

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

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 Rose Y. Caracappa Legislative Auditorium of the William H. Rogers Legislature Building, 725 Veterans Memorial Highway, Smithtown, New York on September 26, 2016 at 2:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Legislator Al Krupski - Chairperson
Legislator Thomas Muratore - Vice Chair
Legislator Robert Calarco - Deputy Presiding Officer
Legislator Steven H. Stern
Legislator Robert Trotta
Legislator Bridget Fleming
Legislator Kate M. Browning

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

George M. Nolan - Counsel to the Legislature
Sarah Simpson - Assistant Counsel/Legislature
Jason Richberg - Clerk of the Legislature
Robert Doering - Budget Review Office
Gil Anderson - Commissioner/Department of Public Works
Darnell Tyson - Deputy Commissioner/Department of Public Works
Gary Lenberger - Director of Transportation/Department of Public Works
Robert Braun - Deputy Bureau Chief/County Attorney's Office
Katie Horst - County Executive's Office
Michael Pitcher - Director of Communications/PO
Alyssa Turano - Aide to Legislator Hahn
Catherine Stark - Aide to Legislator Krupski
Brendan Chamberlain - Aide to Legislator Muratore
Deborah Harris - Aide to Legislator Stern
Elizabeth Sutton - Aide to Legislator Fleming
Greg Moran - Aide to Legislator Trotta
Josh Slaughter - Aide to Legislator Browning
Richard Remmer - Oakdale New York Rising
Jen Siebert - Vision Long Island
Aaron Watkins Lopez - Long Island Bus Riders Union
Rick Brand - Newsday
And all other interested parties

MINUTES TAKEN BY:

Diana Flesher - Court Stenographer
Alison Mahoney - Court Stenographer

MINUTES TRANSCRIBED BY:

Kim Castiglione - Legislative Secretary

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

(*The meeting was called to order at 2:05 p.m. *)

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Welcome to the regular committee meeting of Public Works, Transportation and Energy. Please all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance led by Legislator Browning.

PUBLIC PORTION

We'll start with Public Portion. I have two cards. Aaron Watkins Lopez, and on deck Richard Remmer, who's back for a second appearance with us today. Aaron is up first. Thank you.

MR. LOPEZ:

Good afternoon. My name is Aaron Watkins Lopez. I'm a representative of the Long Island Bus Riders Union as well as a bus rider and a resident of Stony Brook. I'm just here today to remind this caucus of the importance of the buses that are slated to be cut on October 10th. We're happy that the cut was delayed an additional week which will give communities an additional only seven days to kind of acclimate to these devastating cuts. I'm hoping that there can be some sort of alternative to these cuts. We're hoping that DPW might have some other alternatives, as well as we need to find out more information on if there's going to be any other alterations of routes aside from just the S66. We need to be able to divest this information to the communities as soon as possible. A lot of bus riders are being left in the dark about what these cuts -- what's actually happening with these cuts and whether or not they're happening, if they're happening this week, if they're happening next week, if anything is getting rerouted, if anything's not getting re-routed. There's a lot of unclarity.

So we just really would like a clear yes, this is happening, this is the alternatives. If there aren't any alternatives then we need to know that and we need to be able to get this information out to the people that are going to be impacted the most heavily on these bus cuts, those specifically riding those routes. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Thank you. And I am going to ask Commissioner Anderson, after we have run through the agenda, if he could address some of those issues because we did have the two public hearings, one in Riverhead at the County Seat and one here. We had some good input and I just wanted to know what their reaction was to what they heard.

MR. LOPEZ:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Oh, wait. There's a question. Legislator Fleming and Legislator Trotta.

LEG. FLEMING:

Hi. Good afternoon, Aaron. Thank you so much for coming in, for everything that you do in terms of advocacy for public transportation. What exactly is your organization?

MR. LOPEZ:

So the Long Island Bus Riders Union is a coalition of bus riders, bus drivers, safe street advocates, as well as biking advocates that advocate for better, more accessible, more affordable public transportation across Long Island. We do work in both Nassau and Suffolk County. I am a resident of Suffolk County, so this issue hits really home for me. I live right off of Stony Brook Road so I do utilize the S71 when I get to the train station, and I did go to Stony Brook University as a bus rider as well.

LEG. FLEMING:

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

And who are the other members of your organization?

MR. LOPEZ:

So SILO Transportation is also a part of us, Vision Long Island is a part of our organization, Long Island Jobs With Justice. We have very close ties with TWU 252 as well as the Long Island Federal of Labor. Car-less Long Island is a part of us. We actually got a part of Car-Free Day Long Island, so we were one of the sponsors of Car-Free Day. Those are the pretty big -- the biggest members.

LEG. FLEMING:

It seems to cover a big swath of people who have a very sort of on the ground understanding of how public transportation is working or not working in Suffolk County. And to what extent, if any, have you had -- been invited to sit with the Administration and talk about the reconfiguration of routes or what routes work or what routes don't work? Not just recently, but over the course of the past years.

MR. LOPEZ:

So the only time we were asked to kind of sit at the table was over the summer once the last ditch effort to get money from the State failed. We were then brought in to the second meeting. There was a convening prior to where other community groups had been brought in. We were brought in to the second meeting after being kind of put forth by the Welfare to Work Commission, Dick Koubek. Then we were a part of a third meeting that was had and that's been about it.

The sad part was that at those meetings myself and only one other person were the only two bus riders in the room. I think that really shows the kind of disconnect between what's happening at the top and what's happening at the bottom. If you can't get the people utilizing the system to come out and talk about the system you're never going to know how to fix it. The Long Island Rail Road has a commuter committee that sits and talks about the issues. We can't even get a rider to sit in the room with the County.

LEG. FLEMING:

And those two -- you and the other bus rider who were the only one's involved in this discussion, did you make specific -- well, first of all, were you -- was it asked of how, you know, how the routes were working and if you were aware, not only as your own riders, but your organization with all its information from the street. How much did you feel that your input affected the decisions with regard to what, you know, wholesale routes were being cut.

MR. LOPEZ:

To be honest, when we had been brought into the meeting it was -- at that point it had just kind of already been decided. The cuts were happening and it was how are we going to push the State to give more money or how can we get this out to people as soon as possible. So we were only brought to the table once everything had kind of been cut and dry this is what's happening. But we have had conversations with John Corrado from Suffolk County Transit numerous times. Actually, a couple of years ago we had a whole discussion about right sizing before, you know, the S71 had been -- and these cuts had been proposed. So there definitely have been ideas being floated around on the ground and those actually impacted by the system, but we haven't been able to really bring those ideas to the people in charge of actually cutting or adding routes.

LEG. FLEMING:

I think that's really unfortunate, but I do appreciate your efforts and I hope that we can continue to work hard to include the folks who are actually using the buses and involved in organizing folks who use the buses to really get down to nuts and bolts about how to right size the system, how to reconfigure routes, how to change routes so that people who rely on buses, you know, for their way of life aren't affected by wholesale route cuts as opposed to smart approaches that frankly I would

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

have hoped had been happening for a long, long, time, that kind of planning. But thank you for your efforts.

MR. LOPEZ:

Thank you.

LEG. TROTТА:

You live in Stony Brook?

MR. LOPEZ:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

And you go to Stony Brook?

MR. LOPEZ:

I went there, I no longer.

LEG. TROTТА:

And you use the bus everyday?

MR. LOPEZ:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

Where do you go?

MR. LOPEZ:

Well, I take -- I go to Stony Brook Road, so I hop on the S60 to get to work. I work in Hauppauge. So I got -- I usually get on at about -- I go to the bus stop 7:30, the bus doesn't show up until about 7:45, 7:50. Then I go to the mall. I have to wait another half an hour, 25 minutes for the S62. Then I take that all the way down to Oser Avenue where I have to get off and then walk down to Rabro Drive where my job is on the corner.

LEG. TROTТА:

And what do you do?

MR. LOPEZ:

I'm a community advocate. I work for Long Island Jobs With Justice. I'm an organizer for the Bus Riders Union.

LEG. TROTТА:

So how did you get here?

MR. LOPEZ:

I took the bus.

LEG. TROTТА:

From Oser Avenue?

MR. LOPEZ:

I took the 45 up and then I just hopped off and walked over.

LEG. TROTТА:

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

And where does that drop you off, right on the corner there?

MR. LOPEZ:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

All right. So you live in Stony Brook and it takes you how long to get to work?

MR. LOPEZ:

Almost two hours.

LEG. TROTТА:

And then two hours to get home.

MR. LOPEZ:

Yes.

LEG. TROTТА:

Is anybody else on the bus when you get on the bus?

MR. LOPEZ:

Yeah. The 45 is -- usually it's filled. I mean, when I get on it in the morning it's a little bit less filled than that earlier routes. The 62 is always packed. The three o'clock 62 has been late for the last month and a half, so the four o'clock one is usually filled to capacity. Everyone is usually standing.

LEG. TROTТА:

What bus is that where they're standing?

MR. LOPEZ:

The 62. It's the bus that goes from Riverhead to Hauppauge. It's one of the most utilized routes in Suffolk County.

LEG. TROTТА:

And you get on it in Hauppauge on the way home, and where does it go?

MR. LOPEZ:

It goes to the Smith Haven Mall.

LEG. TROTТА:

And you get off and get on another bus. Actually, if you live on Stony Brook Road it's actually not that far of a walk.

MR. LOPEZ:

It's a 45 minute walk from the mall to my house.

LEG. TROTТА:

On Stony Brook Road? On the north end you must live. I look at these buses, I mean, I think you'd agree that it's not practical for us to spend \$82 on one of the buses out east where there's 12 people on the bus and they did the math and it came out, by the County's own calculations, it's \$82 a ride.

MR. LOPEZ:

I don't think it's practical that we have 40 foot buses going down communities that need 20 foot buses, you're right, but I also don't think these conversations should have been happening a month

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

before the bus cuts were being implemented.

LEG. TROTТА:

I agree. What was the name of the bus that's crowded? The S what?

MR. LOPEZ:

Sixty-two.

LEG. TROTТА:

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Oh wait, there's one more question. Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Thank you for being here today. I have an idea as to routes, but tell me again, what times do you take the -- your bus in the morning and what time do you pick it up to take you back for the two hour ride home.

MR. LOPEZ:

I mean, it depends. If my bus is late, if the S60 is late I'll usually take the train to Smithtown and hop on the S45 because that trip is shorter, but I usually leave my house at 7:30. I get to the bus stop at 7:33 in the morning. I wait for about 15 to 20 minutes. Usually the bus shows up at 7:50. I get to Smith Haven Mall at eight o'clock in the morning. I then wait until about 8:20, 8:25 for the S62. That bus -- the 8:20 -- the 8:20 is the schedule. Eight-twenty and 9:30 are always packed. There's always at least two bike riders on it, so both bike racks are being utilized. And then that gets me to Hauppauge at about nine o'clock and I get to my office at about 9:10, 9:15.

LEG. STERN:

That bus being so packed in the morning running from the mall to what was the specific stop there that you get off at?

MR. LOPEZ:

I get off at Oser Avenue.

LEG. STERN:

Oser Avenue. Is that where -- are many of the riders on that packed bus getting off in the Hauppauge area or are they going on to other areas, if you know.

MR. LOPEZ:

Well, no. A lot of them get off over at the Dennison Building and they transfer, so that major bus hub, a lot of people are getting off there. They're going on to 33 so they can go south towards Wyandanch, they're going on to the 27 so they can get to Babylon. The 54, you can get that to Patchogue, you can take that to the Commack -- the Huntington Square Mall, whatever that's called. So a lot of people are using the Hauppauge center as a transfer point, though a lot of people are using it to work here. I do know one bus rider who actually works in this building. He works in reception and he rides everyday and he rides the four o'clock with me.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. So 7:30 is when you're starting the trip -- or 7:50.

MR. LOPEZ:

7:50 is when I get on the bus, but I'm out of my house by 7:30.

LEG. STERN:

Got it. Okay. So 7:50 and you arrive at Oser Avenue at what time?

MR. LOPEZ:

9:15.

LEG. STERN:

And then at the end of the day?

MR. LOPEZ:

At the end of the day, due to the traffic on 347, I mean, the bus is about 30 minutes late. It's supposed to be there at 4:30, it gets there about 4:50, and I won't get to the mall until almost 5:45, 5:50 depending on the traffic.

LEG. STERN:

And then you pick up?

MR. LOPEZ:

The S60, which I have to wait another hour because I've missed the transfer at this point.

LEG. STERN:

So it's another hour from 5:45, so it's 6:45ish --

MR. LOPEZ:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

-- you're getting on the last leg.

MR. LOPEZ:

And then that's another 15 minutes to my house, and then a seven minute walk.

LEG. STERN:

So you're getting home at 7.

MR. LOPEZ:

Yes.

LEG. STERN:

So your day is from 7:30 to 7.

MR. LOPEZ:

If I'm lucky, yeah.

LEG. STERN:

Door for door. Do you have any idea what is going on with those routes that you just mentioned in the middle of the day? You talked about them being crowded buses, they're well utilized in the morning, when you're going to work and when you're coming home at the end of the day. Any idea what the ridership is in the middle of the day?

MR. LOPEZ:

I mean, I'm going to -- if I'm speaking about just the routes that I utilize, the routes that I utilize are the routes that are getting people to the County Center, so a lot of people that are utilizing them

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

in the middle of the day are going to DPW or they're going out to Riverhead. So the 62 comes here and then it goes all the way to Riverhead, so if they have to go to the County Center out they use that. The ridership in the middle of the day are generally riders that are using it to get to doctor's appointments, to do shopping. They're people that aren't using it to get to work. So they're not like the peak rider. They're the people that are using it to just kind of get their lives going and to do things, their daily errands. So ridership kind of dips a little bit, but there's still people that need those buses. They're not taking the bus just for fun. They're doing it because they need to get around and, you know, go to the doctors, go shopping and all that kind of stuff.

LEG. STERN:

Sure. But on those routes that you're familiar with in the morning and at the end of the day, which are very well utilized in your experience, the ridership is dipping. I understand those are routes that are going to be well utilized throughout the day because if you're not necessarily working at the County Center and Dennison, etcetera, the State Office Building perhaps, you're still coming because you're utilizing the services and you have meetings to get to and so I appreciate all of that. But at the same time, the ridership during the day, in the middle of the day dips, and we'll get the numbers on that. But in your experience would you say that it's much more utilized based on what you see, based on what you hear, in the morning hours and the later in the day hours because for the most part people are using it to get to work and to get home from work.

MR. LOPEZ:

For my routes? Yes. It is more utilized during the, you know, the peak hours, but that's because my routes kind of hit the places that need to be hit during peak hours.

LEG. STERN:

Sure.

MR. LOPEZ:

I can't really speak to some of the other buses that don't go to the big County Centers, the non-transfer points, but for my routes, yes. They're utilized mostly for peak hours.

LEG. STERN:

Okay. All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Legislator Fleming has another question for you.

LEG. FLEMING:

Just one more question, thank you. You mentioned that in the meetings where you and one other rider were at one meeting there was also the Director of the Suffolk County Transit who operates on the west side, operates the County buses on the west side of the County. Was there anybody there from Twin Forks Transit or the folks who run the County buses on the east side?

MR. LOPEZ:

Not to my recollection. I mean --

LEG. FLEMING:

Have you ever had discussions with them?

MR. LOPEZ:

I've never had any conversations with them, no, only John Corrado.

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

All right. And the next speaker is Richard Remmer.

MR. REMMER:

Mr. Chairman, members of the board, I will not repeat the testimony I gave this morning or the comments this morning. I did bring a handout. I don't know if each of you have that or not. Okay. Once again, I wear several hats here. I'm the owner of the Snapper Inn Restaurant in Oakdale. I'm also an environmental attorney, and probably most apropos to this map, I served as a Co-Chair for the New York Rising Oakdale-West Sayville Reconstruction Committee. I just wanted to make it clear how significant and important this step in the financing for the development of sewers is to Oakdale, South Oakdale and West Sayville.

As I mentioned this morning, there is a Town of Islip study that was done by PW Grosser, which determined the basic feasibility of taking a line from Great River, hooked up to the Bergen Point Sewer District, take that under the Connetquot River and then running that to Sayville. Then the primary community that would be served when that work is done would be South Oakdale, and if you look at the first plot here, you can see all the homes tucked between Montauk Highway and the Connetquot River. There are four or 500 homes in there where the depth to groundwater is less than five feet. Many of them it's only two feet or so. So you've got a post Sandy situation. People have made a decision to stay in the community, to rebuild. They're building new homes, they're elevating their homes, they're investing in their community. Local businesses are doing the same thing. At the Snapper Inn we invested almost a million dollars back into our facilities after the storm. I know The View Restaurant did something similar to that.

But ultimately there's no place for wastewater to go, and there aren't alternative systems, to the best of my knowledge, because even if you treated it in a box or something aboveground, it's only a foot or two to groundwater. It's going run horizontally. It either ends up in the river or the bay which results in pollution, or it slides across the next store neighbor's yard, a neighbor that is probably considering investing in his own house in his own community. As you can see, it's the vast majority of homes there.

I put that even more clear graphically, if you look at the second page, also prepared by the Nature Conservancy, but with data from the Federal Government. The areas in blue are the areas that flooded in Sandy. And sometimes it's hard to picture as you go down Montauk Highway, and even as you turn and go down Vanderbilt Boulevard, that water in Sandy went almost to Montauk Highway. So every home south of there is six feet or less the surface of the ground to high water, which means the water in their cesspools is two or three feet down at the very most.

This is an area that's critical to get sewers. We have a feasibility study that's already been completed. As I understand, the 1872 financing would put in detailed engineering such that if financing comes in place this could become a reality rather than just a dream.

And once again, my family has lived here for six generations. The Great South Bay is a significant resource, economically, recreational. Having it clean adds to our home values, adds to our tax bases. I certainly hope that you will consider this carefully. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Thank you for coming back. Any questions? Well, thank you.

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

MR. REMMER:

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

All right. That's the end of the cards. Is there anyone here who hasn't filled out a card who would like to speak? Sir.

MR. SEIBERT:

Hi. John Siebert with Vision Long Island and Tri-State Transportation Campaign. I just wanted to -- Aaron pretty much said it all I think, but there are a few other things. With the testimony that we had in Riverhead and Hauppauge it was said by a few folks that there might be 440 daily riders affected based on the numbers with these ten cuts, and it's ten routes, not eight, because the ten route and the seven routes, they really are two separate routes with two different riderships. Sure, if you do the numbers like that it would be 440 riders, but there are a lot of people that use it once or twice a week to go get their groceries or to go to a doctor's appointment or to just go visit downtown on a Saturday. It would completely disrupt their lives, especially the S71, which is the highest populated, highest ridership of the ones that are being cut. That service begins over by the Mastic/Shirley train station, ends at the Stony Brook train station. It's the only bus that goes to Brookhaven Town Hall where you have ridership when there are town hearings at night. Your Probation facility, if folks are just getting out of jail they might not be able to drive. We want them to be able to get to Probation. Long Island State Veterans Home if they want to visit a family member there. It's very important to really look at that.

One other important thing is Stony Brook University, one of the busiest universities that we have left on Long Island. And some of those students travel down the 71 at night and are housed in the Dowling facilities in Shirley. They then take the 70, which is also on the chopping block, up to there. So eliminating those two routes really puts them in a pigeonhole.

As far as economically also, I'm sure, and I do appreciate that the County is in a fiscal crisis. I know there's a lot of money that needs to be cut. I know that the State does not give us our fair share compared to Nassau County or Westchester. We've been going up there every year to Albany still advocating for that. I feel that the State might not want to pony up some of the money if we have some deficiencies here, such as right sizing buses or some of the routes that might not be too populated during the daytime. We got to take a look at that. Maybe you can cut some of the routes and that would cut some of the cost. If you have one or two people riding on a bus I agree, it might not be utilized.

Nassau County just went through a round of bus cuts last year and they found money to restore those cuts, which was wonderful. Right sizing the buses, doing flex ride, sort of like the SCAT system where you can reserve ahead of time, and the ridership has dropped. These folks -- it's going to be very hard for them to come back. They'll either need to look at losing their jobs, find alternatives, or sometimes they end up moving out of the area or things of that sort. If they end up losing their jobs there might be a bump on social services, you know? People would then not be able to afford food.

So it's very important to really look at -- the biggest thing that I'm looking at is it's great that there's an RFP out there for origin destination, that's a wonderful idea. We need to know where people are getting on and getting off. But it shouldn't be after you make the ten cuts. We don't know what we don't know. So how can we responsibly make these cuts and then do an analysis on what we should be doing better. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Thank you, John. Is there anyone else who would like to speak who has not filled out a card? All right, seeing none we'll go back to the agenda here.

TABLED RESOLUTIONS

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

LEG. FLEMING:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Motion to table by Legislator Fleming; motion to second by Legislator Calarco. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1465 - Directing County participation in regulatory proceedings (Krupski). I'll make a motion to table; second by Legislator Muratore. I have been working with Commissioner Anderson, Joe Schroeder and with Dennis Brown on this and we still feel it's important but it seems to be a work in progress, so. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

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

LEG. BROWNING:

Table for public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Is there a second on that tabling? Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1805 - Authorizing the transfer of certain properties from the Suffolk County Department of Public Works to the Suffolk County Department of Economic Development and Planning, Division of Real Property Acquisition and Management (SCTM Nos. 0200-140.00-04.00-030.000; 0200-420.00-02.00-009.000; 0400-146.00-01.00-009.000; and 0600-084.00-04.00-039.000)(Co. Exec.). I'll make that motion. Is there a second?

LEG. MURATORE:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Second by Legislator Muratore. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Thank you. This resolution requests that we surplus five parcels that are adjacent to roads and transfer them over to Real Estate. The locations are at the intersection at 25A and 347 as well as on the west side of Mark Tree Road opposite Kerry Court. The third is at the southeast corner of County Road 11, Pulaski Road, and New York State Route 110, as well as the northwest corner of CR 58 at Old Country Road and Doctors Path. So I stand corrected. The first parcel, the intersection of 25A/347 and 111 is no longer. It's only the next four.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

I have a question for you. The last one there, the Riverhead parcel, by Doctors Path. Is that something that you reached out to the town, either the Highway Department or the town to see if they have any use for drainage?

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I can't answer that. I don't know. I can certainly reach out to them. In either event we would have to declare a surplus anyway, so that would be part of this. We don't have any need as an agency for these properties anymore as far as from a road standpoint.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

I'm not familiar with the other intersections, I'm familiar with this one. Is this intersection -- because I know at one point the County road was widened to four lanes and then it goes back to two lanes, and then there it's kind of -- it's an odd location, it's like four lanes. Is that something you'd never, ever need to make that change, to continue four lanes all the way to 105?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would expect that it wouldn't be. If we are agreeing to surplus it, if we had any concerns about using that in the future we wouldn't have let it go.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Okay. Do you think we could -- so you're going to surplus it either way, if it's going to be auctioned or it can go to the municipality.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I can reach out to the town if you'd like.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Actually we did last week when we saw this, but if you could also I would appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

All right. Any other questions? Do we have a motion and a second?

MR. RICHBERG:

Yes, we do.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1812 - Honoring an American Hero, Army Ranger Sgt. Jason Santora, by renaming a portion of County Road 16 (Muratore). Motion by Legislator Muratore. Second by Legislator Fleming.

LEG. BROWNING:

Does it go in front of the Sitings? Oh, it doesn't have to?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Why not?

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

MR. NOLAN:

Road namings after veterans who have lost their lives in combat do not go to the Namings Committee. They are on a separate track.

LEG. BROWNING:

I did not know that.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Very good.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

May I?

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Just one real quick question, and I think I checked online, too. On the first RESOLVED, where it says between Leeds Boulevard in Farmingdale, was that corrected to Farmingville?

MR. NOLAN:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It was? Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

All right. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved.
(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)

IR 1815 - Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the capital fund, amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds for Chemical Bulk Storage Facilities for Sanitary Facilities in Suffolk County Sewer Districts (CP 8178)(Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second? Do you have any specific projects?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes. This resolution seeks to authorize \$250,000 to construct truck containment areas at each of our sanitary facilities, whether treatment plant or pump station. The work will include storage tank safety devices as well as appropriate documentation and permitting. Currently we're progressing a capital project to permit and replace underground emergency generator fuel tanks at Bergen Point. We're also -- we'll be looking to use funds for similar improvements at various, whether it's pump stations or treatment plants, throughout our districts.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

The question I have is why wouldn't this money come out of the districts?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't have an answer for you on that. John?

MR. DONOVAN:

Good afternoon. Basically it in a way does come out of the district. It's ASRF funds that get charged back to the districts on a percent basis, but it's easier to do one capital project for this type of work

and then do it that way.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

What is the schedule on something like that? I mean, is it five year payback, 20 year payback?

MR. DONOVAN:

It's settled up every year.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Oh, okay. All right. Thank you. So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1818 - Transferring Assessment Stabilization Reserve Funds to the capital fund, amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program, and appropriating funds for Safety and Security Improvements for Sanitary Facilities in Suffolk County Sewer Districts (CP 8103)(Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. Any questions? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1821 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 11 Selden (CP 8117)(Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. FLEMING:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1822 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the increase, improvement and extension to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 18 Hauppauge Industrial (CP 8126)(Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second.

LEG. TROTТА:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

On the motion, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

What is this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This funding is requesting \$6 million to complete the construction of the last two phases of sewers within the Hauppauge Industrial Park. It's Sewer District 18. We'll be installing new sewers within the industrial park and that's what these funds will be used for.

LEG. TROTТА:

Is this connections or?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

This is the actual sewers.

LEG. TROTТА:

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

I thought it was finished at the sewer plant.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The sewer plant is done. This is -- part of -- only a portion of Hauppauge Industrial Park was sewerred. We've expanded that as part of creation of -- the construction of the new treatment plant. So this was broken into I think four or five phases of sewers. So this is the last two phases of sewers.

LEG. TROTTA:

This is the piping, then.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. Within the road.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

All right. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1823 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 7 – Medford (CP 8150)(Co. Exec.).

Motion by Legislator Calarco.

LEG. BROWNING:

I guess I'll second it. Which one is seven? Isn't it Farber?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Seven is -- there's two plants within seven. There is Twelve Pines and then I think what you're calling the Farber Plant. But this is actually for sewer repair and replacement. It's 250,000 for continued sewer repair and replacement of 40 year old, 12 inch diameter asbestos cement pipe along Woodside -- Woodside Avenue that lead to the Twelve Pines Plant.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

So we have a motion and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1824 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 10 – Stony Brook (CP 8175)(Co. Exec.).

Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1825 - Transferring Southwest Stabilization Reserve Funds to the capital fund, amending the 2016 Operating Budget, and appropriating funds for improvements to Sludge Treatment and Disposal at Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (CP 8180)(Co. Exec.).

I'll make a motion. Is there a second? Second by Legislator Stern. Any question about the sludge disposal funding? All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1826 - Transferring Southwest Stabilization Reserve Funds to the capital fund, amending the 2016 Operating Budget, and appropriating funds for Inflow/Infiltration Study/Rehabilitation and Interceptor Monitoring at Suffolk County Sewer District No. 3 - Southwest (CP 8181)(Co. Exec.). Same motion, same second. Commissioner, what does all

that mean?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

What we are doing here is looking to replace piping where -- let me step back. Over the past few years we've done an in flow and infiltration study throughout the district to try and find pipe where groundwater or other types of water are leaking into the system. This will replace that piping to basically create sealed in piping, reducing the water that's going into the plant and making it that much more efficient and saving the County money.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

So since we're talking about Southwest and there is a County golf course next door, there was a celebrated moment on the Peconic River on Friday where the Riverhead Sewer Treatment Plant is now pumping the effluent on to the County golf course and using it for irrigation, and obviously for treatment of anything that's left in the waste after it's been treated. Is there any plans to do that at Bergen Point?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No. Primarily Bergen Point is a secondary treatment facility. I believe Riverhead is tertiary so it's a different level of treatment. Don't necessary want that going on to the golf course. Also, the flow to Bergen is much greater than it is in Riverhead, so it would only be a small portion of it. But if we decided to do that we would have to add in another level of treatment that we don't currently do.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

I thought you were going to say that it's because you golf there.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I won't even go into my golf game.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Is there any other County facility where we would consider that kind of treatment and that kind of water reuse?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, not yet. Not at this point.

LEG. TROTТА:

What about Kings Park? Didn't you just redo that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The Kings Park facility, yeah, but is there a golf course nearby?

LEG. TROTТА:

Smithtown Landing and Sunken Meadow.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I mean, it would have to be pumped a great distance to get to Landing. I know where Landing is. That's way down.

LEG. TROTТА:

It's actually very simple. It's right along the river. It's probably not a half a mile away.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

Well, going down -- you have to go down St. Johnland to quite some way. I mean, you'd have to go through --

LEG. TROTТА:

Not a mile.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's all? I thought it was longer than that.

LEG. TROTТА:

No, it's definitely not. I drive it everyday. And then Sunken Meadow --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We can look at it. I just don't -- I think it's --

LEG. TROTТА:

My question more is the water quality of that quality. It's not. I mean, I thought you put all those --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

All right, yeah. That's the same thing. It's the level of treatment would have to be greater because we outfall.

LEG. TROTТА:

Okay.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

At what point are we going to upgrade to -- so, I mean, Riverhead is doing it and they're doing it to protect the water quality of Peconic Bay. What point will the other sewage treatment plants have to treat the waste to, you know, to a comparable water quality.

MR. DONOVAN:

You would need to, you know, add a lot more treatment. It's almost ultra-filtration to try to get as much of the viruses and whatnot out of the waste, out of the effluent. I was involved -- we were involved with the Riverhead filtration project, and basically for 300,000 gallons a day, which is what they sent to the golf course, only in the summer, they spent I think in excess of \$3 million for that kind of treatment for that amount of water. So it's very expensive. They got a grant so that's why they did it, and they had a State grant. That's one of the reasons they did it. If they had to fund it themselves I don't think they would have done it.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So when you look at the economic driver that Peconic Bay is, whether it's shellfishing or fin fishing or recreation, three million dollars is a really good contribution towards keeping the quality of that bay what it is. It really pales in comparison to the efforts that the five surrounding towns have made towards water quality. So, I mean, that was completely in line, really, with the goals of the whole region, is to keep the water quality clean. So don't you think that that kind of investment should be made elsewhere? It's an unfair question, I'm sorry, but I'd like your opinion anyway.

MR. DONOVAN:

We spoke too early sooner. We did look at this for the SUNY treatment plant that discharges into the Long Island Sound and we looked to use irrigation on the campus grounds and they were a little skittish about being the first ones around to do that. We looked at the St. George Golf Club, which

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

is not far from our treatment plan, and they didn't want to have anything to do with it. So that was probably going on ten years ago before the Riverhead project, but since then we really haven't had any opportunities to look at doing it other places.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is an opportunity at Shelter Island where, you know, it's a homeowners association -- Shelter Island Heights Association has a small sewage treatment plant. They pump about 20,000 gallons a day and it abuts the Shelter Island Golf Course, which is a municipal golf course. So if we could look for some sort of opportunity to work private partner -- I mean private-public partnership at different levels I think it's a worthwhile place to explore.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Do they use a lot of -- I've been -- I've golfed there. Do they use a lot of water there at Goat Hill?

LEG. FLEMING:

They do, in fact.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay.

LEG. FLEMING:

I don't know if you -- we actually also, you were talking about the celebratory moment, we had a celebratory moment on Shelter Island just a couple of days ago where the County is partnering to construct constructed wetland as sewage treatment -- as wastewater treatment, which is a really exciting new technology. It's non-proprietary. So there's a lot of fun things happening on Shelter Island in terms of wastewater treatment. But it would be nice if we could get some attention to that STP. I think it's a possibility to do the golf course there.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

It's a really good idea. Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So I'm assuming that the reason why you can't use it in the golf course is the nitrogen levels are too high, correct? Is that what it is? Or there's other contaminants in the water.

MR. DONOVAN:

There are other contaminants still in the water.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So the -- where the effluent is going right now, obviously it can't be good for that waterway, and we're continuing to hook up other communities, And I see we have the one for Sayville, to continue to hook up other communities to the Southwest Sewer District, but we're not fixing that problem. So it just seems to me if you're going to sewer Oakdale, Sayville, Ronkonkoma Hub and everywhere else that might just want to hook up, wouldn't it make sense to invest the money to better filtrate the effluent?

MR. DONOVAN:

Basically sewage treatment plants purpose is to clean the sewage into an effluent that is acceptable to be discharged, whether into the groundwater or a surface body water, and there are State limits that you have to meet, which we meet on all of our plants. I don't think there's anywhere in the

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

country that cleans it up to drinking water standards, which is almost what you have to do if you want to irrigate it. That's the difference, and to do that it would cost a lot more money at all our plants to meet that quality. I don't think it's necessary. Even going into the ground or into the ocean or into the bay, the pollutants that affect those bodies of water are eliminated, which mostly is nitrogen, suspended solids, things of that nature, phosphorus. The remaining contaminants, if you want to call it, is really just viruses and whatnot that is really very hard to get out of any kind of water.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. Just curious what it would cost if we were to consider improving the filtration of the effluent. Do you have any idea right now?

MR. DONOVAN:

Well, if we use Riverhead as an example, and again, I don't know if this could be correlated to our plants, but it's basically another ten to 15 dollars a gallon. Bergen is a 30 million gallon a day plant, so you're looking at 450 to 600 million gallons. The out of districts total adds up to about ten million gallons at all of our plants, so that's, you know, another 150 million dollars.

LEG. BROWNING:

That's a lot of money. But now that -- okay. The Mt. Sinai Sewage Treatment Plant that I recently went to see and Farber Plant, is the discharge out of them different, you know, as far as the contaminants and the effluent being discharged?

MR. DONOVAN:

It's not drinking water quality.

LEG. BROWNING:

No.

MR. DONOVAN:

It meets the State SPEDES permit criteria.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, but is the amount of contaminants, is it at a lower level than what's coming out of Southwest?

MR. DONOVAN:

All the plants pretty much have the same kind of concentrations coming in, and they pretty much all have to meet the same limits as far as groundwater plants. Surface water plants like Bergen is different. They don't have to remove nitrogen because it's going out into the ocean. So they all pretty much have the same, again, the same concentrations.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. If you could maybe at some point provide us with some of that information I'd appreciate it.

MR. DONOVAN:

Sure.

LEG. BROWNING:

Because when we're doing the new plant in Shirley/Mastics, I'm just curious what's the contaminants that are going to be coming out of that, the effluent. I know that the nitrogen is going to be much lesser, lower than, you know, same on-site system eventually. So it would be nice to see what the numbers are and what the contaminants are. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

I think Legislator Browning's right, I think if you, when you look at some of these other plants that go into different harbors, and they see what Riverhead's doing and they say, *Oh, you know, we'd like our harbor to be cleaner also*, and Riverhead's making a substantial investment there, and it's really for the whole, it's not just for Riverhead, I think they might be looking for more upgrades, too. It's hard to put a price tag on going out fishing or boating and not having the waters closed to bathing. It's hard to quantify that, put a number on that and say that's it, we can't do it, it's too expensive.

MR. DONOVAN:

We upgraded our Long Island Sound Plant to Kings Park, Port Jeff and SUNY to meet the nitrogen -- the stricter nitrogen requirements that the State imposed on us. Riverhead had to do the same thing for discharging into the Peconic Bay. The ultra filtration that they use when they give water to the golf course, they only use it when they give water to the golf course. They do not use it when they discharge into the Peconic.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Thank you. All right. So we have a motion and a second on IR 1826. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1827 - A resolution making certain findings and determinations and issuing an order in relation to the increase and improvement of facilities for Sewer District No. 7 – Medford (CP 8194)(Co. Exec.).

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Motion by Legislator Calarco, second by Legislator Browning. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1835 - Appropriating funds through the issuance of Sewer District Serial Bonds for the improvements to Suffolk County Sewer District No. 14 – Parkland (CP 8151)(Co. Exec.).

Same motion, same second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1855 - Developing A Comprehensive Renewable Energy Construction Plan for Suffolk County (Browning).

LEG. BROWNING:

I am tabling that one for now. We are having some conversation.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Okay. There's a motion to table -- still developing it. Is there a second? Second by Legislator Muratore. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1867 - Requiring the Department of Public Works to provide notice of certain capital projects to towns and villages (Fleming).

LEG. FLEMING:

I make a motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Motion to table, Legislator Fleming. Second by Legislator Muratore.

LEG. FLEMING:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

On the motion.

LEG. FLEMING:

I appreciate the contact from the Commissioner. We're discussing this. I'm very committed to the intent of this, which is to avoid the heavy hand of government coming and undertaking projects that have impacts on local communities without their input. But I certainly appreciate the importance of getting it right in terms of timeline and what projects that would be. So I'm looking forward to further conversation, but we will be bringing this back. I'm tabling it if everyone agrees.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1870 - To expand the Scope of the Energy Utility Legislative Oversight Committee (Martinez). I'll make a motion to expand the scope. Is there a second?

LEG. FLEMING:

Second.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Second by Legislator Fleming. Commissioner, do you have any objection to this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, it appears the legislation, and I would probably check with George, but is expanded where applicable to include the installation and removal of utility poles and transmission lines, so I'm assuming it has to do the double wood poles.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Yes.

MR. NOLAN:

Not exclusively.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We've been having discussions with FEMA on their storm hardening project that's going on right now and their responsiveness in replacing the double wood poles. We're fine with it.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Thank you. I have a motion and a second to approve. Motion by Legislator Muratore; second by Legislator Fleming. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1871 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating Pay-As-You-Go funds in connection with MacArthur Industrial (CP 8102)(Co. Exec.).

LEG. TROTТА:

On the motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

We don't have a motion yet but go ahead, Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTTA:

Can you give us some detail on this?

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Well, we can just have a discussion first I think. Go ahead.

MR. DONOVAN:

This project is to design a force main and pump station in the MacArthur Industrial area that will eventually collect flow from the surrounding industrial park and transfer it to the Ronkonkoma pump station, which will then transfer it to Southwest. So this is just design money for the design of the force main and pump station. It's not for the design of any of the surrounding industrial park. That will come later on when more funding is secured.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

Where does the -- it's for a million dollars?

MR. DONOVAN:

A million dollars for the design, yes.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

So where does this pay-as-you-go money, million dollars, where is that money? Everyone would like to know.

MR. DOERING:

I believe this was money that was actually put in for the discretionary Omnibus resolution into the Pay-Go Fund. Initially I believe the intention was to apply it to a customs house at the MacArthur Airport.

LEG. BROWNING:

Motion to table.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

I have a motion to table by Legislator Browning. Second --

LEG. TROTTA:

Second.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

By Legislator Trotta. Go ahead.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So we originally put this money in for the customs house that we were told was very important and we needed to build. So the suggestion now is to shift to doing a force main that would service the industrial park for our trade zone? Is that what we're talking about?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It would generally service that area, the industrial park south of the airport. It would provide a place where the sewers could connect to and then the effluent be sent -- or the influent be sent up to Ronkonkoma Hub. Similar to what we did in Hauppauge.

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So we would collect in the industrial park and send it to the Ronkonkoma Hub pump station, that would then send it all on to Southwest. Something along those lines.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It would construct a pump station in a preferred location where eventually the sewage from the MacArthur Industrial Park could come to and then we would pump it to Ronkonkoma Hub.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Sure. I guess like this ties into the original plan with Ronkonkoma Hub which was to build a plant, and the plant would service the industrial park as well. Now instead of that we're going to do a collection system that will tie in is what is being proposed.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, in either way we would have had to have done this.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Sure.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Whether it was a treatment plant or a pump station it would have had to have been pumped from MacArthur up through the airport and, you know, it includes the airport, but then into --

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Sure. I guess then the question is for the Administration really because this is more of a policy question than for you, Gil. Was there discussions with the Town of Islip that this was a preferred plan as opposed to the customs house, which I remember about this time last year was something that was being pushed as a very important part of the redevelopment and rebranding of MacArthur Airport.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I can say that the discussion with McArthur Industrial Park has taken place with the town and they -- I can't speak on the custom house issue, but as far as the industrial park, yeah, this has been discussion we've had with Islip.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

And they prefer this plan. They would prefer us to pursue this as opposed to work at the airport.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That I can't answer.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

As I said, it's probably a better question for Katie or someone from the Administration to address. She looks like she's trying to get an answer for me.

MS. HORST:

It's my understanding that the Town of Islip does support this plan, this current plan.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

So they are not moving forward with their plans of bringing in international flights any longer?

MS. HORST:

I wasn't able to get that answer as quickly as the first one, but I will see what I can do.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So we have a motion to table and a second. On the motion, Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

I just have a question with regard to the funding source. These are -- these -- is this funding that has been approved but not appropriated, or has it been appropriated as Operating Budget and now we're transferring it to Capital or being asked to?

MR. DOERING:

These are funds that through the discretionary Omnibus resolution were placed into Fund 101 -- 401, the Pay-Go Fund, but there has been no resolution appropriating these funds at this point.

LEG. FLEMING:

But the suggestion is that these -- this cash in the bank be now transferred to the Capital Fund; is that correct?

MR. DOERING:

The resolution that the Administration has put forward is indicating that they would use the money in this fashion.

MR. NOLAN:

By putting it in a Capital Project they can keep it -- they can spend it next year or the year after. I think that's probably the reason they're doing this, is so they can preserve the money for down the line most likely.

LEG. FLEMING:

But the second Whereas clause is calling for the funds to be transferred to the Capital Fund.

MR. NOLAN:

Exactly. Right now it's in the Operating Budget, it's cash, but if we don't spend it by the end of the year then it goes away and it won't be used for that purpose that we put in the budget for. But if you put it into a Capital Project, then it can -- you know, it still needs to be appropriated this year, but you can use it over a longer period of time. It won't disappear necessarily at the end of this year. I think that's probably why the money is being moved into a Capital Project.

LEG. FLEMING:

Aren't Capital funds usually drawn down from a bond issue?

MR. DOERING:

Typically my understanding is 525 is the Capital Fund and that's where the monies are placed. So when the bonding occurs is when the Capital Project requires funding. So that, you know, the bonding don't usually occur, and correct me if I'm wrong, Gil, you would probably know better with respect to this, but they determine how much money they're going to need on a project and then they actually go out to bond.

LEG. FLEMING:

Could I just ask the Commissioner then what the timing of this project -- what sort of financing does the timing -- the planned timing of the project you've described require?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right now we are preparing the RFP. We anticipate getting the RFP out within the next week or two

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

through our Central Purchasing Office, and it's the goal of the department to award the contract before the end of the year so that we can start work on it right away and get this thing, you know, get it moving. So obviously with that goal in mind that's why we're looking for immediate funding.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Stern. I've got a list, a growing list.

MS. HORST:

I'm sorry. Can I just answer Legislator Calarco's question on the funding? The town is looking for alternative funding for the customs house. They're still looking to move forward with their alternative funding. I don't know where, but they are looking for it.

LEG. STERN:

Both of my questions were asked and answered at this point.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

We don't even know how this Ronkonkoma line is being run, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, we do. We're running right now -- the design is being completed. We're going through Islandia. We've reached an -- you know, I think it has to go through this cycle for the IMA with the Village, but we're running the --

LEG. TROTТА:

Yeah, but we haven't -- you haven't put out a Request for Proposal to design that yet.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, we've been underway for Ronkonkoma Hub for some time. The project was stopped when the Village filed the Article 78, but we just continued --

LEG. TROTТА:

So you have the engineering done?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We're completing the construction plans now.

LEG. TROTТА:

So they were being done prior, and then there was the change.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right. We were up to the SEQRA process two years ago, I think, when the Village filed the Article 78.

LEG. TROTТА:

If it would have went the other way we would have wasted a lot of money is what you're saying, because we spent a lot -- I'm assuming we spent a lot of money on engineers to figure out how to go through Islandia.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

Well, yes, to answer your question, you're right, correct. If we had changed directions it would have spent about a million dollars.

LEG. TROTТА:

So now we're going to spend another million dollars to hook-up to a plant that's not really -- or to a pump station that's not locked in yet.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, I mean, we have the agreement, it's coming before the Legislature, with the Village.

LEG. TROTТА:

What do we get for this million dollars? Physically, what do we get? What are we spending a million dollars on?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The million dollars on this project will get us a pump station, I'm cursorily speaking right now, somewhere in the southwest corner of the MacArthur Industrial Park. That will then have the ability to run a force main up to the north. I'm assuming we're going to connect in with the airport somehow, and then go under the tracks and run into the pump station at Ronkonkoma Hub.

LEG. TROTТА:

That's the design. We don't get a brick, we don't get a mortar, we don't get a pipe.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. You get plans and specifications.

LEG. TROTТА:

I got to tell you, we can't hire someone for \$150,000 a year to do this? It just -- it makes no logical sense.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's more than just one person. You have survey work that's involved, you have various levels of engineering work that are involved, and right now we've got so much sewer work going on that it's not a matter of just, okay, everything we're doing we're going to hire -- add two, or three more people. It's you have to hire surveyors, you have to hire additional engineers, electrical engineers, regular civil engineers.

LEG. TROTТА:

What do we need an electrical engineer for?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

To develop the pump station. There's a lot of electrical work that's involved.

LEG. TROTТА:

I know, but I'm assuming we have 50 pump stations. We know what we're doing with a pump station. I mean, I've had these guys in my office and everyone says the same thing, it's so overkill. Everything is planned and designed and planned.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There's a reason for it. I mean, if you follow the 10 State Standards you have to -- you know, there is safety precautions, safety levels, factors of safety that have to be met. And, you know, the same argument we've had in the past where we discuss with private treatment plant operators and they only bring one guy in where we bring two. There's reasons for it. It's not just trying to -- you know, we're not just being indiscriminate in our spending. We're concerned with safety, we're concerned

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

making sure we have the right safety factor when we're developing these projects and that we're meeting all the standards that are required. It's not 10 State, it's, you know, you've got the Department of Environmental Conservation, all these regulatory agencies that we have to, you know, get their permits and approval.

LEG. TROTТА:

It's a four-inch pipe in the ground.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's not a four inch pipe. It actually more than likely will be two pipes similar to the Ronkonkoma Hub that will allow, you know, initial flow as well as the final flow.

LEG. TROTТА:

Two flowing?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

More than likely. Well, I don't know yet. The size could -- is dependent on, you know, the flow. It's probably -- one will be a small pipe to handle the initial flow, and then the second pipe will enable the capacity to transfer to the bigger pipe and either all contained within a larger pipe or possibly some shared.

LEG. TROTТА:

All right.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

I think Rob asked pretty much what I'm trying to get at, is if we don't do this now, I mean, how critical is it? Because, I mean, you kind of said your assumption is it would go to the airport, so I guess we're putting in something that we're making assumptions on. But if we're going to do, you know, if we're doing Ronkonkoma Hub and sending it down to Southwest Sewer District, we have so much more to be done yet, and that's connected to the Ronkonkoma Hub project. So I just don't see that it's critical for us to do this now, and clearly the way the Budget Working Group that's going to be meeting shortly to decide whether you guys want to do something with that money other than this project. So I kind of feel that maybe we should be working on the Hub project and what needs to be done to head towards Southwest Sewer District, and then that would be -- I don't want to say the afterthought, but part two.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, we are -- and we anticipate completing the Ronkonkoma Hub design and going out to bid end of this year, beginning of next year. So that project's really happening. The -- this project, and the reason we're moving this project forward, is because of the anticipation of future funding that's going to be out there for shovel ready projects. So it's this department's belief that the million dollars is well spent to have a set of plans that when the funding does become available, and we think it's going to be because, you know, not only with Sandy funding that's out there, but there's a lot of Federal funding that they're starting to go for projects they were never completed and take that funding and start to offer it out to other areas where there are needs and plans that are ready so they can just go right to construction.

Just to clarify something I said earlier. What I meant was it was always the intent of connecting MacArthur Airport to the Ronkonkoma Hub. What I meant was I couldn't tell you whether or not we were going to go from the airport down into the MacArthur Industrial Park to the pump station, or

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

from the pump station up to another pump station in the airport up all the way. That would still have to be developed, so that's kind of what I meant if I was unclear. I didn't want to make it sound as though we're still considering the airport. We always wanted to connect the airport, so.

LEG. BROWNING:

I'm not on the work group and AI, I think you're -- you're on the Operating Work Group?

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

(Nodded head yes).

LEG. BROWNING:

I mean, I would assume that you guys would want to have that conversation.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I think you're right. All right. So if there's no other questions, I've got a motion to table and a second. All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions? So moved; 71 is tabled. **(VOTE: 7-0-0-0)**

IR 1872 - Amending the 2016 Capital Budget and Program and appropriating funds in connection with Sayville extension (CP 8106)(Co. Exec.). Motion by Legislator Muratore. I'll second the motion. Is there any -- so, Commissioner, what is this? Give us an explanation.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Similar to the other project, this looks to extend connection to Sewer District 3 by constructing a pump station at a key location within Sayville running a force main over to Oakdale to another pump station at a key location, and then connecting over to Sewer District 3 in East Islip.

The capacity of the pump station would be four-and-a-half million gallons total. It would provide for future connection not only to the Sayville and Oakdale business district, but also eventually the residential areas around that pump station. This differs in funding. This is looking for an offset to -- from Capital Project 5538, which is improvements to County Road 13, which is Crooked Hill Road. It's looking to use those funds as an offset to move this design forward.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

As you know, in Kings Park we spent I don't know how much money to double the size of our capacity at our plant. We spent \$2 million for the design to do downtown, and we have nothing. Zero. So should we be taking on something else that we have -- we haven't even finished this? I mean, it would seem to me in terms of economic development and raising revenue that we should finish a project before we start other ones that are taking valuable money away that we could be finishing the ones that we already have.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We have had discussions I believe with Legislator -- Assemblyman -- Senator Croci, his office, and we've been advised that there is transformative money available, that he's looking to try and get into the area. But, again, we're with the situation where we need shovel ready plans and construction done.

LEG. TROTТА:

You have shovel ready plans. There's shovel ready plans in Kings Park.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

I understand what you're saying.

LEG. TROTТА:

I don't think we should be spending money on more design so we just have 15 things ready and nothing being done.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We developed the plans for Kings Park. We're very aware of what it can do.

LEG. TROTТА:

It's been years and years and years and nothing. You know, we have the spot in Kings Park where people, once it's done, they'll start building. They'll start doing, you know, the construction ourselves. We don't need government subsidies after that. Now here's the thing, we're going to start all over again and drain any funds we have in terms of doing that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There's two separate funds and it's two separate projects. We understand Kings Park. In this particular instance we're here to talk about Sayville and the fact that we have the ability to create shovel ready plans and construction document for very possible funding that would be transformative to the Sayville and Oakdale area.

LEG. TROTТА:

I think we should finish one project before we start another one, because all we have is nothing. We spent \$400 million on Wyandanch Rising and they can't rent a store. Meanwhile, I have a project that people are dying to move stores in and we can't get sewers. There's no way I'm going to support something new before we finish what we started.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Stern.

LEG. STERN:

Yeah, thank you. Commissioner, can you tell me about Project 5538, CR 13, and where the money is coming from.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah, 5538 is a project we've been in the process of completing the construction plans. We were very chose. We had looked to have the funds into this year's Capital Program, but since we're not -- we're not likely to go to construction with that project this year because we weren't as far along as we'd like to be, we'd like to use these funds as the offset. We have a guarantee that additional funds will be put back into this next year so that we can complete -- so we can go to construction next year with the CR 13 project, but at this point we thought it best to use for this one.

LEG. STERN:

And, again, just for the record, because the anticipated work is not going to be done within the time, you believe that timing-wise it's best to transfer it out because the money will be replaced and the work ultimately done.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

LEG. STERN:

But there would just be no way that it would be done within the time period that it is allocated for right now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct. We will need the money next year.

LEG. STERN:

All right. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI :

Commissioner, I don't have a, you know, a community comes forward and they're interested in sewerage their community, so I don't have an objection to that, but could you go over the math? Because how exactly -- we've got a total for one project of 12.7 million, and then we've got a total for another project of 49-and-a-half million, and I just wonder where -- what makes up the difference? And it says here that it will be financed -- this is two questions. Where does all the money come from? The second thing is there's -- oh, here it is. The Suffolk County Serial Bonds -- so is it going to be a sewer district at some point that's going to -- that's going to pay for these bonds and the interest like at a regular sewer district, and why does it say Bond Anticipation Notes will finance this project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

These funds -- the proposed funding source would be bonded, general bonded funds, because this isn't a sewer district at the current time. It would become, I believe, an asset of Sewer District 3 once constructed, and then as areas connect in, their connection fees would reimburse the County for the expenses for this construction. So there's that 30-gallon per day -- \$30 per gallon per day fee that everybody pays, the connection fee, so that helps to pay for an offset the cost the County is first instance funding for this work.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

What -- and why does it say the Bond Anticipation Notes would finance this project? That seems unusual, you know, but I mean, it's an option.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Where is that in the RESOLVED?

MR. NOLAN:

The last RESOLVED.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI :

The fifth RESOLVED. Could we ask Budget Review why that's in there?

MR. DOERING:

I'm not really sure why they're proposing BANs. It does initially indicate serial bonds or BANs. The only reason I might think that they're indicating BANs is because they've indicated a five-year duration for this issuance, and typically a BAN can be issued and reviewed, I believe, for a five-year span of time.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI :

Katie, do you have anything to add to that? No? All right, what is the likelihood of this project happening and repaying the four-and-a-half million dollars back?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Again, as I mentioned earlier, we have been advised that there is a large amount of transformative money that the State could potentially put towards a project that was effectively shovel ready, so given that, if that comes to fruition it's something that I think we can see relatively soon. However, I don't -- you know, to answer your question, I don't really have an answer to your question.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Suppose it never happens. Suppose whatever happens in the State they have other priorities, they're going to fund the bus system instead and they decide not to fund this. So a transformative -- another word for it is -- is that transformative, is that the money they have?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

That's what we're told some type of transformative funding. So the project has to be -- transformative.

*(*Laughter*)*

But, yeah, you know, you're absolutely right. I can't speak for the State. I can only say that there is -- we're making an attempt here to do something that could potentially help the Town of Islip as well as the County, you know, bring sewers into another area. It would save a \$40 million cost of trying to run that main interceptor line down. It would essentially allow multiple connections, whether it's the commercial district or some area of -- you know, some residential area. So, yeah, I don't have anything certain that I can say. Yeah, we're going to get funding in three years, I can't say that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Mr. Remick came in with that really good map of the development along the south of the highway there, and -- so wouldn't the plan be to sewer the residential where all your -- you're getting all your input to Great South Bay? I mean, you mentioned the commercial district, but that -- wouldn't it sewer everything?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yes, absolutely, it could sewer everything. But, again, depending on how the town or whether it's private developers say, you know, in the St. John's area come in or if it's the town is able to progress some type of residential sewer project. You know, it doesn't necessarily have to be one large project. It could be multiple smaller ones.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

And where's the town? Why isn't the town in here asking for this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

The town's been involved in the project. Why they're not here I can't answer that.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Legislator Trotta.

LEG. TROTТА:

How many houses have we hooked up in the past five years?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

As far as?

LEG. TROTТА:

For sewers. I mean, it's unrealistic to come in here, you know, given the history of what we've had, to think that we're going to be able to sewer this, these houses down here, without some huge amount of money coming in from somewhere. Okay, like hundreds of millions of dollars. So we have projects that aren't -- you know, you have a lot on your plate. It almost seems like taking this on now until we -- we haven't finished anything. I mean, it's like nothing's getting done because we

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

keep doing more and more studies, studies, plans. Let's hook something up first.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, I think, you know, we have the \$380,000,000 worth of sewer projects that we're doing with the State funding that we, you know, we have to have completed within the next four to five years. So that's a huge -- you know, and that was again the ability that some of these areas --

LEG. TROTТА:

How much of that is hooked up?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, as of right now, none.

LEG. TROTТА:

Exactly.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON

That's going to be design.

LEG. TROTТА:

We have things that are ready to go that we can't get done.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

There's no funding for that either, honestly.

LEG. TROTТА:

Maybe we can move this funding to do that. We need economic revitalization and we're not getting it with this. Spending another \$4 million for a plan that will sit on a shelf for ten years is not the way to do this. We need money now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I disagree. It moves it closer. We have been waiting --

LEG. TROTТА:

In a perfect world with a lot of money I agree with you 100 percent, but there's limited funds and nothing gets done.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

It's getting done. We're starting to move closer and closer.

LEG. TROTТА:

I've been saying that since I have been involved in civic, the sewers, the plan, the plan, we did the plant, ten years, nothing, zero. So I don't think anybody here should support anything until we start getting something done.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Calarco.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Yeah, I would just disagree with that sentiment. I think that we've been moving things along and it really is because this County has been willing to stake the big steps to try to move projects forward. Legislator Browning was a great advocate for the Mastic/Shirley area when nobody thought there would be ever a chance of funding a project down in the neighborhood when we're talking the size of

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

a project that we're going to do in the Shirley area. And yet because of her leadership and pushing to get a map and plan done and get the engineering work started under the County general obligation bonds, because there was no sewer district to charge it to, we were able to capitalize on that when a storm came and now we're going to get a substantial amount of State and Federal money to make that project a reality.

That's not just the Mastic/Shirley. The same goes for the Carlls River area in North Babylon community where Legislator Stern and Legislator D'Amato fought very hard to get engineering money and to get the plans in place. And now that we have the plans in place we were able to capitalize on that and get a substantial amount of money to make those projects happen. And for that matter, because of the leadership down in the Village of Patchogue, who also made sure that they had things in place for when the time came, we were able to get money for the Village of Patchogue.

I think that's the same thing we're looking at here with the Oakdale/Sayville project. We know those communities are hard hit. We know those communities will need to be sewerred. We know it's important for our water quality, we know that it's important for our economic development. This is a small investment that the County can make on the front end to be prepared for when our State leaders are ready to start giving out the money. The reality is, is Albany is probably one of the few places out there right now who does have money and they're going to be looking to give it out. And if our State elected officials who are actively campaigning right now want to try to secure some extra dollars, let's make sure we give them the way to get it to us.

LEG. TROTTA:

Well, to Legislator Browning. How many houses have been hooked up in your district so far? None.

LEG. BROWNING:

We're not hooked up yet.

LEG. TROTTA:

Exactly. The point of the matter is, let's get something done.

LEG. BROWNING:

Hold on. But there is a process that I've been working on for about ten years to get us -- hold on -- to get us shovel ready.

LEG. TROTTA:

You made my point.

LEG. BROWNING:

No, no, no. I haven't made your point. The fact of the matter was there was no money available until a couple of years ago, and that was actually post Superstorm Sandy. So knowing that there was no money available I knew that there was a need to get the process. There was actually about eight years ago Congressmen Bishop called me up and said, *How are you doing with your project? Are you shovel ready?* And I said, *No*, and it was when the ARRA money was available, we weren't shovel ready, we didn't get the money.

So now we have done what's needed to get us to a shovel ready stage which made us eligible for this \$300 million. There is a process that you have to go through. I understand that you've done everything you need to do to be shovel-ready, but -- so that is something that we did not knowing where the money was coming from but thank God it finally came up.

LEG. TROTTA:

Well, it's not there yet.

LEG. BROWNING:

But it will be.

LEG. TROTTA:

Maybe it will be.

LEG. BROWNING:

It absolutely will be. We're in the design stage at this point.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

Gil, where are you with the Mastic/Shirley project right now?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right now we've selected a consultant. We're --

LEG. TROTTA:

Selected a consultant.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, that's where we are. I mean, look. I understand your frustration. We've been scratching and clawing for every cent to extend sewers wherever we could within the County, and it's our intention to complete and build sewers wherever we can for the environmental benefit as well as the economic benefit. So I get what you're saying, but to just stop everything and stop progressing wherever we can I think is a huge mistake. Over the past five years we've seen more movement -- and again, as Legislator Browning says, it's a process.

LEG. TROTTA:

It's like the builder who's building 100 houses but doesn't finish any. You've got to move them forward and sell them.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

You're seeing progress; progress is happening.

LEG. TROTTA:

Progress is not happening. I have been sitting here for ten years watching something. Progress is not happening.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

But ten years ago -- ten years ago nobody would even talk about sewers, okay.

LEG. TROTTA:

Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Until we started talking about the economic benefit of sewers.

LEG. TROTTA:

I have had a finished design for years, years, sitting there waiting.

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

But there was no funding. So put funding in.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

You have a great Senator who represents your district up there. Maybe he can pull you some State money back.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. So I have one more question, Commissioner, on the funding. You said that with the County Serial Bonds that when the sewer district is formed where they join the Southwest Sewer District, the County gets reimbursed.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I believe so, yes.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So what about -- is it the same with the Bond Anticipation Notes?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Yeah.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I just want to make sure that -- it says and/or Bond Anticipation Notes, and I want to make sure there's no like way of saying no, we used Bond Anticipation Notes, the sewer district doesn't have to reimbursement that at all ever.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

They will.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

I just want to make sure that that is going to be guaranteed reimbursable.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

They will.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay, thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

Al, I did have a question.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Browning has one very short question.

LEG. BROWNING:

Very short. 5538; how much money is in that? Because I think that's my favorite project (*laughter*).

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I think there was 8 million or 8.5 million.

LEG. BROWNING:

Say again?

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I thought the original, under the Capital Project 5538, which is 13, is that County Road 13?

LEG. BROWNING:

Yeah, that was Crooked Hill Road around Pilgrim State.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I think it was an eight or an eight-and-a-half million dollar project.

LEG. BROWNING:

I remember quite a few years ago, and that's when Legislator Horsley was here, it was a \$3 million project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Right.

LEG. BROWNING:

And transformed into a \$20 million project.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

If you look at the third RESOLVED, if I put on my glasses and I look, it says we have \$10 million in construction.

LEG. BROWNING:

That was --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Oh, wait.

LEG. BROWNING:

I know that dates back when it was a \$3 million project and ballooned.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I seem to recall it being 8.5 million or 8 million.

LEG. BROWNING:

So, Rob, you want to talk about an offset? You've got an offset. And so I -- 5538 is not a project I support and I think, you know, the Sayville/Oakdale area because of this, that's something we need to be moving. So I can support this because we need to make sure that those south shore communities are getting taken care of. And being that you're heading from the Ronkonkoma Hub and heading south, I will still stand with the position that that sewage treatment plant should have been built on that County property up by the Ronkonkoma Hub, however, the way things have gone I don't want to delay what's going on. So I'll support this.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

All right. So we have a motion to approve and a second.

MR. RICHBERG:

No, we don't.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Oh, I thought we had a motion.

D.P.O. CALARCO:

I'll make a motion.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. Legislator Calarco and Legislator Browning; motion and a second.
All in favor? Opposed? Abstentions?

LEG. TROTТА:

Opposed.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Abstentions? So moved. *(VOTE: 6-1-0-0 - Opposed: Legislator Trotta)*. All right.

LEG. TROTТА:

I just have a question for the Commissioner.

LEG. BROWNING:

I do, too.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Oh, no, we're going to get to the busing. We have one more resolution. No, we're done with the resolutions. I'm sorry. And we do have questions about the busing.

LEG. TROTТА:

Mine is not about busing. Just, Gil, when that red light camera thing came out last year in December for 2014, there was intersections in my district that experienced over 100% increase and you said that you were going to do a study into those to find out what went wrong. So from what I'm hearing the accidents are still up, that we have these cameras that are supposed to be safety issues, and the accidents increased over 100%. In one case I think 183%. I was wondering what the status is.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I will look into it and I'll get back to you.

LEG. TROTТА:

It's been a year.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I understand. It was a big -- if I remember right, it was a big ask. It wasn't just --

LEG. TROTТА:

You know, it was over a year -- coming up on a year ago.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I understand.

LEG. TROTТА:

People are getting in accidents at a rate of 100% more.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Well, I mean, you're talking -- it's a handful -- I believe the number --

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

LEG. TROTТА:

It was 44, the increase. So, it's an issue. There's people getting in accidents in intersections where they're supposed to be for safety and clearly it's not. So will they take them down, are you going to take them down? Are we going to move them?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I don't have those answers on me. I will get them for you.

LEG. TROTТА:

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay. And then, Commissioner, if you could. We had two public hearings about the buses. There were a number of suggestions made. I was at one of the hearings, one of my staffers was at the other one here in Hauppauge. Do you have anything to share with us based on what you heard or based on anything else as far as the routes go and the ridership?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

We listened to everything that was said. From a departmental standpoint we were directed to come up with savings that attributed to \$4 million a year. At the current time we are going to stand with the ten routes that are being eliminated at this time, because we looked at -- you know, when we started looking at any type of realignment there's a cost associated with it, and that cost could run anywhere up to probably between two to two-and-a-half million dollars when you start looking at all the asks that were out there. There was a handful of asks that were -- you know, and similar to the previous discussion, you know, the folks who do transportation, this is what they do. This is what they live for. They like what they do. They're not looking to do cuts, but were directed to do cuts. So, in our opinion, we're moving forward with the termination of the ten routes for this year under the Capital Program. I can list the routes if you want, but I believe they're on our website.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

The most frequently asked question we get is -- and I asked you this last year at budget time, almost a year ago, I said well -- because then it was proposed ten million that was going to be cut. I said, *Well, which routes are going to be cut?* So the most frequently asked question we get is why do they find out about it now instead of like a month ago or two months ago or three months ago when people could have made more of an adjustment.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

To be frank, we looked at, and we were hoping that certain savings such as fuel savings, would be sufficient to carry us through the year. We became -- we started realizing that we wouldn't be able to do this a few months ago, and that's when we started saying we had to start making a decision and we developed the plan that we did. By the time we, you know, initiated the hearing process it just came out that -- you know, originally we tried to do it in September, but with the public hearing process, and maybe we got off the dime late, I don't know, but, you know, we're making the cuts now. They will be initiated I believe October 10th.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

And there is some other planning process taking place now reviewing routes?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

No, not any longer. We looked at it briefly. We looked at it to see what we could potentially do, but when you start looking at costs, you know, it just -- you're looking in the order of magnitude of about two, two-and-a-half million dollars.

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

Will there be layoffs?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I can't answer that. I don't know.

LEG. FLEMING:

Well, you're cutting out a bunch of routes. What happens to those drivers?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

I would assume that they would either start having to drive on the school bus routes or there may be some termination.

LEG. FLEMING:

I prefer a clearer answer. I'm not criticizing you in any way, but I see Garry is coming up.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Understood.

MR. LENBERGER:

From what I understand from talking to the bus contractors, what would happen is there would be a progression downward whereas a fixed route bus driver would be -- if they were the low man, so to speak, they would go down to the Paratransit Division, and then the Paratransit Division, and I'm not 100% sure on that because there are different unions involved at the private contractors, that they would go to school buses after that. But there could be quite definitely some layoffs associated with that.

LEG. FLEMING:

And have the costs associated with these reassignments and any potential Department of Transportation, Department of Labor proceedings that have to happen in order to do that, have those costs been factored into the \$4 million savings?

MR. LENBERGER:

No.

LEG. FLEMING:

And what about STOA funding? The reduction of mileage is going to affect the STOA formulation, the STOA -- what do you call that? Calculation.

MR. LENBERGER:

Not necessarily. A few years ago, just to give you an example, when the State was undergoing budget arrest the County was actually increasing its mileage by adding Sunday service as a result of resolutions here in the County, and we added additional service in the evening and in the morning and we increased our revenue miles by three to four million miles and our STOA went down -- or I'm sorry, remained neutral. And Nassau County was reducing their mileage by a similar amount in the opposite direction and they were getting the same amount that we were as far as on a percentage allocation.

LEG. FLEMING:

Okay, so you're saying not necessarily.

MR. LENBERGER:

Right.

LEG. FLEMING:

But this is -- you're basically assuming that you're not going to lose any of that funding after you're cutting significant mileage off the network.

MR. LENBERGER:

I can only assume that at this point.

LEG. FLEMING:

I would think assumptions are dangerous to make when you're claiming a four million dollar savings, when you're directly affecting people's whose lives, whose way of life depends upon this method of transportation. In my district, southwest portion of Southampton Town, those folks will have no, zero access to public transportation, none, unless they qualify for SCAT. So I think this is a very significant concern, and if you're not certain of the savings that you're claiming, I just am coming up with two off the top of my head where there very well may be additional costs to the County that are not going to allow you to realize those savings. How can we move forward with this?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

As I mentioned earlier, we were directed to make savings, you know, come up with savings with a magnitude of \$4 million over a year. You know, because we were able to realize savings from gas prices we didn't have to initiate it as early in the year, but it was something that was worked in through the budget. You know, it's not something -- and I understand where you're coming from. Again, Garry, he's been in transportation 40 years. It's not something we're doing lightly. This is something that we, you know, we have to do.

LEG. FLEMING:

I appreciate that, but here's my concern. It was not at the end of the Legislative session when this last minute attempt to get MTA funds didn't work that we knew we were in trouble. That \$82 a person cost was there a year ago, two years ago most likely, and yet my understanding is that the East End operator was never included in a discussion of reconfiguration of these routes until I asked that he be included. Now the horse is out of the barn, the door is closed and that \$90 is going to get cut when it is the only method of transportation for folks who don't have a car in the southern part of Southampton Town running from Moriches all the way over -- through Quoque.

MR. LENBERGER:

With all respect, we had Hampton Jitney in, which is the subcontractor operator of Twin Forks back in March. We had them in for some other meetings, and this was brought up in discussions with them and we did ask them to present a layout for us, which they only recently provided about two weeks ago.

LEG. FLEMING:

I have a completely different version of that I'm sorry to say, but at any rate this is -- this is something that I think we need to be extremely concerned about.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Legislator Browning.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay, so, again, I look at it and I say okay, you have a west end bus that has a ridership of, I don't have the chart in front of me right now but I remember looking at the buses that you planned to keep and the ones that are going to be eliminated. And the 71 I believe it was had something like

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

159 ridership, and some of the west end ones had ridership of like 22, 23. Am I correct? Right. I'm getting a nod from the back of the room. But -- so when you want to look at cutting, and I don't want to see anybody being cut, but you're looking at a ridership of 159 people versus 20 plus people. And the only reason that I understand that that was cut is because it costs more per person per ride than it does on the west end. And like Legislator Fleming, we feel like the East End, and I can consider myself an East End, the East End people are being discriminated against because of the distance it takes -- it's further to get from point A to point B. And the 71, which is a critical bus for the people in my district to get to Stony Brook, to get to the Town Hall, you know, it's a route that is widely used and very much needed. That just because it costs more per rider, you know, per day, it's getting cut, but you have so many people more impacted than a west end bus with 20 plus people.

So it just seems like it's really, really unfair to them. It's going to have a terrible impact and, you know, I spoke with some people in my district who are saying they're going to start applying for SCAT. Marilyn Tucci who comes, she said she met people at Social Services. They're going to go to the doctors and get medical notes to say that they're disabled so they're eligible for SCAT. So what's that going to do to our SCAT costs?

There's something more that we need to be doing and, again, when I have residents who are telling me that they're not going to be able to get to work -- one that she told me about, you know, works at Target and takes a bus to get to Target. Now, I'm sure she's not overly paid. She's going to lose her job in Target. I have the people in the industrial site who could potentially lose their jobs because they can't get to work. So now they're going to go on Social Services. So while you think you're saving money here, it's going to cost you over here, because don't forget, Safety Net is out of control and it's costing us a fortune. So, you know, it's kind of like you're cutting off your nose to spite your face.

I'm not blaming you, Garry. I know you've tried, but the fact -- and you were given a number and that's what you have to work with. But when we start to hear from our constituents and the impact it's going to be on them, and then we look at what the cost is going to be when they tell us, well, this is my alternative, I'm going to start signing up for SCAT. So I'm curious to see what's going to happen with SCAT. I know that Debbie Hagan had mentioned that in Nassau County when they made some cuts within six months they came back and said no, we got to restore it because they noticed the impact in less than six months.

I know I've asked you about, you know, the transportation. You said, you know, with the RFP that's gone out looking at the routes, I don't remember if you mentioned -- now the rides that are now going to be eliminated, you can't include them in that study, correct, when that study is being done?

MR. LENBERGER:

The study will encompass the entire County because we're a designated recipient of the FTA, so we have to cover the entire region, so that will be accommodated as well.

LEG. BROWNING:

And another thing is I know that Suffolk Transportation, Debbie had mentioned that, you know, Suffolk Transportation had come up with some ideas to help with efficiency. What did you guys do with that?

MR. LENBERGER:

Every route modification included a cost and the modifications would have increased the amount of our Operating Budget and we still had to keep it at that designated amount, so we could not implement those modifications.

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. If we were to try and keep everything in check right now, I see it was October 3rd, now it's October 10th.

MR. LENBERGER:

October 10th.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. From October 10th until the end of the year, how much money does it take to keep it in place, to keep everything in place as it is right now?

MR. LENBERGER:

Roughly a million dollars.

LEG. BROWNING:

Pay-as-you-go sound good? So -- okay, a million dollars.

MR. LENBERGER:

Yeah, \$995,504.

LEG. BROWNING:

Think we can find some money? How much for next year's budget?

MR. LENBERGER:

Multiply it by four. You're talking roughly 4 million.

LEG. BROWNING:

Four million.

MR. LENBERGER:

And we do have a, as Gil just mentioned, there is a 3% COLA index tied to the contract which is based on Federal data provided to -- well, from the United States government so that that COLA index will be also added to those contracts.

LEG. BROWNING:

And the other thing is, granted I'm talking about the 71, when you're looking at the ridership, rather than totally eliminate some of these runs to try and take a look at some of them and say okay, you know, between six and nine, that's when the ridership is needed most, that's when that bus needs to be online the most, and let's say between ten three there's really not much of a ridership. Could we not look at trying to at least provide a service so people can get to work and get home from work?

MR. LENBERGER:

Regarding the 71, there is various alternative routes that you can take to get to Suffolk Community College and to Stony Brook and Smith Haven Mall and various other locations. The problem with doing something like that is when you cut out mid-day routes you have to be very careful in doing it because you have people that work part-time jobs, people that are shopping. A lot of the major business districts are shopping areas. There's people that are going shopping for maybe three hours at a time, some people work part-time, they have to get home to their children at say three o'clock or two o'clock, and you can't necessarily just cut those routes out and those people would not even be able to utilize --

LEG. BROWNING:

The 71 is getting cut period anyway, so at least trying to accommodate somebody rather than

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

nobody. That's the way I see it.

MR. LENBERGER:

Again, if we started dissecting that route I think we'd lose a lot more ridership and then we'd have to look at alternative routes and possibly others because that is a very expensive route to operate.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So I've talked about the students in my district that go to Stony Brook. There was a press conference and I contacted them and I said do you want to go to the press conference, and his class, he had a ten o'clock class. So I'm just curious, if the 71 doesn't exist and he lives in Mastic, what bus would he take from Mastic to get to Stony Brook before ten o'clock? So what buses would he take, because from what I can see, there would really be no buses for him to take, out of Mastic anyway.

MR. LENBERGER:

We did manage to do one adjustment on the S66 and we added an additional run in the morning. The 66 turns into the 61 and then he can take that up to Stony Brook. So a student that would have to get there by eight o'clock should be able to make that. And that was a net neutral adjustment.

LEG. BROWNING:

So if he wants to get to class by 10 o'clock?

MR. LENBERGER:

Yes.

LEG. BROWNING:

He would have to leave to get the first bus at what time?

MR. LENBERGER:

Pretty much a similar -- I don't have the schedule in front of me, I apologize. But if you'd like you can call our office; please do.

LEG. BROWNING:

No, I'm curious, because he was telling me the 71 can get him there in about 45 minutes, which is pretty good.

MR. LENBERGER:

Yeah, it is. It's going to take a little bit longer, but he should be able to even make an earlier class if he'd like. Please have him call our office and I would be glad to speak to him.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. I can do that.

MR. LENBERGER:

Can I have his name?

LEG. BROWNING:

Chris. His first name is Chris. I'll give it to you afterwards.

MR. LENBERGER:

Okay. Thank you.

LEG. BROWNING:

Okay. So we need a million dollars to keep it all running. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thanks. I have one question, too, sorry. So 2009 there was a {Chiwani} report that I believe recommended cutting some of these routes as a cost savings measure. What happened in 2009? Why were those decisions never made? Why were the routes either cut or not adjusted then?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Everybody I believe in the Legislature at the time was given a copy of the report or it was e-mailed to the Legislature. At that time, anything as a tax -- I mean as a route cut or even in a fare increase was completely, any time it was discussed, was completely shutdown, so.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

So now here we are today.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON:

Correct.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Thank you. Legislator Fleming.

LEG. FLEMING:

Two questions.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

A very brief question.

LEG. FLEMING:

Two brief questions. I think it's briefer than I would like it to be, actually. With regard to the S90 and an alternative for anybody who's trying to get somewhere in the southwest part of Southampton Town, what's the alternative?

MR. LENBERGER:

That route is going to be eliminated, so there's going to be no connection at that area from Westhampton.

LEG. FLEMING:

And one of the speakers talked about flex ride, so -- because I agree with Kate, you know. You're going to have SCAT ridership go way up. Those are additional costs that you're going to see.

MR. LENBERGER:

The only thing I can mention about SCAT is that you have to be certified as disabled by a doctor. That's not something that you can take lightly. It's not where, you know, because you're 80 years old or whatever your situation is that you could just have a doctor fraudulently say that you're disabled.

CHAIRPERSON KRUPSKI:

My question was flex ride, Garry. Is there any possibility that folks who now are going to have absolutely no way without their own private transportation to get to and from work or to their kids or whatever it is they need to do, is there anything that we can do for them along the lines of a SCAT that doesn't require disability? A point to point service.

9/26/16 Public Works, Transportation & Energy Committee

MR. LENBERGER:

Not at this time.

CHAIRMAN KRUPSKI:

Okay, thank you. We have no further business. We are adjourned.

*(*The meeting was adjourned at 3:57 P.M. *)*

{ } Denotes spelled phonetically