At this point it's a capacity issue.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All right.

LEG. STERN:
And, Commissioner, at what point when -- when the expansion is complete, what would you say, what is the projected total capacity?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right now we're looking at 41 million gallons per day will be the new maximum capacity. However, and you'll see later on there's another piece of legislation, we're also looking to add additional -- two additional clarifiers, which will not only improve the process, but it'll give us additional capacity, possibly up to 45 million gallons per day, I believe, is what I was told.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
We're taking this from smaller sewer funds; from sewer districts, this money? Like I'm reading --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
This is escrow, yeah, that -- what we're doing is using these funds -- I believe these funds come in as either connection fees or something like that.

LEG. TROTTA:
Are these fees -- are these places using the Southwest Sewer District?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, they're -- what happens in a lot of the cases, these places will use the ASF funding, that assessment stabilization funding. So we felt we'd use the escrow funds to help the Southwest Sewer District.

LEG. TROTTA:
Are we allowed to do that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe we are.

LEG. TROTTA:
Counsel? Dr. Lipp?

MR. NOLAN:
I think that's a good question to be honest with you.

LEG. TROTTA:
I'm full of good questions. (Laughter) I'm full of a lot of stuff.

MR. NOLAN:
But that's something I'm going to have to look into.

LEG. TROTTA:
I mean, it seems to me that if, you know, one sewer district is running something up, then we're taking money from it.

MR. NOLAN:
It think it's a legitimate question, which I'll look at this week.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'm pretty sure it would have been just -- I can check as well and I will.

MR. NOLAN:
I don't know the answer --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah.

MR. NOLAN:
But the fact you're taking escrow accounts from, appears to be other projects that are not related to Southwest --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

MR. NOLAN:
-- it just raises a question in my mind.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, absolutely. I'll get an answer on that as well. Because I would envision this went before the County Attorney's Office before we vetted it but --

LEG. TROTTA:
So did Chief Burke.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Legislator Browning, you have a question?

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Huh. Or a statement?

LEG. BROWNING:
No. Expansion -- because you said this is to expand capacity. And the capacity for who and for what?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's -- okay, this would be for the Southwest Sewer District number three. So that's where -- and, again, that -- that additional capacity is available to outside areas to connect in.

LEG. BROWNING:
Like Ronkonkoma Hub?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Like Ronkonkoma Hub, Town of Islip, Town of Huntington, Central Islip; different projects we have working.

LEG. BROWNING:
Instead of building a sewage treatment plant, buy the Ronkonkoma Hub. Again.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:
Gil, in talking about these -- where the money's coming from, these escrows, aren't all these projects connected into the Southwest Sewer District? You got the Club at Melville, Tutor Time Melville, Melville Plaza, Broad Hollow Road, Highland Green Residences, Geiger Lake, Babylon.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
You're absolutely right.

LEG. CALARCO:
Those all appear to be within the district, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
They actually are. They're all within -- Geiger Lake is within Babylon; Highlands, I believe is --

LEG. CALARCO:
So those key -- those key monies, those -- people paid in, intended for improvements to Southwest Sewer District.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:
And this project is for improvements to Southwest Sewer District.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:
So it would appear to be the appropriate place for these monies to come from.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. CALARCO:
Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Thank you. That was a good pickup.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Good work. All right, we have a motion and a second. I don't remember.

LEG. BROWNING:
Who made the motion and the second?

MS. ELLIS:
I have Calarco and Stern.

MR. NOLAN:
I think you can -- you can vote it out of committee especially based on what the Commissioner and Legislator Calarco just alluded to, which is a fact that all these entities are hooked into the Southwest Sewer District so -- but I will follow-up with further --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
They are hooked up.

LEG. TROTTA:
Oh, I thought you said they weren't.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. This -- in reading the names of the escrow accounts, each of these is within the -- is connectees to the South --

LEG. TROTTA:
It goes up to Melville?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. Yeah.

LEG. TROTTA:
Wow.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We go all the way up to Walt Whitman Mall and actually at some point looking at going beyond.

LEG. TROTTA:
The Walt Whitman Mall is hooked up to the Southwest Sewer District?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yep.

LEG. TROTTA:
The Mall itself?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, they connect in as a special sewer district. And they run a force main down to another set of sewers that eventually runs into district three.

LEG. TROTTA:
Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Goes all the way to Shea Stadium. (Laughter)

LEG. CALARCO:
Well, there's other extension plans for this district as well, which is the plan to sewer the Carlls River corridor region and -- what's that, North Babylon, Deer Park region, that's -- that would all connect into the Southwest as well as the plan to sewer around the Connetquot River region and Great River; and hopefully if monies come available in the Oakdale region, would all go to Southwest as well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Absolutely. We're also looking at studying in Central Islip. Central Islip is a business area as well as actually further to the north of the Walt Whitman Mall.

LEG. CALARCO:
And Heartland.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. Heartland already has capacity.

LEG. CALARCO:
They would connect to -- Heartland would already have capacity assured to them.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
They would be connecting into this plant as well if that project ever occurred.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
But they have reserved capacity. They connected -- they reserved capacity. They have a conceptual plan -- conceptual approval, sorry. And they hook in through the old Pilgrim State pump station.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Legislator Browning has another question.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay. So I think you know my position on this. Going from Ronkonkoma Hub down to the Southwest Sewer District, I don't think it's a good idea. This is something that Bill Lindsay, our Presiding Officer, had very strongly advocated for. So my concern is I don't want to vote for this if it's to help the Ronkonkoma Hub. I think we should do it right the first time. I think it's a band aid. We're going to run a pipeline from the Ronkonkoma Hub to the Southwest Sewer District instead of building a sewage treatment on a piece of property that we own. And I think it's shortsighted. I

think that Oakdale and Sayville could sewer in, too, if we had the plant at Ronkonkoma Hub. I don't know why this decision to change because we've really never gotten a real answer. But I don't think it's the right thing to do. So will the Ronkonkoma Hub project come back to us to vote? Or is this going to allow this to continue to move?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The Ronkonkoma Hub, I believe, already has capacity reserved. I can check, but this -- this is not -- this is not intended to be used for the Ronkonkoma Hub. This is additional capacity that other areas could use similarly with Ronkonkoma Hub. My understanding is the selection to use a pump station and force it down to sewer district three was based on the value of the land that was to the south of the railroad tracks that we originally were going to put the treatment plant. So it was cheaper at the end of the day without having -- and I fully appreciate, you know, former -- the former Presiding Officer's point. And, you know, he had -- he had the foresight to get this thing moving and --

LEG. BROWNING:
He had the foresight and that's a man who knows what he's talking about -- knew what he was talking about. And, again, it's -- so if we didn't approve this capacity expansion and we said you're going to build the plant in Ronkonkoma, Ronkonkoma -- that amount that's reserved aside could be -- how much is -- how much is the Ronkonkoma Hub? How much is reserved for that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
In total there'll be 1.5 million gallons, but this -- this funding, and even the other project, has no impact on -- as far as -- I believe has no impact on the Ronkonkoma Hub, whether it comes in or comes out. That capacity's already been requested and approved. What we have here --

LEG. BROWNING:
For Ronkonkoma.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
For Ronkonkoma.

LEG. BROWNING:
However, if we wind up -- if we were to say we're not going to do the Ronkonkoma Hub, we're not going to hook it to the Southwest Sewer District, then that capacity could be transferred over to the other projects.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:
Right. So build the plant in Ronkonkoma. That's the way I see it. And do it right the first time. So, I know it's not -- it's not your fault. It's like four or five acres, right, the Ronkonkoma property?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Nine acres. The actual treatment plant was nine acres.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay.

LEG. TROTTA:
We own that.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes, we own that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, it's -- in the parking area, it's just to the -- it's the undeveloped area next to the parking lot at Ronkonkoma. It's a wooded -- it's a wooded lot just to the east.

LEG. BROWNING:
It's just so shortsighted to say we're going to sewer to the Southwest Sewer District from Ronkonkoma when we can build a plant and sewer more communities if we had a plant there. So that's the issue. And it's, again, when we're -- you know, if we're thinking about selling nine acres of land for a one-shot for the budget again, you know, that -- it doesn't make sense --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No.

LEG. BROWNING:
-- because we're talking about our holdings and what land we own and we should be -- we should be building there; we should be sewering more communities. We're talking about water quality, you know, it just doesn't make sense.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
There is no intention to sell that land. The reason -- again, as I said earlier, the reason we went from the treatment plant to sending a force main to the west was because of the value of that land as future potential connection to the airport; or for the parking that -- you know, that's reserved there. Because we're not looking to give that parcel land up or sell it.

LEG. BROWNING:
Well, if we're going to be doing something with the airport, then, it's not to our benefit. I just -- well, we know the pipe is not cheaper. (Responding to an off-the-record comment) No, it's not.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Okay, Commissioner, so the question is, is it -- what ballpark, we're not going to hold you to a number, ballpark, what would it cost to build a plant to treat the waste at the big development at the Ronkonkoma Hub for whatever number of units you can imagine it is versus the new plant to run the sewer pipe around Islandia into every other community on the south shore before it gets to the outfall?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay, let me just say one thing that just keeps getting thrown in here: While the initial construction -- an intent of construction was to help serve the Town of Brookhaven's Program for the Ronkonkoma Hub, it's also intended to provide 1.1 million dollars -- sorry -- 1.1 million gallons per day of capacity for future development in the area, whether it's the airport, the industrial areas to the south, the Holbrook community to the east. So it's not just for Ronkonkoma Hub. But having said that, and I'd have to look back at my numbers because it's been awhile, it was my understanding when we were looking at the treatment plant, it was a $24 million treatment plant. And with the force main, it's actually less than that. It's now about 21, 22. I'll verify that and get that to you all but --

LEG. BROWNING:
What about the -- at that time I believe it was Senator Croce when he was Supervisor wanting some additional lines to service Oakdale Sayville area. And that was increased in the price. I mean, I gave you that article. Is that article incorrect?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The -- let me go back to senator -- Senator Croce. At that point to run the -- either -- to try and sewer Islip and Sayville along with Ronkonkoma Hub, to the south or bringing in -- would -- obviously would increase the fee and it would increase the cost. So, you know, right now what we're looking at is an option of what it would take to run from Sayville into Oakdale and then connect into East Islip or into the Connetquot River, which project -- which we're looking to do through the state funding that we have. So I don't know if that answers your question per se.

LEG. BROWNING:
Yes and no. I mean, I gave you an article with the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. BROWNING:
-- with a proposed project and how things have changed, requests have changed --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
-- right.

LEG. BROWNING:
-- changed the price. So it was -- it was 24 for a plant, 22 if we just run the pipeline to the Southwest Sewer District. But based on what the Supervisor had required -- requested back then, it raises the price up to 55 million. So --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. BROWNING:
Do we want to spend 55 million or do we want to spend 24?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right now -- well, right now, I believe, our plan is to -- for the -- you know, we're looking at multiple options. We're looking at the 24 million to connect directly through to Southwest Sewer District. And we're looking to facilitate to the south and connect Sayville and Islip as well.

LEG. BROWNING:
So what we're --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
And we're also -- if I may, we're also looking at trying to get funding to bring the industrial area that's to the south of the airport, to facilitate that similar to what we did in Hauppauge Industrial Park, you know, expanding the sewers to them, so running sewers up to them into the Ronkonkoma -- excuse me -- the Ronkonkoma Hub plant.

LEG. BROWNING:
But -- okay, so the additional project for the Oakdale, Sayville area would cost how much?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
If I recall -- and I'd rather get you those numbers, I'm just -- off the top of my head, I want to say it was -- it was 45 million but I don't -- let me -- let me get you that information because --

LEG. BROWNING:
Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
-- I'm trying to do it from --

LEG. BROWNING:
No, it's --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
-- memory which is --

LEG. BROWNING:
No, I'd rather you give us the right answer than a guess.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, I'll get you that information.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Legislator Calarco.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yeah, I saw -- maybe talked on those points, Gil, and maybe we can clear up our timeline. If I remember correctly what happened, we were originally looking at a plant. And the plant would cost 24 million; correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:
That plant would have served just the Ronkonkoma Hub and, I think, potentially the Foreign Trade Zone by the airport?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It was -- it was the Ronkonkoma Hub but also provided 1.1 million dollars --

LEG. CALARCO:
Gallons.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Gallons, sorry, of capacity.

LEG. CALARCO:
So that would have picked up the industrial area probably.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Picked up that. We've looked at --

LEG. CALARCO:
Probably the airport as well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The airport was always considered as part of that. So we didn't know what the volume would be. And as potential we've looked at --

LEG. CALARCO:
But that plant wouldn't have gotten us down into Oakdale, Sayville.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No.

LEG. CALARCO:
Okay. So if we were to go down to Oakdale, Sayville with that plant, we'd have to make a bigger plant.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No. What would happen is we would have to -- if we ran from the Ronkonkoma Train Station site, the Ronkonkoma Hub site to the south, we would then have to put in additional pump stations in south -- in Sayville and in Oakdale. Each one of those would have to be sized to facilitate the area that's planned for the --

LEG. CALARCO:
Would the -- would the $24 million plant handle their capacity?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, it wouldn't. We'd have to --

LEG. CALARCO:
We'd have to have them build a bigger plant.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
To run that way -- to run from Ronkonkoma south to Sayville and Oakdale would be between 55 to $65 million.

LEG. CALARCO:
For the plant.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
For the -- well, for the plant, for the pump -- sorry -- for the plant, for the pipes and for the additional pumps stations that we would have to have along Sayville and Oakdale.

LEG. CALARCO:
Okay. So then what had had happened, if my timeline's correct, we were looking at the plant; then we looked at doing a pipeline so it was cheaper, right, 20 million, 21, so it was a few million cheaper, not a big difference. And it was going to run through Islandia; correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. CALARCO:
The Village of Islandia brought an action, they contested our ability to go and sue the Village without their permissions and we started looking for alternative routes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yep.

LEG. CALARCO:
Is that correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:
That's kind of how Oakdale, Sayville got brought into the mix?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Especially since we were already looking at bringing the sewer line into the Oakdale area to connect the Connetquot River region into sewers at that point; correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
Okay. So now we're kind of looking at combining two projects into one: The Connetquot River sewering project and the Ronkonkoma Hub project into one project that would go to Southwest in one continuous pipeline; right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:
Okay. So what we have then gotten to, and that was that part -- that was looking at, I think that's the number you guys were talking about that you wanted to research some 45, 55 million to do that kind of a thing, so about the same. But now you have, it looks like my understanding is I heard we have now kind of worked through the issues with the Village of Islandia and that route is now the preferred route?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Route.

LEG. CALARCO:
Correct? And Islandia seems to have dropped their objections?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
When we met with them, they said they would have no objections if we came through their property -- or within their roadway.

LEG. CALARCO:
Okay. So then you're back at looking at going through Islandia with a pipe that would be about $22 million to build-out.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe so, yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
And then we still are pursuing through this -- through the federal and state funding the build-out to bring Southwest further east through -- into Great River; correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I believe -- yes, we have the -- we have the state funding to expand into the Connetquot area and --

LEG. CALARCO:
How much is that going to cost us?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'll get you that information.

LEG. CALARCO:
That pipe stops where; in East Islip, correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah.

LEG. CALARCO:
If my memory serves right from working over there -- (inaudible)

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
The other side of the Connetquot River is where it will stop.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yeah, it's kind of -- East Islip stops just short of --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes.

LEG. CALARCO:
-- of the Great River neighborhood.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Well, it's really looking to go into the Great River area as well.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yeah. That's what the project will get us if we do that.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. CALARCO:
But then -- in order to get into Oakdale, you're only talking bringing the pipe across the river and getting it into the Oakdale community; correct?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct, but there is, you know, significant amount of work that's involved in it. You'd have to put a pump station, you have to -- you have to go under the river, things like that.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yeah, of course. No, it's a whole project, but I mean sewering Oakdale one way or the other, whether -- regardless which way you're coming from --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. And keep in mind the numbers that I've quoted were really only to bring the mainline, say, from Montauk Highway through. They would have to -- all the areas around it, whether it's the business community or the residential areas --

LEG. CALARCO:
Of course, of course, yeah, I mean it's no different Mastic Shirley, if you're going to build a plant --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. CALARCO:
-- but it's going to ultimately cost us closer to a billion dollars once we sewer everybody.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. CALARCO:
And we really need to sewer everyone down there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. CALARCO:
Yeah. Okay. So I just wanted to make sure that the timelines are all lined up and we know what the costs are --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right.

LEG. CALARCO:
-- for the different routes. But we can still get into Oakdale and Sayville and it may actually be a little bit cheaper just coming a little bit further east from the project that we already have funding for on the south side since it's the next neighborhood over.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. Yeah, that'll help.

LEG. CALARCO:
All right. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:
For that phase of sewering down to that residential and commercial area of Oakdale River, is there an approximate number as to how many homes, how many connections could there possibly be in that phase of it?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Are you asking about the Great River side or are you talking about the Oakdale side?

LEG. STERN:
Together.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Which one?

LEG. STERN:
Together.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Together, I'll get that for you. I don't know. I wouldn't even want to hazard a guess. I'd be wrong.

LEG. STERN:
Do you know the numbers on the first phase of it on the -- first phase, which would come first?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No, I don't have that.

LEG. STERN:
I'd be interested to see those numbers.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yep. I'll provide that.

LEG. STERN:
The issue of Islandia and now having the ability to go through the Village, is that conditional in any way?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't know the details at this point. I'll have to -- I'll have to find out.

LEG. STERN:
Okay. George, do you know?

MR. NOLAN:
I don't.

LEG. STERN:
I'd be interested to know if that is an unconditional ability to go through the Village.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
We -- what we discussed with the Village was, as we do in many cases, is once we put the -- once we placed the force main or sewer piping, we would repair their road and we would repave their road so that they weren't just looking at a whole trench going right down the center of their roadways.

LEG. STERN:
But that wouldn't include anything else; it would specifically be to restore.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct, yeah.

LEG. STERN:
Because of the work.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Right. And we -- we also -- they requested some additional capacity, which we said, you know, we're always willing to -- if the Village came and made that request, we would be more than willing to address that. And then we also guaranteed that we would protect the Connetquot River's bed that runs through the, you know, that area that when we're constructing the site, we would run it beneath the river so that we wouldn't impact that bottom.

LEG. STERN:
Gil, has there been an analysis as to what the theoretical extent of any future expansion of the Southwest Sewer District could or should be? I mean could you expand and have everything go into that direction into that facility with expansion indefinitely; or is ultimately there a capacity?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Ultimately the -- whatever we do is constrained by the equipment that we put in there. So the force main, you know, we've been looking at 1.5 million gallons. So when somebody -- when enough people connect that may want to -- that would use up all that capacity, obviously then we would have to look to increase that somehow if that's wanted. We've done a number of studies. We did a -- there was a study done probably about 15, 20 years ago by the department where we looked at expanding into the four corners of the Southwest -- beyond what the Southwest Sewer District currently is, into West Islip, West Babylon, East -- I forget the other -- the other areas but -- so we've done a number of studies to look at how far we think it could go to. It really depends on how much interest there is for the connection and the need and the willingness to appropriate the funding or to come up with the funding.

LEG. STERN:
But at this point there's never been an analysis beyond what the next larger phase might be going further to the north or further to the east than what what is already -- what is already part of an analysis of expansion.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I don't believe so.

LEG. STERN:
Okay, thanks.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
So if you could, I know we're going to have a larger discussion at the General Meeting, if you could have every possible detail about this project about possible expansion, about what Legislator Browning's concern is all that freshwater, instead of it being recharged into the aquifer at Ronkonkoma or having that pumped all out into the ocean, how that freshwater withdrawal is going to affect, you know, possible saltwater intrusion. I know that's a concern. So if you could have -- and also the cost of, when you look at all these -- you're looking at sewering all these other communities, you know, the cost of setting up districts and kind of an idea of what that's going to look like.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

LEG. CALARCO:
Regardless of whether or not this resolution passes --

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Well, it seems to be -- since it's going into the Southwest Sewer District, it seems to be relevant.

LEG. CALARCO:
Gil, all this -- all this, as you said, this resolution that we have before us right now is irregardless of whether or not Ronkonkoma was connecting.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct. This is really only to facilitate the ongoing project that we're doing right now.

LEG. CALARCO:
Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All right. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1384, Appropriating funds through the issuance of sewer district serial bonds for the planning improvements for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 21 SUNY (CP 8121). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Calarco; second by Legislator Fleming. Anyone want to comment on this one? No questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1385, Appropriating funds through the issuance of sewer district serial bonds for the planning improvements for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 20 William Floyd (Ridgehaven) (CP 8147). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Browning; second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**
IR 1386, Transferring Southwest Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund and appropriating funds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest (CP 8170). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Calarco. I'll second the motion. Is there anything specific on this one, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes. Yes, sir. It's um -- what we're looking to do is we need funds to help plan masonry window replacements at the administration buildings, designing a building over our sludge shoot, natural gas feed for a turbine generator and to determine a file storage room, design of file storage room within an existing atrium within the administration building.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Thank you.

LEG. TROTTA:
This is all for planning money, $2 million?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Going to be quite the sludge shoot. All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
One opposed. So moved. **(VOTE: 5-1-0-1. LEG. TROTTA OPPOSED. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1387, Amending the 2016 Capital Budget, transferring Southwest Stabilization Reserve Funds to the Capital Fund and appropriating funds for the Expansion of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 Southwest (CP 8183). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Fleming. I'll second the motion. Commissioner, is this the actual project itself, then?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yeah, this was -- again, this was what I mentioned earlier. This is actually for planning design of two additional clarifiers that would allow us to easily expand the district. These are the -- this is work that needs to be done. It'll help the treatment process, but it also, you know, it allows a further expansion of the capacity.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Thank you. I have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1388, Appropriating funds in connection with preparing a Sewering Feasibility Study for Downtown Central Islip (CP 8198). (Co. Exec.) Motion by Legislator Stern; second by Legislator Calarco. I have a question on the motion, Commissioner. Where do the funds -- where do we appropriate the funds from?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
General Fund. Yeah, I believe the General Fund. Yep, serial bonds.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Okay. What's the timeline on something like this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
If this was approved by the next cycle, probably the end of next year. By the time we've procured the services, they've had a chance to analyze and prepare the report. So I would say by the end of 2017 we'll have that report completed.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Thank you. All right. On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:
What exactly are they going to do? They're going to -- a feasibility study?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
A feasibility study to look at expanding or connecting the Central Islip Business District to the Southwest Sewer District. It's along Carlton Avenue and Suffolk Avenue, installing sewers possibly, low pressure sewers or some type of pump station or gravity sewers; and then developing what those costs would be to build them and then come up with a general rate of what it would cost the, you know, the local connectees.

LEG. TROTTA:
It has nothing to do with the design of it; this is just a --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
It's a feasibility study, right. We'll look at -- I mean essentially what they're going to do is developing options.

LEG. TROTTA:
So you're going to hire a company to do this? You can't -- we don't have the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
To be frank, with what we've got going on right now between these four large sewer projects and everything else, we'd never get this one done.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All right, we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed?

LEG. TROTTA:
Opposed.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 5-1-0-1. LEG. TROTTA OPPOSED. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)**

IR 1389, Appropriating funds in connection with Reconstruction of Drainage Systems on Various County Roads (CP 5024). (Co. Exec.)
I'll make a motion. Is there a second?

LEG. STERN:
Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
Second by Legislator Stern. Oh, yes, you certainly can.

LEG. BROWNING:
Can we talk about drains? William Floyd, I mean, we just had Cornell talking about checking outflow pipes and I know that that is a project on the William Floyd Parkway that -- gone out to the Unkechaug Creek.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. BROWNING:
What's the status and when do we plan to get that done?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
I'll find that one out. I have -- I took the notes when you were discussing it with Cornell Cooperative. This really is more of, I would call it the sister project to the repaving -- the repaving project that we -- was approved earlier. Generally when we come in and we repave an area, we look to improve upgrade the drainage systems in those areas. So if we have to add a leaching pool, replace a catch basin, replace piping, anything like that, excuse me, that's what we try to do with these funds.

LEG. BROWNING:
Okay. It's, you know, it's sorely needed. Because I know that the gentleman who just bought that property, that outflow pipe, you know, it's just everything is getting -- it's bogging things down for him, that he, you know, there's no access. There used to be a boat slip there. He's planning to do some work there. I know we've a lot of ideas that we've got in place, but, you know, it just keeps getting built up and a lot of gunk; needs to be cleaned out again. Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Will do. I'll get back to you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All right. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved.
(VOTE: 6-0-0-1. LEG. MURATORE NOT PRESENT)

We have been joined by Legislator Kennedy. And she has asked to go back to IR 1358. We did have a discussion about the -- I thought a prolonged discussion about the Nissequogue River, but apparently Legislator Kennedy has some additional questions. We did approve it.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Thank you, Chairman Krupski, and thank you to the Committee. I apologize. The meeting in Hauppauge went too late. I just wanted to ask the Commissioner a couple of questions. This, I don't have the bill in front of me, the 900,000 and change is from the Village of the Branch grant that we turned over to the County and the 300 is matched; 300 and change is matched?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Yes, this is -- but, this I believe we were first instancing -- we're first instancing funding. So we're looking here to appropriate the full $1.273 million.

LEG. KENNEDY:
Okay. This will not delay the project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
No.

LEG. KENNEDY:
If we pass this, this will not delay the project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:
Correct.

LEG. KENNEDY:
All right. Thank you. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All right, thank you. So if there's no other business, I'd like to thank Supervisor Scott Russell for

coming today. We have three more days of committees here, Scott, so you're welcome any of those three days, if you want to have more discussions about sewers, etcetera. So -- and Bridget?

LEG. FLEMING:
Yeah, I'd just like to note also that Mayor Peter Sartorius from Quogue was here earlier and I think he had to leave, but really grateful for the leaders to come and show up. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:
All right. Any more? Yeah, any other -- if there's nothing else, we're adjourned.

THE MEETING CONCLUDED AT 3:23 PM
{ } DENOTES SPELLED PHONETICALLY