

**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 Maxine Postal Legislative Auditorium of the Evans K. Griffing Building, 300 Center Drive, Riverhead, New York on August 29, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.

**Members Present:**

Legislator Al Krupski - Chairman  
Legislator Tom Muratore - Vice-Chair - Excused  
Legislator Rob Calarco  
Legislator Kate Browning  
Legislator Steven Stern  
Legislator Bridget Fleming  
Legislator Rob Trotta

**Also in Attendance:**

George Nolan - Counsel/Suffolk County Legislature  
Valerie Smith - Asst Counsel/Suffolk County Legislature  
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office  
Amy Ellis - Chief Deputy Clerk/Suffolk County Legislature  
DJ Russo - Clerk's Office/Suffolk County Legislature  
Gil Anderson - Commissioner/SC Department of Public Works  
Darnell Tyson - Deputy Commissioner/SC Department of Public Works  
Catherine Stark - Aide to Legislator Krupski  
Liz Sutton - Aide to Legislator Fleming  
Brendan Chamberlain - Aide to Legislator Muratore  
Alyssa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn  
Michael Pitcher - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory  
Rob Fonti - Aide to Presiding Officer Gregory  
Katie Horst - Director/Intergovernmental Relations  
Jason Hann - County Executive's Office  
Fred Thiele - State Assemblyman  
Robert Braun - County Attorney's Office  
Geoffrey Lynch - Hampton Jitney, Inc.  
Aaron Watkins - Lopez - LI Bus Riders Union  
Paul Pressman  
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 2:04 p.m. \*)*

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

All rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Calarco.

***Salutation***

Welcome to the regular committee meeting, Public Works, Transportation and Energy. For the record, Tom Muratore has an excused absence. I have a number of cards here for Public Portion. The first is Fred Thiele.

**ASSEMBLYMAN THIELE:**

First of all, Mr. Chairman, I commend you. The State Legislature never starts this promptly ever. Ever.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

So -- and secondly, just let me also welcome you to the First Assembly District. We are in the Riverhead County Center, which of course is located in the Town of Southampton.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Your time's up, sir. Thank you for your comments.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**ASSEMBLYMAN THIELE:**

So there are just two things I briefly wanted to comment on in the Public Portion. One is with regard to the proposals that have been put forth on the County level with regard to cuts in bus service. And, you know, first of all, just two points I want to raise. One is that I hope that there will be the opportunity for more public involvement in this particular issue, certainly before any decisions are made. I know that Legislator Fleming has -- is certainly scheduling and trying to schedule meetings with this regard, and I do think there's the need for more public input.

But the second substantive point that I really wanted to make with regard to buses is that we have embarked really, at least with regard to the East End, on efforts to improve public transportation and public transit with the Long Island Railroad. And, in fact, the Long Island Railroad, as you know, has committed to restoring service to the North Fork on a weekend year-round basis, and on the South Fork that made the commitment to add in essence what are two commuter trains in the morning and one commuter train in the afternoon, to move people back and forth, get them off of County Road 39, for example, and to allow people to have a public transit option.

The one thing I just wanted to say to the members of the committee and to the Legislature is that this may present an opportunity as you are looking to really repurpose what you need to do and look anew at the resources you have with regard to the bus system. The fact that on the East End that we're looking at this increased rail service, you know, I believe presents the opportunity also to coordinate with the rail service and maybe provide routes that might be -- might better serve the needs than the routes that are there now that have been the same routes I think since George Nolan and I were in the Suffolk County Legislature together.

So my two points really are one, that we allow more public input on this and get the public more involved, and that the County work with the State, work with the MTA and the Long Island Railroad to maybe make a more effective and more efficient system as you have to look at how you're going to do -- make the best with the limited resources that you have.

And then finally, I guess I would be remiss if I didn't say something with regard to the -- my support and sponsorship, of course, of Assemblyman Ramos' legislation that would have provided additional funding to the County. Whatever happens here in the short-term, we remain committed members of the Long Island Delegation for basically public transit equity for Suffolk County when compared with other suburban counties, and we will continue to pursue that although it was not successful this year. We're not going to give up on that and I know that Assemblyman Ramos feels the same way.

The second item that I just briefly wanted to talk about was Assembly -- I almost promoted Bridget Fleming. Legislator Fleming's resolution -- and believe me, there are days where I would like to promote you to the State Assembly. But your resolution that's before the committee, 1688, with regard to guardrails in Noyac in the Village of North Haven in Legislator Fleming's District, I just wanted to let the committee -- make the committee be aware that we were able to identify \$250,000 of State funding towards this project to offset the County expense. This project was done. There was not a lot of public input, and there's been great opposition to the project. It is one of the most scenic vistas in the district that Bridget and I share, and there's the desire to replace the metal guardrails with wooden ones. I'm mindful of the fact that the metal ones can be repurposed someplace else in the County, but that we've made State money available for this.

I know that I put the request in and I know that the Department of Public Works that are on the County level has already filed the paperwork with the State Assembly that's necessary. To be fair, it will take probably somewhere in the neighborhood of six months before all the paperwork is done, but nonetheless it would be helpful on the State level to know that the County is committed to moving forward, so I would urge you to support Legislator Fleming's resolution and here to also assure you that that State grant of \$250,000 will be there for this particular project. So thank you very much and I appreciate the opportunity to speak first.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you and thank you for the warm welcome to your district. Legislator Fleming has a question for you.

**ASSEMBLYMAN THIELE:**

Sure.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Hi, Fred. Thank you for being here in the district we share. We're very proud to have brought the meetings here, so it's a great thing that you could come, and I really appreciate your partnership on so much of what we work on together. I think you're really someone to be admired in your public service. I'm really lucky to partner with you on so many things.

I wanted to ask you, with regard to Assemblyman Ramos' bill, as you know, I went to Albany with a delegation from the County Executive's Office to lobby that those funds, you know, that increased funding come to us, the suburban counties, from the MTA bill, and I'm just wondering what we were told, Fred, was that it would be more appropriately considered during the budget process. I'm just wondering if you -- I mean, I'm more than willing to get back in the car and go back up to Albany. Do you think that we will -- that our chances will be better of getting some of our fair share back from those MTA funds during the budget process?

**ASSEMBLYMAN THIELE:**

Based on the way that, you know, the process in Albany works, it's a money item and success or failure. What made it hard for us is that Assemblyman Ramos' bill was after the budget process. This is a budget item and I wouldn't wait until January. It would be best of all if the Legislature and the County Executive could convince the Governor to put the money in the budget to start with. That's the equivalent of starting on third base as opposed to having the Legislature attempt to add the

money in. Believe it or not, your budget process is, you know, upon you, but on the Executive Branch on the State level it's the fall when they start doing this. So, frankly, right after Labor Day I think we should all be working to lobby the Governor to try to get money into the budget for 2017.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you. I appreciate that.

**ASSEMBLYMAN THIELE:**

I just want to say that the things that you said at the outside, and I know that George Nolan can attest to this also, you said the nicest things about me that were ever said in all the years that I was in this room. Thank you very much.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thanks. And, Fred, also you mentioned public comment on the bus system. We are having a meeting here at 3 o'clock on September 8th, a public meeting, and also one on the 9th in Hauppauge, to address the -- to get public comment.

**ASSEMBLYMAN THIELE:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thanks. The second speaker is Geoffrey Lynch.

**MR. LYNCH:**

Good afternoon. Geoff Lynch, President of Hampton Jitney. Also Vice-President of Twin Forks Transit, who is one of the operators of the Suffolk County transit routes out here on the East End. I might be jumping the gun a little bit here because Darnell has not yet given his presentation on the service cuts, but I would like the committee to take note that these cuts hit the Township of Southamptton the hardest, in my opinion. And certainly we recognize that it's the County's prerogative to cut service levels to better align the County budget, but three of the eight proposed route cuts are in this community and it's going to hit the seasonal workforce pretty hard.

So as the operator, we think a modified S90 might be one solution to reduce the level of service cuts and maintain some routes in at least Western Southamptton that would connect to other routes further east. So we hope the committee and DPW, Suffolk County Transit, is willing to work with us on that. Thanks very much.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. We look forward to more comments and insight from you. Thank you.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Can I make another note? I'm sorry.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Go right ahead.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you, Geoff, for coming and on short notice, I appreciate it. I just did want to note for the committee that, you know, it's troubling to us in the District Office and I think to Geoff as well, that when these cuts were determined Geoff really had no -- Hampton Jitney had no input and he is the operator of the buses where three of these lines are proposed to be cut. So I am thankful that John Schneider agreed to a meeting. Geoff and I will be meeting with Mr. Schneider based on that, and it had to be rescheduled because of the tragic accident last week, but we're looking forward to it.

I'm glad that you can be involved because obviously, Geoff, I think you -- I mean, the S90 is an important aspect of it, but there are lots of important aspects that it will be very difficult for you to articulate at three minutes at the podium.

We're talking about those new buses, the small buses that we authorized and authorized the funding for. We're talking about additional, as Assemblyman Thiele said, they proposed the potential expansion of rail service, and there are a lot of things in the mix. We may get them MTA funding. It was disappointing, to say the least, that folks who are involved in the operation of the buses where we are in our district were not involved.

So thank you, Geoff, for coming today, but I look forward to really full conversations with you and the Administration with your input on the specifics, your maps and all of the things that you've shown me.

**MR. LYNCH:**

Okay. Thank you very much.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

The last card is Paul Pressman.

**MR. PRESSMAN:**

Good afternoon, Legislators. In respect to what Assemblyman Thiele said, I just want to let you know that I had a meeting with State Senator Boyle on Friday, who I speak to on a regular basis at least once a month, and I have also been in touch with State Assembly -- State Senate Speaker Flanagan, and that Mr. Boyle has said to me that he and Mr. Flanagan are going to get together about trying to get some money for Suffolk County for buses, okay.

The other point is this AVL system. I know we're going to have a presentation today and I've had many discussions with Mr. McVoy. I'm not saying the system is terrible, but there's a real big problem with it on the buses, especially with the announcements. That is the biggest problem and it's causing a lot of confusion at all the transfer stops because they are not working correctly inside the bus. The electrical systems are only working on about 50% of them, and if I have to I will get the bus numbers, okay, because the problem is they are not announcing when you get to a transfer point like the old ones did, what buses you can transfer to. They do not announce the hospitals. They don't announce a lot of things and none of the bus drivers are doing any of the announcements as per ADA regulation that is stated in every single bus. And there is a big problem with that, okay?

The other thing is, like I said, I've spoken with the Senators because Mr. Boyle is in my district. I have spoken with Mr. Ramos' office. I was on the phone while I was on the SCAT bus, which was late to pick me up to get me here today, but I was on the phone with his office this morning. I have spoken to everybody on the Transportation Committee. I have sent e-mails to every one of them so they're aware of the situation in Suffolk County that we need money. There are buses that they cannot replace. There are buses we had a problem with the other day that I personally was on that I got on in Bay Shore and the farebox was literally off the ground. It had broken away from where it is in the bus where it's screwed down to the ground. The actual farebox was moving this way. The bus driver was holding it with one hand while he is driving, and he's on the phone with Suffolk Transportation asking them what to do, and they don't even know what the heck to do, whether to let him keep driving the bus with one hand, taking it to Babylon, and then deciding what to do or to stop the bus there. He's trying to get ahold of Mr. Grimaldi, and of course they won't even get him to him. He finally ended up going to Babylon and they ended up sending a new bus

eventually all the way from Ronkonkoma because they have no buses where they were supposed to be in Bay Shore.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

One thing to be sure, you know, you asked a question about which buses the AVL system is and isn't working on, and that's one of the questions that I'm going to ask the gentlemen from DPW who are here.

**MR. PRESSMAN:**

Can I just say one last thing?

**CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:**

Sure.

**MR. PRESSMAN:**

I asked Mr. McVoy, and he told me to get the bus numbers. I actually called up Suffolk Transportation and asked them. I says, "Look." I says, "I don't understand why if you're having a problem with AVLs, and you know they're not working, why you can't get in touch with Mr. McVoy". And it seems to me that there is no minds of getting together between the private bus companies and Suffolk County to get this thing fixed. We spent \$100,000. We bought it two years ago, it's been in operation three months, and forget about everything else it's supposed to do. The main thing is to at least let the people know where the bus stops are, especially people that can't walk around and everything else. It's not working correctly and after three months it should be fixed or the company that sold it to us ought to get in there and fix it.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Sure. Well, hopefully we'll hear their explanation now. Thank you.

**MR. PRESSMAN:**

Fair enough. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

The presentation is about the Suffolk County transit proposed service changes. So, gentlemen, if you want to. Welcome.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Thanks. Good afternoon. My name is Darnell Tyson. I am the Deputy Commissioner at the Suffolk County Department of Public Works. I work alongside Gil Anderson, the Commissioner, the new Commissioner -- I'm sorry, Deputy Commissioner, Tom Vaughn. I am here today to talk about a topic that I guess if I -- you know, sort of in a place where we don't necessarily want to be, but yet here we are. So the goal is to give information on where we are with the proposed service cuts and talk about some of the other projects that we at the Suffolk County DPW are working on in terms of with the eventual goal of improving the transportation system.

And so this first slide here is actually just a little -- actually a collage of photos that I took, you know, on some of the affected routes. I actually went out on each of the routes to just get a sense of sort of in real time the locations they're serving, the neighborhoods, see the people that ride them.

So the first question that has already been answered actually in some respects is how did we get here, and what this graphic here shows is so Suffolk Transit on a yearly basis reports to the National Transportation Database sort of where we are, a whole set of metrics on, you know, on the passage of miles that we cover, the revenue miles that we operate, which is when the bus is in operation,

you know, sort of collecting fares. Can I put it on a computer?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

We can forward it to you after the presentation.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Rest assured the rest of the slides actually don't have such sort of fine detail. But the major points that I wanted to illustrate out of this slide is basically the revenue miles that the bus system operates, and if you look at it from 2012 to 2014, that factor, that metric has been increasing. In 2012 we were operating approximately 13 million revenue miles, and that number has steadily increased to, in 2014, close to 15 million revenue miles. So those increases are -- include some of the additional Sunday service that we now operate on 12 routes, in addition to longer operating hours in the evenings on some of our busier routes.

So it's sort of in, you know, conjunction with that our operating costs to provide this service has increased as well. So the green circle, you know, actually represents the total cost of operating the system, which has steadily increased as well. It's gone up from 61 million, which is where it was in 2012, to approximately 70 million, including both the fixed route and the paratransit network. So commensurate with that the local share, meaning the share that we at Suffolk County have to, you know, send into the system, you know, sort of dropping out Federal funding, State funding, that factor has grown as well. So where we are at present is we have approximately \$34 million that we contribute to the system, up from 30 million in 2012.

And so this year we were faced with -- we were given the constraint of actually having to decrease our budget, the budget that's spent on the system, to approximately 30 million. And so what we have as a result of that is basically a \$4 million shortfall that we were tasked with trying to figure out how to satisfy. And in particular this year what Assemblyman Thiele, you know, spoke about was there was a bill that was being circulated that would have recouped some of the taxes that we spend, that we pay to the MTA, and it would have taken that money and actually sort of funneled it back, a portion of it back, our direction for operating costs of the system. And unfortunately what happened was that bill that was in circulation, you know, that process took place after the budget had been already agreed upon, and so the bill failed in June, which is basically when we got the directive to actually go out and fill the shortfall.

And I would ask, I guess, you know, if you don't mind to hold the questions to the end so that way I can actually write them down and respond to them as well.

And so we're faced with the task of having to come up with \$4 million of annual operating savings. You know we went, I guess, a set of different analyses to try to come up with, you know, the best way to do this unfortunate task, and so we looked at various scenarios. I mean, what this table shows is a set of metrics for each of the routes, each of some of the lower performing routes of the system, and so you have the ridership, you know, which each of the routes actually, you know, provide or serve. We have the revenue that is generated by that ridership, and so one way that you could go at sort of parsing out which of these routes are actually the worst performing, is to just take that ridership value and just take the routes that have the lowest ridership and actually just cut those.

And so if you do that, that gives you sort of a set of routes, which actually aren't very much different from the set that you have here, but the metric that we actually arrived upon is actually taking that annual ridership and instead making -- taking that annual ridership and setting it up to find out how many people actually ride the system per day, and that's actually where some of the most telling data is. If you look at some of these routes you have ridership of 159 a day down to 12 a day, and that factor was then -- it was taken as a denominator with cost on top. And the metric that we

actually arrived upon was the cost per ride to what you see here. Those eight routes that are represented there have an average -- if the system has an average cost for a rider as \$7 per customer, these routes here that are above the red line actually cost greater than \$20 for a rider, and the average is actually \$30 per rider. One of the routes in particular has a cost per rider of \$82. So this actually was the metric that we wound up, that we settled upon, that resulted in the routes that you see before you. So we'll just get a little more into that particular scenario.

So if you're looking from west to east you have the 1B and the 35 on the western portion of the County, you have the 5A, the 71, the 7D and E in Central Suffolk, and then traveling out east here you have the S90, the 10D and E, and the 10A. Those routes, you know, if you go a couple of slides back, those routes actually have the highest costs per rider. And so, again, I think with the County's goal of trying to make these cuts to affect few as people possible, the routes that were most expensive to operate in current basis are the ones that made the most sense, according to the data, to exclude.

So some of the things that I wanted to pinpoint here is you wind up with, as I mentioned, approximately \$4 million of annual savings and operating costs. The SCAT service network that operates County-wide, the decision was made early on to not, you know, affect that portion of service, which actually I think was pretty interesting and important because it then sort of reduces the impact on some of our most vulnerable population that need this service, and in particular, we've actually taken steps to increase, you know, the amount of coverage that the SCAT network provides. So the decision was made, again, to not affect the SCAT network. And then also, the routes that operate, you know, on these are the routes that are on this list, actually none of them operate on Sunday, so Sunday service would not be affected.

If you look in terms of numbers, in terms of miles affected, there's approximately 400 miles in Suffolk County on these routes. Brookhaven actually is the town that has the highest set of mileage that is affected by this. Southampton is second and then I think Babylon is like the least affected.

And so to just get into a little more detail on the particular routes that are affected, I want to step through the list. So at the top of the list you have the 10D and E. These routes serve East Quogue, Tiana Plaza, Hampton Bays and then out to Ponquogue. As I mentioned before, they have a combined daily ridership of 12 per day and the cost per rider as a result of that is \$82 per rider. The estimated savings that one would look to expect from discontinuing service is approximately 250,000 a year.

Also, on the East End we have the Route 10A, a daily ridership of 20, actually serving Southampton SUNY, Southampton Town Hall, Southampton Railroad, traveling up to Noyac and North Sea, and the cost per rider on this route is approximately \$55. It's estimated an annual savings of 342,000.

On the West End we have Route 1B. It operates to Tanner Park, through Copiague, past the railroad station in Copiague up to Sunrise Highway and through Lindenhurst Village, terminating at the Lindenhurst Railroad. And so that route has a daily ridership of 21 per day. The estimated annual savings is approximately 260,000.

In the center of the Island we have Route 5A which operates past Port Jefferson Railroad, through Miller Place, Sound Beach, over to Leisure Village, Ridge, and terminating at the King Kullen Shopping Center in Middle Island. It's a daily ridership of 64. The busiest time points that are served by this route are actually during the mid-day. There's like a 12 o'clock trip that is pretty well utilized, as well as the 5:20 trip in the afternoon. The annual savings was approximately five -- I'm sorry, 758,000.

We have Route 90, which operates from Center Moriches close to what I imagine must have been a railroad station in the past, through Speonk, into West Hampton Beach, has a branch that operates past Gabreski Airport, and then also another branch, more service provided over to East Quogue. It has an average daily ridership of 30 per day, approximately. Cost per rider is \$35, again, compared to the average ridership -- I'm sorry, the average fare or average cost per rider of \$7. And the estimated annual savings is approximately \$322,000.

A few more routes. The S35 on the west end of the Island, the west end of the County, rather. It operates from the South Shore, the Great South Bay Shopping Center in West Babylon, past Lindenhurst Railroad. It connects with the Babylon Town Hall in Lindenhurst and then operates on a loop past the EBT depot basically. It travels into West Babylon and then circles back down. That's a loop route. It has an average daily ridership of 29 and a cost per rider of \$34, and an estimated \$257,000 in savings upon its discontinuation.

The 7D and the 7E operating through the Mastic-Shirley area. The 7D operates up north to Yaphank, east Yaphank, through Mastic on a loop. And the 7E is actually the southern-most of the two loops and operates down to Smith Point Park as well as through the Mastic Beach area. The two routes combined serve approximately 98 people a day, with the average cost per rider of \$27; an estimated savings of 837,000.

The S71, a particularly long route. I think it's approximately close to 30 miles long. It operates from Stony Brook, it serves the Technology Park off of Nesconset Highway, it passes Suffolk Community College, operating south on Horseblock Road through the Bellport area on Patchogue Yaphank and Sills Road, past our offices, the County offices on Yaphank Avenue, down terminating at the Mastic-Shirley area down by William Floyd Plaza; daily ridership of 159 and estimated at almost \$996,000 of annual cost.

And so that is the set of routes that are up for this proposed service change. If I had to sort of globally speak about the information that's been gathered on them, I mean, there's that detail that I showed you as well, but I think that we at the County are also looking at where, you know, service at least at some of the locales could be restored. I mean, again, this is a situation that we, you know, this is where we are, but I think that this whole process is actually about engaging, you know, you all and also hearing from your constituents, from our citizens and riders about the locations that are important to them. And so to that end the public hearings are important, but our hope is to, you know, I think actually as the Assemblyman also spoke about sort of this is where we are, but trying to figure out how to fashion the system moving forward as a more efficient system so that we are not necessarily as subject to these constraints in the future. I mean, if we could figure out whether or not there are locales that we are right now not serving that we should be, or locations that we should be providing more service, then maybe we could have more ridership on these buses and sort of avoid this situation in the future.

So I say all that to say looking forward we would hope to be able to interface with the public apart from these hearings, to sort of rethink that vision of what our system looks like. I mean, it's 50 routes right now, but can it be done differently in the future? So one of the things that we do look to do longer-term is to sort of lay a blueprint out for, you know, what the system could look like moving forward. It's sort of obviously a large scale objective.

Just a bit more information about what's proposed to date. Right now we have these service cuts, but there is no fare increase. And I anticipate at this time, as Assemblyman Thiele, you know, alluded to, we sort of failed with the effort to, you know, get that mobility tax back and it's good to hear a conversation about when it makes sense to sort of restart that effort. I mean, I think if you asked me a couple of weeks ago maybe I would have thought that January was the right time, but if we get back out there and get engaged sooner than that, you know, even better. I think for us is to

figure out, again, how to do that and when to do that and to sort of, you know, restart that effort and sort of build a coalition in order to get that funding that we so desperately need back here to the County.

You know, our State Operating Assistance Funding was slightly increased over the past year, maybe to the tune of a million dollars, but we would also reengage them as well, them being the State, to figure out, you know, whether or not there is more that they could do, you know, for us.

And, again, you know, as I had mentioned before, the SCAT service is -- it's in this but it's not, you know -- it is not, you know, expected to be affected by these service cuts so it's not a part of it.

So going forward where are we? As Legislator Krupski mentioned, there are two public hearings that are scheduled, you know, to hear about the service cuts and sort of how folks are affected. They will be held actually out here on Thursday, September 8th, from 3 to 7. Bus service will be provided, you know, on the routes that run here and the intent is to actually provide at least one connecting bus after the end of the hearing. The point is to give an opportunity for the public to come out and talk about, you know, the areas, the locales that are important so that we can figure out how to use that information so, again, once funding becomes available we know where to deploy it and where to use those resources. Similarly, on Friday, September 9th, there will be a meeting held in Hauppauge, again, another opportunity to meet with the public and hear about this and find out basically what they need and how we can help. Staff will be on-site to try to, again, assist with travel planning sort of in a new system for those that will be affected, and comments can also be sent by mail or e-mail. And the current expectation is that these service changes would begin on October 3rd, which is a Monday.

So I just wanted to talk briefly about the automatic vehicle location project and then also, you know, a few other Suffolk Transit specific items. So, again, although we are here, you know, at current sort of faced with this situation, it should be clearly noted that planning and design and work is going on, you know, on a number of different efforts at Suffolk Transit. The folks there, you know, do a lot of work and, you know, they sort of have, again, have this to deal with as well, but we are still in the process of purchasing and fabricating the mid-sized vehicles. Some people call them right-size. It's our expectation that these vehicles actually would sort of allow for some savings because they have better fuel efficiency. In a similar way we are also in the process of purchasing and manufacturing new hybrid buses that we also expect to be more efficient and thereby also sort of recoup a savings in operating costs.

The AVL system is actually currently being installed on the fixed route system. It's already installed on the paratransit network. We have approximately 300 vehicles amongst those two and that number is growing, but we are still installing the modules for the AVL system.

So just as a clarification. AVL is basically a GPS for buses. It basically tells you where your bus is. So you take that system, which is AVL, and from that data, once you know where your buses are, you can then design software to take that information and push it out to users. So when we talk about like the bus location app, that's taking that information from the AVL system and formatting in a way that is like readable for everyone. But the caveat to that is that although the AVL system is still being installed, there is a module that we need to purchase or that we are in the process of purchasing from the FTA that would actually take the schedules that the buses operate on and update them to today's standards. You see, the schedules that we have out there are sort of legacy. They haven't changed much over the past some number of years, 15, whatever have you. And so for us the process is actually to go back out route by route and say okay, the bus route takes 25 minutes to get from point A to point B, or it did in 1995, how much time does it take to get there now. And so the module that we have that we're purchasing would actually do that on a system-wide level and allow us to update the entire system to today's travel times. So we could

actually take that information today and send it out there, but it doesn't look good because it's being sort of compared against old data. Once we get this module, which we expect to have towards the end of the year and we're able to, again, update the system to new current travel times, we can then take that data and push it out to the public, because then it's actually much closer to accurate than it is today.

So in addition to the AVL system, a small percentage of the buses that are currently sort of on the system have what we call APCs, automatic passenger counters, and approximately ten buses out of the 150 that have them on them at present. The new buses that we're purchasing actually all of them would have the APCs on them, but the current buses, there are about ten of them that have these APCs on them that allows us, again, to collect real time data as to where people are getting on and off of our buses. We have a lot of legacy or historical data, but in terms of a system-wide stop by stop picture of the system, we really can't right now get much finer than route level other than those ten bus.

And so one other item that's actually not on this list would be what the last speaker referred to, which is on-board audio-visual. So right now, yes, we have a mandate to announce to our customers basically where all of the major transfer points are. A lot of that deals with ADA and making sure that, again, our customers know where they are. That system is linked into, again, knowing where the bus is. So although the AVL system is and it's still being updated on the buses, they have not yet all been linked into the old BAF network. So that is our goal. We are aware that that's a problem and it's our intent to link up the audio-visual system to the AVLs as they are, as they continue to be installed. The same thing could be said for the destination signs. I mean, there was a time during the summer where they were actually experiencing issues related to this as well.

And so, you know, just quickly, we are in the process also of purchasing new fareboxes. The new fareboxes will allow for at least different and more ways to pay your fare. I guess in particular one of the things that you would be able to do is as a rider you will be able to get a receipt back for an overpayment of fare, which is something at present you can't do. Again, that's another item that is being purchased at present that should be installed during the next calendar year.

And then, you know, finally, what I had talked about in terms of a long-term vision plan, I think right now -- I guess I don't need to speak to it again, it is our goal, again, to figure out how to create a new, more efficient system moving forward. We would look to have your input and support on that when that time comes.

And so finally I wanted to end with this thought. It's actually from the Riverhead News Review, and again, as Assemblyman Thiele referred to, year-round service on the North Fork on the railroad is being restored. And so the significance of this is, you know, before I came here I was actually in the Operations Planning Department at New York City Transit, and I was actually there when the service was cut in June, 2010. And so to see this, you know, the railroad is not the city, it's not city transit, but I think the same truth holds. Just because the services is being cut right now because of where we are, it doesn't mean it is gone for good. And I think that, you know, it would be my hope that at, you know, a future date when funding becomes available, that we would be able to restore some of the services that affect some of the major points and locales. So it would be our hope that, you know, at some future date we would be able to write an article just like this for, you know, the current bus system. I think that was -- yeah, that's it. Thank you all for your time.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. I'm sure we're going to have a lot of questions. Just to be clear, in 2010 you were with the MTA when they cut service to the North Fork?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

I was with Transit when they cut service in the outer five boroughs. I'm not the one that brought this up if that's your question.

*(\*Laughter\*)*

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I've got a couple of quick questions. On the 8th and the 9th, who's going to run those meetings?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

That's an interesting question. I think it would be -- we would run them. I guess the Department of Public Works.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

DPW.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Are you going to give a presentation like this, too, so people have an idea? I mean, because you probably would answer -- I mean, something like this you'd probably answer most of the questions with. Are you going to give a presentation first or are you just going to take comment?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

I think that that's up to -- certainly that would be helpful.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

My own thought was more of boards and having people being able to go up and actually see what's being cut and having people there. But certainly this is something, you know, we'd consider.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

I mean, it was pretty comprehensive.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, absolutely.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

A couple of more short questions here. You mentioned receipts for fare overpayment.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

So how does that work?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

So presently if you pay, you know, the 2.25 in order to get on to a bus and you paid with three dollar bills, you don't actually, you know, get anything back. The intent of the new system would be that if you actually do an overpayment like that, you would be given a credit, a receipt, which is similar to I'm told like the magnetic strip that you get for a transfer and you could take that card and actually dip that in as a fare payment medium on a future bus.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay. And the AVL, the update, you know, the travel times for the routes -- but -- are you going to notice a lot of different travel times for different times a day? You are going to be into school bus

season soon, and obviously on a weekend you're going to have really peak times coming out on the North Fork, the travel is going to be real heavy. Are you going to account for those different -- it's kind of predictable -- travel time differences?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

I would think so. I mean, you know, I don't want to speak for the Transportation Division team, but it would be sort of really broad brushed to say that all day, you know, travel time between two points is the same. That's now not how I, you know, I've always thought of it as different from my days at Transit and I would think that it should be different here, too. Certainly, if you look at some of the routes like the 92, the summer schedule and the travel times that are out there would be markedly different from what you have there in the fall. And so without going into too much detail, I would think that you would want to have different sort of travel times based on time of day, but you know, again, I don't know the intricacies of sort of making that happen, but it makes sense that you should have those differences.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

And then just one more question before I let the committee ask. I know we're going to be asked this over the course of time. It's about the SCAT service, and I know you said the SCAT isn't going to be affected by this today, but we just increased the SCAT service because we got some grant money in. If that grant money dries up or disappears we're just going to just address that in a separate time in a different day if that happens.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Yeah, I believe we have the funding for two more years. At the end of that time hopefully there's more funding that can be obtained, but I would say or suggest that we address that when we get there.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

For now we have at least 50% of it paid for.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Okay. Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Anybody on the committee have any questions? Legislator Browning.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Okay. A young man I know, first day back to school, he goes to Stony Brook and lives in Mastic, so I think you know what bus he's taking to get to school. What's going to happen to him? He's in his senior year in Stony Brook and is not going to be able to possibly complete his year because there's no transportation.

I know that we've reached out to you about the industrial site across from the 7th Precinct, that now there's concerns by the employees who work there. Granted, there may not be too many of them, but the potential of losing their job because they can't get to work. And paying for a taxi is unrealistic. To say, you know, get a taxi to work because they might as well go on social services. They'll make more money.

So that I know that there are some crossovers and, you know, so are you looking at -- I know that the two bus routes in the Mastic-Shirley area, looking at them where maybe they're not crossing over but more of a connect, and did you look at the one that goes to Stony Brook? That's 71; correct?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Did you look at that to see where is the drop-off on the ridership? Where you do pick up the majority of the ridership, where does it drop-off, and is there a way to reconfigure the run and maybe hook it to say -- maybe go to Patchogue or take it up to Stony Brook. You know, are you looking at all of that? I'm assuming you would be.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah. I mean, I think that -- so the short answer to your question is yes, we are looking at it. I think we are sort of constrained with what we have to do right now to meet the requirement of, you know, of making the -- fixing the budget shortfall, but in particular, yes, Stone Brook, you know, is definitely one of the locations that we've looked at, you know, that we would like to figure out how to serve. And so from a global sense, again, without, you know, going into the specifics, you know, if there is a route that operates nearby like say the 60 that can serve the Long Island veterans home, you know, that is something that's under consideration. Similarly, you know, the 62, which operates by the Technology Park, you know, maybe that's a way that, you know, could run in there as well. You know, what you mentioned with Mastic to Stony Brook is a -- that is an issue. I mean, one could -- you could take the 68 to Patchogue and then you could take the 63 up to Smith Haven Mall and then maybe take the 3D back, you know, over to Stony Brook. So you could do it, but you're talking about, you know, more transfers and increased travel time. So it's possible, it's just that it won't be as convenient as it is right now.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right. You know, I think the entire system and how we operate the buses and I still think that there should be hubs in every town. There should be a hub in the Shirley-Mastics area maybe where people can take their bus to that particular hub and then be transferred to another hub, which will take them to where their end destination is. I just think that our system out here is so poorly done, and I guess when you look at Nassau County it's a bit more organized. I think it is.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah, I agree with you. I think that there -- you know, Nassau County by virtue of being just one county over from the City just intrinsically has higher ridership, more density, and more people on their buses. And it's just we always -- we're like one county away from that, so we like sort of fall back, you know, by geography. It's an unfortunate, you know --

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Right, and what's unfair is the funding, and I'm not going to say who said it, but when I spoke to a representative, not the one that was here today, about the funding and the fact that we don't get our fair share. Granted, geographically we're bigger. Maybe we don't have as big a ridership, but the comment that I get is, "Well, you don't have as large of a ridership." Well, yeah, maybe we would have a better ridership if we had a better service like Nassau County. So that was just a very poor excuse to me. So I really think that obviously we have to do more push from the State to fund us better, and maybe we could improve our ridership. We're, you know, I know I have a lot of kids in my district who are going to Suffolk Community College. Like I said, the one I just spoke to yesterday, his first day back today for his senior year going to Stony Brook. You know, how do you tell these people, "Well, sorry there's not much I can do for you." They got to finish school. They

got to get to work.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

All right. I mean, I think that we certainly, you know, again, to those that show up at the public hearing we would -- if they had sort of point to point details like, you know, you described we could sit down with them and sort of plot out, you know, a different way to get, you know, to work or to school. We could exchange that information. But, you know, to your point, I think that's when we talk about that long-term vision plan. I mean, what would you like to see the system, you know, look like in the future. That's what we're getting at. I mean, maybe it is hubs and even going out, you know, to look at these routes. You could sort of tell where the natural locations are. Like over at, you know, over near Mastic-Shirley, you know, right down Montauk Highway. People just congregate there and they're catching whatever bus, you know, like the 66 to Riverhead or you know, they're going back to Patchogue.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Train stations. Train stations can be hubs.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah.

**LEG. BROWNING:**

I know that Patchogue is working on getting the buses and you've been getting the buses into the Patchogue -- it's a hub. So that's what we need to be doing to improve it. And, you know, I know you got your work cut out for you. I think it's a major mess, how our transportation system is working. You know, it's a service we provide. It's not a revenue generator; it shouldn't be. Maybe there is some need for discussion to do a 50 cent increase. I know people don't really want to do that, but maybe now they will, but I think we need to have a better fight for our fair share to provide that service for the people who really need it. Thank you for your work.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

My pleasure.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Yeah, I think we all do appreciate the work you put into this. This is a daunting task.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Thanks.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Anyone else have a question? Legislator Fleming.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Hi, Darnell. Good afternoon, gentlemen. Thank you for coming and giving us this presentation. I think we can all agree that we have a unique and challenging public transportation landscape in Suffolk County. We're spread out, we have smaller riderships and we contribute per capita more than half of what New York City contributes to a much more expensive system to run, and we don't get our fair share back from the MTA and I think we all know that.

I am a little troubled by the idea that this idea of the long-term planning process, I appreciate wanting to have a longer-term blueprint and starting in January, but we heard from the Assemblyman that the fall is when we need to be in Albany. I will be, I hope that you will be as well. I think there are arguments to be made, but when, you know, and Assemblyman Ramos' bill is a good one. And I have to say, he garnered the support of the Black and Hispanic Caucus, which

is really meaningful because that's New York City votes, and what we're always competing against are those votes for our suburban needs. So there is a political -- I believe that there is a political will to get that thing across the finish line, but we have to do it the right way and we have to do it at the right time. So I'm glad to hear that there's a commitment to that, but I think, you know, the warm-up is done. Now it's time to show up for the true performance and get those funding dollars.

I mean, the other problem, of course, is that we are subject to Federal mandates as well as State mandates and the funding in those areas continues to drop, except for STOA. We did get some increased STOA funding, which was a good thing, but I'm very concerned. How do these, and this may be a question for you, Gil. How do these cuts affect the formula that's going -- that provides the STOA funding? Are we going to lose STOA funding because of these cuts?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

I mean, I think that that is a possible, you know, residual effect of this. I mean, if our overall revenue miles is decreasing because we're operating eight fewer routes out of the 53 then, yeah, one could expect if the formula is based on the number of miles that we operate, if we're operating fewer miles, we would get a sort of incrementally, you know, reduced rate. But, yes.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I appreciate that, but is that in your calculation? You showed us a slide with each of the routes that you're cutting and what the savings represented. Did that include loss of STOA funding?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah, obviously not.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

And what about layoffs? If we're losing staff because of this, I mean, it's because we receive funding from State and Federal Government, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the U.S. Department of Labor, those requirements call for a pretty comprehensive approval process if you're going to lose any staffing over this. Is that process calculated into your savings that you say we're going to realize through these service cuts?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

So the way that we calculate our operating expenses is basically by the number of miles that we operate, and so like that factor -- it's sort of like a flat rate. For every mile that we provide of service we pay between five and six dollars.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Does that not include staffing costs?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

It is, but it's a secondary -- it's not a cost that we as a department bear directly.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I guess my question is there are -- you know, it's -- it can seem fairly cut and dry to say these routes cost this much to operate, and therefore if we eliminate these routes we save that much money, but I've just come up with two places where that -- those cuts could actually cost us money. My question is are those offsets to the savings included in your calculations?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

At the current time, no.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Okay. Have there been -- I appreciate that you feel that this is a bump in the road with regard to the long-term planning, but for the folks who have been flooding my office with phone calls, they don't consider that a bump in the road. I guess my question to you is similar to Kate's question about the individuals trying to get to Stony Brook. What alternatives -- I mean, I appreciate -- let me back up a little bit. I appreciate that these are dollars, that you're trying to cut the dollars. You're looking at the routes where the dollar savings are going to be realized. I question, though, already from the two offsets that I'm thinking about just sitting here, but what about looking at it from the service provision side? What alternatives exist for the 10A and the 10E and the S90 riders?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

I think that that situation varies on the locations you're talking about. I mean, if you're talking about the 10A in the vicinity of Southampton running from SUNY to Town Hall, you can take the 92, but then the 10A actually diverts and goes up to Noyac and North Sea.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Noyac Road, 10A on Noyac Road. Those folks, how do they get to work?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Absolutely, you're right. I mean, this service cut would affect them because that one route that's there would not be there anymore, and that is, again, we talk about we didn't just, you know, we didn't just do this. It is a situation that we have, but that means that yes, there are instances in which corridors that had one route on them will not have service, but I think that, again, for us that's an opportunity to, again, find out from the public sort of which locations are the ones that, again, if we had resources we could allocate that funding. You know, that's why we need to hear from, you know, from the public at the hearings, you know, to again have those voices heard and answer those questions about how you get from point A to point B in the new system.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Okay. I appreciate that, and I don't mean to be targeting you personally for this. I know this isn't easy for anyone. I guess my question is when you say staff will be on hand for travel planning, you know, in the new system, what are you going to say to somebody who takes the 10A on Noyac Road? How do you get to work?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

10A on Noyac is a problem. It depends on if you're close to where the 92 intersects out by Sag Harbor or if you can get down to the 92 on 39. But to your point, yeah, there are people right now that will not be close to service and they will have to seek other alternatives to get there. We were aware of this.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I appreciate that. And so I guess I just am curious a little bit about the process. You know, you talk about a longer-term blueprint and looking at a vision of a more efficient system, but you've announced these cuts and so you're going to have -- as I noted the operator in my district was not included in a conversation prior to the cuts. I'm very grateful that we will be having that, but I think the public in my district needs to know what this process is. You've announced the cuts and then you say you're having public hearings. Are you intending to be responsive to those public hearings by making adjustments?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

It's a possibility. I mean, what we have right now is a proposed list. And actually maybe I should let the Commissioner speak.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No, no, please.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Okay. I mean, it's a proposed list. This is -- we, again, we were given the task to come up with \$4 million and this is the set of routes that made that happen, but it's not set --

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Okay. And again, I don't mean to be, you know, too hard on you personally. I just need these questions to be asked in a public forum, I hope you appreciate, on behalf of the folks in my district.

I guess, you know, we talk about this longer-term blueprint, which I think people have been crying out for for quite some time. Today is not the first day we learned that there were or even two months ago or even when we lost the fight in Albany, was not the first time we knew that we were subject to mandates and not getting our fair share. We also knew that these routes had not been reexamined in a very long time. We, the Legislature, authorized the purchase of different smaller buses. It was my hope that what that meant is that you would work with the operators, the advocates, some of whom are in the room now, and really look for that long-term blueprint. Now we now have the possibility of expanded rail services.

Well, what's the planning process, Darnell? Where -- how is the careful planning happening around a real data driven approach to what we need, how we're going to serve these folks who are out there riding the buses?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I can answer this one for Darnell. One of the first things we need to have is real data. Right now, as Darnell pointed out, we're -- and I'll grant anybody, we've been working on this for some time, but getting the AVL system into our buses, into all our buses, not just the paratransit, but the fixed routes, once we have that have data we can start to look at who's getting on where, where they're going, how fast our times our buses are running, are they running hot are they running cold. So all of this -- you know, we have talked internally about this for quite some time about being able to do this, otherwise it's not a data driven discussion.

So when we talk about long-term we are committed, and I have to speak on behalf of my staff who is fully committed to make this happen. None of them want to be going through this any more than the riders do. However, we were fortunate this year to only have to do this at the end of this year because of gasoline and diesel prices being what they were, there were savings that were realized. We were able to only do this in the last quarter of this year.

To that -- to answer your question, once we have the data in place from the AVL system we'll be able to do long-term planning. I don't anticipate it happening in the beginning of next year, but over the course of next year certainly if the State is able to fund additional service on the East End for the railroad it's something we will consider, but until we have the AVL operational, fully operational, the discussion is just really -- is not going to be there.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I appreciate that. I do think that there are some sources that you haven't tapped into, most particularly the operators of the buses on the East End, and I'm looking forward to a fuller discussion with them. I appreciate the statement that these are proposed cuts, and I hope that at the very least with their input as well as the input of the ridership we can look at how we're going to get these folks to work. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I don't understand how, you know, in this 10D and E we are paying \$82 a day.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

It's actually \$82 per ride. For each of those 12 people that get on the bus a day, that cost that should be on average \$7 a rider is \$82.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So only 12 people -- now, this bus -- on all these routes they just go from one end to the other, they turnaround and come back and go the other way?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah, it's a loop. I took a trip on the bus, on one of each of them. I think three people got on the 10D and then --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

When does it start? In the morning?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

They both start form -- well, they run all day.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So like eight o'clock in the morning until what time?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Maybe eight to six. I'm just speaking globally here. I don't want to you, you know.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Okay. My question is how did we let this happen? How did this -- who would ever do this? How could you -- after three days the bus would be shut down. How did this happen?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

There is certainly an historical element to this, right. If you have locales that --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

But I can go through each one of these -- I mean, we could have bought each one of these people a car, \$21,000 a person, we could have bought them a car. I mean, this is the reason why, you know, this is indicative of everything I see in the County. We just do stupid things continually over and over again because we've been doing it for 20 years. I mean, I think Kate hit the nail on the head with some of kind of hub system. There is no big buildings here. This is an Island.

When you said that Noyac Road, they're going to be hurting? Well, guess what? 2 Lane Court in Fort Salonga and somewhere else, somewhere else, you're going to have to walk to a bus. You can't go everywhere. It's just the nature of it. They are going to have to get a ride from Noyac Road to Montauk Highway. I mean, this is the most inefficient thing. It's up, it's down, it's in circle, it's ridiculous. I mean, who would get on a bus to go anywhere that goes around in a circle on side roads. I mean, I'm appalled to even look at this. We're paying \$82? If the taxpayers knew we were paying \$82, we could have bought these people cars, no wonder we're three billion dollars in debt. This is something that should be done now. I mean, something that you should look at and say look, we're going up and down. I'm flabbergasted how this has happened.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I may, Legislator. This is not the first time this has been brought to this body. Annually when we talk about the Operating Budget we advise the Operating Budget that's running on a deficit. We have had reports done, I don't know, it's like five years ago the Chiwani report was completed. It was -- you weren't here at the time, but they identified cuts that should have been taking place at that time. Cuts are not popular and, you know, unfortunately this is where we are right now given the system that we've had.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Is there a hub system? I mean, that only makes sense. There's got to be a hub system.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

So the two routes do operate out of the Hampton Bays, you know, Macy's, so that is -- you could consider that sort of like a natural hub for that area but, you know, to a point they are --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I don't know about all of them but, I mean, they seem to go in circles, on side roads, back, they cross over.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Well, in some cases loops work because if you have, you know, like very narrow streets you don't want to operate in both directions, so actually operating in one direction makes sense. And if you're doing that on a route that you can make that loop in a half hour, then it makes sense, again, on these, you know, narrower streets. But loops are confusing to folks.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

If I may. One other statement I would like to make, and Darnell please correct me if I'm wrong. A lot of these routes originated from the private sector. When the County took them over we took over their routes. So while that's some time ago, and hopefully the long-term planning will change that, these were routes that were found to be efficient enough that they could be maintained on an annual basis. Some, since that time since we took them over, there have been routes added, without question, but in many cases these are the same routes that originated in the 1960's and maybe even earlier.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So when it says the daily ridership, that's not a guy going from one end to the other. He could be going, you know, two stops. Correct?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah, a lot of these trips that are made are fairly short. I mean, like from -- I think when I did the 10D there was somebody that went from Hampton Bays to Tiana Plaza. And then, you know, there was maybe some folks that came up --

**LEG. TROTТА:**

For 82 bucks.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

I misspoke when I said that nobody was on the E. There was some folks that came up out of Shinnecock Hills and rode down to Hampton Bays. So folks make short trips and long trips. You know, they're basically trying to get to the nearest shopping center. So it does vary.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

So they want to go to the nearest shopping center. That's interesting. So now we have one from

Stony Brook all the way out to Mastic, and 159 people ride it a day. Some of them short, I'm assuming, at 20 bucks -- I mean, has anybody ever looked in to say listen, we can just pay these people if they want to go to a shopping center?

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

No, I mean, as a transit operating system we have to operate on a fixed route with a fixed fleet in order to use FTA funding.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

This isn't -- I mean, in my realm of thinking here I think we want to spend \$300 million for rapid bus transit coming up Nicolls Road, yet we have 159 people at a cost of \$20 a person. I mean, there's no big buildings here. This is a residential community. People have to walk to the -- it just blows me away that this is going on.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

All right. So we have -- everyone has had a chance to ask questions. I wasn't going to end it yet. Go ahead.

**LEG. STERN:**

Just a quick question. Now with these two scheduled meetings coming up it's an important conversation to have, not just among riders, but all of our stakeholders, businesses, those that are served by those who are taking the bus rides, etcetera. What's being done, if anything, to promote these two sessions to make sure that there is as good a turnout in participation as we hope to expect.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

So the information that I just gave you in terms of the dates, times, routes affected or routes, you know, nearby is posted on the Suffolk Transit website. We're actually posting it also in the Smithtown Messenger and the other paper that we have also in Smithtown, and notices are on the buses also. So we -- those are just off the top of my head the ways that we are notifying the public of this at a cost.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

There's no bus cuts in Smithtown. Maybe you should use like a South Shore paper or East End paper.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Well, those are the two official papers. By law we have to use the two official Suffolk County papers.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Maybe there will be a story in Newsday, I don't know.

**DEPUTY COMMISSIONER TYSON:**

Yeah, I think there was one.

**MR. PRESSMAN:**

I called the guy that wrote the story.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

All right. So someone who was unable to come for the public portion I would like to give them an opportunity to address the committee. And if you guys could just stay here for just in case anyone else has another question. Aaron Watkins-Lopez. Thank you.

**MR. WATKINS-LOPEZ:**

Good afternoon. I'm Aaron Watkins-Lopez. I'm with the Long Island Bus Riders Union. So just a few things that were said. Annually these cuts would be saving \$4 million. This year it's only one million, so we're going to be cutting service in the middle of winter for a million dollars.

Another thing, I know that Legislator Trotta had said why do we have them going down back streets, why is it all this looping. Well, not everyone can walk. Not everyone has the ability to walk or see or hear. The point of a public transportation system is to give everybody access to everything else. It's to get people to meetings or to get people to doctor's offices and so on and so forth.

As you all noticed when you looked at these maps, these are the routes that connect our major routes. If you get rid of those there's nothing there. We already have a portion of Suffolk County the size of Nassau without service. We're going to take what little service they already have and get rid of that.

As I hope that you are all aware, there is an RFP that has been put out to get a full system-wide analysis done of the Suffolk County Transit. As the Bus Rider's Union along with our coalition partners, Vision Long Island, Tri-State Transportation Campaign, the Sierra Club, Car-less Long Island, Car Free Day Long Island, we want a moratorium on these bus cuts. If you're going to be doing a full analysis of the system in 2017 or whenever the RFP says, why are you not doing it of all the routes? For a million dollars is it really worth it to kick people off their one mode of transportation, to disrupt people's lives for the next three months, for what, for a million dollars? It's not worth it.

I guess lastly what I would like to say is that there needs to be a bigger push from the County for this bus system. You look, there is a thousand signs throughout the Hauppauge County Complex that say watch out for motorcyclists. Not one that says watch out for pedestrians or watch out for bus riders. We don't have a County that's paved over. How many pedestrians get hit every week? We hear it in Newsday -- we see it in the newspaper, we heard it on the news.

We need to be thinking these bus cuts are not just affecting bus riders. If we kick people off the buses and they lose their jobs, then they go on social services. How much are we paying to keep -- to give them benefits to support them and then support their families and support their partners. It's more than just -- and as Legislator Fleming said before, and then you have the drivers, and then you have the driver's family. So what is the analysis being done on the County level of how these cuts impact everyone. What is this going to do for sales tax revenue? If people can't get to the malls, if people can't get to our universities, what does that mean for businesses, what does that mean for our local colleges? The analysis that is being done on these bus cuts is a very, very superficial, top layer of well, cut and dry as, you know, Legislator Fleming said before, of this is how much it costs to run the system, not how much is this going to cost the County when people lose their jobs and people can't get to school and people can't get to work, when people are sick. What does this mean for Suffolk County? It means a lot.

And Suffolk County, in my opinion, Suffolk County has done a really great job, a better job than Nassau County in funding their system and doing what was right for bus riders. And if you cut this service it's going to wipe away everything good you've ever done. And the State already has said, very black and white, cutting service means no money at all. And I think that we really need to think about what we're going to be doing in the future while we're running less service hours, getting less STOA funding, and the State won't even look at us because we're cutting service left and right. Thank you.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you. Anybody else have any other comment? Otherwise, we'll get on with the agenda.

Okay. Darnell and Gil, thank you very much.

**Tabled Resolutions**

Tabled Resolutions. ***IR 1322 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law to further incentivize the creation of affordable housing and to clarify requirements for residential developments connecting to a sewer district (Calarco).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion to table, Legislator Calarco; second, Legislator Stern. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore)***

***IR 1407 - Establishing the Suffolk County Safer Streets Program (Cilmi).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion to table.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Second the motion to table.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco; second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore)***

**MR. BRAUN:**

What was that a motion to do?

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Table. Sorry. ***IR 1465 - Directing County participation in regulatory proceedings (Krupski)***. I'll make a motion to table. Second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. ***(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore)***.

***IR 1668 - Re-establishing the Tick Control Advisory Committee (Fleming).***

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion to approve, Legislator Fleming; second by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Go right ahead.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

What happened to it?

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

They got bad babesiosis. They had to go home.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

That is not a funny joke. If I may through the Chair, respond to Legislator Trotta?

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Please.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

So they -- it was only a one-year term for the committee. It needed to be reestablished, and in light of the new Capital Program we did some work on reviewing how efficiently it was operating and made some changes, and now are reintroducing it in a new configuration. It will only meet three or four times a year and it will be advising this Tick Research and Management Program, which has now been established in the Arthropod-Borne Disease Lab.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

Does this cost any money?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

No.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

It's a nice committee. It's a lot of volunteers who are giving a lot of time and making a lot of effort to try to improve, you know, the tick-borne illness epidemic that we have. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore)**

***IR 1669 - A resolution making certain findings and determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 16 – Yaphank Municipal (CP 8158)(Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion by Legislator Browning.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

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

***IR 1670 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the planning improvements for Suffolk County Sewer District No. 5 – Strathmore Huntington (CP 8115)(Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. STERN:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

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

***IR 1671 - Appropriating funds in connection with Complete Streets (CP 3313)(Co. Exec).***

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion by Legislator Calarco.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Second by Legislator Stern. Commissioner?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This resolution looks to appropriate \$250,000 for construction of sidewalks, curbs and spot drainage at various locations. Work will be completed in conformance with the County's Complete Street Program as well as with the American's With Disabilities Act. The locations proposed are County Road 80, which is Montauk Highway extending from Louis Avenue to Old Neck Road in Brookhaven; County Road 71, Mill Road from Montauk Highway to Oneck Lane in Southampton; and County Road 11, Pulaski Road, from Stony Hallow to Woods Lane in Smithtown. This project and the next project, IR 1672, are standalone projects. We will be looking to do this work and the funding will be combined to do these projects.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

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

***IR 1672 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Construction of Sidewalks on Various County Roads (CP 5497)(Co. Exec.).***

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

***IR 1673 - Authorizing execution of a road maintenance agreement with the Town of East Hampton (Co. Exec.).***

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion by Legislator Fleming.

**LEG. CALARCO:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Second by Legislator Calarco. What is the agreement, Commissioner?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

This agreement is with the Town of East Hampton. They maintain our County roads within East Hampton. It's for a fee, but it enables us to not have to, especially during snowstorms, to go out to the East End, you know, and plow during a snowstorm.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

It's only per event then?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

But it's also if there's drainage that needs to be cleaned out. If there's, you know, work that needs to be done on our roads, you know, they will take care of that for us.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Is it a flat fee or is it based on performance or necessity to do any work?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

It -- I believe it's a flat fee, but it is based on performance, because if anything goes wrong out there we do hear it, and they're very responsive. If it turns out to be -- it's a not to exceed \$120,745 annually.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Thank you.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

You're welcome.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

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

***IR 1688 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Installation of Guide Rail and Safety Upgrades at Various Locations (CP 5180) (Fleming).***

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Motion by Legislator Fleming.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Second by Legislator Stern.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

On the motion.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Legislator Trotta.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

I was told that this is something that we put up and it blocks a view or something? Can someone?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

I'll be happy to answer if I could.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Legislator Fleming.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Another question I'll answer for you, Rob. So this is -- there was a steel guide rail that was installed without any community input by DPW that is pretty much destructive of an iconic vista. It's the one that Assemblyman Thiele was talking to you when he -- his second point here when he was here earlier today. The State has agreed to put up \$250,000 towards this. This is the first of what's planned with the Village of North Haven, the State and the County. The Town Trustees are also involved of a two-phase project that will include pedestrian safety and walkways, but this is just for the installation of the alternative system, which is DOT approved and which is supported at \$250,000 by the State.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

When did this go up, these steel ones?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I want to say a couple of years ago but I don't really know the date. We were advised there was an issue. We looked into it, we did a warrant study. The guide rails are warranted, they are needed in that location, and we put up the steel guide rails.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Were there ones there before?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

No.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

It was a very, very dramatic --

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Because they don't look good we're changing them?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

I'm sorry, could you repeat it?

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Because they don't look good we're changing them?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

The concern is twofold. One is the aesthetic impact on an iconic beach. It's one of our, as Assemblyman Thiele pointed out, it's one of our iconic vistas in Sag Harbor, and it also created a hazardous situation for pedestrians, joggers and runners in particular, who are now, you know, running up against this steel guide rail. The second phase is to get those pedestrians on the seaward side of this now less intrusive guide rail, which is the first step.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Did we spend planning money on this or we just put up the guardrail?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The guide rail was designed in-house.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Could I just note one thing that was troubling to me about this project initially, and I think it's something that the County really needs to focus on going forward. I was at the time a member of the Sag Harbor Chamber of Commerce, a member of the Noyac Civic Council, and a member -- an elected member of the Southampton Town Board, and this took me by surprise. It took the Assemblyman by surprise, and it took the entire Village Trustees by surprise. It's right here. That's Long Beach.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So on that long road there?

**LEG. FLEMING:**

It's called Long Beach. It's a beautiful site and it's a lot of family -- it's a family beach.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

Is there parking for the beach there? I don't see parking.

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Oh, yes. It's a major beach for us.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

On the west side of the road there's areas for parking.

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

Again, once the issue was or once DPW was made aware of the issue and we agreed that, in fact, the steel guide rail or the guide rail in general was warranted, we set about to install them. Albeit they're steel. Their reason for being is to protect the traveling public.

**LEG. TROTTA:**

So they want wood. Isn't steel better than wood to protect the public?

**COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:**

The guide rail that's installed is actually -- or that is proposed is steel constructed with wood fascia on it. It's, if I remember right, there's a steel beam and then on the outside there's a half-moon, there's a carpentry term, I can't think of it, but it's, you know, it's a half-moon portion that runs down the entire length.

(Sidebar conversation)

**LEG. FLEMING:**

Al, I think we're ready for a vote.

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I'm just going to abstain and go look at it.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

All right, thank you. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

**LEG. TROTТА:**

I'm abstaining.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

One abstention. So moved. **(Vote: 5-0-1-1 Abstention: Legislator Trotta; Not Present: Legislator Muratore)**

***IR 1711 - Authorizing execution of an agreement by the Administrative Head of Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest and 575 Broadhollow Rd. (HU-1208.1)(Co. Exec.).*** I'll make a motion.

**LEG. STERN:**

Second.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

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

And ***IR 1764 - Adopting Local Law No. -2016, A Local Law establishing a sewer connection policy to foster economic growth in Suffolk County (Browning).***

**MR. NOLAN:**

Has to be tabled.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Legislator Browning, do I get a table motion?

**LEG. BROWNING:**

Sorry, table for public hearing.

**CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:**

Table for public hearing. I'll second that. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? **(Vote: 6-0-0-1 Not Present: Legislator Muratore).**

Is there any other business for the committee? If not, then we are adjourned. Thank you.

**(\*The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m. \*)**